

从复述情节到写出感悟：抓触动点写作四步法

初中批改西游记读后感，最常见的毛病是大段抄情节：前四百字从石猴出世讲到三打白骨精，最后一句我的感想是做人要坚持不懈。问题不在学生偷懒，在于他们不知道感悟从哪里来。我后来用抓触动点四步法教了两届学生，抄情节的习作基本消失了。

第一步，标记触动点。要求学生在读原文时用铅笔在任何心里一动的句子下面画线，不管多小。有学生在大圣被压五行山那段画了线，理由是等了五百年，没人来看他。有学生在悟空被赶走时回头磕头那段画了线。全班交流画线处时我发现，学生不是没有感觉，是从来没被要求相信自己的感觉。

第二步，写下一动的原因。每处画线旁边补一句话：我为什么在这里停下来。那个写五行山的学生补的是，等很久却没人来，这种事我小学转学时等过。这句话就是感悟的雏形，它比任何歌颂坚持的套话都真实。

第三步，把原因连到自身经历。我给了一个固定句式做脚手架：书里这个细节让我想起我自己的一次经历，然后写那件经历。注意只写一件小事，不许写我的同桌我的妈妈这类泛例。有个学生写了父亲接他放学时在车里多坐十分钟才上楼，因为他那天考砸了。这段连上了大圣等五百年那段，两篇完全不同的习作就从同一段原文里长出来了。

第四步，用触动点开头成文。禁止从《西游记》是我国四大名著之一开头，第一段直接引那个句子，写它为什么停住你，第二段展开书里相关情节，第三段写自己的经历，最后回到那个句子收束。结构固定后，学生不用再纠结怎么开头，把力气花在写具体的事上。

四步法的关键在第一步。触动点必须是学生自己找出来的，教师给统一段落等于回到雷同。两届学生的画线处加起来没有重复的，因为每个人停下来的地方不一样。读后感的差异化，从相信学生自己的那一下心动开始。

From Plot Summary to Genuine Reflection: A Four-Step Method Built on the Moment That Moves You

When grading Journey to the West reading responses in middle school, the most common flaw is copying the plot: four hundred characters from the Stone Monkey's birth to Three Beat the White Bone Demon, ending with the line that we should persevere. The problem is not laziness; students do not know where a reflection comes from. I have taught two cohorts using a four-step method built on the moment that moves you, and plot-copying essays have largely disappeared.

Step one: mark the trigger. Students underline, in pencil, any sentence that makes them pause while reading, however small. One student underlined the passage where the Great Sage lies pinned under Five Elements Mountain, because he waited five

hundred years and no one came. Another underlined the moment Wukong turns back to kowtow as he is driven away. When the class shared their marks, I realized students do have feelings; they had simply never been told to trust them.

Step two: write down why you paused. Next to each mark, add one sentence explaining the pause. The student who wrote about Five Elements Mountain added: waiting a long time with no one coming is something I experienced when I changed schools. That sentence is the seed of a real reflection, worth more than any praise of perseverance.

Step three: connect the reason to your own life. I gave a fixed sentence frame as scaffolding: this detail in the book reminds me of one experience of my own, then write that experience. Only one small event is allowed; vague examples about classmates or mothers are not. One student wrote how his father sat in the car for ten extra minutes after picking him up from school, because he had failed a test that day. Connected to the five-hundred-year wait, two completely different essays grew from the same passage.

Step four: open the essay with the trigger. Starting with Journey to the West is one of the Four Great Classical Novels is banned. The first paragraph quotes the sentence and explains why it stopped you; the second develops the related scene in the book; the third tells your own experience; the ending returns to the sentence. With the structure fixed, students stop struggling with openings and spend their effort on concrete details.

The key is step one. The trigger must come from the student; if the teacher assigns one passage for everyone, sameness returns. Across two cohorts, no two students marked the same place, because everyone stops somewhere different. Differentiated reading responses begin by trusting each student's own moment of being moved.

一次课堂实例：一个学生怎样从抄情节改成写悟空被赶走

这个实例来自我辅导一个初二学生的过程，用它说明引导一个学生比讲十遍写作技巧有用。他的读后感交上来，前四百字复述了三打白骨精到被赶走的全过程，结尾是我从中明白了要辨别是非。我把他叫到办公室，只做了三件事。

第一问：读这一段的时候，你有没有哪一句读得特别慢，或者想再看一遍？他想了想说，可能是悟空走之前那段，他吩咐沙僧照顾好师父，又给唐僧变了三个分身护身。第二问：你为什么多看一遍那一段？他说，不知道，可能就是觉得他都这样了还操心师父。第三问：你家里有没有人，跟你闹得很僵，但还是操心你？他沉默了一会儿，说他爸。他爸妈闹离婚那阵，他爸从不

问他学习，但每次晚自习回来，客厅灯都给他留着。

三个问题问完，触动点找到了：悟空被赶走了，还在安排唐僧的安全。我让他把这篇重写，只写这一段，把留灯的事写进去。他交来的第二段是这样写的：悟空知道师父嫌他杀人，还是把能护师父的办法都留下了。我爸跟我半年没说过一句正经话，可他不知道我几点下晚自习，灯却每天亮到十一点。我看到这段时知道，这篇不会再雷同了。

回看这次辅导，起作用的是那三个问题，不是写作方法。抄情节的学生缺的不是文笔，是没被引导去把自己的阅读体验和经历接起来。这三个问题可以通用：哪一句你读得慢，为什么会慢，生活里谁像书里这个人。任何一个学生，只要真的读过原文，三问之内都能找到一个只属于他的落点。

这个案例也让我调整了全班的教学。以前我在黑板上写读后感结构，学生照着填；现在我在阅读单上加了那三问，作为每阶段阅读的固定题。批改时我只看一件事：他写的触动点是不是只有他能写出来。

A Classroom Case: How One Student Moved from Copying the Plot to Writing About Wukong Being Driven Away

This case comes from tutoring one eighth-grade student, and it shows that guiding one student beats lecturing ten times on writing technique. His essay opened with four hundred characters retelling everything from Three Beat the White Bone Demon to his banishment, ending with I learned to tell right from wrong. I called him over and did only three things.

