

反思：学生作文里的口号从哪来？三个源头和对应的改法

讲评《一次诚信的考验》时我在黑板上写了一句话：这篇作文里最好删掉的，是它自己。全班愣住。投影的病文只有四百字，口号却有五句：「诚实是中华民族的传统美德」「我要做诚实的孩子」「诚信是金」。故事呢？只有「我捡了一支笔还给了老师」一句带过。学生为什么只会喊口号？我把这次讲评课当镜子，照出三个源头。

源头一：范文里就有口号。翻学生手里的作文选，写诚信的范文结尾十有八九是「让我们做一个诚实守信的人」。学生不是不会写，是把范文的结尾当成了标准答案。口号是他们眼里「像作文」的标志。改法：讲评课直接带学生数范文里的口号，数完问一句——删掉这句，故事塌了吗？不塌，就撤。把「结尾必须升华」的旧规矩当众废掉。

源头二：题目和批改在逼着升华。平时出题爱写「通过一件事表现诚信，写出你的感受」，「感受」两个字一到手，学生就知道要讲道理。打分时也习惯给点了题、喊了口号的作文多一分。学生极聪明，口号就是他们摸出来的得分捷径。改法：出题换成「写出那件事里你身体感觉最明显的三十秒」；批改时给动作句加分、给口号句画圈，让捷径失效。

源头三：日常没有可写的事。学生不是不会写具体，是脑子里没有诚信的现场。拾金不昧被写了一百遍，真实的纠结——答应同学保密却发现他说错了——没人引导他们记。口号是素材空白的遮羞布。改法：班里设「诚信现场」小本子，每周记一件自己或身边真实发生的与诚信有关的小事，一两句话就行，要求写细节不写评价。讲评课的素材从本子里抽。

三个源头对应三处改：读物里撤口号、命题里换问法、日常里攒现场。讲评课只能治标，源头都在平时的阅读、出题和积累里。这是我这次最大的教训：口号不是学生的毛病，是我们喂给他们的。

Reflection: Where Do the Slogans in Students' Compositions Come From? Three Sources and Matching Fixes

While reviewing the composition 'A Test of Honesty' I wrote one line on the board: the best thing to delete from this essay is the essay itself. The class froze. The projected weak draft ran four hundred words and carried five slogans: 'honesty is a fine tradition of the Chinese nation', 'I will be an honest child', 'honesty is gold'. The story? One line: 'I found a pen and gave it back to the teacher.' Why can students only shout slogans? I held this review lesson up as a mirror and found three sources.

Source one: the model essays contain slogans. In the essay anthologies students own, eight or nine out of ten integrity pieces end with 'let us all be honest and trustworthy people'. Students are not unable to write concretely — they have taken the anthology ending as the standard answer. A slogan is their marker of 'essay-ness'. Fix: in the review lesson, count the slogans in model essays aloud, then ask

one question — if this line is deleted, does the story collapse? If not, remove it. Publicly abolish the old rule that 'the ending must subliminate'.

Source two: prompts and grading push sublimation. Prompts often read 'show honesty through one event and write your feelings'. The word 'feelings' tells students to preach. Grading also tends to give an extra point to essays that state the theme and shout a slogan. Students are sharp; the slogan is the scoring shortcut they discovered. Fix: replace prompts with 'write the thirty seconds in that event when your body felt it most'; in grading, award action sentences and circle slogan sentences, so the shortcut stops paying.

Source three: daily life offers nothing to write. Students lack a live scene of integrity, not the skill. Picking up lost money has been written a hundred times, while real dilemmas — promising a classmate secrecy then learning he got it wrong — go unrecorded because nobody guides the recording. Slogans are the fig leaf over an empty well. Fix: keep an 'integrity scenes' notebook in the class; each week every student logs one true small event about integrity, one or two sentences, details required, judgments forbidden. Review-lesson material comes from this notebook.

Three sources, three fixes: remove slogans from reading material, change the question in prompts, collect scenes in daily life. A review lesson only treats symptoms; the sources live in regular reading, prompt design, and accumulation. That is the biggest lesson: the slogan is not the students' flaw — it is what we fed them.