*

Why do so many children stop asking "why" – and what can teachers do to bring their natural curiosity back to life?

# Why Does the Gecko Eat the Mosquito?

## Reclaiming Inquiry-Based Wonder in the Primary Classroom

**Rivan Gestiardi**
*Independent Researcher, Malang, Indonesia*

**Subanji**
*Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia*

**Picture a 1st-grade classroom bathed in morning light. Twenty-five children sit on small wooden chairs, their hands shooting up like eager saplings. "Teacher, why are butterflies different colors?" one girl calls out. "Why does rain fall down instead of sideways?" a boy in the back shouts, not even waiting for his turn. The room buzzes with a joyful orchestra of curiosity. Every question earns a smile from the teacher; every wild guess sparks laughter and wonder.**

Now fast-forward three years. Walk into the same school, the same hallway, but open the door to a 4th-grade classroom. The same children sit in rows. Their eyes are fixed on the whiteboard, expressionless. No hands rise. The only sound is the teacher's steady lecture and the scratching of pens on notebooks. The room is quiet — not the quiet of concentration, but the quiet of extinguished wonder.

Something happened between 1st grade and 4th grade. What killed the curiosity?

This is not fiction. Susan Engel, a developmental psychologist at Williams College, has shown that the frequency of children's questions drops dramatically once they enter formal schooling.[1] Children who ask between 40 and 100 questions per day at age 4 gradually learn to stay silent. They don't stop wondering, but the traditional classroom environment and teaching approach convinces them that wondering is irrelevant or, worse, risky. Researchers Jamie Jirout and David Klahr[2] suggest that this decline stems less from cognitive maturation than from learning environments that inadvertently crush the habit of asking.

This erosion of wonder is the product of three forces that work in concert across education systems worldwide: pedagogical fatigue and administrative overload, the "one right answer" trap, and the testing treadmill.

## Pedagogical Fatigue and Administrative Overload

Consider the reality facing a typical primary school teacher today. In the span of five years, she may have been asked to adopt three different curricula, attend training on two new digital platforms, master a new grading software, and fill out a redesigned set of administrative forms, all while teaching 30 children five days a week. Each reform arrives with its own jargon, its own set of mandatory workshops, and its own stack of paperwork. By the time she has learned the new system, another one replaces it.

This phenomenon, which we call Method Fatigue, goes beyond simple inconvenience. Cognitive scientist Daniel Willingham[3] explains that the human brain avoids deep thinking because it consumes enormous cognitive resources. When a teacher's limited cognitive bandwidth

is consumed by learning yet another administrative tool or filling out yet another compliance checklist, she has no energy left for the most important part of her job: listening to a child's question and turning it into a learning moment.

Beyond cognitive depletion, every new curriculum brings a wave of technical requirements: revised lesson plan templates, new reporting formats, updated digital platforms, and additional training hours. Teachers find themselves spending evenings and weekends filling out compliance documents instead of preparing engaging lessons. This bureaucratic weight leaves teachers chronically exhausted. When a teacher is overwhelmed by paperwork deadlines and technical procedures, she loses the patience to entertain a student's "off-topic" question. She loses the time to turn that question into a teachable moment. The result is a classroom where administrative survival displaces pedagogical creativity.

Overwhelmed teachers default to the safest, most efficient mode of instruction: lecture, assign, test. This mode requires minimal improvisation and produces predictable outcomes. But it also eliminates the space for surprise, for detours, for the messy magic that happens when a child asks, "But why?" As Sir Ken Robinson has argued, schools have become factories optimized for standardization, not gardens designed for growth.[4]

## The "One Right Answer" Trap

In classrooms around the world, the implicit contract between teacher and student is simple: the teacher asks a question and the student provides the correct answer, the one printed in the textbook. Divergent answers — creative, unexpected, or unconventional answers — are treated as errors, not as invitations to deeper thinking. Education researcher Ronald Beghetto[5] calls this "killing ideas softly." It happens through practices that seem harmless: ignoring answers that fall outside the lesson plan, steering class discussions toward a single predetermined conclusion, or praising only those students who parrot the textbook.

Over time, these micro-signals teach children that original ideas are not welcome. If a child fears being wrong, she stops trying anything new. As Carol Dweck's research[6] on mindsets has shown, the belief

that mistakes are shameful rather than instructive shuts down the willingness to experiment.

## The Testing Treadmill

When assessment operates on a binary right-or-wrong scoring system, students learn to avoid mistakes at all costs. The higher the testing stakes, the narrower the curriculum becomes.[7] Research documents the collateral damage: rising student anxiety, declining intrinsic motivation, and an eroding trust between teachers and students. In developing countries, these effects are magnified. In Indonesia, for example, teachers who have not yet mastered one curriculum are already forced to adapt to the next, resulting in surface-level implementation at best.

