久違的《師路》，或許大家已忘記了它的存在，不過，在學期即將結束之際，仍然希望能夠透過這個平台，讓同工互相交流，彼此學習。Communicative Approach 和 Task-based Learning對許多有豐富教學經驗的老師可說是耳熟能詳，但也可能是久違了的名詞，尤珮怡老師把這兩個教學的取向再次呈現我們的眼前，讓我們可再反思個人的教學，特別是面對學生學習差異越來越大的情況下，作為英文科教師如何在課堂內讓學生以英語作為學習的主要的語言，尤老師提供了五個可行的方法。至於電子教學的前路應如何走下去，也是值得我們深思的問題，因此，希望藉着個人一點的看法，讓大家也能反思資訊科技對教學的影響。而吳達全老師的分享，也提醒我們毋忘感恩。

主編：李明珠副校長

A reflection on task-based learning and communicative language teaching in primary schools in Hong Kong

MissYauPui Yi

Introduction

The exclusive use of English in English lessons is a rare phenomenon in primary schools. However, it is assumed to be mandatory in the newly reformed task-based syllabus. This article analyses the underlying reasons and provides some suggestions to alleviate the problem. At the beginning of this article, a glance at what communicative language teaching (CLT) and task-based learning (TBL) are will be presented, followed by raising the problem of exclusive use of English in the existing TBL curriculum. Then the efficiency of the suggestions and recommendations made by the Education Commission Reports will be analysed and evaluated. Lastly, five practical suggestions from frontline teachers’ perspectives will be provided at the end of the article.
Communicative language teaching (CLT)

Communicative language teaching (CLT) is a language teaching approach, which focuses on the communicative purpose in mastering language. Hong Kong has adopted CLT since the 1980s. According to the Curriculum Development Council (CDC) Syllabus (1997), authentic and purposeful activities such as role play and problem-solving tasks are recommended to be used to promote communicative interactions in class. Teachers act as facilitators in assisting students to accomplish the activities in class. The degree of intervention given by the teachers is based on the communicativeness of the classroom activities (Richards and Nunan, 1990). Less intervention should be given by teachers with highly communicative activities in class. The emphasis of CLT is to provide learners opportunities to use target language in a purposeful and meaningful way through authentic activities designed by teachers.

Task-based Learning (TBL)

Task-based learning (TBL) is an extension of CLT. The notion of a task is well defined as ‘learning activities that help acquisition of specific information and skills’ by the target-oriented curriculum (TOC) (Education Department, 1994, p. 19). The learning activities should be goal-oriented with a clear purpose (Willis, 1998) and provide opportunities for learners to communicate in the target language (Nunan, 1991). Based on Willis’ (1998) TBL framework, TBL can be simply divided into three main parts: pre-task phase, task cycle and language focus. Teachers explore the topic with the class in the pre-task phase, monitor from a distance in the task cycle and teach language form in language focus. Therefore, TBL in line with CLT calls for “purposeful and contextualized use of learner’s frameworks of knowledge and skill” (Clark and Scarino, 1992, p. 482).

TBL began to be recommended to be employed in Hong Kong’s English language curriculum framework at the primary level beginning in the mid-1990s. Primary teachers are advised to implement it in school settings. English is the mandatory language in all English lessons. According to the English Language Curriculum Guide (Primary 1-6) 2004, English teachers should use English in their daily teaching and promote interaction between learners in English. Therefore, teachers not only are encouraged to use a list of simple English for classroom
interaction (refer to Appendix 1) but also are required to support learners to take part in learning activities in English effectively.

**The failure of using English as the Medium of Instruction (MOI)**

However, frontline teachers might not be able to uphold the principle of exclusive use of English in class for two main reasons. First is related to the students’ tendency to use their mother tongue (MT). It is found that students tend to use MT or code-switching from English to their MT for interaction in learning activities particularly in the task cycle even though they are able to use English for communication. It is true that the use of MT has potentially positive consequences especially for second language learners at their early age. The use of MT enhances clarification as learners may reconfirm the meaning of what the teacher has said (Careless, 2002). Moreover, it also enables learners to express their views precisely and confidently and reduce anxiety (Tsui, 1996). More importantly, it creates construction of scaffolded assistance through collaborative dialogue (Holliday, 1994; Swain and Lapkin, 2000). Nevertheless, it is equally true that the creation of a language-rich environment is extremely important for second language acquisition (English Language Curriculum Guide, 2004). Giving permission to use MT in class may not only lead to a risk of failing to support learners to take part in learning activities in English effectively but also causes teachers frustration and tension (Careless, 2008). Apart from the student factor, the language proficiency of teachers is another major concern. Teachers with limited language proficiency may not be able to meet the requirement of using English exclusively in English lessons even if they believe that a good command of English is crucial (Lee, 1996). There is still a wide gap between the policy of new professionalism and the traditional way of teaching in English classrooms (Man, 2000).

