

我们班的「取经四人组」：组队、分工、和好的三步法

四年级下学期，科学课老师宣布每班选一组参加科技节比赛，四人一组，自己组队、自己分工。我和同桌、前排的小杨、还有总坐在最后一排的阿远凑成了一组。老师开玩笑说我们四个像取经队伍，从此我们班多了个「取经四人组」的名号。名号好听，活儿难干。我后来能算组长，靠的不是嗓门大，而是先把三件事做对了。

第一件事是分工前先摸清每个人的长处。我们没有把任务对半切，而是先开了个十分钟的「摸底会」。规则很简单：每人说一件自己最拿手的事，再问别人一个问题。小杨说他爸带他做过航模，他会粘机翼；阿远说他家养了六只乌龟，乌龟吃什么他全知道；前排的小雨——她是后来补进组的——写字特别工整，字帖都临过两本。我把这些记在一张纸条上，然后分配：小雨负责抄展板上的文字，小杨做模型，阿远查资料，我负责把三样东西拼成一份讲稿，比赛时由我主讲。分工表贴在小雨的文具盒盖上，谁忘了就打开看一眼。给每件事起名字很管用：「抄字」「做翅膀」「查资料」「念稿」，责任一下就有了归属，没人能说「我以为是他做」。

第二件事是把大任务拆成带日期的小节点。我们没有定「周五交」这种吓人的死线，而是排了四个小节点：周一晚放学前交资料要点，每人三条；周三中午前模型粘完主体；周四放学前文字抄完；周五中午在教室后排合练一遍。每个节点只查一小块，查不完当天就能补，不至于最后一天集体熬夜。周五合练时我们发现讲稿太长，念完要六分钟，超时。我当场删掉了两段乌龟笑话，把时间压到四分钟。删稿的时候没人心疼，因为前四个节点都按时交了，改的只是最后一环。

第三件事是闹矛盾时不评对错。周三中午，小杨和阿远吵起来了。阿远查的资料里说航模机翼要长一点才飞得稳，小杨说他做的短翼更灵活，两个人各拿一张纸比划，谁也不服谁。我过去没说「你俩别吵」，也没说「听谁的」，只提了一个办法：短翼长翼各做一片，周三放学在操场试飞，飞得好的上展板。结果长翼多飞了四秒，小杨心服口服，还主动帮阿远把资料贴到展板上。处理矛盾的关键是回到任务本身——争的是「哪片翅膀飞得远」，不是「谁厉害」。另外，矛盾要趁早。小雨有次连续两天不说话，我看出不对，放学拉住她问，才知道阿远嫌她字抄得慢，说了句「你这速度黄花菜都凉了」。我们把「抄字」拆成两半，阿远抄一半，小雨抄一半，第二天两个人有说有笑。矛盾像纸屑，看见就捡，别等它堆成堆。

比赛我们拿了二等奖，奖状现在贴在教室后墙。但对我来说更要紧的是另一件事：学期末换座位，我们四个被拆散，可下次班级活动组队时，这套「摸底—拆节点—试飞」的办法被小雨原样搬到了她的新组里。她说，取经的人散了，取经的路还在。

Our Class's 'Scripture-Seeking Team of Four': A Three-Step Method for Teaming Up, Dividing Work, and Making Up

In the second semester of fourth grade, our science teacher announced that each class would pick one team for the science festival contest: four per team, choose your own teammates, divide the work yourselves. My deskmate, Xiao Yang from the front

row, and A-Yuan, who always sat in the very back, ended up in one group. The teacher joked that the four of us looked like the scripture-seeking pilgrimage team, and since then our class had a nickname: the 'Scripture-Seeking Team of Four.' The nickname sounded great; the work was hard. I ended up as team leader not because I was loud, but because I got three things right first.

The first thing was to figure out everyone's strengths before dividing the work. We didn't cut the task in half. Instead, we held a ten-minute 'strengths meeting.' The rule was simple: each person names one thing they are best at, then asks one other person a question. Xiao Yang said his dad had built model planes with him and he could glue wings. A-Yuan said his family kept six turtles and he knew everything about what they eat. Xiao Yu, who sat in front and joined our group later, wrote beautifully neat characters and had copied two copybooks of calligraphy. I jotted these on a slip of paper, then assigned roles: Xiao Yu would copy the text for the display board, Xiao Yang would build the model, A-Yuan would research, and I would stitch the three parts into one speech and present it at the contest. We stuck the assignment list on the lid of Xiao Yu's pencil case - anyone who forgot could open it and take a look. Naming each job worked well: 'copying text,' 'making wings,' 'research,' 'reading the script.' Responsibility suddenly had an owner, and nobody could say 'I thought he was doing it.'

