



Trajectory of Curiosity towards Historical Figures in Primary and Secondary Schools and a Study on Historical Curiosity

Adnan Altun ¹

Abstract

When the studies on literature are reviewed, it appears that there are basically two types of curiosity; perceptual curiosity and epistemic curiosity. While perceptual curiosity is generally activated by extraordinary situations, events, factors or developments affecting sense organs such as hearing, seeing, tasting and feeling the heat, epistemic curiosity emerges in various degrees depending on individual and new information obtained by or delivered to that individual. The fact that epistemic curiosity emerges mainly from information brings the following question into the mind: *If the curiosity emerges from information, then, can we speak of different curiosity types specific to different types of information or discipline? For example, can there be a different type of curiosity specific to the discipline of history?* The present study stemming from this hypothesis aims at reaching a meaningful pattern through analysing the reasons or motives of curiosities of participants towards historical figures, events, times and places. To this end, grounded theory process was chosen out of qualitative research methods. In this study, it is focused on the curiosities of primary and secondary school students towards historical figures as a part of afore-mentioned grounded theory process. As it is intended to generate a theory regarding historical curiosity, grounded theory method was preferred. In this study that can be seen as the fourth phase of "theory generating process", the processes of "collecting data", "analysing the collected data" and "generating a new theory" are carried on simultaneously. The sample group consists of 606 primary and secondary school students. The data collected by means of this study that was conducted by "face-to-face interview method" is analysed through continuous comparative analysis method and the study is supported with theoretical notes. The figures most wondered by the students appear to be the historical ones and those serving in the army, with Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and Fâtiḥ Sultan Mehmet occupying the first places. Besides, according to the findings of the study, the reasons of curiosities can be summarized as follows: *"Historical importance, extraordinariness, personal qualifications, truth, empathy, sympathy, influence of media, insufficient information, environmental effect and antipathy"*. Based on these findings, it was reached to the following

Keywords

Historical curiosity
Primary and secondary
school students
Curiosity trajectory
Historical figures
Curiosity types

Article Info

Received: 09.22.2016
Accepted: 08.07.2017
Online Published: 03.01.2018

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2018.4210

¹ Abant İzzet Baysal University, Faculty of Education, Department of Elementary Education, Turkey, aaltun@ibu.edu.tr

classification in connection with historical curiosity: “*Important curiosity, extraordinary curiosity, experimental curiosity, emotional curiosity, dilemmatic curiosity and environmental curiosity*”. It is expected that this classification that appeared as one of the most important findings of the present study will contribute to history-teaching, mainly in the fields of writing textbooks and “teaching-approaches” of the teachers.

Introduction

In our daily language, curiosity mainly means “desire to understand or learn something; desire to acquire, do, engage in or deal with something; fondness, keenness, affection, addiction, eagerness” (Türk Dil Kurumu [TDK], 2016). The word “Curiosity” is generally used as synonym of the word “interest”. It can also be claimed that “curiosity” is an instantaneous state and that “interest” is a lasting state arising after curiosity.

The first theoreticians studying on curiosity deemed curiosity as a basic “drive” (Jirout & Klahr, 2011) and the studies on it over the course of the preceding century were mostly carried out together with educational psychology in an entwined manner (Kölbl & Straub, 2001). As the time went by, the studies made in the fields such as seeking and collecting information, learning, motivation, intelligence and memory (Engel & Randall, 2009; Kang et al., 2009; Koo & Choi, 2010; Litman, 2008; Loewenstein, 1994; Lowry & Johnson, 1981) defined the curiosity with different terms or concepts (as cited in Eren, 2011, p. 164):

- Epistemic (Berlyne, 1954; Litman, Hutchins, & Russon, 2005),
- Interpersonal (Litman & Pezzo, 2007),
- Social (Renner, 2006; as cited in Eren, 2011, p. 164),
- Perceptual (Collins, Litman, & Spielberger, 2004; Loewenstein, 1994),
- Sensory (Litman, Collins, & Spielberger, 2005),
- State and trait (Spielberger & Reheiser, 2009; as cited in Acun, Kapıkıran, & Kabasakal, 2013).

Although there are various approaches regarding curiosity, almost all of them share some common points. The most common point all of the curiosity theories agree on is that the curiosity is an approach-oriented motivational state associated with exploration (Kashdan & Silvia, 2009). Loewenstein (1994) suggests that in spite of the fact that there are apparent disputes over the definition of curiosity, there is also a common understanding about it, and he summarizes this consensus under three headings (Loewenstein, 1994).

The first consensus or common understanding is that curiosity, by its very nature, is considered as a desire with the motivation of acquiring information. The fact that Aristo associated man’s interest in science to intrinsic reasons and that he stated that this interest had nothing to do with any pragmatic-end may constitute a good example of this common understanding. Or, Cicero’s definition of curiosity as “a passion of acquiring and learning information without having a pragmatic-purpose, that exists in the nature of man” can also be given as another example of this consensus.

Secondly, curiosity is seen as “a long-standing passion with motivational density”. Hume (1888) explains this distinction in a clearer way and defines the curiosity as an inconsistent attitude expressing opponent feelings. While one of this opponent feelings is a good kind of curiosity known or called as “passion for information”, the other is a bad kind of curiosity known or called as “passion deriving from a quite different principle”. Again, while good curiosity is exemplified with “scientific questioning”, bad or evil curiosity is exemplified with “man’s insatiable passion towards learning his neighbours’ behaviours and living conditions”.

Thirdly, the concept of curiosity is considered as “appetizing”. Bantham’s (1789) using the clause “appetite of curiosity” in his book or Burke’s (1757) definition of curiosity as “a very strong passion” may constitute good examples of this definition.

There are various theories shown as reference-point in many studies carried out in the field of curiosity. These theories are summarised in the following table (Rowson, Young, Spencer, Lindley, & Gecius, 2012).

Table 1. Curiosity Theories

Theory	Explanation	Theoretician
Drive	Curiosity is a human drive just like hunger.	Berlyne
Incongruity	Curiosity is evoked by incongruity between something (an event, object, etc.) and a person’s existing world-view	Hebb, Piaget, Hunt
Gap	Curiosity arises when someone becomes aware of a gap between his or her existing set of information and some other desired information	Loewenstein
Tactile	Curiosity arises from physical engagement with things that we believe we might change	Sennett, Crawford, Heidegger

Leaving aside the various discussions and interpretations in connection with this matter, curiosity, in recent years, is defined as the passion for acquiring a new affective-experience along with acquiring a new information that will widely prompt the exploratory behaviour (Litman & Spielberger, 2003). If it is focused on this definition, it will be seen that curiosity has two dimensions: “*perceptual curiosity*” and “*scientific or epistemic curiosity*”. William James (1890), one of the vanguards of researchers studying on curiosity, states that curiosity has two main dimensions. The first dimension is *the metaphysical wonder* involving in sensation and anxiety that were felt when something new was observed. And the second dimension is scientific curiosity essentially involving in more specific kinds of information. Similarly, Berlyne (1954) also asserts that one of these dimensions is “*perceptual curiosity*”, considered as a drive or thought which is evoked by a new situation and decreases when it was uncovered. And the second is “*epistemic curiosity*”, defined as “a passion for acquiring information” (as cited in Jirout & Klahr, 2011). Compared to other curiosity types, epistemic curiosity attracts more attention in educational or academic environments as it constitutes one of the most important factors of “concern”, “motivation” and “success” of the students trying to acquire information (Eren, 2009, 2011). Epistemic curiosity;

- has much to do with the passion for learning “more and more” or with the strong desire for acquiring information on some matters or persons,
- is, by its very nature, more cognitional than perceptual curiosity, and
- is relevant to the “thinking” deriving mainly from experience.

Some researchers concentrating on curiosity dwelled upon subtypes of epistemic curiosity. Berlyne claims that the second type of curiosity, called by him as epistemic curiosity, has two dimensions, namely “specific curiosity” and “diversive curiosity”. While specific curiosity is defined as the desire for inquiring about a piece of specific information, diversive curiosity means a general behaviour of “inquiring” and “examining” mainly originating from the feeling of embarrassment. Whereas diversive curiosity is generally observed at our daily pastime activities such as plays, games, entertainments, amusements, funs, specific curiosity is explained as “a curiosity drive” directed towards a specific matter or point” (Loewenstein, 1994; as cited in Demirel & Coşkun, 2009). Epistemic-diversive curiosity is a kind of desire or passion aiming at getting information with a view to discovering or disclosing the facts. The behaviour observed when somebody surfs on TV channels in Sunday afternoons or when he is engrossed in various thoughts or matters constitutes a good example of this type of curiosity. Epistemic-specific curiosity is also a desire or passion aiming at getting information. However, it tends or endeavour directly to get the answer of a specific question. This can be a curiosity

forcing us to solve a Sudoku puzzle or a curiosity motivating a doctoral student to finish his thesis (Rowson et al., 2012; as cited in Eren, 2011). Leslie (2015), too, draws attention to these two dimensions of curiosity. One of these dimensions urges us to pick up a stone or roll it to see the thing underneath it, to shuffle the cabinets, cupboards and wardrobes, or to click on internet sites and pages, while the other dimension diverts us to our fields of interest such as finishing a voluminous novel, deeply indulging in reading articles or texts or watching video recordings about cars, or learning a new foreign language. In other words, the desire for learning the thing behind a mountain is “diversive curiosity” and the desire for acquiring the information that would help us to survive when we reach there is “epistemic curiosity”. Litman (2010) also makes mention of two different kinds of epistemic curiosity. First of them (I type) involves in acquiring information expected to trigger positive emotions regarding curiosity or interest, while the second (D type) has something to do with decreasing unwanted situations or conditions regarding deprivation of information. I type curiosity takes action when individuals face with the opportunities of discovering or uncovering things that are completely new or unknown by them, while D type curiosity is stimulated when individuals do not have the information they are very keen to include in their mines of information.

This study focuses on epistemic/scientific curiosity and specific curiosity which is a dimension of epistemic /scientific curiosity. To be more specific, it concentrates on historical curiosities, which is a special and attractive field of interest for primary and secondary school students.

Historical Curiosity

If you happen to browse through the literature on history education, it will be noticed that there is no study aiming directly at historical curiosity, other than those (Altun, 2014a, 2014b; Canlı & Altun, 2014) published in respect of “grounded theory research”, of which this study is a part. However, some indirect references or attributions appear in the studies about historical importance, historical understanding, historical consciousness and teaching with documents. When it is looked through these studies, the following three points draw attention: The first attention-drawing point that stands out is the factors having effect upon historical curiosity. First of all it should be kept in mind that a great deal of studies in history education reveal that information factor has an important and effective role in the development of individual’s perceptions and thoughts of history (Dilek, 2000). Grant (2001) also asserts that historical understanding is affected by individual’s foreknowledge and experiences. It is emphasized that social environments of the students constitute an important factor in this point (Barton & McCully, 2005). Emphasize is also put on the fact that especially parents, family members and close relatives play a very important role in the increase or improvement of students’ interests in history (Barton, 2001, 2008). Similarly, discussions on history that take place among family members and close relatives have also an influence in the formation of historical curiosity (Lévesque, 2003). Other two factors having an influence in the emergence of historical curiosity are “written and electronic media such as television, movies, commercial books and internet” and “the contents of these media tools” (Dimitriadis, 2000; Grant, 2001; Lévesque, 2003; Barton, 2008). Visits to museums and historical places, and encountering with various historical objects inside or outside home also increase historical curiosity (Barton, 2008; Reio, 2008). Lévesque (2003) suggests that actions or activities of the governments, propagandas and sermons may also have some sort of effect on the construction of historical curiosity. To sum up, in the light of the outcomes of this study it can be alleged that personal, social, popular, pedagogic and religious factors have important roles in the emergence of historical curiosity. Alongside with these factors, it should also be kept in mind that curiosity is at the same time “context-sensitive” (Reio, 2008). Its being context-sensitive is closely related with the epistemic dimension of curiosity and is main reason of the use of the term “historical curiosity”. When looked through the literature, it will be seen that the second attention-drawing point is also related with this matter, that is, with the historical subjects being wondered. History educators propound that students are highly interested in socio-cultural aspects or topics of the history (Levstik & Groth, 2002; Yeager & Terzian, 2007). It is also stated that when studying on social and political matters, students take interest especially in the average men and the influences of the events over them (Barton, 2008; Levstik, 2011). In the literature, it is also mentioned that students show more interest to the negative and conflicting aspects of the history, to the subjects involving emotions, morals and personal convictions and, above all, to the subjects that are

considered to have happened under extra-ordinary conditions (Levstik, 2000; Barton, 2008). It is also observed that events that can be described as unusual, strange and interesting and the effects of these events on human lives are also wondered by the students (Kohlmeier, 2005; Reio, 2008; Levstik, 2011). The interest felt about the history of the family or the place where people live may constitute evidences of the interest of the students towards local history (Kölbl & Straub, 2001). It is argued that especially secondary school students take more interest in the subjects of contemporary history, or in other words in recent history (Lévesque, 2003; Barton & McCully, 2005; Barton, 2008). Finally, it is claimed that the interests of the students tend to increase when the otherness is being discussed and the otherness turns to be foreigner (Kölbl & Straub, 2001).