**Government’s suggestions**

Aiming at raising the language standards in Hong Kong, the Standing Committee on Language Education and Research (SCOLAR) took advice from the Education Commission Reports and formulated an action plan in 2003. Concerning the problem of using MT in primary school English lessons, the action plan has forcefully enhanced the language standard of English teachers through developing the Language Proficiency Requirement for Teachers (LPR) and offered a series of supportive measurements since the
2000s (Action Plan to Raise Language Standards in Hong Kong - Summary of Recommendations, 2003). These include an incentive grant for in-service language teachers to acquire the recommended qualifications and the deployment of Native-speaking English teachers (NETs) to “bring in innovative teaching methods and promote the professional development of local English Language teachers” (Action Plan to Raise Language Standards in Hong Kong - Summary of Recommendations, 2003, p.4). Even though the LPR has been criticised that it fails to reflect teachers’ English proficiency (SCMP Editorial, 2013), the overall language standard of primary school teachers in Hong Kong has been raised. Nowadays, permitted primary school English teachers should attain the LPR and possess a relevant English teaching qualification (Teacher Training & Qualifications, 2008). In other words, unqualified teachers are not able to teach in English. Consequently, the basic language standard of primary school English teachers can then be guaranteed. Although the action plan has successfully raised the language standard of primary school English teachers, it seems to neglect the problem of using MT by learners in English classrooms. Looking through the Education Commission Report, it provides general suggestions for students with different learning abilities, for instance, the development of intervention programmes for slow learners (Education Commission, 1996), but concrete and specific strategies are not offered in the action plan.

Suggestions from teachers’ perspective

In order to alleviate the problem of using MT by learners, there are five practical measurements suggested from frontline teachers’ perspective. Firstly, incentives could be an effective motivator for learners who use MT in English class because of laziness. For example, a reward system such as giving stickers or stamps can be established for students to show appreciation of target language use (Careless, 2002, 2008). Secondly, assigning ‘language monitors’ and recording devices are also useful ways to monitor the use of MT in class (Careless, 2008). Teachers may assign a student in each group to be the ‘language monitor’ who is in charge of reminding the rest of the group members to use English for discussion. At the same time, recording devices can be placed next to each group to record the discussion to facilitate checking the group’s use of English. Thirdly, some learners may not be able to use English for discussion due to their limited English proficiency and the complexity of the task (Careless, 2004). For this reason, a certain amount of MT dialogue
could be tolerated in class discussions. In order to alleviate the use of MT, Bygate’s (2001) “task repetition” can be adopted. For slow learning classes, tasks can be rehearsed in the MT first. Then the same task can be repeated with the use of around 25% of English, then the third time 50% of English, then 75% of English and then the last time 100% of English. By using this approach, teachers should state the expectations for language use explicitly at the beginning of the task (Careless, 2002). Fourthly, teachers should be good language models themselves by using English as far as possible in class to create an “English atmosphere”. Learners may become “less inclined to persevere with target language interaction” if they “are accustomed to hearing the teacher frequently code-switching” (Careless, 2002, p. 393). Lastly, language of interaction should be taught. Learners should know simple language for classroom interaction in order to communicate effectively during the task cycle (Careless, 2002). For instance, teachers could teach language of agreement and disagreement such as “I don’t agree”, “I agree with you” and “I don’t think it’s right”, language of clarification such as “Can you repeat that?”, “Pardon?” and “Can you say it again, please?”. Therefore, the language of interaction is one of the critical tools for learners to carry out tasks smoothly in English.

Conclusion
This article has briefly discussed the purpose and rationale of both communicative language teaching and task-based learning. Then it has brought out the issue that primary school teachers fail to use English exclusively as the Medium of Instruction in daily practice. It has summarised two major reasons for the failure: students’ tendency to use their MT and teachers with limited language proficiency. This was followed by evaluating the government’s reports including Education Commission Reports (ECR) and the action plan formulated by the Standing Committee on Language Education and Research (SCOLAR). It has shown the great success of government measures related to promoting teachers’ language proficiency. To conclude, I suggested five practical measurements from frontline teachers’ perspective. They are using an appropriate incentive system to show appreciation of using English, using monitoring devices to encourage the use of English, adopting a “task repetition” strategy, being a good language model and teaching the language of interaction.
應用資訊科技於教與學的反思

李明珠副校長

以資訊科技提升學與教的成效是學校這幾年的發展重點，因此，除了換上大批新型號的電腦及加大學校伺服器的容量外，亦在四至六年級的課室安裝電子白板及添置 30 多部 iPad，在硬件上投入的資源可謂不少；而在教與學上，很多教師亦努力去學習及鑽研如何使用這些硬體以加強教學的效能，雖然有他山之石可以作為參考，但更多時候是摸着石頭過河，當中有成功的經驗，也有失望的時候，但無論如何，這些難得的經驗，都讓我們對資訊科技教學有更深刻的認識。事實上，運用資訊科技教學是一個大趨勢，不過，當我們要朝着這個方向繼續向前走時，或許也是時候去重新思索資訊科技教學的意義與本質。

在準備寫這篇有關資訊科技教學的文章時，在網上搜尋有關的資料，當中印象最深刻的是林偉業寫於 2007 年「資訊科技中文教學應用」1的教材，雖然部份內容已不合時宜（例如當年流行用 WebQuest 去協助探究學習；又如現今流行的「移動學習」當時亦未有提及），但當中對資訊科技教學的一些基本看法，今天看來還是值得參考的。