Question one: while reading this part, was there a sentence you read especially slowly, or wanted to read again? He thought for a while and said maybe the part before Wukong leaves, where he asks Sha Monk to take care of their master and conjures three effigies to protect Tang Monk. Question two: why did you read that part twice? He said he was not sure, maybe because even after all that, Wukong was still worrying about his master. Question three: is there someone at home who is on bad terms with you but still worries about you? He was silent for a moment, then said his father. During his parents' divorce, his father never asked about his studies, yet every time he came back from evening study, the living room light was left on for him.

After three questions, the trigger was found: even as he was driven away, Wukong was still arranging Tang Monk's safety. I asked him to rewrite the essay around that passage alone, with the light included. His second paragraph read: Wukong knew his master hated him for killing, yet he left behind every way he could to protect him. My father and I went half a year without one real conversation, yet although he never

knew when my evening study ended, the light burned until eleven every day. When I read that paragraph, I knew this essay could never look like anyone else's.

Looking back, what worked were the three questions, not writing methods. Students who copy the plot lack not skill but guidance connecting their reading to their own lives. The questions generalize: which sentence did you read slowly, why did you slow down, and who in your life resembles this character. Any student who actually read the text can find a point that belongs only to them within three questions.

The case also changed my whole-class teaching. I used to write essay structures on the board for students to fill in; now the three questions appear on every reading sheet as fixed items. When grading, I check one thing only: is the trigger something only this student could write?

读后感评价方式怎么改：从单一打分到三条具体反馈

西游记读后感教到第二遍，我发现最大的漏洞不在写作环节，在评价环节。全班统一打分，优良中差，学生拿到本子只看一眼分数就合上。评价方式单一，等于告诉学生读后感只有一个标准答案，他们下次就继续猜老师想要什么。我做了三个改动。

改动一：批注只写一句具体的话，不打等级分。每篇习作我找一处最具体的地方写批注，比如你写悟空被赶走还变出三个分身护师父，这个细节全班只有你注意到，这就是好读后感。分数仍然要记，但学生先读到的是这句话。实行一个月后，学生开始互相打听老师给自己写了什么批注，而不是自己得了什么等级。

改动二：按触动点真实度分层，不按文笔分层。我把评价标准写成三条：触动点是不是原文里真实存在的细节；这个触动点和他自己的经历连上了没有；连上之后有没有展开写。文笔差但三条都做到的，我给最高档。有个学生字写得潦草，但他写自己害怕像悟空一样被误会，连着写了被同学冤枉拿钱的那件事，三条全中。他在作文本上第一次看到最高档。

改动三：互评只找一个任务。以前让学生互评，他们只会写好样的或者抄评语。现在互评表上只有一栏：找出这篇里只有作者能写出来的那个触动点，用一句话说明为什么只有他能写。这个任务逼着读者认真读，也让被评的学生看到自己的独特之处。有篇习作被同学评的是，你写你奶奶总把你小时候的画压在玻璃板下面，这个只有你写过。

三个改动实行一学期后，变化最明显的是后三分之一的学生。以前他们知道怎么写都拿不到好等级，就放弃；现在他们发现写自己的事能被看见，交上来的篇幅普遍变长。评价方式决定写作动机，单一打分让中等以下的学生退出，具体反馈让他们留在场里。

Rethinking How Reading Responses Are Graded: From a Single Score to Three Concrete Comments

Teaching the Journey to the West reading-response unit a second time, I found the biggest flaw not in the writing stage but in the grading stage. The whole class received a single letter grade; students glanced at it and closed the notebook. A single grading standard tells students there is one right answer, so next time they keep guessing what the teacher wants. I made three changes.

Change one: write one concrete comment instead of a letter grade. For each essay I find the most concrete moment and comment on it, for example: you noticed Wukong conjuring three effigies to protect his master even as he was banished, and you were the only one in class to catch that detail, which is what a good reading response looks like. Scores are still recorded, but the sentence comes first. After a month, students started asking each other what the teacher wrote about their essay, not what grade they got.

Change two: tier by the honesty of the trigger, not by polish. My rubric has three items: is the trigger a detail that really exists in the text; is it connected to the student's own experience; is that connection developed. A messy writer who meets all three gets the top tier. One student's handwriting was sloppy, but he wrote about fearing being misunderstood like Wukong, tied to the time classmates falsely accused him of taking money. He met all three items and saw the top tier on his notebook for the first time.

Change three: peer review has exactly one task. Previously, peer review produced only praise or copied remarks. Now the review sheet has a single field: find the one trigger in this essay that only its author could have written, and explain in one sentence why only he could write it. The task forces readers to read closely, and the author sees their own uniqueness. One essay was reviewed with: you wrote that your grandmother keeps your childhood drawings under the glass of her desk, and only you could have written that.

After a semester, the clearest change appeared in the bottom third of the class. They used to give up, knowing no effort would earn a good grade; now they see that writing about their own lives gets noticed, and their essays grew longer. Grading shapes motivation: a single score pushes weaker students out, while concrete feedback keeps them in the game.