The third and the last attention-drawing point in the literature covers the suggestions on what can be done to revive the historical curiosity in class. Farmer & Knight (1995; as cited in Yıldız, 2003) states that history does not only consist of hard and complicated subjects, it has also a good deal of clear and interesting topics, and that it is advantageous to study in groups on interesting or attention drawing topics. Especially the studies asserting that original sources or first-hand information evoke curiosity in the students (Barton, 2005; Doğan, 2006; Reio, 2008) are striking. Barton (2005, p. 1420) claims that original historical sources may also stimulate students' historical curiosities just as extra-ordinary events that provoke curiosity in science education. Science teachers make use of physical demonstrations such as "fall of objects with different weights at the same speed" in order to arouse interest and curiosity and to cause perceptual discrepancy. Also in history, original sources serve the same purpose. Bewildering and extra-ordinary sources such as man-made physical objects, visual images or written texts often pave the way for many questions. For example, primary school students exploring for the first time some household goods belonging to the 19th Century may wonder what they are used for. As for Levstik (2011), commercial history books and non-textual sources (visual images and historical artefacts) also draw students' attention. Another factor that can be used to revive students' historical curiosity is to refer to anecdotes. Evans (1989, 1994; as cited in Brophy & VanSledright, 1997, pp. 67-68), too, states that story-telling stirs up interests of students in historical studies or cause them to study history. This view is also supported by the remarks concerning effect of stories and story-telling for children, stated both in Andraess' (1939) study about classification of children's perception of history in the sections explaining the stages which they name "story epoch" and "Robinson epoch", and in Egan's (2010) study about types of perception of history of children in the sections explaining "mythical perception" and "romantic perception". On the other hand, there are also other studies concluding that stories may excite some students, but only stories or history teaching through story-telling will not be sufficient to increase students' interests toward history (Grant, 2001). Kohlmeier (2005, p. 11) says that many of his students consider the history as a sum of "interesting" realities perfectly placed inside the narration of world's single and unchanging past.

Literature on curiosity also points out that curiosity is both affective and epistemic. Epistemic curiosity and specific curiosity, that is one of the two sub-dimensions of epistemic curiosity, bring to mind the fact that, as a different field of information, there can also be a type of curiosity towards history, and that this curiosity may presents a specific structure. With reference to this perspective, it can be alleged that different information structures or disciplines may cause the emergence of different types of curiosity behaviours. *So, when the history is in question, how does the curiosity appear? What kind of reasons or motives stay behind this curiosity that can be called as historical curiosity? How does historical curiosity show up during primary and secondary education?, and what kind of changes will it be exposed to during the following years?* During the present comprehensive (grounded) theory research process, of which this study is a part, it is being sought after the answer of the following question: *"What kind of pattern appear in connection with historical curiosity?"* or, in other words *"How can historical curiosity be classified?"*

In their study on historical importance, Yeager and Terzian (2007) attempted to answer the question of how historical curiosity or interest can be classified, and separated it into two groups as "in-class interest" and "out of class interest". However, it can be claimed that this classification is not only special to history-education, and that it can be generalized for all fields of education just as "in-class science curiosity" and "out of class science curiosity" and therefore, it can be said that they fell short in the classification of historical curiosity in a proper and accurate way. In the present study, efforts and

attempts to classify historical importance are continued by focusing on a different sample as a continuation of previous studies (Altun, 2014a, 2014b; Canlı & Altun, 2014) concentrating on the sample at the level of bachelor degree and carried out in a voluminous research process and based on grounded theory. The first study done by Altun (2014a) focuses on teacher candidates and examines the points they wonder about historical figures, events, places and periods, and the reasons why they wonder them. At the end of the study, curiosity reasons are summarized as follows: *“Historical importance, extraordinariness, personal qualifications, truth, empathy, sympathy, influence of media, insufficient information, environmental effect and antipathy”*. Based on these reasons or by taking these findings into consideration, it was reached to a new classification on historical curiosity. A similar pattern emerged also in Altun’s study (2014b) examining historical curiosities of primary and secondary school students. Although there are slight changes in the classification-headings in the previous and present studies, and in the present one a new curiosity-type denominated as *“social curiosity”* is added into the pattern, they are more or less the same. Again, the same pattern appeared in a study done by Canlı and Altun (2014) and focusing on historical curiosities of candidate-teachers of social studies.

Table 2. Studies Endeavouring to Classify Historical Curiosity

Altun (2014a)	Altun (2014b)	Canlı & Altun (2014)	This study
• Important curiosity	• Important curiosity	• Important curiosity	• Important curiosity
• Extraordinary curiosity	• Extraordinary curiosity	• Extraordinary	• Extraordinary
• Emotional curiosity	• Emotional curiosity	curiosity	curiosity
○ Empathetic curiosity	○ Empathetic curiosity	• Emotional curiosity	• Experimental curiosity
○ Sympathetic curiosity	○ Sympathetic curiosity	○ Empathetic	• Emotional curiosity
○ Antipathetic curiosity	○ Antipathetic curiosity	curiosity	○ Empathetic curiosity
• Factual curiosity	• Factual curiosity	○ Sympathetic	○ Sympathetic
○ Dilemmatic curiosity	○ Dilemmatic curiosity	curiosity	curiosity
○ Curiosity emerging	○ Ignorant curiosity	○ Antipathetic	○ Antipathetic
from the need of	• Environmental curiosity	curiosity	curiosity
information	○ Popular curiosity	• Factual curiosity	• Dilemmatic curiosity
• Environmental curiosity	○ Social curiosity	○ Dilemmatic	• Environmental
• Popular curiosity		curiosity	curiosity
		○ Ignorant curiosity	○ Popular curiosity
		• Environmental	○ Social curiosity
		curiosity	
		○ Popular curiosity	
		○ Social curiosity	

In the present study that is a part of a grounded theory process, it is endeavoured to answer the question of *“how can historical curiosity be classified?”* based on the subject group’s curiosities towards historical figures. The most important factor urging the researcher to decide to focus on historical figures is the fact that there was a good deal of data obtained during the course of the study on the curiosities of the students participating in the sample group towards historical figures as compared with historical events, epochs and places. The researcher was also motivated by various studies carried out about *“the effects of historical figures on history teaching”* (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Şimşek, 2006; Er, 2010). Consequently, the study questions were decided to be as follows:

- What historical figures are wondered the most by primary and secondary school students?
- How do the curiosities of children towards historical figures evolve through the first grade in the primary school and the last grade in the secondary school (8 years in total)? Or, in other words what is the trajectory of historical curiosity?
- How can the historical curiosity be classified if the reasons leading primary and secondary school students to be curious about historical figures are taken into consideration?

Method

The present study is carried out as a part of a comprehensive “grounded theory research” being conducted in order to find an answer to the questions “*If the curiosity emerges from the information, then, do the different information patterns cause the emergence of different curiosity types? Or, in other words, does the information on history cause the emergence of different forms of curiosity on history?*” Theory construction, known also as grounded theory (Merriam, 2013, p. 29), is a research method created by Glaser and Strauss (1967) with a view to breathing a new life into the researches on sociology (Johnson & Christensen, 2014, pp. 399-400). However, today it draws attention rather as being an important qualitative research method resorted in many different fields, including studies on history-education (Özsüer, 2015). Instead of departing from a special or existent theoretical framework, the grounded theory mainly consists of focusing on theory construction through the steps and processes of linking induction and deduction, uniting research environments, resorting to theoretical sampling and fabricating new concepts by way of additional literature review. During the research process, obtained data is analysed with constant comparative method and, just as in almost all of other qualitative research processes, in grounded theory studies also, the researcher and the research process contribute to the theory (Patton, 2014, p. 125). As stated above, the present study, too, was carried out as a part of a grounded theory process aiming at constructing a new theory regarding historical curiosity. During the processes of previous studies, it was worked on the sample groups such as candidate-teachers of social studies (Canlı & Altun, 2014), candidate-teachers of primary schools (Altun, 2014a) and primary and secondary school students (Altun, 2014b). Primary and secondary school students’ curiosities toward historical events, epochs and places were studied by Altun (2014b). In this study, due to the abundance of collected data, primary and secondary school students’ historical curiosities that mainly intensify on historical figures were also worked on. Again in this study that can be considered as the fourth phase of a theory generating process (See: Table 2), the processes of “collecting data”, “analysing the collected data” and “generating a new theory” (Çelik & Ekşi, 2015) are carried on simultaneously.

Sample Group

In the course of this grounded theory process, chain/snowball sampling was preferred among purposive sampling methods. Those who were considered to be in the scope of the subject being studied on and who are thought to be able to supply as much information as possible were reached in turn. Within this framework, candidate-teachers of primary school who were being trained in the field of history-teaching under their formal education processes and candidate-teachers of social studies who assisted in the continuation of this process were contacted as the sample group during the first stages of the grounded theory process. During the study primary and secondary school students for whom these candidate teachers are responsible for were taken as sample group (Table 3).

The individuals forming the sample group of this study were chosen in such a way so as to represent three different (lower, middle and upper) socio-economic levels. As for determining the primary and secondary schools from where the students of sample groups were chosen, the thoughts and views of administrative staff and teachers of those schools were taken beforehand. Three schools situated in the city centre of Bolu Province were chosen to form a sample group representing three different socio-economic levels, namely “lower” (X), “middle” (Y) and “upper” (Z).

Table 3. Sample Group of the Study

Grades	X		Y		Z		Total
	Girl	Boy	Girl	Boy	Girl	Boy	
1. grade (Primary School)	10	15	15	13	16	19	88
2. grade (Primary School)	17	18	15	14	12	13	89
3. grade (Primary School)	19	8	6	8	20	17	78
4. grade (Primary School)	18	19	12	12	13	9	83
5. grade (Secondary School)	14	12	9	12	10	11	68
6. grade (Secondary School)	21	22	9	10	6	3	71
7. grade (Secondary School)	13	15	8	15	13	6	70
8. grade (Secondary School)	10	18	11	10	6	4	59
Total	122	127	85	94	96	82	606

As sufficient amount of data could be collected, the number of the students in the sample group were not increased. Consequently, in the course of the study, 88 students at first grade, 89 students at second grade, 78 students at third grade, 83 students at fourth grade, 68 students at fifth grade, 71 students at sixth grade, 70 students at seventh grade and 59 students at eight grade were consulted. Out of 606 students consulted, 303 were girls and 303 were boys¹. Due to this structure of the sample group, this study can be said to have, to some extent, cross-sectional characteristics or to have the characteristics of “development research”.