首先，資訊科技教學的基本含義是甚麼呢？就是運用資訊科技到教學上，以利用資訊科技的優點，提高教與學的效果。把資訊科技應用到教學上，是因為運用了比不運用有更好效果，換言之，在運用資訊科技到教學上的課堂或學習環境之中，資訊科技應有其不可替代的角色與地位，甚至應具有沒有資訊科技，便無法的達至效果的作用。而資訊科技教學的另一個更重要的關鍵是——不在教師怎樣教、用了甚麼高新技術，而是學生怎樣利用資訊科技有效地學習。

而運用資訊科技到教學之上，林提出下列五種不同的模式：

1. 講述演播 Expository

教師準備好學生學習的內容，以各式各樣的媒體傳遞給學生，例如在課堂上教師運用 PowerPoint 演播（present）教學內容適合用於一些知識點十分明確的學習內容。

2. 歸納發現 Inductive learning

---

教師準備材料，讓學生分析，綜合，藉此令學生把握到教師希望學生學習的內容，例如：MindTools^2幫助（所謂 Scaffold）學生思維（激發創意，整理思緒等）的工具。

3. 課業探索 Task-based/ Project-based learning

學生通過完成一項課業，從中把握到要學習的內容，林以WebQuest為例子，讓學生把大量已有資料 (resources) 「轉化 (transform)」成為具體學習成果 (outcome) 的過程，從中學生把握到須學習的知識與能力。雖然現在已很少人用WebQuest，但內容其實與我們進行的專題研習相似，教師提出一些議題，然後提供一些問題給學生參考，學生參考這些問題然後定出研究的方向，再從網上找尋相關的資料，經過分析、綜合、評價等成為個人學習的成果。

4. 同儕協作 Peer collaborative learning

學生與學生互相討論、辯證、協商，在合作的過程共同建構出知，例如各式各樣的 Groupware、學習平台 (Learning Platform)，或Knowledge Forum

5. 資源自學 Resources-based self-learning

學生自行閱覽大量的學習材料，從中自學，例如，香港在校內互聯網上發放講義，提供學習的網頁，讓學生取讀自學

隨着資訊科技的迅速發展，今天的資訊科技教學又豈止上述五種形式，電子白板、移動學習(Mobile learning) 、ipad 互動學習，這些都是當年尚未廣泛應用到教學之上的模式；然而，不論資訊科技的教學模式有幾多的可能性，但教學的重心始終在學生的學習上，因此，無論資訊科技的發展如何一日千里，運用資訊科技教學，其目的是要把學生(students)變成真正的學習者 (learners)這個意義始終不變。

WebForm：（http://web.hku.hk/~jwilam/PCEd_FT_2003_IT/webform/SimpleStoryFormPage.htm）
Story Mapping：（http://www.readwritethink.org/materials/storymap/index.html）
感恩分享兩則

吳達全老師

的確，與主同在時刻也不怕「冷」。

第一則

冬至當日，父親入院了。甫進入醫院，他即時說：「很感恩！」

由於父親最近患上濕疹，於是兩個多月來也深受困擾。最近他的幾個親戚及教友先後在醫院離世，他怎也不願住進醫院。後來父親真的抵受不了，不單全身痕癢，雙腳還紅腫了，舉步為艱，不得不入院。入院後即時獲得醫生和護士的悉心照顧，他的心情於是放鬆了，不再額頭猛皺，見到我們到醫院探訪，即時就說：「很感恩！」

母親多月來在家照顧父親，為他的起居飲食傷透腦筋，時刻擔憂他的身體情況。現在父親住院了，得到醫護人員的悉心照顧，對症下藥；雖然她每日要準備湯水，到醫院探病，舟車勞頓，但她可放心多了，晚上可以成眠。她不禁說：「很感恩！」

父親入院剛好在聖誕和新年假期中，四兄弟姊妹可隨時候命，父親需要什麼物品和照顧，我們也可即時辦妥。假期完結前，父親出院了，我們齊聲感恩。

第二則

八月底，就在暑期結束前的一個星期，我與太太一起做身體檢查。十月報告結果出來，太太非常健康，而我的血壓、膽固醇和糖尿樣樣都很高。第一個星期我較難接受這個事實，到第二個星期我的心情平復下來：由不肯接受，到完全接受；由對身體健康不加理會，到按步就班改善身體狀況，是一個頗具挑戰的過程。我也感謝天父，因為太太可以專注照顧我的起居飲食。

從此我的生活作息時間改變了，變得作息有時。飲食方面，告別多肉少菜、與零食為伍的日子，由不多喝水轉為天天隨身一壺茶，正正是每天過著「清茶淡飯」的日子。一星期過後，原以為必然慘淡的日子，反而成了快樂的泉源。

現在我最為享受的，是在臨睡前可以圍著家居附近的羽毛球場與太太你追我逐三十圈，從急步和跑步中尋回昔日追求太太的美好時光。

的確，為要見證天父而事情必須發生，但神總會在旁守護，巧妙安排，讓愛祂的每個人快樂。