The second thing was breaking the big task into small dated checkpoints. We didn't set a scary deadline like 'due Friday.' We scheduled four checkpoints: research notes, three points each, by Monday before school ended; the main body of the model glued by Wednesday noon; the text copied by Thursday after school; one full rehearsal at the back of the classroom on Friday noon. Each checkpoint checked only a small piece, so anything unfinished could be fixed that day, and we wouldn't all pull an all-nighter on the last day. At Friday's rehearsal we found the speech was too long - six minutes, over the limit. I cut two turtle jokes on the spot and brought it down to four minutes. Nobody minded the cuts, because all four earlier checkpoints had been delivered on time; we were only adjusting the last link.

The third thing was not judging right or wrong when we fought. On Wednesday noon, Xiao Yang and A-Yuan quarreled. A-Yuan's research said model plane wings should be longer to fly steady; Xiao Yang insisted his short wings were more agile. Each waved a sheet of paper, neither yielding. When I came over, I didn't say 'stop arguing' or 'listen to so-and-so.' I offered one method: make one short wing and one long wing, test-fly them on the playground after school, and the one that flies better goes on the board. The long wing stayed airborne four seconds longer. Xiao Yang admitted defeat and even helped A-Yuan paste the research notes onto the board. The key to handling conflict is returning to the task itself - the argument was about 'which wing flies farther,' not 'who is better.' Also, catch conflicts early. Xiao Yu once stayed silent for two days straight. I sensed something wrong, caught her after

school, and learned that A-Yuan had complained about her slow writing, saying 'at that speed the dish will be cold.' We split the copying in half: A-Yuan took one half, Xiao Yu the other. The next day the two were chatting and laughing. Conflicts are like paper scraps - pick them up when you see them, don't wait for them to pile up.

We won second prize, and the certificate is still on the back wall of our classroom. But what matters more to me is another thing: at the end of the term we were separated by a seat change, yet at the next group activity Xiao Yu reused this exact 'strengths-checkpoints-test-flight' method in her new group. She said: the pilgrims may scatter, but the road to the scriptures is still there.

黑板报风波：一次闹矛盾又和好的真实经过

先说清楚：我们四个不是真姓孙猪沙唐，是因为都爱看《西游记》，被同学起了外号「取经四人组」。我负责讲，像悟空；周小舟画画好，脾气也急，像八戒——别学他；刘词作文好，慢条斯理，像沙僧；马小跳知道得多，坐不住，像唐僧一样爱念叨规矩。科技节要出黑板报评比，我们四个接了任务。

分配任务是当天下午放学前定的。黑板分三块：刊头、插图区、文字区。周小舟包下刊头和插图，刘词写「西游小知识」栏目，马小跳找五条冷知识，我抄最终稿。分工没吵架，因为我主动认领了抄文字——这是最累最慢的活，我写字快，虽然丑，但远看整齐。周小舟当时还拍我肩膀说「够意思」。

矛盾出在美术和文字抢地盘。周三中午，周小舟画的恐龙占了大半个版面，刘词的「西游小知识」被挤成一条窄缝。刘词说：「知识栏目是评比必查项，你画这么大，评委看什么？」周小舟说：「黑板报没图叫黑板报吗？你那字远看像蚂蚁排队。」两个人越说越大声，最后谁也不理谁，连着两天没说话。那两天黑板中间空着一块，谁也不肯先填。马小跳试着打圆场，说了句「你们一个像悟空一个像八戒，吵起来比取经还像取经」，没人笑，他自己也没笑。

和好不是靠道歉促成的，是靠两件事。第一件是我去找了美术老师，不是告状，是问「评比表上构图分和知识分各占多少」。老师让我们把评比表抄下来贴在黑板角，然后提了个办法：恐龙改成从边框后探出头，文字绕着画排。周小舟和刘词都盯着那个空位想了一会儿，几乎同时开口：一个说「那就让恐龙探头」，一个说「我绕着排也行」。谁也没道歉，但谁也没等对方道歉。第二件是收工那天，刘词主动帮周小舟的插图配了一句说明——「白垩纪的恐龙可没空看黑板报」，周小舟愣了下，把边框上多画了一根金箍棒，说「送给齐天大圣」。两个人就这么和好了，比说一百句「对不起」都快。

比赛结束，我们拿了年级二等奖。评委点评说构图有想法、知识栏目齐全，就是字可以再大点。领奖那天我们四个一起上去，周小舟抢着举黑板擦做的「奖状」，马小跳对着人群背了条恐龙体长数据，没人拦他。回教室的路上我们才发现：那两天谁也没想过要「团结」这个词，只是