Data Collection Tools

In this study, both face to face interview method and interview forms were used as data collection tools and the students were asked to state “historical figures, events, epochs and places they are curious about the most” and “the reasons why they are curious about them”. Due to the abundance and magnitude of collected data, the present study deals only with historical figures. Therefore, it was naturally focused only on the answers given to the questions of “Who is the historical figure you wonder the most” and “Why do you wonder him” existing in data collection tools. As it is thought that primary school students attending the first and the second grades may not be able to express themselves in written forms (to write down their ideas), face to face interviews were made with them to get their views orally. As for getting the views of other students attending 3rd and 4th grades of primary schools and 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades of secondary schools, interview forms containing the same questions were used. The researcher carried out all of data-collection activities including face to face interviews and delivery of the interview forms in person.

During the face to face interviews, to help especially the 1st grade students of primary schools better understand the questions asked to them, they were given the example of the figure “Bilgecan Dede” (Grandfather Bilgecan) and “his time machine” appearing in Keloğlan, one of the cartoons being telecasted on TRT², and then, instead of answering afore-mentioned study-questions on interview forms, they were asked to answer the question “If the time machine of Bilgecan Dede were here and we were able to travel to past or to old times, who would you like to see or who would you like to get acquainted (meet) with?”.

¹ Sex (gender) factor was taken into consideration when forming the sample groups and analysing the obtained data. However, in the “findings” section of the study, this sex factor was not touched upon as no notable or significant difference could be established between girls and boys. Although there were slight differences between girls’ and boys’ reactions such as girl students being curious about “the wife of Atatürk” or “the curtain in Atatürk’s house” while boy students being curious about Atatürk’s weapons, it can be said that new sex-oriented studies should be conducted through face to face and in-depth interview technique to be able to get more evident and remarkable results on this point.

² Turkish Radio and Television Company

Data Analysis

In the course of analysing the obtained data, it was resorted to “theoretical memo-writing method” and the notes taken in this way contributed a lot both in data-analysing process and in the subsequent processes, especially in the preparation of study-report. The data acquired through the answers given to the question “*who is your most wondered historical figure*” that is either contained on interview forms or asked directly during face to face interviews were sorted out with content analysis and presented in detail under the sub-headings “political/military”, “science/art/literature”, “religious”, “familial (domestic)” and “others” in findings and recommendations chapter. As for the data obtained through the answers given to the question “*Why do you wonder him*” asked to the students as a part of theory generating process, they were analysed with “constant comparative method” which is one of analyse-types used in theory generating process. Although constant comparative method is not different from content analysis with regard to the performed-procedures since an inductual path is followed in both of them, it might also be claimed to differ from content analysis in the context of processes. When constant comparative method is applied, a part of data is compared with the other part to be able to decide on the similarities and differences. The collected data is grouped on similar dimensions. Dimensions are temporarily denominated, and then transformed into categories. The purpose of this analysis is to analyse the sections of the collected data. These sections are designed inter-relatedly in the construction of grounded theory (Merriam, 2013, p. 30). In other words, the obtained data is analysed through being continuously compared with “core category” in the grounded theory research.

In grounded theory, the concepts “core category”, “category” and “characteristic” and “hypothesis” point out and serve important functions. All of the categories and the characteristics defining the categories are conceptual constituents either produced inductually or grounded in the collected data. As for “core category”, it is the main conceptual constituent which all other categories and features are attached to. And, hypotheses are the relations obtained from categories and characteristic (Merriam, 2013, p. 30). When the hypotheses are being formed, a deductual process is followed, where the existent categories and characteristic are used. Therefore, the fact that grounded theory is both deductual and inductual process (Patton, 2014, p. 454) is also observed in the present study. Within the context of the pattern emerging during the previous phases of the grounded theory process that was carried out regarding historical curiosity (Altun, 2014a, 2014b; Canlı & Altun, 2014), “core category” is considered as “theory pieces” as denominated by Glaser (2000, pp. 7-8; Patton, 2014, p. 491). In other words, temporary terms are preferred in coding, and if these terms (or this phenomenon) are wide-spread, then labelling is made as follows: “*Important curiosity, extraordinary curiosity, empirical curiosity, emotional curiosity (empathetic, sympathetic and antipathetic curiosities), dilemmatic curiosity, and environmental curiosity (popular and social curiosities)*”.

Validity and Reliability of the Study

As qualitative researches contain analyses made depending on interpretations (Morse, 1994) and have subjectivity by nature (Armstrong, Gosling, Weinman, & Martaeu, 1997), they do not meet prevailing criteria of validity and reliability (as cited in Kaya, 2015). Therefore, with a view to ensuring validity and reliability in the present study, it was focused on the criteria suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985; as cited in Çelik & Ekşi, 2015) such as credibility, transmissibility, consistency and confirmability. As for credibility, three experts in different fields were consulted, respectively the first being a history educator, the second being a social studies educator and the third being a historian. To ensure transmissibility, participants’ views were given as they are without being subjected to any change. When it comes to consistency and confirmability, the obtained data were analysed through “constant comparative analyse method”, that is, they were continuously compared with the findings (core category) and data obtained from the previous two different sample groups (candidate primary school and social studies teachers).

Results and Recommendations

In the present study, findings and recommendations are treated under two different headings. The first and the second study questions are dealt with under the first heading, and the third study question is discussed under the second heading. That is, the points handled under the first heading are “the historical figures most wondered by primary and secondary school students” and “the evolution of or changes in this curiosity towards historical figures through primary and secondary school years (the trajectory of historical curiosity)”, and under the second heading it is attempted to classify the historical curiosity types as a part of “the grounded theory process” being conducted based on the views of primary and secondary school students.

1. The Curiosity towards Historical Figures and the Trajectory of this Curiosity

In this section where the findings of the present study aiming at reaching a meaningful pattern on historical curiosity moving from historical figures are exposed, it is first of all focused on who the most wondered historical figures are. And before exposing the big photo in this regard, outlines of the findings are portrayed in detail in Table 4.

Table 4. List of the Most Wondered Historical Figures by Fields

Theme	Historical Figure
Political and military	Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (152), Fatih Sultan Mehmet (80), Kanuni Sultan Süleyman (21), Seyit Onbaşı (14), Sultans of Ottoman Empire (10), Kürşat (8), İsmet İnönü (7), Mete Han (5), Hürrem Sultan (4), Ali Rıza Bey and Zübeyde Hanım ^[parents of Atatürk] (4), Ulubatlı Hasan (3), Alparslan (3), Yıldırım Bayezid (3), Çelebi Mehmet (3), Osman Gazi (2), Genç Osman (1), Sultan Vahdettin (1), Gazneli Mahmut (1), Kaptan-ı Derya (1), Prime-ministers (1), Murat Han (1), Turgut Özal (1), Kazım Paşa (1), Abdülmecid (1), Yavuz Sultan Selim (1), Deli Osman (1), Barbaros Hayrettin Paşa (1), Piri Reis (1).
Science, literature and art	Mehmet Akif Ersoy (21), Edison (12), Einstein (8), Evliya Çelebi (8), Kâtip Çelebi (7), Hezarfen Ahmet Çelebi (4), Mimar Sinan (3), İbn-i Sina (3), Dede Korkut (2), Afet İnan (2), Nasrettin Hoca (2), Archimedes (1), Cahit Arif (1), Köroğlu (1), Hacivat Karagöz (1), Graham Bell (1), The man inventing the basketball game (1), The man who explored America first (1), Dede Efendi (1), The man inventing the computer (1), Louis Pasteur (1), The man inventing the electric light bulb (1), Halil Dikmen (1),
Religious	Hız. Muhammed ^[prophet of Muslims (Peace be upon him)] (37), Mevlânâ (14), Şeyh Edebali (1), Hız. İsa ^[Christ] (1), Hız. Musa ^[Moses] (1)
Familial	Grandfather (22), Grandmother (17), Uncle (brother of mother) (2), Uncle (brother of father) (2), Friend (2), Mother (1), Father (1), Childhood of mother and father (1), Elder brother (1), Elder sister (1), Brother of a friend (1).
Others	Cave man (3), Michael Jackson (2), British (2), Turgut Özakman (1), Women in history (1), Mayas (Maya civilization) (1), Wife of Atatürk (1), Spaceman (astronaut) (1), Americans (1), Cow-boys (1), Benten (1), Winks (1), Monkey (1), Keloğlan (1), Ancestry (1), Historian (1), Bilgecan Dede (1), Red-kid (1), Inna (1), Justin Bieber (1).

As shown above, on “political and military” field 29, on “science, literature and art” field 23, on “religious” field 5, on “familial” field 11, and on “others” field 20 different figures were stated by the students as the most wondered historical figures.

Out of these 88 figures, 10 are women, 64 are men and 14 are the figures whose genders are not known (such as “my friend”, “spaceman”, “historian”). These results can be said to confirm Levstik and Groth (2002) who claim that “normal history is predominantly men-oriented”. Taking this fact into consideration, one might, well, grant right to Tuchman (1978) who claims that women are symbolically ignored or neglected with regard to history education. Also on the study of Köse (2004, 2011), it was

concluded that students happen to remember some important historical woman figures though they are not mentioned as much as they deserve in textbooks, and that this point proves the insufficiency of textbooks in this regard. He furthermore claims that this negative fact is one of the reasons of indifference of girl students to history lessons. The problem of lack of representation of women is not peculiar only to history-teaching. For example, a study carried out by Yıldız, Göl, and Hacısalihoğlu Karadeniz in 2016 indicates that similar problems are also valid for mathematics-teaching. However, the point that appears to be more important here is the fact that the number of historical women figures with whom the girl-students would be willing to identify themselves or whom they would take as a model is much more less than historical men figures with whom boy students identify themselves or whom they take as a model.

Prominent historical figures appear to be grandfathers and grandmothers in the familial field, Atatürk and Fatih Sultan Mehmet in the political and military field, Mehmet Akif Ersoy and Edison in the science, literature and art field, Hz. Muhammed and Mevlana in “religious field”, while cartoon heroes and contemporary singers take the lead in “others” field. In his study, Er (2010) alleges that curricula of lessons of “social studies” and “Revolution History of Turkish Republic and Kemalism partly meet the expectations of the students in respect of the biographies of scientists, artists and craftsmen, writers, politicians, soldiers, sportsman and sportswoman, and of those in other occupational groups. Besides, Er states that those the students are most willing to write the biographies of (members of the most preferred group) are artists and writers. In spite of these important findings, it appears that new studies that would clearly and comprehensively exhibit the expectations of students with regard to “biography-teaching” are highly needed.

It will be logic and useful to display the big photo only after handling the wondered historical figures at full length. The situation is depicted with its main lines in Table 5:

Table 5. The Most Wondered Historical Figures

Historical Figures	Grades (f)								Total	%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Political and military	31	52	43	22	33	50	53	50	334	62,2
Science, literature and art	1	10	24	16	18	7	5	3	84	15,6
Religious	2	6	5	20	6	3	7	5	54	10,1
Familial	30	11	-	1	-	-	-	-	42	7,8
Others	13	5	2	-	1	1	-	1	23	4,3
Total	77	84	74	59	58	61	65	59	537	

When you look at Table 5, it will be seen that the students wonder predominantly political figures and military (62 %). Here comes the question of whether there is a relation between the historical figures wondered by the students and the figures included in textbooks. In this respect, it can be looked at the findings of the study of Kaymakçı and Er (2013) on “curriculum of social studies and life stories (biographies) of important figures in textbooks”. In this study, it is noticed that a special emphasis is put on the biographies of various historical figures in different fields such as science, art, sports, policy and military, and that biographies of scientists come to the forefront. In spite of the discrepancy between these two studies carried out mainly on important figures, the present situation can be explained with the fact that historical subjects are being treated from political and military perspectives rather than from the perspective of important figures. Another attention-drawing point is that while figures in the field of “science, literature and art” are increasingly more wondered in primary school years, this curiosity starts to gradually decrease in secondary school years. This finding also differs from the outcomes of the study of Kaymakçı and Er (2013). This difference might originate from the teaching-approach in secondary schools of important figures in “science, literature and art” field.

