

English as a Second Language/English as a Foreign Language Distinction: Its Pedagogy & the Nepalese Context

Ramesh Shrestha
Department of English
Kirtipur Campus, T.U.

Introduction

The initial interests in the non-native varieties of English such as the Indian and the Nigerian, were restricted largely to a descriptive curiosity, to the description and analysis of the variety, of the levels, the 'deviant' features, problem of intelligibility, and the like. However, more recently, in the study of non-native and 'nativized' English, the nature of emphasis has changed from being merely descriptive to that of being more prescriptive. The orthodoxy that English belonged only to Great Britain, USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa where it is spoken natively seems to have generally been giving way to the view which asserts that English belongs and is legitimate to countries where it is spoken, albeit non-natively in the classical sense, such as India, Singapore, the Philippines, Hong Kong, and Malaysia. There is nothing new in the concept of English as an international language, but what is quite refreshing is the idea that English is a World Language, a European, and an Asian language. Larry Smith (1976a) presents this point of view with the strongest force:

We in ELE [English Language Education] need to find redundant ways to point out that English belongs to the world and every nation which uses it does so with different tone, colour, and quality. English is an international auxiliary [now intranational] language. It is yours (no matter who you are) as much as it is mine (no matter who I am) ... English is one of the languages of Japan, Korea, Micronesia, and the Philippines. It is one of the languages of the Republic of China, Thailand, and the United States ... It is a language of the world.

This perspective has important consequences in the English language teaching (ELT) in countries where English is a non-native language. The target language bias has been very strong in the literature of second language acquisition. The non-native elements have always been looked down as 'errors'. Nemser (1971) makes a special mention of Indian English as an instance of his LA (i.e. the approximative system) and suggests that effective language teaching implies preventing, or postponing as long as possible the formation of permanent intermediate systems and subsystems. Selinker (1972), too, takes

Indian English as an example of 'interlanguage utterance' underlying the interlingual behaviour that results from a learner's attempted reproduction of target language norms. He believes also that a successful language learning/teaching will reorganize the IL (Interlanguage) materials in favour of target language.

In this paper, I shall begin by reviewing the categorization of English as a second language (ESL) and as a foreign language (EFL) and the pedagogy such a categorization is supposed to imply. I shall finally show that the distinction between the ESL and EFL is ambiguous; The definitions fail to establish the status of English at least in Nepal. I shall also show that the pedagogy accruing from this distinction, especially the model question, too, remains vague.

ESL/EFL Distinction

The use of English in a non-native situation is often distinguished between whether it is used as an ESL or an EFL.

Paul Christopherson (1960) was interested in making the distinction. For him it consisted essentially "in the personal attitude and in the use that is made of the language. A foreign language is used for the purpose of absorbing the culture of another nation; a second language is used as an alternative way of expressing the culture of one's own." Marckwardt (1963) also insisted on making the distinction, a distinction which he observed was maintained in Britain and not in the USA. According to him, English is a foreign language if it is "taught as a school subject or at an adult level solely for the purpose of giving the student a foreign language competence which he may use in one of several ways—to read literature, to read technical works, to listen to the radio, to understand dialogue in the movies, to use language for communication possibly with transient English or Americans." It is a second language when "English becomes a language of instruction in the schools, as in the Philippines, or a lingua franca between speakers of widely divergent languages, as in India."

Stevens (1971) reports of a conference in Britain in which it was suggested that the term second language be used to describe those countries in which English is the medium of instruction in some important sector of education (Hong Kong, Malaysia, and the Philippines) and foreign language in which English holds a dominant position as the principal language of advanced study (principal "library" language) but it is used only to a limited degree as a medium of instruction (Indonesia, Nepal, Thailand), and in which English is used not for internal purposes or as a medium of instruction, but where the position of English reflects its status as a major instructional language (Japan, Cambodia, and Laos). Stevens (1978) defines a country as ESL if English is accepted as an official language or as a medium of instruction, and if it receives the major time allocations in broadcasting system. In EFL countries, English has no such special status. Following Smith's terminologies, he equates EFL with countries where English is taught

as an international language and ESL with those where significant use of English is made although it is not a primary (intranational) language. Richards (1976) reflects similar view. Richards and Tay (1978) point out that in Singapore, English has never been considered a foreign language because of its status as an official language, as an important language of education, a dominant working language, a lingua franca, and a language for the expression of national identity. By these criteria, Thailand, Japan, Korea and Russia are considered EFL countries whereas India, the Philippines, and Singapore ESL.

