

教学反思：流水账的四个真实来源，以及我课上的对应改法

批完全班四十二本《难忘的一天》，我在讲评课前的统计本上记了四个数字：写到三件事以上的有二十一本；全文没有一个动作描写的有十六本；出现我们很开心、我难忘这类结尾句的有三十三本；开头是那是一个难忘的早晨这类套话的有九本。这四个数字就是讲评课要打的靶子，也是这份反思的起点。

第一个问题，写得多。二十一本写三件事以上，说明学生把难忘的一天理解成这一天的清单。原因出在布置作文时我说过一句话：把那天发生的事都写下来。这句话本意是提醒学生别漏事，实际效果是鼓励学生罗列。改进：下次布置时把要求反过来，只写一件事，这件事从那天里挑出来，挑的标准是想到它的时候心里还会动一下。

第二个问题，没有动作。十六本通篇是我、我们、然后，人物像影子一样飘过。深挖原因，讲评课我虽然教了慢动作，但指导课那次只讲了顺序，学生写初稿时根本不知道动作可以拆。改进：指导课就要做动作拆解练习，不放到讲评课才补。具体做法是课前准备一段三十秒的视频，比如投篮，播放后让学生把投这个字拆成接球、屈膝、举臂、出手四个动词，当堂写一段。

第三个问题，结尾贴标签。三十三本用我们很开心收尾，学生不是不会感受，是以为感受必须用总结句报告出来。原因在我，之前的讲评我夸过一篇用了我很感动的作文，学生接收到的信号是这类句子得分。改进：讲评标准里加一条，全文不许出现开心、难忘、感动的总结句，情绪只能从画面里透出来，谁写了这种句子，全班一起把它删掉，看删完是不是反而更清楚。

第四个问题，开头套话。九本用一个难忘的早晨起头，这是背范文背出来的。范文本身没错，错在我让学生背了开头。改进：范文只分析不背诵，同时在班级墙上贴一个开头禁区清单，学生自己投票选出最烦的开头句，写进去，写作文前先看一眼。

这份反思让我确认一件事：流水账不是学生态度问题，四个成因里三个出在我的指令和评价上。下一轮教学按只写一件事、指导课教动作拆解、评价不奖励贴标签三条执行，两周后再批一次同题作文，用同一本统计本对比四个数字。

Teaching Reflection: Four Real Sources of Running Accounts and My Corresponding Fixes

After marking all forty-two copies of An Unforgettable Day, I recorded four numbers in my tally book before the review lesson: twenty-one wrote three or more events; sixteen had not a single action description; thirty-three ended with lines like we were very happy or I will never forget; nine opened with stock phrases like that was an unforgettable morning. These four numbers were the targets of the review lesson, and the starting point of this reflection.

Problem one, too many events. Twenty-one pieces with three or more events show

students read the title as a checklist of the day. The cause traces to one sentence I said when assigning it: write down everything that happened that day. I meant do not leave things out; the effect was encouraging a list. Fix: next time reverse the instruction, write only one event, chosen from the day by one test, whether your heart still moves when you think of it.

Problem two, no actions. Sixteen drafts are all I, we, then, with people drifting like shadows. Digging deeper: the review lesson taught slow motion, but the earlier guidance lesson only taught sequence, so students had no idea actions could be split when drafting. Fix: teach action splitting in the guidance lesson itself, not wait for the review. Concretely, prepare a thirty-second clip such as a basketball shot, play it, and have students split the verb shoot into catch, bend, raise, release, then write a paragraph on the spot.

Problem three, label-slapping endings. Thirty-three close with we were very happy. Students can feel; they simply believe feelings must be reported in summary sentences. The cause is mine: in earlier reviews I praised a piece for using I was deeply moved, and students took the signal that such sentences score. Fix: add one rule to the review criteria, no summary sentences with happy, unforgettable, or moved anywhere in the piece; emotion may only leak through pictures, and whenever such a sentence appears the class deletes it together to see whether the writing actually becomes clearer.

Problem four, stock openings. Nine begin with an unforgettable morning, learned from memorized model texts. The model texts are fine; my mistake was assigning them for recitation. Fix: analyze model texts without reciting them, and post a forbidden-openings list on the class wall, chosen by student vote on the most annoying opening lines, to be glanced at before writing.

This reflection confirmed one thing: running accounts are not an attitude problem; three of the four causes sit in my instructions and my praise. Next round I will implement three rules, one event only, action splitting in the guidance lesson, and no reward for label sentences, then assign the same title in two weeks and compare the four numbers in the same tally book.

