

读出自己的提问支架：一条四问链

教中高年级写西游记读后感，最普遍的问题是读不出自己：全班四十五人，四十二人的感想是不做事要坚持、要团结。不是学生没有生活，是题目没有递到他们手里。我试过直接问联系你的生活实际，全班沉默。后来设计了一条四问链，学生才真的开始写自己。

第一问：书里哪个角色最像你？这个问题门槛低，人人能答。有个学生答猪八戒，因为他一遇到难题就想放弃，数学考试最后两道大题他从来不做。第二问：哪个角色最不像你？这问逼出对照，有个学生说最不像孙悟空，因为他被误会从来不辩解，被同学说拿了别人的笔，他只是把笔放回桌上就走了。这两问的答案本身就是一段真实的读后感。

第三问：书里的哪件事你也遇到过？这问要求从角色转到事件。学生一开始答不上，是因为他们记不住书里的小事。我在阅读单上加了每阶段记三件小事，比如八戒第一次嚷着分行李是在哪一回，沙僧挑的担子里装的是什么。有了这些小事，学生才能对上自己的事：有个学生把行李对上自己转学前跟朋友说好谁也不理谁，结果第一天就破功。

第四问：你想对书里的谁说一句什么话？这问收情感。有个学生对白龙马说，你驮了师父一路，没人夸过你，我想说你记得。这句话后来成了他那篇习作的开头。

四问的顺序是设计过的：先选角色，再对照，再找事件，最后说话，从易到难。使用时的关键是当堂写，四问的答案当堂写在阅读单背面，不许回家写，回家写的会重新变成套话。批改时我只看第一问和第三问的答案是否具体，具体就给过。

这条支架用了两个学期。它不能保证每篇都出彩，但能保证每篇里有这个学生自己。读不出自己，多数时候不是学生的能力问题，是教师没有把问题切成他们能够得着的高度。

A Questioning Scaffold for Personal Reading Responses: A Four-Question Chain

In upper primary grades, the most common flaw in Journey to the West reading responses is the absence of the self: out of forty-five students, forty-two write that we should persevere and cooperate. It is not that students have no lives; the prompt was never handed to them. I once asked directly, connect this to your real life, and the class went silent. Later I designed a four-question chain, and students finally began writing about themselves.

Question one: which character is most like you? Low threshold, everyone can answer. One student said Bajie, because he gives up whenever things get hard and never even tries the last two math problems on a test. Question two: which character is least like you? This forces contrast. One student said least like Sun Wukong, because he never defends himself when misunderstood; when classmates accused him of

taking someone's pen, he just put it back on the desk and walked away. These two answers are already an honest reading response.

Question three: which event in the book has also happened to you? This shifts from character to event. Students initially could not answer because they could not remember small events in the book. So my reading sheets now require noting three small events per reading stage, such as which chapter Bajie first proposes splitting up the luggage, or what is in the load Sha Monk carries. With those small events on hand, students can match their own: one student matched the luggage-splitting to his promise with a friend before changing schools that neither would talk to the other, broken on the first day.

Question four: what one sentence would you like to say to a character? This gathers the feeling. One student wrote to the White Dragon Horse: you carried our master the whole way and no one ever praised you, and I want you to know we remember. That sentence became the opening of his essay.

The order is deliberate: choose a character, then contrast, then find an event, then speak, easy to hard. The key is writing in class: answers go on the back of the reading sheet during class, never as homework, because homework quietly turns back into clichés. When grading, I only check whether the answers to questions one and three are concrete; concrete means passing.

I have used this scaffold for two semesters. It does not guarantee every essay shines, but it guarantees the student is inside every essay. Students fail to read themselves out mostly because the teacher has not cut the question into steps they can reach.

示范环节怎么示范：教师下水文的三个坑和一个改法

读后感教学的示范环节，我前两年做得不对，这里复盘。当时的流程是我先读一篇自己写的下水文，再让学生照着写。三个坑都在这流程里。

坑一：下水文太完美。我写的那篇从原文引用到自身经历过渡流畅，学生听完只说一句话，老师你写得真好，然后继续抄情节。完美的范文把过程藏起来了，学生看到的是成品，不是方法。

坑二：段落全班共用。我示范用的是三打白骨精，结果全班四十五人三十九人写三打白骨精。我选的那段成了指定段落，示范反而制造了雷同。

坑三：只示范结论，不示范过程。我的下水文里写这段让我想起外婆，但学生不知道我是怎么想到外婆的。他们学到的是读后感要联系亲人这个格式，于是全班开始联系外婆、奶奶、妈妈。

改法是在课堂上现场读、现场找、现场犹豫。我重教这个单元时，带自己的书进教室，从学生阅读单上得票最高的三个段落里抽签选一段，当堂默读三分钟，把想法说出来：这段悟空被红孩儿骗了变成牛魔王那段，我停在这里，因为我想起一个事，不对，再往前看看，哦，是他拜假父亲那段，这个更像，我小学时被邻居小孩骗过，他还让我叫他哥。我说完这些，学生开始翻自己的书找段落，那节课教室里第一次全是翻书声。

关键在把犹豫说出来。我故意让学生看见我第一处没找对、换了地方。他们由此明白触动点不是背出来的，是在原文里试出来的。有学生后来在周记里写，原来老师也要找半天，我找不到很正常。

示范环节的目的在于不是给一篇好例子，是让学生看见读出自己的过程长什么样，包括找不到的那部分。下水文可以写，但要在学生动笔之后发，作为对照，不作为起点。

How to Model a Reading Response: Three Traps in Teacher-Written Samples and One Fix

I got the modeling stage of reading-response teaching wrong for two years, and this is my review of it. The old flow was: I read aloud a sample essay I had written, then students wrote following it. All three traps sit inside that flow.