1.1. Most Wondered Political and Military Figures

Frequency values indicate that political figures take the lead in the list of historical figures most wondered by the students and 29 different political and military figures were uttered by them. It should be kept in mind that the heading “political and military figures” covers sultans (emperors), rulers (administrators), commanders and soldiers. Table 6 displays the trajectory of historical curiosity towards these figures.

Table 6. The Trajectory of Historical Curiosity towards the Most Wondered Statesmen (Politicians and Military)

Statesmen (Politicians and Military)	Grades (f)								Total (f)	%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Mustafa Kemal Atatürk	29	41	19	18	21	14	4	6	152	45,5
Fatih Sultan Mehmet	-	1	9	-	6	9	25	30	80	23,9
Kanuni Sultan Süleyman	-	-	4	-	3	4	7	3	21	6,3
Seyit Onbaşı	1	3	2	1	1	5	1	-	14	4,2
Others	1	7	9	3	2	18	16	11	67	20,1
Total	31	52	43	22	33	50	53	50	334	

The most wondered historical figure among statesmen (politicians and military) is Mustafa Kemal Atatürk who was uttered by almost half of the participant students (45,5 %). He is followed by Fatih Sultan Mehmet, Kanuni Sultan Süleyman and Seyit Onbaşı. As for those taking part under “others” heading, it appears that, besides these three figures leading the list, the following historical figures are also wondered by the students:

- Pre-Islamic Turkish history: *Mete Han and Kürşat*.
- History of First Islamic Turkish States: *Gazneli Mahmut and Alparslan*.
- History of Ottoman Empire: *Sultan, Barbaros Hayrettin Paşa, Fatih Sultan Mehmet (Mehmet the conqueror), Piri Reis, Kanuni Sultan Süleyman (Suleiman the magnificent), Abdülmecit, Yavuz Sultan Selim, Deli Osman (Genç Osman), Hürrem Sultan, Osman Gazi, Murat Han, Çelebi Mehmet, Sultan Vahdettin, Seyit Onbaşı*.
- History of Turkish Republic: *Atatürk, Ali Rıza Bey, İsmet İnönü, Zübeyde Hanım, Kazım Paşa, Başbakanlar, Turgut Özal*.

Especially, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk draws attention both as being the historical figure most wondered by the students and as being the figure causing children to get acquainted with the history. In their study, Kaymakçı and Er (2013), also, concluded that Mustafa Kemal Atatürk is the figure whose biography is most used in curricula and textbooks. It can be alleged that, as Ata (2008) also pointed out, this fact may emerge from the density of course subjects dealing with or touching upon Kemalism in primary education and the density of learning outcomes obtained due to the matching of these course subjects of primary education with curriculum of social studies education. It is observed that students become acquainted with the History by being taught about Atatürk and that this curiosity towards Atatürk decreases as the time goes by. The findings of a study carried out by Er (2005) may be of help in the explanation of this decrease: “There isn’t sufficient material about the life of Atatürk. Some words and terms used in the textbooks or by the teachers cannot be understood, a boring and tedious language is used in the presentation of subject. And the supplied information does not meet the needs and expectations”. However, if the following answers given by the students are looked through, it may be claimed that students’ curiosities towards Atatürk decrease over time as they are in the opinion of already having sufficient amount of information about him. In contrast with this decrease, an increase is observed in the amount of curiosity towards Fatih Sultan Mehmet. In overall assessment on statesmen (politicians and military), it is witnessed that the curiosity on the history of Turkish Republic is gradually decreasing while the curiosity on the history of Ottoman Empire is increasing.

- *I wonder a lot Atatürk’s life. And now, I fulfil this curiosity with the information I get from the books (2; Sixth grade girl student).*

- *I used to wonder a lot Atatürk's life. But this curiosity passed off when I knew him. I don't wonder anybody else other than him (34; Seventh grade boy student).*
- *I hear a lot of things about Fatih Sultan Mehmet. That is why I wonder him. (34; Seventh grade girl student)*
- *I frequently face with the name of Fatih Sultan Mehmet (87; Sixth grade boy student)*

As for the reasons of students' curiosities towards statesmen, the outstanding points that draw attention of the students are mainly "these figures' historical successes and achievements (reforms, conquests, etc.)", "their personal characteristics (bravery, farsightedness, youngness, power, having attracting physical features such as a beautiful face)", "their names' being popular and frequently heard by the students (their names' being often appeared and mentioned on media, in daily discussions and in classes during the teachers lecture)", "students' not having seen them in person" and especially "their having been involved in extraordinary and amazing events and situations which the students have difficulty in understanding".

- *Mustafa Kemal Atatürk: The reasons why I wonder him are his successes, farsightedness and bravery (51; Eighth grade boy student).*
- *Fatih Sultan Mehmet: I wonder how he managed to conquer İstanbul when he was only 21 years old (69; Eighth grade girl student).*
- *Sultans (Kings): I am highly curious about the sultans. I cannot understand how a single man can manage to rule the whole country by himself. I wonder how it is like to rule a big country alone (81; Second grade girl student).*
- *Seyit Onbaşı: His being able to lift a cannon ball weighing two hundred kilograms or so is a miracle. That is why I want to see him (82; Second grade boy student)*

1.2. Most Wondered Figures in the Field of "Science, Literature and Art"

According to the frequency values of this study, important figures in the field of "science, literature and art" take the second place in the list of historical figures most wondered by the students who, under this heading, uttered the names of 23 historical personalities consisting of scientists, poets, painters, travellers (those travelling to discover new things) and explorers. Table 7 displays the trajectory of historical curiosity towards these figures.

Table 7. The Trajectory of Historical Curiosity towards the Most Wondered Figures in the Field of "Science, Literature and Art"

Important figures in the field of "science, literature and art"	Grades (f)								Total (f)	%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Mehmet Akif Ersoy	1	7	6	3	4	-	-	-	21	25
Edison	-	-	-	5	4	1	2	-	12	14,3
Einstein	-	2	-	2	4	-	-	-	8	9,5
Evliya Çelebi	-	-	7	-	-	-	1	-	8	9,5
Others		1	11	6	6	6	2	3	35	41,7
Total	1	10	24	16	18	7	5	3	84	

In the field of "important scientists, artists and men of letters" (science, art and literature), it appears that the trajectory of historical curiosity has a very unbalanced distribution. The reason of this unbalance may be explained with the fact that historical figures in this field were not sufficiently introduced to the students (Kurt, 2016, pp. 140-144; Erbudak, 2016, pp. 147-148). Under this heading, the most wondered figures by the students appear to be Mehmet Akif Ersoy, Edison, Einstein and Evliya Çelebi. When it comes to the "others" heading, it will be seen that, besides these figures, the students are curious about the following historical figures:

- Among scientists: “The man who explored America, the man who invented the electric light bulb, the man who invented the computer, the man who invented the basketball game, Graham Bell, Archimedes, İbn-i Sina, Louis Pasteur, Hezarfen Ahmet Çelebi, Cahit Arif, Afet İnan”.
- Among men of letters: “Koroğlu, Nasrettin Hoca, Hacıvat and Karagöz, Dede Korkut, Kâtip Çelebi”.
- Among artists (craftsmen, artisans): “Dede Efendi, Mimar Sinan, Halil Dikmen”.

As for the reasons of students’ curiosities towards scientists, it appears that the most outstanding point or factor is their inventions. It is also observed that students generally identify themselves with scientists they are curious about and that they want to live at the same time (age) with them. It is an attention-drawing fact that curiosities of the students towards men of letters and artists are correlated with the fields they are good at and they are interested in.

- Einstein: I wonder Einstein. Because he is very wise and knowledgeable person. He would teach me (what to do) and I would do that (76; Second grade boy student).
- Mehmet Akif Ersoy: I wonder him as he wrote very long and beautiful poems (62; Third grade girl student).
- Dede Efendi: I love music and he has many beautiful compositions. For example, “Gülnehal” (68; Fourth grade girl student).
- Cahit Arif: I love mathematics. Therefore, I love also Cahit Arif (41; Fifth grade boy student).
- Thomas Edison: I wonder very much how he invented the electric light bulb and how he could imagine to do that! And, I strongly desire to have lived at his time (58; Sixth grade boy student).
- Mimar Sinan: I wonder him because he managed to construct a good deal of mosques (34; Eight grade girl student).

1.3. Most Wondered Religious Figures

Religious figures take the third place in the list of historical figures most wondered by the students who, under this heading, could utter the names of only 5 historical religious personalities. This may be interpreted that students were not sufficiently taught about important historical religious characters. Table 8 displays the trajectory of historical curiosity towards these figures.

Table 8. The Trajectory of Historical Curiosity towards the Most Wondered Religious Figures

Religious Figures	Grades (f)								Total (f)	%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Hız. Muhammed (peace be upon him)	2	5	5	13	5	2	2	3	37	68,5
Mevlana	-	1	-	5	1	-	5	2	14	25,9
Hız. İsa (Christ)	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1,9
Hız. Musa (Moses)	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1,9
Şeyh Edebali	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1,9
Total	2	6	5	20	6	3	7	5	54	

In this field, the religious figures most wondered by the students are Hız. Muhammed (peace be upon him), Mevlana, Hız. İsa (Christ), Hız. Musa (Moses) and Şeyh Edebali. Students didn’t utter any other name in this field. As for the reasons of students’ curiosities towards religious figures, the emphasised points are “what they had done (such as their aids to people, benevolences, conversations, didactic qualities and why they became prophets)”, “their personal characteristics (their being knowledgeable, good humoured, genial, tolerant, forgiving, Muslim and successful)”.

- Hız. Muhammed (Peace be upon him): (I wonder him and) I want to go to his time, to see him, to talk to him, to commune with him, to learn some prayers from him. I also wonder the life at the time he lived. (82; Second grade boy student).

- *Mevlana: I read a book entitled “Mevlana ile bir gün (A day with Mevlana)”. From that day on, I am eager to know more about him (84; Second grade girl student).*
- *Mevlana: I want to see what kind of man Mevlana is (42; Fourth grade boy student).*
- *Hz. Muhammed (Peace be upon him): I heard that he was good-humoured, benevolent, tolerant and forgiving. That is why I wonder him (69; Fifth grade girl student).*
- *Hz. Muhammed (Peace be upon him): The reason why I wonder him is his having proven his prophecy through various extraordinary acts and behaviours (miracles) (14; Eight grade boy student)*

1.4. Most Wondered Familial Figures

Another field or heading of historical figures wondered by the students is “familial figures. 11 familial figures were expressed to be wondered by the students. Table 9 displays the trajectory of historical curiosity towards these figures.

Table 9. The Trajectory of Historical Curiosity towards the Most Wondered Familial Figures

Familial Figures	Grades (f)								Total (f)	%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Grandfather	13	8	-	1	-	-	-	-	22	52,4
Grandmother	7	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	19
Uncle (brother of father)	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	4,8
Uncle (brother of sister)	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	4,8
Others (friends, sisters, etc.)	7	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	19
Total	30	11	-	1	-	-	-	-	42	

In this field, students’ most wondered familial figures appear to be their grandfathers, grandmothers and uncles. Apart from these figures, the students wonder their friends, their mothers, brothers and sisters of their friends, their fathers, their elder sisters, the childhood of their parents and their elder brothers. As for the reasons of students’ curiosities towards familial figures, two points come to the front. The first is *their not being alive anymore*, and the second is *their being/living away from the place students live*:

- *My grandfather is dead and it is said that I saw him when I was a baby. I wish I could see him now (37; First grade boy student).*
- *It is said that brother of my mother died in a traffic accident. I wish I could hear his voice and I could see his face and colour of his eyes (39; First grade girl student).*
- *I wish I knew my grandmother. She lives far away, in Aydın (46; First grade girl student).*

It is observed that during the first years of primary school, students wonder their family members as the historical figures. Though they still continue to be curious about their family members living away or being dead, it is obvious that, as from third grade, they do not anymore keep on seeing their family members as a part of the history or the past. This fact which is directly related with the students’ perceptions of history (their thoughts about what the history is) gives us important clues about the trajectory of history-learning.