各自守着自己的活，又都给对方留了位置。位置留了，人和好就是迟早的事。

The Blackboard Newspaper Storm: How We Fought and Made Up

To be clear: none of us four is surnamed Sun, Zhu, Sha, or Tang. We all love reading *Journey to the West*, so classmates nicknamed us the 'Scripture-Seeking Team of Four.' I do the talking, like the Monkey King; Zhou Xiaozhou paints well but has a short temper, like Pigsy – don't learn from him; Liu Ci writes great essays and moves at a calm pace, like Friar Sha; Ma Xiaotiao knows a lot but can't sit still, and loves reciting the rules like Tripitaka. When the science festival announced a blackboard newspaper contest, the four of us took the job.

We settled the assignments before school ended that afternoon. The blackboard was split into three parts: the masthead, the illustration zone, and the text zone. Zhou Xiaozhou took the masthead and illustrations, Liu Ci wrote the 'Journey to the West Fun Facts' column, Ma Xiaotiao hunted five trivia items, and I copied the final draft. Dividing the work caused no fight, because I volunteered for the copying – the most tiring, slowest job. I write fast; my characters are ugly but look neat from a distance. Zhou Xiaozhou slapped my shoulder and said, 'That's decent of you.'

The conflict came from art and text fighting for territory. On Wednesday noon, Zhou Xiaozhou's dinosaur took up most of the board, squeezing Liu Ci's facts column into a narrow strip. Liu Ci said: 'The knowledge column is a must-check item for the judges. With a drawing this big, what are they supposed to read?' Zhou Xiaozhou shot back: 'Is it a blackboard newspaper without pictures? Your characters look like a line of ants from far away.' Their voices got louder and louder, and in the end neither would speak to the other – two whole days of silence. Those two days, a blank patch sat in the middle of the board, and neither would fill it first. Ma Xiaotiao tried to smooth things over: 'You two argue like Sun Wukong and Pigsy – your fights are more like the pilgrimage than the pilgrimage itself.' Nobody laughed. He didn't laugh either.

Making up didn't happen through apologies. It happened through two things. First, I went to the art teacher – not to tattletale, but to ask how many points composition and the knowledge column were each worth in the judging sheet. She had us copy the judging sheet and tape it to the corner of the board, then suggested a fix: change the dinosaur to peek out from behind the border, and wrap the text around the drawing. Zhou Xiaozhou and Liu Ci both stared at the empty spot for a moment and spoke almost at the same time – one said 'then let the dinosaur peek out,' the other

said 'I can wrap my text around it.' Neither apologized, but neither waited for the other to apologize first. Second, on the finishing day, Liu Ci volunteered to write a caption for Zhou Xiaozhou's illustration - 'Cretaceous dinosaurs had no time to read blackboard newspapers.' Zhou Xiaozhou froze for a second, then added a golden staff to the border, saying, 'A gift for the Great Sage.' Just like that they were friends again, faster than a hundred 'sorry's.'

In the end we won second prize for our grade. The judges' comment: creative composition, complete knowledge column, but the text could be bigger. On award day the four of us went up together. Zhou Xiaozhou insisted on holding up the 'certificate' made from a blackboard eraser, and Ma Xiaotiao recited dinosaur length statistics to the crowd - nobody stopped him. On the way back to class we realized something: during those two silent days, nobody had thought about the word 'unity.' We each just guarded our own job and left room for the other. Leave the room, and making up is only a matter of time.

组队像取经，但这些错我们全犯过

取经队伍要是组队不当，走不到灵山；班级小组组队不当，也做不完任务。我们「取经四人组」一学期做了三次小组任务，踩过的坑比拿过的奖多。下面这五个坑最常见，每一个后面都跟着我们后来真正管用的改法。

坑一：按关系组队，不按本事组队。第一次组队，我们四个是因为天天一起打球才凑一起的，结果没人会做模型，展板上的模型是借隔壁组的。改法：组队前先列任务需要的三样本事，比如「会画」「会查资料」「会讲」，至少有一样有人顶得上，再谈关系好不好。关系好但三样全空的组，看着热闹，开工就散。

坑二：任务平均分，四个人各做四分之一。第二次做「植物观察小报」，我们一人画一棵、一人写一段、一人查一种、一人排版，听着公平，结果四样都做得半生不熟：画的人字丑，写字的人画歪，查资料的人查得深但没人看，排版的人把最好的内容挤到了角落。改法：按长处分工，一人只做一两件最擅长的事，宁可让画画好的人画三棵，也别让每个人各画一棵。