The definitions reviewed above are functional, that is, they take into account the social, effective functions that the English language is put to play or plays in a country. These functions, in turn are supposed to lead to the nativization (also called indiginization) of English in its formal features, giving us another very important criterion on which the ESL/EFL distinction is based. Singapore (Richards, 1978; undated mimeo) and India (Kachru, 1978) are often taken as examples of the countries where English is reported to have nativized in such a way. It is further postulated that nativization is possible in an ESL and not in an EFL situation. The reason being that there is the marked tendency to standardize local accents and varieties in the ESL whereas such a tendency does not exist in the EFL countries. The 'nativized' English thus emerges and serves as a marker of a regional, social class, or ethnic identity. The new English is widely used for social transactions and is not modelled on British or American English as the use and learning of the target language has already moved from an external to an internal norm.

Pedagogy

In countries where English is not a native tongue, regardless of its status, the model for classroom teaching/learning has traditionally been standard British or American English. Teachers and curricula are designed and required to present the native model and the goal of teaching has invariably been "native speaker competence" or "near-native/native-like proficiency." In the new perspective, when the foreign and second language distinction is taken to be of practical importance in matters of model, it is assumed that the EFL countries tend to follow the external model (British, American, etc.) and the ESL the standard local variety of English. Richards (1976) maintains that there is the fundamental attitudinal and cultural difference between an ESL and EFL classroom as a context for learning English, in that, not only, for example, that the Indians see English as a language of India and the Japanese as the language of the British or the Americans, but that the EFL textbooks are about life and customs in Britain or the USA whereas the ESL textbooks are about life and people in the student's own country. Smith (1976) even though he refuses to maintain the ESL/EFL distinction strictly, also agrees that the model of teaching differs according to the functions of English within a country.

Kachru (1978) favours a polymodel approach. He suggests that a distinction between different varieties of English for local, national, and international uses should be made and the educational model should be chosen accordingly, Richards and Tay (1978), on the other hand, propose what they call a 'non-developmental model of proficiency' and recommend 'native fluency' in the different lectal norms as the aim of learning English in the ESL context. Smith (1976) and Strevens (1977) propose an educated variety as the model for any non-native situation. Smith believes that such a variety cuts across dialectal/national boundaries. Strevens calls this variety the "internationally high-valued form" and believes that "the more educated the ESL speaker gets, the more widely intelligible he should be."

The Nepalese Context

NEPAL : ESL OR EFL

The functional criteria of ESL/EFL distinction reviewed above appear clearly to place Nepal in the category of an EFL. English is not a second language in Nepal because it is not one of the official languages of the country; it is not an intranational language (in that it is neither a language of wider communication nor a language of any group identification). English is not a dominant working language. It is rather a foreign language because it is taught as a subject of study and is used by the adults for the purpose of reading literature, science, listening to the radio, etc. Furthermore, it is the principal "library" language and is used to a limited degree as a medium of instruction.

The societal use and the effective function of English in Nepal do generally fit in the EFL criteria and as such there would be little hesitation in granting Nepal an EFL status. However, in the English language (ELT) of Nepal, where EFL/ESL categories need to have their greatest motivation for distinction, the distinction is either far from clear or of little relevance. In the context of Nepalese education, in the use of English as a medium of teaching-learning other subjects, the distinction is complicated both historically and synchronically. The question of nativization makes the issue even more complex. I shall attempt to clarify these points in the following pages.

ELT in Nepal

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

ELT began in Nepal only in the beginning of this century and the aims and objectives of this were formulated even earlier by Macaulay. Macaulay (1835) had argued in favour of English education in India on what he assumed to be the "intrinsic value of our [English] literatures" over those of Sanskrit and Arabic. The aim of English education in India as propounded by him was 'to make the natives of this country thoroughly good English scholars,' and this may be taken to be the

unstated aim of English education in Nepal. The Nepalese aims and objectives could not essentially differ from those of the Indian because the schools and colleges of Nepal were affiliated with those of India. Even after the founding of a native university, the people who planned the Nepalese curriculum were trained in that country. The English syllabuses were literature based and the methodology that of grammar-translation. Teaching-learning of English was equated with teaching-learning of formal grammatical system, reading literature and moral philosophy, inculcation of classical and humanistic spirit, cultural enrichment, etc.