Researchers Tim Post and Juliette Walma van der Molen[8] have found that children express significantly less curiosity inside school than outside it, a gap they attribute to the evaluative pressure of the classroom environment. The testing treadmill does not teach children how to think. It teaches them what to think.

## The Why Revolution: A Different Way to Begin

What if the solution does not require a new curriculum, a bigger budget, or cutting-edge technology? What if it starts with something beautifully simple: one question that makes a child open her eyes wide and whisper, "Teacher, why?"

The Why Revolution is not a new method to replace existing curricula. It is a small but fundamental shift in how teachers begin and facilitate daily lessons, placing provocative questioning at the entry point of learning. George Loewenstein's[9] "information gap" theory explains why this works: curiosity arises when a person becomes aware of a gap between what she knows and what she wants to know, creating a cognitive itch that demands scratching. The following two classroom illustrations show the approach in action.

## The Gecko and the Mosquito

In a traditional science lesson on animals, the teacher instructs: "Open your textbook to page 34. A gecko is a reptile. It has four legs, breathes through lungs, and its body is covered in scales." Students copy the facts. The lesson ends. Nobody asks a question. Nobody needs to.

The Why Revolution transforms the entry point. Instead of opening the textbook, the teacher opens with a question:

> "Children, here is something strange. A mosquito flies toward a gecko on the wall. The mosquito knows, somehow, that the gecko is dangerous: the gecko eats mosquitoes. And yet, the mosquito flies closer. Why? What is the gecko's secret weapon?"

Now imagine the classroom dialogue that follows:

*Student A:* "Maybe the mosquito is not smart enough to know it's dangerous?"
*Teacher:* "Interesting idea. But mosquitoes have survived for millions of years. Are they really that foolish? What else might explain it?"
*Student B:* "Maybe the gecko has a smell that attracts the mosquito?"
*Teacher:* "Now you're thinking like a scientist. What would you need to test that idea?"
*Student C:* "Wait, does the gecko's skin color help it hide? Maybe the mosquito can't see it!"
*Teacher:* "So you're saying camouflage might play a role. How could we find out?"

Without opening a textbook, the students have begun discussing predator-prey relationships, adaptation, camouflage, and the scientific method. They are learning the same content, but through questions they generated themselves, driven by genuine curiosity. The teacher's role is to facilitate: to ask follow-up questions, not to provide answers.

## The Elephant Versus the Ant

This imaginary battle is designed to train critical thinking and multi-perspective analysis. The teacher opens the lesson with a provocative challenge:

*Teacher:* "Today, we're going to imagine a battle between an elephant and a colony of one million ants. Who would win?"
*Student D:* "The elephant! It's huge!"
*Teacher:* "You said the elephant because it's big. But does being big always mean being strong?"
*Student E:* "What if the ants crawled into the elephant's trunk? Into its ears?"
*Student F:* "The ants could win because they work together. The elephant is alone."
*Teacher:* "So you're saying that teamwork can beat size? Where else have you seen that happen, in real life, not just animals?"
*Student G:* "In football! A small team can beat a bigger team if they have a better strategy."
*Teacher:* "Exactly! So what does this tell us about what it really means to be strong?"

That final question bridges the science lesson into a broader discussion about cooperation, strategy, and the limits of brute force. Students learn that strength is not determined solely by size, but also by strategy, cooperation, and adaptation, a lesson that extends far beyond the science classroom. When students confront problems that challenge their assumptions, initial failure ("obviously the elephant") becomes the foundation for deeper understanding.[10]

## Four Strategies Teachers Can Use Tomorrow

The Why Revolution does not require waiting for large-scale curriculum reform. Here are four strategies that teachers can implement immediately.

**Strategy 1: The 5-Minute Wonder.** Dedicate the first five minutes of every lesson to one "strange" question that ignites curiosity. The question does not need to connect directly to the day's topic. Examples: "Why can't we tickle ourselves?" or "If fish could talk, what would they complain about?" The purpose is not to find the right answer, but rather to build a daily habit that normalizes questioning. Simple routines like this can increase children's expressions of curiosity, especially when practiced consistently.

**Strategy 2: Safe-to-Fail Zones.** Create moments in the lesson where wrong answers are not merely tolerated but explicitly celebrated, as long as the reasoning is logical. A teacher might begin by announcing: "In this room, there are no wrong answers. There are only answers that aren't complete yet." When a student gives an incorrect response, the teacher responds: "Your answer isn't quite there yet, but your reasoning is fascinating. Tell me more." This approach aligns with growth mindset research. The way a teacher responds to student failure has long-term effects on intellectual courage.

**Strategy 3: From Teacher to Facilitator.** The most fundamental shift required for teachers is not a change of method, but rather a change of professional identity from being a "source of knowledge" to being a "thinking partner." Effective facilitators ask more questions than they answer, listen more than they talk, and respond to student questions with follow-up questions rather than final answers. Education researcher Keith Sawyer[11] calls this "disciplined improvisation," the ability to respond spontaneously to student ideas while still steering learning toward meaningful goals.