1.5. Other Most Wondered Figures

In this study, as indicated under “others” heading, 20 different figures were also stated as most wondered figures, although their frequencies are lower. Among these figures are contemporary artists, singers, cartoon heroes and other personalities, and some general or common delineations are made by the students about these figures. Table 10 displays the trajectory of historical curiosity towards these figures.

Table 10. The Trajectory of Historical Curiosity towards Other Most Wondered Figures

Other Figures	Grades (f)								Total (f)	%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Cave man	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	13
Michael Jackson	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	8,7
Others	8	5	2	-	1	1	-	1	18	78,2
Total	13	5	2	-	1	1	-	1	23	

In the field of “others”, especially contemporary artists, singers and cartoon heroes who are not actually historical figures are declared by the students as the most wondered historical figures. These answers containing the names of non-historical figures were given by the students attending the first grades of primary schools, whose perceptions of time (history, past) have not yet sufficiently developed. The figures most wondered by the students including the popular ones are the followings: “cave man, Michael Jackson, British, Turgut Özakman, women in the history, Mayas (The Maya civilization), wife of Atatürk, spaceman (astronaut), Americans, cowboys, Benten, Winks, monkey, Keloğlan, our ancestry (forefathers), historian, Bilgecan Dede, Red-kid, İna and Justin Bieber.

2. Analysis Regarding Historical Curiosity

2.1. Classification of Historical Curiosity (Primary and Secondary School Dimensions)

At this dimension of the on-going grounded theory process, that is being handled within the framework of the present study, it is attempted to clarify the pattern on historical curiosity through some alterations. In this context, factual curiosity and ignorant curiosity (one of the two subheadings of factual curiosity) taking place in the previous patterns are removed from the pattern on account of the fact that all curiosities already intrinsically contain the need for information, and dilemmatic curiosity (the second subheading of factual curiosity) is considered as one of the main headings. On the other hand, after evaluations, a new type of curiosity under the title “experimental curiosity” was included as a new heading in the new pattern since it was observed that the desires such as seeing the historical figures up close, meeting them in person, experiencing the same events they had already experienced in the past, etc. that were previously considered to be empathetic curiosity types increase in volume especially at primary school level. In short, statements of primary and secondary school students in connection with the reasons of their curiosities towards historical figures were analysed, previous patterns of grounded theory process have been taken into consideration and, finally, historical curiosities were classified under the following headings:

Important curiosity: According to Seixas (1994), the subject of “historical importance” is one of the main materials of historians. It is impossible to study and to do researches on everything or every field. Historical importance is the historians’ assessments of the criteria through the evaluation of the question “From which parts of the whole structure of the history can a meaningful and coherent story be created”. Stating that an event is important means that it is historically worth-studying. With regard to historically important events, the level of importance may change depending on the time. On the other hand, historical importance is not related only with the events happened in the past and the relations between the people living in the past. Importance is about the relations among “the events happened in the past”, “the people involved in these events” and “us, that is, those trying now to think historically” (Seixas & Peck, 2004; as cited in Er Tuna, 2014). In his study, Er Tuna (2014) manifested that perception of importance of the students are formed by the features or abilities of historical events such as influencing the future, causing changes, breaking a new ground, having impacts on everybody

and being remembered. One of the findings of the present study is that students mainly wonder “the works and actions that make a historical figure important (his/her big and significant successes, his/her overcoming the difficulties, his/her performing useful things and his/her suffering from serious pains and distresses)”, “how he/she could manage to do these kind of things” and “what kind of person is this historical person who could manage to perform such significant things”. This curiosity type (important curiosity) may be considered as a curiosity type appropriate for the nature of history that researches what is important. However, here, the following point is not to be overlooked: “*Who decides on what is important? Student or somebody else? Or, in other words, does the student himself/herself explore the historical importance of something, or is it transmitted/reported by the teacher?*”. Important curiosity is a type of curiosity that is directly related with perception of historical importance. The study carried out by Tarhan and Altun (2014) on historical importance disclosed a noteworthy finding in this context. According to this study, historical importance is transmitted or reported by curricula, textbooks or teachers rather than being detected by the students. As with historical importance, historical curiosities of the students are also oriented or formed by the perception of transmitted importance, but not by the information explored by the students by themselves (epistemic curiosity). Briefly, here, there is a type of historical curiosity that can be denominated as “important curiosity”. But, in order to be able to ensure the use of this curiosity type in a more efficient way in history teaching, the perception of historical importance should base on explorations of the students instead of transmissions by other sources. This view is also supported by the findings of Levstik, Henderson, and Schlarb (2005; as cited in Levstik, 2011) disclosing that students, when learning history, prefer “studying on a special question to be solved” to “learning an already finished story”. Important curiosity is also clearly observed in the statements of the students:

- *M. Akif Ersoy: (I wonder him because) he wrote Turkish National Anthem (100; First grade girl student).*
- *M. Kemal Atatürk: (I wonder him because) he saved our country (44; Second grade boy student).*
- *Luis Pasteur: (I wonder him because) he found rabies vaccine (72; Third grade girl student).*
- *M. Akif Ersoy: (I wonder him because) he is a very important and self-sacrificing man (39; Fourth grade girl student).*
- *M. Kemal Atatürk: (I wonder him because) he was so successful under difficult conditions when he was a child like us (75; Fifth grade boy student).*
- *Afet İnan: (I wonder him because) she is the adopted daughter of Atatürk. Therefore, knowing her is important (10; Sixth grade girl student).*
- *Kanuni Sultan Süleyman: (I wonder him because) he is the most important figure contributing to the development of Ottoman Empire. I wonder how he could manage to be so successful (42; Seventh grade boy student).*
- *Mimar Sinan: (I wonder him because) he managed to construct a good deal of beautiful mosques (34; Eight grade girl student).*

Extraordinary curiosity: This a type of curiosity that shows up when the situations or events that happened in the past and that can be considered as interesting, mysterious, unbelievable, creative, ingenious, surprising, impossible, funny or amusing are in question. Extra ordinary historical events, epochs, places and figures (no matter how old they are or what sex they are) draw students’ attentions. Studies performed in this field support this view. In his study, Andraess (1939, p. 21) examined historical understandings of children at different ages and suggested that interesting historical figures and legends about the country attract their attentions more at certain periods of their childhood. Kohlmeier (2005) states that many of his students consider the history as a sum of interesting realities of the world well placed in a single and unchangeable story. Kölbl and Straub (2001) remarked that extraordinary and mysterious subjects such as witch-hunts in middle ages or slavery draw students’ attentions. Similarly, Barton (2008) also expressed that students are especially interested in the events that happened under extraordinary conditions. As for Levstik (2011), he pointed out, depending on the findings of his studies, that students are curious about learning the effects of extraordinary historical events such as human rights violations on human lives. All of these studies demonstrate that students

wonder the subjects that are described as “extraordinary” more than other subjects. Some examples of this type of curiosity are given hereafter:

- *Sultans (Kings): I am highly curious about the sultans. I cannot understand how a single man can manage to rule the whole country by himself. I wonder how it is like to rule a big country alone (81; Second grade girl student).*
- *Kanuni Sultan Süleyman: (I wonder him because) I want to know how reach he was (87; Third grade boy student).*
- *Nasrettin Hoca: I wonder him very much. Because his anecdotes are very amusing (59; Fourth grade boy student).*
- *Hürrem Sultan: The reason why I wonder Hürrem Sultan is that she is very clever and intervenes in the rule of the Ottoman Empire (3; Fifth grade boy student).*
- *Seyit Onbaşı: I wonder how he could manage to lift and carry a very heavy cannon ball weighing approximately 200 kilograms by himself (6; Sixth grade girl student).*
- *Çelebi Mehmet: As far as I heard he killed his 10 brothers or so (86; Seventh grade girl student).*
- *Kürşat: I wonder why he went there putting his neck on the line in spite of the fact that he knew he would die if he went there (52; Eight grade girl student).*

Experimental curiosity: In this type of historical curiosity, students are willing and curious about experiencing the things such as seeing historical figures who lived in the past and are not alive anymore with the naked eye, speaking with them, witnessing their successes and other important actions, living in the same era or being in the same place with them. It is observed that this curiosity type which comes into existence or is formed through experimental desires and wishes starts to get intensified especially at young ages and decreases toward the last years of secondary school. This finding of the present study is a dimension different from the dimensions of previous studies (Altun, 2014a, 2014b; Canlı & Altun, 2014) carried out as a part of the grounded theory process being performed in the field of historical curiosity. And this fact is directly related with the sample group of the study. In the present study it is focused on the primary and secondary school students, while the sample groups of the previous studies consisted of candidate-teachers. It is also witnessed that especially first grade students in primary schools have a quite shallow biographical chronology of mind ranging from caveman to the family members who already passed away. At this stage of the process, historical curiosity comes into prominence. Findings of Andraess (1939, p. 6) explain this fact. He states that “perception of past” of the children, especially of those attending primary schools is yet vague and tenuous, and that they are affected or influenced mainly by life-styles of their families, their school lives, traditions and their own previous experiences. He tends to associate this fact with the time-perception of the child and alleges that “hundred years ago” and “thousand years ago” mean the same thing for a child and it would be enough if the uttered words imply “the past” no matter how far the past is. Similarly, in his study, Şimşek (2006) also concluded that children do not generally have correct information about when the history started and that they do not know the concepts of “historical time” and “chronology”. Besides, he displayed that this weak time perceptions of children develops depending on age factor, social interactions and their successes in the fields of mathematics and language (Turkish). Some statements of students that can be given as examples of experimental curiosity are listed below:

- *I wish I could meet the father of my grandmother (mother of my father), unfortunately she is dead (53; First grade girl student).*
- *Einstein: I wonder Einstein. Because he is very wise and knowledgeable person. He would teach me (what to do) and I would do that (76; Second grade boy student).*
- *Kâtip Çelebi: I wonder him because I want to meet him and talk to him face to face (79; Third grade girl student).*
- *Hız. Muhammed (Peace be upon him): I would like to go and see our Prophet. Because I wonder him very much and I want to see him (19; Fourth grade boy student).*

- *Hız. Muhammed (Peace be upon him): I wonder the outlook of his face, that is, his facial features (11; Fifth grade girl student).*
- *Thomas Edison: I wonder very much how he invented the electric light bulb and how he could imagine to do that! And, I strongly desire to have lived at his time (58; Sixth grade boy student).*
- *Fatih Sultan Mehmet: (I wonder him. Because) His plans (to conquer İstanbul) are very meaningful. I wish he narrated me how he conquered İstanbul (6; Seventh grade boy student).*
- *Mustafa Kemal Atatürk: I wish "I lived with Mustafa Kemal", "I were together with him during his achievements", and "I fought the enemy together with him (55; Eight grade boy student).*

Emotional curiosity: Emotional curiosity breaks down into three sub-sections, namely empathetic, sympathetic and antipathetic:

(1) Empathetic curiosity: In his literature-based study that can also be specified as a type of meta-analysis, Barton (2008) claims that though students are more interested in matters involving sensation, morals and personal opinions than in other matters, they like to develop empathy towards other people as well. In the beginning, children do not empathise with historical figures. When they face with the situations that can be called as mysterious or incomprehensible, they tend to have a haughty attitude implying that those people behave in that way just because they are stupid or not as developed as we are³. After this initial period, they start to understand that they behave logically from their points of view. At first, they approach these people (these figures or the regions they live in) with suspicion or stereotyped-views. Later on, though they tend to attribute more specific justifications with regard to their behaviours, they still keep on evaluating them from the point of view of 20th Century. Consequently, they begin to understand the need for constructing possible new perceptions with regard to historical figures through reconsidering or taking into consideration all available historical sources (Evans, 1989, 1994; as cited in Brophy & VanSledright, 1997, PP. 67-68). Leslie (2015) speaks of the emergence of empathetic curiosity as a new and different type of curiosity in parallel with the rise of epistemic curiosity, which he describes as "intellectual steam power" of industrial revolution that began in England toward the end of 18th century. According to him, this curiosity type is mainly based on the desire for learning feelings and thoughts of various people. Explanation of the concept of historical empathy may facilitate the definition of empathetic historical curiosity. Historical empathy is defined as a person's capacity to understand the behaviours of another person depending or based on his own experiences, behaviours and the information he has on other person's situation (The Southern Regional Education Board [SREB], 1986; as cited in Karabak, 2003). It is noteworthy that this capacity has both cognitive and sensory constituents. P.J. Lee (1984; as cited in Karabak, 2003) approaches the historical empathy from four angles: Power, purpose, process and tendency/desire. Empathy is the power to separate feelings and thoughts of somebody else from those of himself. As for purpose, empathy involves in understanding the beliefs, values, feelings and aims of a person or a group. As a process, empathy is to explore what somebody believes in depending on the available proofs. When it comes to tendency/desire, empathy is the tendency towards or desire for understanding point of view of somebody else. When this viewpoint regarding tendency/desire is considered as true, it appears that empathetic historical curiosity emerges from the feeling of empathy. In this context, empathetic historical curiosity may be defined as the desire for understanding the beliefs, values, feelings, aims, thoughts (viewpoints) and behaviours of a person or group. Some statements of students that can be given as examples of empathetic curiosity are listed below:

- *People living in the past: (I wonder) how the ancient people lived, what they ate and what they wore (72; First grade girl student).*
- *M. Kemal Atatürk: (I wonder) the feelings of Atatürk when his father died (60; Second grade girl student).*
- *M. Kemal Atatürk: (I wonder) how much the parents of Atatürk loved him and why people talk so much about him (15; Fifth grade girl student).*
- *M. Kemal Atatürk: I wonder his feelings (52; Fifth grade boy student).*
- *Sultans ^[Kings]: (I wonder) how they lived and how they died (54; Sixth grade girl student).*

³ Ashby and Lee (1987) describe this attitude as the lowest level of historical empathy and denominate it as "stupid past".

(2) Sympathetic curiosity: The notions of empathy and sympathy are frequently confused. Sympathy is a subjective state appearing when we acknowledge a person to be right no matter whether we understand him/her or not, while empathy is the experience of “trying to behave as if we were that person” based on objective observations in order to better understand him or her (Katz, 1963; Dökmen, 1997; as cited in Karabağ, 2003). While empathy contains both cognitive and affective components, sympathy contain mainly affective components. Therefore, historical empathy is different from sympathy and, therefore, sympathy of students felt towards some historical figures can be condoned in history teaching. Even, studying a sympathised figure may give cause for the emergence of empathy. In this connection, Foster (1999; as cited in Karabağ, 2003) states that “*The aim of history lesson should not be (to construct) sympathy. History requires an objective and unbiased study, which is impeded by sympathy*”. This view can be considered to be right for history-writing when the sympathy of the writer is not apparent and under the situations where it is difficult to differ historical realities from sympathy-based interpretations or comments. However, if the historian did not hide his sympathy for a historical figure from the readers and disclosed it, and if the reader has the capacity of differing this sympathy from historical realities when assessing the views of the writer, this view remains meaningless. What’s more, when history teaching is in question, “building a national identity” appears to be one of the most important aims of this teaching and sympathy based-history teaching is considered as one of efficient approaches in this context. The present study reveals that participants wonder and sympathise with historical figures either because of their various personal characteristics or abilities (their being clever, powerful, successful, good, self-sacrificing, unselfish, brave, meritorious, knowledgeable, good humoured, genial, tolerant, affectionate) and their deeds (dancing, writing nice poems, dealing with or engaging in mathematics, composing nice musical works), or because they are willing to identify themselves with them. In short, sympathetic curiosity can be described as a kind of subjective curiosity type emerging from favourable feelings towards historical figures, where one identifies himself with one of these figures and tries to behave as if he/she were him or her. This sub-dimension of emotional curiosity (empathetic curiosity) can be exemplified with the following statements:

- *Michael Jackson: (I wonder him because) I love him, the way he danced and the interesting acts he did when he danced (75; First grade boy student).*
- *M. Kemal Atatürk: (I wonder him because) he saved our country and I love him. I have never heard his voice (44; Second grade boy student).*
- *Ottoman Sultans (Emperors): (I wonder them because) I love Ottoman Sultans since I was small (19; Third grade girl student).*
- *Dede Efendi: (I wonder him because) I love music and he has many beautiful compositions. For example, “Gülnehal” (68; Fourth grade girl student).*
- *Cahit Arif: (I wonder him because) I love mathematics. Therefore, I love also Cahit Arif (41; Fifth grade boy student).*
- *Mete Han: (I wonder him because) I love him very much (75; Sixth grade boy student).*
- *Mevlana: (I wonder him because) he writes nice poems (60; Seventh grade boy student).*
- *Ali Rıza Efendi and Zübeyde Hanım (Parents of Atatürk): (I wonder them because) they know the method of bringing up such a self-sacrificing, patriotic and clever child (26; Eighth grade girl student).*

(3) Antipathetic curiosity: During the previous phases of the research, this dimension had been defined as a type of curiosity caused by negative feelings such as anger and hatred about controversial matters in history. However, at this stage of the research carried out on primary and secondary school students, no statement was made by the students regarding this dimension of emotional curiosity. The absence of antipathetic curiosity at primary and secondary school levels may be seen as a positive situation in respect of a peaceful history teaching. Nevertheless, not being able to supply the students with correct information about historical figures that have the potential of being wrongly introduced (being otherized) as the time passes, in other words not giving information on them or clothing the reality may gradually give way to informal and unscientific enlightenment of the children resulting in the emergence of hostile feelings towards others (Altun, 2014a; Canlı & Altun, 2014).

Dilemmatic curiosity: This is a type of historical curiosity that appears when the students face with dilemmatic situations during history-teaching, when a suspicion arises about historicity, and when the students desire to learn the reality to dispel the suspicions about the information supplied to them. When the information gathered during grounded theory phase is examined, it appears that the dilemmas are generally witnessed when contradictions such as “*traitor or hero, good or bad, right or wrong, true or lie, happened or did not happen, objective or subjective*” are in question. It is also observed that the perception of suspicion emerges mainly when students think that what is taught by the teachers or what is narrated in textbooks or in the sources on history is different from what in fact happened, when there is no agreement on many different viewpoints, or when the figures/events/matters in question are narrated or reported continuously from the same negative point of view. In his study, Levstik (2000) attempted to explain the disunity or difference between “students’ beliefs on historical importance” and “the subjects and problematical issues which, according to the teachers, are to be dealt with in the class”. In this study, he exposed that the curiosities of the students towards “unfavourable” and “compulsive-controversial” aspects of the history of U.S.A. were being purposely ignored or pushed to the background by the teachers desiring to include systematically “revolutionary story of the events of national history” in their curricula. Teachers, textbooks, peers and sources of dilemmas are really important. However, what is more important is the source of the curiosity towards dilemmas. Though source of curiosity, here, has generally something to do with “which one of the two options of the dilemma is correct”, occasionally persistent-narration of only one of these two options appears as the source of this curiosity. The responsibility of removing and getting rid of historical dilemmas may be assigned to the teacher, curricula and textbooks or to the student him/herself. This is not important either. What is important is to manage an objective process based on the proofs and leaving the final decision to the students (for example a process where there will be no selections or omissions of the proofs and subjects to be submitted and narrated to the students, which naturally ends up with the emergence of prejudices in the hearts of the students). At the primary and secondary school dimension of the study, some views emerged with regard to the dilemmatic curiosity:

- *İbn-i Sina: (I wonder him. Because I want to know) what kind of person he is? Good or bad? (75; Third grade – Girl student)*
- *Sultan Vahdettin: (I wonder him. Because) There are a lot of controversial information narrated about him (50; Eight grade – Girl student)*

Environmental curiosity: This is a type of curiosity occurring when an individual is impressed or influenced by different people around him or by various productions of media, and is divided into two sub-groups namely social and popular:

(1) Popular curiosity: This curiosity type can be defined as a kind of curiosity which emerges under the effects of the factors such as printed means of media containing historical stories like books, magazines and newspapers, visual means of media like cinemas, films, serials and documentaries, and finally digital media (internet and social media) uniting all of other media types in itself with its popular convergence feature. When the literature is reviewed, it is observed that various studies carried out in this field emphasize that written and electronic media such as television, cinema, commercial books and internet have an important effect on the formation of student’ curiosities towards historical subjects and on their developing right or wrong understandings about the history (Dimitriadis, 2000; Grant, 2001; Lévesque, 2003; Barton, 2008). The following statements of the students participating in our study can be given as examples of this type of curiosity:

- *Our ancestries (forefathers): (I wonder them. Because) I saw them when they were rejoicing for something on TV (43; First grade – Boy student).*
- *Mevlana: (I wonder him. Because) I read a book entitled “Mevlana ile bir gün (A day with Mevlana)”. From that day on, I am eager to know more about him (84; Second grade girl student).*
- *Atatürk: (I wonder him. Because) I am curious about learning his life. And I satisfy my curiosity with information on the books I read (2; Sixth grade – Girl student)*

(2) Social curiosity: Social curiosity, that is directly related with the curiosity of the society a person lives in, emerges mainly from historical stories narrated by family members such as mother, father, grandfather or grandmother and from frequent references of the people in social environment to the matter being wondered about. Kölbl and Straub (2001) alleges that historical curiosity may appear depending on various factors, the dominant one being socio-cultural context. Children learn the history from their mothers, fathers, grandmothers, grandfathers, brothers, sisters, relatives and their peers, and due to this social environment, their interest in the history increase (Barton, 2001; Lévesque, 2003; Barton & McCully, 2005; Barton, 2008). The following statements of the children can be given as examples of social curiosity:

- *Atatürk: Everybody speaks of Atatürk. That is why I wonder him (60; Second grade – Girl student).*
- *Seyit Onbaşı: I wonder him because people speaks so much about him (6; Fourth grade – Boy student).*
- *Fatih Sultan Mehmet: (I wonder him because) Everybody speaks of him and wonders him (92; Sixth grade boy student).*
- *Fatih Sultan Mehmet: I have heard his name many times. That is why I wonder him (34; Seventh grade – Girl student).*
- *Sultan Vahdettin: (I wonder him because) People speak a lot on the subjects concerning him (50; Eight grade girl student).*

2.2. The Trajectory of Historical Curiosity (Primary and Secondary School Dimensions)

In this study, it is attempted to examine and develop the pattern emerging with regard to historical curiosity on the one hand, and it is endeavoured to explain the evolution of this pattern through primary and secondary school years on the other. Data on the trajectory of historical curiosity through primary and secondary school years are presented below in Table 11.

Table 11. The Trajectory of Historical Curiosity in Primary and Secondary Schools

Historical Curiosity	Grades (f)								Total (f)	%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
Important curiosity	6	25	37	27	28	25	33	25	206	50,74	
Extraordinary curiosity	-	4	14	3	4	11	11	12	59	14,5	
Experimental curiosity	26	16	5	10	3	1	4	-	65	16	
Emotional curiosity	Empathetic curiosity	1	1	-	-	5	2	-	-	9	2,2
	Sympathetic curiosity	5	10	11	10	6	9	1	5	57	14
	Antipathetic curiosity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dilemmatic curiosity	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	0,3	
Environmental curiosity	Popular curiosity	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	0,74
	Social curiosity	-	1	-	1	-	2	1	1	6	1,5
Total	39	58	68	51	46	51	50	43	406		

When the trajectory of historical curiosity is examined, it is noticed that especially the dimension denominated as “*important curiosity*” appears to be the most intense dimension through the whole process. However, here, it would not be a healthy assessment to conclude that what the students wonder more is the thing that is important. Because, as pointed out earlier, the crucial point here is to find out “who decides on what is important”, or in other words, to establish which one of the following historical importance perceptions is in question in this type of curiosity (important curiosity); “that which is explored by the students themselves” or “that which is transmitted to the students through historians, textbooks and teachers”? Unfortunately, transmitted historical importance perception is in question in the formation of important curiosity. And, therefore, it can be said that what leads the students to historical curiosity is the transmitted-memorized information, rather than the explored information. It is also possible to say that the transmitted-memorized information doesn’t lead to historical curiosity, on the contrary it extinguishes it. Evolution of the thoughts of a student stating in the beginning “I

wonder what kind of a woman did Atatürk marry to (65; Second grade girl student)" and stating as the time passed by "Afet İnan is adopted daughter of Atatürk. It is important to know this (10; Sixth grade girl student)" can be given as an example to support this view. In order to overcome this disadvantageous situation, it can be paid more attention to the curiosities of the students in history teaching. As in the past, today also interesting, mysterious, unbelievable, incredible, creative, surprising, impossible things and the like draw attention and result in the emergence of curiosity. This study also supports the idea that extraordinary curiosity keeps its existence with an increasing tendency through primary and secondary school years. It can be recommended to benefit from this extraordinary curiosity type more consciously and more intensely in order to transform the somewhat boring history class into a more interesting and enjoyable class that would create more curiosity.