讲评片段复盘：那节我以为成功的课，卡在了哪一问

讲评课第二环节，我投影了一篇写观日出的作文片段，原文是：早上四点，我们爬山。五点到了山顶。太阳出来了，很红很圆。我们欢呼起来。我觉得大自然真伟大。我当时设想的教学路径分三步：先问这段写了几件事，学生答四件；再问哪件最该细写，学生答日出；最后问怎么改，

学生应该说出把太阳写细。前两步都按剧本走，教室气氛热烈，我在教案上给自己记了一功。

第三步卡住了。我问怎么把日出写细，举手的答案是加好词，用金光闪闪、光彩夺目。我说这些词好，然后呢，读者能看见太阳是怎么出来的吗？没人接。我又问，你们看过日出吗，太阳是一下子跳出来的吗？这一问把问题挑明了：学生没有观察过日出，也没有观察过任何事物，他们脑子里的日出就是金光闪闪四个字。我让学生闭眼回忆自己见过的天亮，有学生说先看见窗上有白光，有学生说妈妈先开的灯。我说把窗上的白光写进去，比金光闪闪值钱十倍。

课后我把这个片段复盘了三遍。第一层结论：前两问是假问题，答案是我喂的，问几件事、哪件最该细写，学生凭常识就能猜中我的意图，热烈气氛是假象。第二层结论：学生不是不肯写细，是拿不出细节，细节的原料是观察，而观察这一步我的教学里从来没有出现过。第三层结论：我那句把窗上的白光写进去当时有效，但属于临场救火，救火能力不该依赖课堂灵感，应该提前变成教学环节。

复盘后我做了两个具体调整。一是给讲评课的提问做减法，删掉几件事这类数数问题，只保留两类真问题：这一段里你亲眼见过哪个画面？没有的话，这周去补看一次再写。二是给班级加一个观察作业，每周三布置五分钟的看，看水开、看蚂蚁、看放学时的校门口，写三行，不评好坏，只交流谁看到的画面别人没看到。观察原料有了，讲评课的慢动作才有东西可拆。

Reviewing One Review Segment: The Question Where My Seemingly Successful Lesson Stalled

In segment two of the review lesson I projected a paragraph about watching sunrise: at four we climbed; at five we reached the top; the sun came out, very red and very round; we cheered; I feel nature is great. My planned teaching path had three steps: ask how many events, students say four; ask which deserved detail, students say the sunrise; ask how to make it detailed, and students should say describe the sun better. The first two steps went exactly to script, the room was lively, and I gave myself credit in the margin.

Step three stalled. When I asked how to write the sunrise in detail, the raised hands answered with fine words, glittering gold, dazzling radiance. I said those words are good, and then? Can the reader see how the sun actually comes out? Silence. I asked again: have you watched a sunrise, does the sun jump out all at once? That question exposed the core: students had never observed a sunrise, or anything else; the sunrise in their heads was four characters meaning dazzling. I asked them to close their eyes and recall any dawn they had seen; one said white light first appeared on the window, another said mother switched on the lamp first. I said putting the white light on the window into the paragraph is worth ten times glittering gold.

After class I replayed the segment three times. First layer: the first two questions were fake, the answers were fed by me; how many events and which needs detail are guessable from social cues, and the lively atmosphere was an illusion. Second layer: students were not unwilling to write detail, they had no raw material, detail comes from observation, and observation never appeared anywhere in my teaching. Third layer: my save about the white light on the window worked in the moment but was improvisation; teaching should not depend on classroom inspiration, it should become a planned segment in advance.

Two concrete adjustments followed. First, subtract from review-lesson questions: delete counting questions like how many events, keep only two real questions, which picture in this paragraph did you actually see, and if none, go observe this week and then write. Second, add an observation assignment: every Wednesday, five minutes of watching, boiling water, ants, the school gate at dismissal, three lines, no grading, only sharing which pictures others missed. Once observation supplies exist, slow motion in the review lesson has something to split.