**Strategy 4: The Inquiry Anchor.** This strategy directly addresses Method Fatigue and administrative burden. The Inquiry Anchor is a single, overarching thematic question that a teacher adopts for the semester or the year, one big question that remains stable even as administrative methods, digital platforms, and grading systems shift around it. For example, a science teacher might choose the anchor question: "How do living things solve problems?" Every lesson, whether it covers insects, plants, weather, or the human body, connects back to this anchor. The gecko lesson becomes an

exploration of "how the gecko solves its food problem." The ant-elephant debate becomes an inquiry into "how ants solve the problem of being small." A language arts teacher might ask: "Why do people tell stories?" A math teacher might ask: "How do numbers help us understand the world?" The Inquiry Anchor gives both teacher and students a stable intellectual home, a consistent thread of curiosity that no curriculum reform can take away.

## Try It Tomorrow: Three Questions for Your Students

*The Gecko Question:* "Why does a mosquito fly toward a gecko even though the gecko will eat it? What is the gecko's secret weapon?" (Activates scientific thinking about predator-prey dynamics.)

*The Elephant Question:* "If one million ants fought one elephant, who would win? Why?" (Challenges assumptions about size versus strategy.)

*The Tickle Question:* "Why can't you tickle yourself? Try it right now." (Opens discussion about the brain, prediction, and the senses.)

*Tip: Do not answer these questions yourself. Let students debate, speculate, and disagree. Your job is to ask follow-up questions, not to provide answers.*

## Gardens, Not Factories

The decline of student curiosity in upper primary grades is not a failure of children. It is a failure of the systems we built for them. Children do not become "lazy thinkers." They stop asking because we teach them that asking is unsafe, unproductive, or irrelevant. Every time we say, "That won't be on the test," we close off one line of inquiry. Every time we reward only the "correct" answer, we extinguish one spark of creativity.

Creativity is not a gift granted to a talented few. It is a muscle that every child possesses and that must be exercised consistently. Curiosity is its primary fuel. Without curiosity, there are no questions. Without questions, there is no discovery. Without discovery, there is no meaningful learning.

The Why Revolution is not a magic solution that will transform education overnight. It is a small but fundamental shift. Begin every day with one question that sparks wonder. Create spaces where failure is not a disgrace but a stepping stone. Stop being "the teacher who knows everything" and start being "the teacher who is curious alongside her students." Anchor your inquiry in a big question that no curriculum reform can touch.

Ultimately, we must choose: Will our classrooms be factories producing uniform memorizers, or gardens growing bold thinkers? The answer does not require a new curriculum. It does not require a bigger budget. It does not require cutting-edge technology. It starts with something beautifully simple: one question that makes a child open her eyes wide and whisper, "Teacher, why?"

*Notes:*


[1] Engel, S. (2011). Children's need to know: Curiosity in schools. *Harvard Educational Review, 81*(4), 625-645.

[2] Jirout, J., & Klahr, D. (2012). Children's scientific curiosity: In search of an operational definition of an elusive concept. *Developmental Review, 32*(2), 125-160.

[3] Willingham, D. T. (2009). *Why don't students like school? A cognitive scientist answers questions about how the mind works and what it means for the classroom.* Jossey-Bass.

[4] Robinson, K., & Aronica, L. (2015). *Creative schools: The grassroots revolution that's transforming education.* Viking.

[5] Beghetto, R. A. (2013). *Killing ideas softly? The promise and perils of creativity in the classroom.* Information Age Publishing.

[6] Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success.* Random House.

[7] Berliner, D. (2011). Rational responses to high stakes testing: The case of curriculum narrowing and the harm that follows. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 41*(3), 287-302.

[8] Post, T., & Walma van der Molen, J. H. (2018). Do children express curiosity at school? Exploring children's experiences of curiosity inside and outside the school context. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 18,* 60-71.

[9] Loewenstein, G. (1994). The psychology of curiosity: A review and reinterpretation. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*(1), 75-98.

[10] Kapur, M. (2008). Productive failure. *Cognition and Instruction, 26*(3), 379-424.

[11] Sawyer, R. K. (2012). *Explaining creativity: The science of human innovation* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.



*About the Authors:*

Rivan Gestiardi is an independent researcher based in Malang, Indonesia. He holds a doctoral degree from the Department of Basic Education at Universitas Negeri Malang. His research examines the intersection of generative artificial intelligence, critical pedagogy, and assessment innovation in higher education contexts across the Global South.

Subanji is a professor at the Department of Mathematics, Universitas Negeri Malang. He is also active in creative and innovative mathematics learning research, and contributes to the development of pedagogical content knowledge for mathematics teachers.



*Disclosure Statement:*

The authors report no conflict of interest.