Experimental curiosity that can be claimed to originate from students' development features rather than their knowledge of history within the context of epistemic curiosity appears to seriously decrease from the first years of primary school to the last years of secondary school. It even disappears in the eighth and last year of the secondary school. This curiosity type that manifests itself as the desire for seeing historical figures, talking to them, and experience some events together with them reminds us the understanding of "narrative history" and it even leads us to discuss on whether the understanding of imaginary history can be pedagogic or not? There exist even some studies alleging that stories/anecdotes excite the students and increase their interests and desires to study history (Brophy & VanSledright, 1997; Grant, 2001). However, in the years to come it can be attempted to find ways of keeping this curiosity type on a more realistic base. Seeing the documents, goods, personal belongings or other things used by historical figures with naked eyes and perhaps even experiencing them may contribute to the continuation of experimental curiosity on a realistic base instead of being imaginary. Similarly, at every stage of history education, first-hand sources belonging to historical figures may increase both quality of teaching and students' curiosities and interests towards history (Ciardiello, 2003; Reio & Wiswell, 2000; as cited in Reio, 2008). Experimental curiosity may be of help in the field of history teaching and even in the development of history/time perception within the framework of the perspectives called as "story age" by Andraess (1939) and as "Mythical understanding" by Egan (2010).

As for emotional curiosity, it is the second most observed curiosity type after important curiosity. Antipathetic curiosity, one of three sub-dimensions of emotional curiosity, is not apparent in the sample of primary and secondary schools. Though this fact can be considered as a positive state within the context of "peace education", it may also be useful to resolve the curiosity towards "others" in order to overcome prejudices and stereotyped-judgements and to prevent enemization. Antipathetic feelings with regard to history generally emerge from controversial subjects. However, as these controversial subjects are not adequately touched upon, the background information needed for the emergence of epistemic curiosity towards history cannot either be acquired. As for empathetic curiosity, it is observed, though limited, during the first years of secondary school. Especially when you think about the unfavourable results of excessive sympathy and antipathy, it can be recommended to benefit pedagogically from this curiosity type more than other emotional curiosity types. Performing historical empathy studies in this context can contribute to the development of students' historical understandings. Though sympathetic historical curiosity is generally witnessed during primary school years, it manages to keep its existence through the whole process. Students see and wonder sympathetic figures at every stage. For the teachers, it should be a primary and indispensable view-point to ensure the development of all emotional curiosity types depending on historical proofs or in a coherent way.

Dilemmatic curiosity that is clearly observed at bachelor degrees (Altun, 2014a; Canlı & Altun, 2014) is almost never witnessed at primary and secondary school levels. Although limited, environmental curiosity that has two sub-dimensions namely "popular" and "social" is also witnessed at primary and secondary school levels. It can be alleged that this fact is closely related with the interest of the society and the media in historical matters.

When examining the trajectory of historical curiosity, variables such as sexes and socio-economical levels of the students are taken into consideration during the coding (boy=b, girl=g, lower=l,

middle=m, high=h). Though no remarkable difference was observed with regard to these two variables, it is noticed that the students at lower socio-economical level follow their peers from behind from epistemic view-point (in terms of knowledge of history). It appears that the students at lower socio-economical level become acquainted with historical figures and their features and their deeds later than the others, and they can reach to the information level of their peers only when they attend to 2nd or 3rd grade. When the trajectory of historical curiosity is reviewed, it appears that first grade students in primary schools have a quite shallow biographical chronology of mind ranging from caveman to the family members who already passed away. As the time goes by, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk is included into this chronology. In other words, in Turkey, children step in history with Atatürk. At secondary school stage Fatih Sultan Mehmet appears on the scene. It can be continued to give similar information about the trajectory of historical curiosity of the students. However, attention is to be concentrated here especially on one point. It should be in fact focused on “how the trajectory of historical figures must be”, not on “how it is at present”. The following questions and similar ones should be cared about within the context of history education and the academicians being expert in the field of history education must ponder on the matters such as;

- Which historical figures in Turkey should be the first ones with whom our children would step in history?
- Who should the children become acquainted first with?
- What features of these historical figures are to be taught to the children?
- Which historical figures are to be included into this epistemic travel or trajectory?

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

This study has two main dimensions; the first one is “the trajectory of historical figures most wondered by primary and secondary school students (which figures are the most wondered ones through primary and secondary school years?)” and the second one is “the trajectory of historical curiosity and its classification based on curiosity reasons”. As for the trajectory of historical figures wondered by the students, the most important point that draws attention is that political and military figures constitute a big majority among them with the rate of 61%. Though teaching of political history that naturally does not draw children’s attention may be considered as a negative point, the reason of political and military historical figures’ being wondered the most by the children may be the fact that children, who are on romantic age of their lives according to the classification of Egan (2010), degrade the history into only the history of big activist personalities.

It is also observed that, though not sufficient, also some figures in the field of “science, literature and art” come to the forefront in the list of important historical figures. However, unfortunately, women, olds, children and people in different fields excluding the afore-mentioned ones, that can be called as “ordinary people” do not appear or are not sufficiently represented in this list. In the present study done based on the views and statements of 606 primary and secondary school students, the students stated to wonder 88 different historical figures in total. The results may be assessed as insufficient with regard to the representation (breakdown of the fields of curiosity) and total number of the wondered historical figures. Within the context of the trajectory of historical figures, it can be recommended that, with a view to promoting the interest towards historical subjects, students should witness a more balanced representation of the lives (especially lives of the figures who already passed away) and get acquainted with more historical figures in the lessons of “life study” and “social studies” (at al.). As already stated by Levstik and Groth (2002), in order to find a remedy to this problem of lack of representation and fewness of the wondered historical figures, it should be endeavoured to increase the interests of the students towards historical culture (perhaps towards all dimensions of history from an inter-disciplinary perspective) and to ensure a larger diversity and a better balance of women and men with a view getting the historical events and lives of the children more meaningful by changing the classical focus of history on symbolic figures (concentration mainly on political and military heroes, and on some woman heroes). In other words, it is necessary to shift the centre of gravity of history-

teaching from “men” to “women, children, sick people, invalids and slaves”, that is, to ordinary people, or in short from “political history” to “all dimensions of history”.

Out of 88 most wondered historical figures stated by the students, 27 are from “political and military” field, 23 are from “science, literature and art” field, 5 are from “religious” field, and 11 are from “familial” field. Especially when we look at the political figures, it is noticed that intensive curiosity towards Turkish Republic (in general meaning) and Atatürk (as a person) that is felt during the first years of primary school diminish seriously during the last years of secondary school. It can be said that the reason of this gradual decrease in the curiosity felt towards Atatürk might originate either from the sufficiency of the information acquired about him or from frequent repetition of the subjects regarding Atatürk. The question of “Why does this curiosity come to the point of disappearance as time goes on” needs to be answered through further studies in this regard. On the contrary, a gradual increase is observed on the curiosity felt towards Ottoman Empire and Fatih Sultan Mehmet through primary and secondary school years. This rise of interest might originate from the fact that the information about the history of Ottoman Empire are given to the students at an increasing density and rate at higher grades. Again, in the context of the trajectory of historical curiosity, it is noticed that, though not so intensively, Seyit Onbaşı is also wondered at every level of age within the framework of curiosity. As from third grade of the primary school, students begin not to consider or give up considering their family members as historically wondered figures. As already emphasized in the preceding paragraphs, this development may be related with the improvement of “time perceptions” of the children. Other than those changes so-far stated in connection with the trajectory of historical curiosity, it is not possible to speak of any other decreasing, increasing or constant trajectory with regard to other figures.

Besides the trajectory of the curiosity towards historical figures, some other attention-drawing points about the trajectory of the types of historical curiosity also come into prominence in this study. Especially important, extraordinary and sympathetic curiosity types are witnessed at every age-level of the children. As for experimental curiosity, it is intensively observed during the first grades of primary school and starts to disappear in the following years. Here, the question on which the emphasis should be put on is “How can we make use of the trajectory of curiosity types in the field of history-teaching”.

The grounded theory process, of which the present study is a part, is still being continued comparatively (See: Table 2). Although there are some slight differences on the studies performed on different samples within the scope of this grounded theory process, it can be alleged that there is also a self-repeating pattern. In fact, the curiosity, or rather “all types of curiosities” have something to do with the lack of information by their very nature. Therefore, classifying or denominating factual curiosity and ignorant curiosity (a sub-dimension of the factual curiosity) as new curiosity-types that are different from the others would be a mistake, and thereof both of these two types were left out of the classification and of the scope of this study. But the dilemmatic curiosity that used to be, beforehand, the second sub dimension of factual curiosity took its place as a new sub-heading of historical curiosity types. On the other hand, partly due to the effect of the sample chosen for this study (especially due to having been focused on the primary and secondary school students), experimental curiosity became more apparent and consequently denominated as a new and different historical curiosity type. The pattern that appeared at this stage of the grounded theory process consists of the following sub-headings: *Important curiosity, extraordinary curiosity, experimental curiosity, emotional curiosity (empathetic, sympathetic and antipathetic), dilemmatic curiosity and finally environmental curiosity (popular and social)*. It can be alleged that, with the present study, the historical curiosity types have become more evident (crystallised) and definable. Although, in this study it was focused on historical curiosity within the context of epistemic curiosity, the new pattern that emerged through this study may also be considered as sub-dimensions of epistemic curiosity because of the nature of the information. Within this context, additional studies can be carried out on whether this pattern is valid for different information structures and disciplines.

The sample of the next step of the theory construction process, that is still going on, will be the students attending to the Department of History of Faculty of Arts and Science, who are intensively

exposed to historical information. Later on, it is aimed at focusing on different regions of Turkey with a larger sample, and finalizing the process with a sample of international dimension.

It is also intended to continue to perform studies on each one of the sub-dimensions under the umbrella of a different working process. For example, additional studies can be carried out in order to determine wide-spread historical dilemmas and their sources and to solve the determined dilemmas.

This study reveals that primary and secondary school students;

- take their first steps into the “*Past*” through the information they get from their family members,
- become acquainted with Atatürk through the information they get in *history* lessons, and
- have a biographical chronology/trajectory of history that starts with above steps (getting information about “the past” and “Atatürk”) and, in the course of time, continues with acquiring new information on the other historical figures in the fields of policy, science, arts, literature and so on.

This trajectory of mind which is considerably empty and jumps from cave-man to grandfathers and grandmothers during the first years of the primary school, continue his travel over time with historical figures from different fields and, thus, gets rich. This travel on the trajectory of the mind brings the following questions to mind:

- What should “the biographic learning trajectory” of our children be with regard to historical subjects and matters?
- What kind of process or processes should be followed?
- Who should our children know first in historical context?
- And, how should this process of knowing (getting acquainted with historical figures) progress throughout the education period?