治流水账的五个误区：方法看着都对，用起来全错

教了十几年叙事作文，治流水账的方法我学过不少，回头看，至少有五种我自己也用过的办法，方向看着都对，实际全错。这篇把它们摆出来，每个配一个自查问题和一条替代做法，同行可以直接拿去对照自己的课堂。

误区一：要求写具体，却不给路径。自查问题：你在课堂上说写具体、写生动的时候，学生手里有没有一个能照着做的动作？我以前的答案是没有，具体在我嘴里是一个形容词，在学生手里什么也不是。替代做法：把写具体翻译成可执行的动作，比如把一个动词拆成四个动词，比如给一段文字补上看见、听见、摸到各一处。学生做完动作，具体自然出现。

误区二：只教好词好句。我黑板上曾经长期有一栏积词，学生笔记本上也有，批作文时发现一个现象：词抄得越勤的，作文里的形容词越多，流水账改得越少，因为好词是贴在事件骨架上的标签，骨架本身还是那天先然后后。自查问题：学生的词是在描写还是在贴标签？替代做法：每个词必须配一个学生自己见过的画面才能入账，配不出画面的词退回。

误区三：把流水账当态度问题。我说过这篇写得太敷衍，重写的学生交回来一篇更长的流水账，因为态度挨了批，方法还是零。自查问题：你批评的是字数和篇幅，还是具体的病灶？替代做法：批评换成诊断，指出这一段的病是没有动作，开药方是拆三个动词，重写只重写这一段。

误区四：范文让学生背开头。背范文的开头背成了那是一个难忘的早晨，全班九本撞车。自查问题：你让学生背的是开头句，还是开头的做法？替代做法：范文只拆不背，拆它为什么从声音起头、为什么略写前事，做法可以学，句子不许搬。

误区五：讲评课只挑毛病不示范改法。我讲评时说过这段太平，全班跟着点头，第二周作文照旧，因为挑毛病只告诉学生哪里不行，没让他们看见行长什么样。自查问题：讲评课上当场改通过几段？替代做法：每节讲评课必须当堂改活一段，改前改后都投影，让学生看见同一件事在两种写法里的差别。

五个误区的共同点只有一个：要求停在形容词上，没有变成可检查的动作。把这五个自查问题贴在备课本扉页，我的下一轮课把每条要求都改写成学生能做完、我能检查的动作，两周后用同题作文验证。

Five Traps in Curing Running-Account Essays: Right-Sounding Methods, Wrong Results

After teaching narrative essays for over a decade, I have collected many methods for curing running-account writing. Looking back, at least five that I myself used sounded right in direction and were wrong in practice. I lay them out here, each with one self-check question and one replacement practice, so colleagues can compare them against their own classrooms.

Trap one: demanding specificity without a path. Self-check: when you say make it specific or vivid in class, does the student hold anything actionable? My old answer was no; specific was an adjective in my mouth and nothing in their hands. Replacement: translate specificity into executable moves, such as splitting one verb into four verbs, or adding one thing seen, one heard, one touched to a paragraph. When students perform the moves, specificity appears by itself.

Trap two: teaching only fine words and phrases. My blackboard once kept a permanent vocabulary column, and students kept notebooks full of collected words. Marking revealed a pattern: the more diligently a student collected words, the more adjectives appeared and the less the running-account skeleton changed, because borrowed words are labels stuck onto the event frame, and the frame is still first-then-after. Self-check: are the words describing or labeling? Replacement: a word enters the notebook only with a picture the student actually saw; no picture, word returned.

Trap three: treating running accounts as an attitude problem. I once said this piece is sloppy, rewrite it, and the student returned a longer running account, because the attitude got scolded while the method stayed at zero. Self-check: are you criticizing length, or a named lesion? Replacement: replace scolding with diagnosis, name the disease as missing actions, prescribe splitting three verbs, and rewrite only that paragraph.

Trap four: making students recite model-essay openings. Recited openings became one unforgettable morning, and nine copies in my class collided. Self-check: did you assign the opening sentence or the opening technique? Replacement: take model essays apart, never recite them, study why one opens with sound or compresses earlier events; techniques may be borrowed, sentences may not.

Trap five: review lessons that only point out flaws without demonstrating fixes. I used to say this part is flat, the class nodded, and next week the essays stayed the same, because pointing out flaws tells students only what is wrong, never shows what right looks like. Self-check: how many paragraphs did your review lesson bring to life on the spot? Replacement: every review lesson must rewrite one paragraph live on stage, projecting before and after, so students see the same event in two kinds of writing.

The five traps share one root: the demand stops at adjectives and never becomes a checkable action. With these five self-check questions taped to my lesson-plan cover, next round I will rewrite every demand as something students can complete and I can verify, then test it with the same essay prompt in two weeks.