坑三：没有日期节点，只在最后一天碰头。第三次任务前两周几乎没人动手，最后一天晚上九点才在群里炸开：「你的部分呢？」第二天早上展板角落还是空的。改法：把大任务拆成带日期的小节点，每个节点只查一小块。比如「周一交三条资料要点」「周三中午模型粘完主体」。节点小，当天就能补，不至于最后一天集体熬夜。

坑四：矛盾只靠「算了算了」糊过去。有次两个人对「要不要加恐龙」吵不出结果，组长说了句「算了算了，不加了」，事情看似过去，做插图时一个人故意把恐龙画得特别小，藏在边框角落，另一个人看见了，又吵起来，这次连「算了」都不管用了。改法：矛盾回到任务本身解决。争「加不加恐龙」，就各画一小块比效果，或者去问评比表上哪一项分值高。当场定输赢不丢人，

拖到下一环才丢人。

坑五：只有组长一个人出头。前两次比赛都是组长上台讲，组员站在旁边。第三次做完，老师让每个组员讲一段自己负责的部分，有个人憋了半天只说了句「我负责查资料」，脸通红。改法：完成任务后让每个人都出面讲一段，哪怕只介绍自己负责的那一小块。不出头的人会觉得自己的活白干了，下次活动就不参加了。

这五个坑有个共同点：组队时只想到了「人」，没想到「事」。先想清楚需要什么，人自然就配对了。取经路上八个难，难难不同；组队做任务，坑坑相似。下次组队前把这五条检查一遍，能少吵三回架，多拿一个奖。

Teaming Up Is Like Seeking Scriptures – but We Made All These Mistakes

If the scripture-seeking team had teamed up badly, it would never have reached Vulture's Peak; if a class group teams up badly, it won't finish the job either. Our 'Scripture-Seeking Team of Four' did three group projects in one semester, and we stepped in more pits than we won prizes. These five pits are the most common, and each comes with the fix that actually worked for us.

Pit one: teaming up by friendship instead of by skill. The first time, we four got together because we played ball every day, and it turned out nobody could build a model – the model on our board was borrowed from the next group over. Fix: before teaming up, list the three skills the task needs, say 'can draw,' 'can research,' 'can present,' and make sure at least one is covered before talking about how well you get along. A group of good friends with all three skills empty looks lively and falls apart the moment work starts.

Pit two: splitting the task evenly, each person doing a quarter. For our 'plant observation poster,' one person drew a plant, one wrote a paragraph, one researched a species, one did the layout. It sounded fair, but all four parts came out half-baked: the drawer wrote ugly text, the writer drew crooked lines, the researcher went deep but nobody read it, and the layout person squeezed the best content into a corner. Fix: divide by strength, letting each person do only one or two things they are best at. Better to have the good artist draw three plants than each person draw one.

Pit three: no dated checkpoints, meeting only on the last day. For the third task, almost nobody moved for two weeks; at nine o'clock on the final night the group chat exploded: 'Where's your part?' The corner of the board was still empty the next morning. Fix: break the big task into small dated checkpoints, checking one small piece at a time – 'three research points due Monday,' 'model body glued by Wednesday

noon.' Small checkpoints can be fixed the same day, so nobody pulls an all-nighter at the end.

Pit four: covering conflicts with 'forget it, never mind.' Once two teammates argued about whether to add a dinosaur, and the leader said 'forget it, don't add one.' It seemed settled, but when the illustrations were being made, one teammate deliberately drew the dinosaur tiny, hidden in the corner of the border. The other spotted it, and they fought again - this time even 'forget it' didn't work. Fix: resolve conflicts by returning to the task. Arguing about 'dinosaur or not'? Each draw a small piece and compare, or check which item on the judging sheet scores higher. Deciding on the spot costs no pride; dragging it to the next stage does.

Pit five: only the leader gets the spotlight. In the first two contests, the leader presented while teammates stood off to the side. After the third task, the teacher asked each teammate to say a few words about their part. One person stammered for half a minute and managed only 'I did the research,' face bright red. Fix: after finishing, let everyone speak about their own piece, even just a small one. People who never get the stage feel their work was wasted and skip the next activity.

All five pits share one thing: when teaming up, we thought only about the people, not about the task. Think through what the task needs first, and the people fall into place. On the pilgrimage there were eighty-one trials, each different; in group projects, the pits repeat. Check these five before your next team-up, and you'll argue three fewer times and win one more prize.