Trap one: the sample was too perfect. My essay moved smoothly from quotation to personal experience, and students said one thing only, that you write well, teacher, then went back to copying the plot. A perfect model hides the process; students see a finished product, not a method.

Trap two: one passage for everyone. I modeled with Three Beat the White Bone Demon, and thirty-nine of forty-five students wrote about Three Beat the White Bone Demon. My chosen passage became the assigned passage; the model manufactured sameness.

Trap three: modeling the conclusion but not the process. My sample said this passage reminds me of my grandmother, but students never learned how I got to grandmother. What they learned was the format connect to a relative, so the whole class started writing about grandmothers and mothers.

The fix: read live, search live, hesitate live. When I re-taught the unit, I brought my own copy of the book, drew one of the three passages the class had voted for on their reading sheets, read silently for three minutes in front of them, and spoke my thinking out loud: I stopped at the part where Wukong is tricked by Red Boy disguised as the Bull Demon King, because something came back to me, no wait, let me look a bit earlier, ah, the part where he bows to a fake father, that fits better, a neighborhood kid once tricked me in primary school and made me call him big brother.

When I finished, students opened their own books to hunt for passages, and for the first time the room was full of page-turning.

The key is voicing the hesitation. I let students see that my first pick was wrong and I switched. They understood that a trigger is not memorized but tried out inside the text. One student later wrote in his journal: so even the teacher has to search for a long time, it is normal that I cannot find one right away.

The point of modeling is not to hand out a good example but to let students see what the process of reading oneself out looks like, including the part where you cannot find it. A teacher's sample essay is fine, but send it after students start writing, as a comparison, never as the starting point.

一次课后辅导：那个只会写我们要团结的学生

小宇的西游记读后感交上来，又是那套：取经团队很团结，我们要学习团结。这已经是他第三次写团结。我没有在作文本上批要联系自己的生活，把他叫到办公室，决定先弄清楚他到底读进去过没有。

我借来他的书。书里夹着阅读单，页边有几处铅笔批注。我发现他在白龙马出现的段落旁画了三次线，都在变马驮师父那几回，批注只有一个字：唉。我问为什么叹这口气。他说，白龙马没人跟他说话。再问，你家里有没有人也不怎么说话。他说他爸，早出晚归，跟他一天说不上三句话，有一次他考了进步，他爸看了一眼卷子，说了句还行，就进屋了。他说这些的时候语气很平，像在说一件早就习惯的事。

我让他把这篇重写，只写白龙马和他爸，不用写团结。他写得很慢，办公室安静了二十分钟。他交来的开头是：白龙马驮了十万八千里，没人说过辛苦了。我爸也是，他送我上学从不问我冷不冷，可是我的校服他记得收。结尾他写：我想对白龙马说，我知道你一直在。那篇习作后来贴在教室后墙，小宇的名字下面围着好几个同学，都说家里也有一个不说话的人。

这次辅导之后，我把个别辅导的做法改了。不再从习作的问题入手，而是先翻学生的书，看他反复停留、反复画线的地方。读后感写不出自己的学生，书里几乎都藏着一个他真正在意却没说出口的段落，找到那个段落，他自己的话就出来了。

全班四十五人，我每学期只能这样辅导十几个。剩下的学生靠提问支架兜底，辅导过的学生则常常在作文里带出新东西，再反哺到全班的讨论里。读出自己这件事，有的学生需要全班的方法，有的学生需要一次二十分钟的安静。

An After-Class Session: The Student Who Could Only Write About Teamwork

Xiao Yu's Journey to the West reading response arrived again with the same lines: the pilgrimage team was united, and we should learn teamwork. That was his third essay about teamwork. Instead of writing connect to your own life in his notebook, I called him to my office, deciding first to find out whether he had actually read anything in.

I borrowed his book. Reading sheets were tucked inside, with a few pencil notes in the margins. I found he had underlined passages around the White Dragon Horse three times, all in the chapters where the horse carries his master, and the only note was a single sigh of a character. I asked why the sigh. He said no one ever talks to the White Dragon Horse. I asked whether anyone at home barely talks either. He said his father, gone early and back late, exchanges maybe three sentences with him a day; once when Xiao Yu made academic progress, his father glanced at the test paper, said not bad, and went into the room. He said all this in a flat tone, like describing something long since routine.

I asked him to rewrite the essay about the White Dragon Horse and his father only, with no teamwork required. He wrote slowly; the office was quiet for twenty minutes. His opening read: the White Dragon Horse carried our master a hundred and eight thousand li, and no one ever said thank you for the hard work. My father is like that too. He drives me to school and never asks if I am cold, but he always remembers to bring in my school uniform. His ending read: I want to tell the White Dragon Horse, I know you were there the whole time. That essay went up on the back wall of the classroom, and several classmates gathered under Xiao Yu's name saying there was also a silent person at their home.

After that session, I changed how I do individual tutoring. I no longer start from the flaws in the essay; I first look through the student's book for the places they keep returning to and underlining. A student who cannot write themselves into a reading response almost always has one passage in the book they truly care about but never said out loud. Find that passage, and their own words come out.

With forty-five students in the class, I can tutor only a dozen this way each term. The rest are carried by the questioning scaffold, while tutored students often bring new material back into whole-class discussion. Reading oneself out sometimes needs a method for everyone, and sometimes needs one quiet twenty-minute session.