But, looking for answers to these questions may also be interpreted as “getting the teaching-process stable”. However, when “scantiness of historical figures taught to children” and “shallowness of the supplied information on these figures” are taken into consideration, and when you conduct a different study for each lesson/discipline to answer these questions, it will be understood that the claim of “getting the teaching-process stable” is out of question, and that answers to be given to these questions are indicators of the fact that the matter in question is approached scientifically and in a planned manner. Therefore, as stated above, it should be concentrated on the following question: “*What should the biographic learning trajectory of our children be with regard to historical subjects and matters*”. In fact, at this point, this question can be expanded as follows: “*Is it possible to create a learning-trajectory about Turkish history that would range from primary school to high school?*”.

Acknowledgements

I especially thank Professor Bahri Ata and Associate Professor Selahattin Kaymakçı who have been invaluable sources of inspiration of this study.

References

- Acun, N., Kapıkıran, Ş., & Kabasakal, Z. (2013). Merak ve keşfetme ölçeği II: Açımlayıcı ve doğrulayıcı faktör analizleri ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 16(31), 74-85.
- Altun, A. (2014a). Sınıf öğretmenleri adaylarının tarih merakına yönelik bir inceleme. *Route Educational and Social Science Journal*, 1(3), 16-32.
- Altun, A. (2014b). *İlkokul ve Ortaokul Öğrencilerinin Tarih Merakının Yörüngesi: Olaylar, Zamanlar ve Mekânlar*. Paper presented at the III. Uluslararası Tarih Eğitimi Sempozyumu, Sakarya.
- Andraess, E. (1939). Çocuğa uygun tarih tedrisatı (K. Kaya, Trans.). İstanbul: Tan Matbaası.
- Ashby, R., & Lee, P. J. (1987). Children's concepts of empathy and understanding in history. In C. Portal. (Ed.), *The history curriculum for teachers* (pp. 62- 88). London, UK: Falmer.
- Ata, B. (2008). Sosyal bilgilerde Atatürkçülük konularının eğitimi ve öğretmenin rolü. In B. Tay, & A. Öcal (Eds.), *Özel öğretim yöntemleriyle sosyal bilgiler öğretimi* (pp. 283-299). Ankara: Pegem A Publishing.
- Barton, K. C. (2001). You'd be wanting to know about the past: Social contexts of children's understanding in Northern Ireland and the USA. *Comparative Education*, 37, 89-106.
- Barton, K. C. (2005). Tarihte birinci elden kaynaklar: Efsaneleri / mitleri aşmak (Y. Doğan, Trans). *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 29(5), 1407-1426.
- Barton, K. C. (2008). *Research on students' ideas about history, The handbook of research in social studies education*. Levstik, L. S. and Tyson, C. A. (Eds.). New York: Routledge
- Barton, K. C., & McCully, A. W. (2005). History, identity, and the school curriculum in Northern Ireland: An empirical study of secondary students' ideas and perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37(1), 85-116.
- Barton, K. C., & Levstik, L. S. (2004). *The role of individual narratives in history education. Teaching history for the common good*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Berlyne, D. E. (1954). A theory of human curiosity, *British Journal of Psychology*, 45(3), 180.
- Brophy, J., & VanSledright, B. A. (1997). *Teaching and learning history in elementary schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Canlı, M., & Altun, A. (2014). *Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretmen Adaylarının Tarih Merakına Yönelik Bir İnceleme*. Paper presented at the III. Uluslararası Tarih Eğitimi Sempozyumu, Sakarya.
- Collins, R. P., Litman, J. A., & Spielberger, C. D. (2004). The measurement of perceptual curiosity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 1127-1141.
- Çelik, H., & Ekşi, H. (2015). *Nitel Desenler Gömülü Teori*. EDAM Yayınları.
- Demirel, M., & Diker Coşkun, Y. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerinin meraklılık düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(18), 111-134.
- Dilek, D. (2000). Öğrencilerde tarih düşüncesinin gelişimi: Tarih derslerinde öğrenme ve anlama. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, (145), 50-54.
- Dimitriadis, G. (2000). Making history go at a local community center: Popular media and the construction of historical knowledge among African American youth. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 28, 40-64.
- Doğan, Y. (2006). Sosyal bilgiler öğretiminde tarihsel yazılı kanıtların kullanımı (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Egan, K. (2010). *Eğitilmiş zihin: Bilişsel araçlar anlama süreçlerimizi nasıl şekillendirir?* (F. Keser, Trans.) Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Er, H. (2005). *Sosyal bilgiler dersinde biyografi öğretimi: Atatürk'ün hayatı metninin analizi ve yeni bir tasarım* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

- Er, H. (2010). *Sosyal bilgiler eğitimi kapsamında ilköğretim öğrencilerinin "biyografi" kullanımına ilişkin görüşleri* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Er Tuna, Y. (2014). *Ortaöğretim öğrencilerinin bazı tarihsel olaylardan hareketle tarihsel önem kavramına ilişkin algı ve görüşleri* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Erbudak, K. C. (2016). *Ortaokul öğrencilerinin bilim tarihi konularına ilişkin tarihsel önemlilik alguları* (Unpublished master's thesis). Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Educational Sciences, İzmir.
- Eren, A. (2009). Examining the relationship between epistemic curiosity and achievement goals. *Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 36, 129-144.
- Eren, A. (2011). Prospective teachers' general epistemic curiosity and domain-specific epistemic curiosity: The mediating role of perceived instrumentality. In R. M. Teixeira (Ed.), *Higher education in a state of crisis* (pp. 163-183). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Glaser, B. G. (2000). The Future of Grounded Theory. *Grounded Theory Review*, 1, 1-8.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory Strategies for Qualitative Research*, Aldine Publishing Company, Chicago.
- Grant, S. G. (2001). It's just the facts, or is it? Teachers' practices and students' understandings of history. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 29(1), 65-108.
- Hume, D. (1888). *A Treatise of Human Nature*, L. A. Selby Bigge (ed.), Oxford.
- Karabağ, Ş. G. (2003). *Öğretilebilir ve bilişsel bir beceri olarak tarihi empati* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Kashdan T. B., & Silvia, P. J. (2009). Curiosity and interest: The benefits of thriving on novelty and challenge. In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 367-375). Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kaya, F. (2015). Öğretmenlerin üstün zekâ kavramı ve üstün zekâlı öğrencilerin özel gereksinimleri. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 40(177), 59-74.
- Kaymakçı, S., & Er, H. (2013). Sosyal bilgiler öğretim programı ve ders kitaplarında biyografinin kullanımı. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25, 198-224.
- Kohlmeier, J. (2005). The impact of having ninth-graders do history. *The History Teacher*, 38, 499-524.
- Kölbl, C., & Straub, J. (2001). Historical consciousness in youth: Theoretical and exemplary empirical analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 2(3). Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2003-2001/2003-2001koelblstraub-e.htm>
- Köse, M. (2004). *Tarih öğretiminde kadın ve Türk kadını imajı* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Köse, M. (2011). *Tarih öğretiminde kadın imajının yeniden inşası* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Kurt, F. (2016). Dünya bilim ve teknoloji mirasının farklı ülkelerin sosyal bilgiler ders kitaplarına yansımaları üzerine karşılaştırmalı bir inceleme (Unpublished master's thesis). Adıyaman University, Institute of Social Sciences, Adıyaman.
- James, W. (1890). *The Principles of Psychology*. <http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/James/Principles/prin10.htm> adresinden erişildi.
- Jirout, J., & Klahr, D. (2011). Children's scientific curiosity: In search of an operational definition of an elusive concept. *Developmental Review*, 32, 125-160.
- Johnson R. B., & Christensen L. B. (2014). *Educational Research: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches*. SAGE Publications. Fifth edition.
- Lee, P. J. (1984). Historical imagination. In A. Dickinson (Ed.), *Learning History* (pp. 85-116). London: Heinemann

- Leslie, I. (2015). *Merak* (C. E. Topakbaş, Trans.). İstanbul: NTV Publishing.
- Lévesque, S. (2003). Bin Laden is responsible; it was shown on tape: Canadian high school students' historical understanding of terrorism. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 31(2), 174-202. doi: 10.1080/00933104.2003.10473221
- Levstik, L. S. (2000). Articulating the silences: Teachers' and adolescents' conceptions of historical significance. In P. N. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives* (pp. 284-305). New York: New York University Press.
- Levstik, L. S., & Groth, J. (2002). Scary thing, being an eighth grader: Exploring gender and sexuality in a middle school U.S. *History Unit, Theory & Research in Social Education*, 30(2), 233-254. doi: 10.1080/00933104.2002.10473193
- Levstik, L. S. (2011). Learning history. In R. E. Mayeris, & P. A. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of research on learning and instruction* (pp. 108-126). New York: Routledge.
- Litman, J. A. (2010). Relationships between measures of I- and D-type curiosity, ambiguity tolerance, and need for closure: An initial test of the wanting-liking model of information seeking. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 397-402.
- Litman, J. A., Collins, R. P., Spielberger, C. D. (2005). The nature and measurement of sensory curiosity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39, 1123-1133.
- Litman, J. A., Hutchins, T. L., & Russon, R. K. (2005). Epistemic curiosity, feeling-of-knowing, and exploratory behaviour. *Cognition and Emotion*, 19(4), 559-582.
- Litman, J. A., & Pezzo, M. V. (2007). Dimensionality of interpersonal curiosity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43(6), 1448-1459.
- Litman, J. A., & Spielberger, C. D. (2003). Measuring epistemic curiosity and its diversive and specific components. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 80(1), 75-86. Retrieved from <http://drjlitman.net/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Litman-Spielberger-2003.pdf>
- Loewenstein, G. (1994). The psychology of curiosity: A review and reinterpretation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116(1), 75-98.
- Merriam, S. B. (2013). *Nitel Araştırma Desen ve Uygulama İçin Bir Rehber*. Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Morse, J. M. (1994). *Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Methods*. SAGE Publications.
- Özsüer, E. (2015). Tarihin "öteki" yüzü: Türkiye ve Yunanistan örneğinde tarihi yeniden algılama. *Türk Tarih Eğitimi Dergisi (TUHED)*, 4(2), 165-201.
- Patton, M. C. (2014). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice*. SAGE Publications. Fourth edition.
- Reio, T. G. (2008). Curiosity and primary source materials: Making history come alive. In D. M. Mc Inerney, & A. D. Liem (Eds.), *Teaching and learning: International best practice* (pp. 51-77). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Rowson, J., Young, J., Spencer, N., Lindley, E., & Gecius, E. (2012). The Power of Curiosity. UK: RSA Social Brain Centre. Retrieved February 23, 2016, from <http://www.thersa.org>
- Seixas, P. (1994). Students' understanding of historical significance. *Theory & Research in Social Education* 22(3), 281-304.
- Şimşek, A. (2006). *Türkiye'deki sosyal bilgiler öğretimi alanı çocuk edebiyatı ürünlerinden yararlanma bağlamında çağdaş dünyanın neresindedir? II. ulusal çocuk ve gençlik eğitimi sempozyumu bildiriler kitabı*. Ankara: A. Ü. Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Publishing.
- Tarhan, M., & Altun, A. (2014). Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretmen Adaylarının Tarihsel Önem Algıları: Kişi, Olay, Zaman ve Mekânlar. Paper presented at the III. Uluslararası Tarih Eğitimi Sempozyumu, Sakarya University, Sakarya.
- Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news - a study in the construction of reality*. New York: The Free Press.
- Türk Dil Kurumu (2016). Heves. Retrieved from <http://www.tdk.gov.tr>

- Yeager, E. A., & Terzian, S. G. (2007). "That's when we became a nation": Urban Latino adolescents and the designation of historical significance. *Urban Education*, 42(1), 52-81.
- Yıldız, Ö. (2003). Türkiye’de tarih öğretiminin sorunları ve çağdaş çözüm önerileri. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2(15), 181-190.
- Yıldız, C., Göl, R., & Hacısalıhoğlu Karadeniz, M. (2016). Matematik dersi öğretim programlarında kadın matematikçilere yer verilme durumunun incelenmesi. *Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(14), 191-214.