The need for changing the aims and objectives of ELT in Nepal was felt only in the beginning of the sixties. In 1964, the Board of English Studies is reported to have felt the need to separate the teaching of language from the teaching of literature (Malla 1968: 77). However, even after the split of English into General and Special, the spirit of the compulsory General English remained classical and literature-based. A National Conference of College Teachers of English was held in October 1968 of which a report was published in 1969. It was during this conference, I think it was for the first time, that the status of English in Nepal was discussed. David Rathbone (1969:9) forcefully pointed out:

There are some very important points which must be hammered home. One of these and perhaps the most important of these is that English must be taught as a foreign language. ... English is a foreign language in Nepal. For many of your students it is not even a second language. It is the third or fourth. This is very important. Because, I am afraid, your present courses, your present methods, your present examinations-all presume, unjustifiably, that English is the first language.

It took a decade of discussion and reflection before any meaningful change was brought about in the aims, objectives and methods of ELT in Nepal. Dr. Alan Davies, the Head of the Board of English Studies, introduced a new syllabus for colleges of Nepal in 1971, which may be taken as the date marking the end of the Macaulayan, grammar-translation period of ELT in Nepal. The syllabuses since 1971 until today remain essentially similar in spirit. Emphasis has now been shifted from literature to language teaching. 'Providing some access to contemporary spoken and written language' is the general objective of courses formulated by Dr. Davis. The teaching materials consist now not of the 'classics' but of materials written more recently. English language newspapers are prescribed as model of living language. In general, the grammar-translation is replaced by pattern practice. The emphasis naturally is on speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills. Speaking and listening as units of teaching were introduced for the first time in 1971. Some of the course titles used currently are expressive of their objectives: Remedial English, Common Core English, Contemporary English, and English for Special Purpose. The teaching units are spoken English,

verb pattern, grammar, usages, dictionary, framework essays and other forms of composition.

MODEL and PRIORITY

Before 1971, whereas the model of ELT in Nepal seems implicitly to have been classical English literature, the work and style of Shakespeare and Bacon, Carlyle and Ruskin, the model of today's ELT is contemporary English. Malla (1977) defines contemporary English as 'the kind of English used in the twentieth century by well-educated persons in Great Britain and the USA, an unmarked "standard national variety" -British, American, or other standard native varieties'. Kansakar (1977) defines the model of speech as 'no longer the commonly known term "Received Pronunciation" (RP) but what is now called the "classless accent" or "General British Pronunciation"'. Thus, the model has been native English throughout the Nepalese ELT.

Priority in the sequencing of skills has also been more carefully defined. Truthful to the audiolingualism, speaking is prior to all other skills. In the ELT before 1971, reading was given the highest priority.

ENGLISH AS A MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION AND SUBJECT OF STUDY

The Nepalese schools in the beginning of this century generally followed the patterns of British schools in India (HMG, 1964). Durbar School was affiliated with Calcutta University until 1910 and then with Patna University until 1933. This not only means that the courses prescribed in the Indian Universities were taught in this and other schools but also that the textbooks written in India for the Indian students had been in use. The medium of examination and possibly instruction was English. English was also a subject of study.

In 1934, the SLC Board of Examination was established in Nepal. English was retained as a compulsory language. As a medium of instruction and examination, it was the language which was 'voluntarily opted by the SLC candidates of the forties and the fifties' (Malla, 1976). In the sixties, the instructional medium at the secondary level was English and Nepali both (HMG, 1961, 99-101). Nepali became the only medium at secondary level after 1971.

In the higher education, until the inception of Tribhuvan University in 1959, the colleges of Nepal, too were affiliated with the Indian Universities, and therefore courses taught according to the latter's syllabuses. English was a compulsory subject of study and was the medium of instruction and continued to be so even after the founding of the native university. The University Act, 1959 envisaged that Nepali would replace English as the medium of instruction by 1974. The National Education System Plan (1971) kept the medium question undecided.

It should also be of interest to note that English has received the highest priority as a subject of study in the Nepalese education. In the SLC Board syllabus of 1934, it was the only compulsory language of study; Nepali came to be compulsory only in 1951 (HMG, 1964). In the revisions of 1953 and 1965, English carries more than 20 percent of the total marks allocation for the level whereas Nepali only 5 percent. It was only in 1971 that these two languages are equalized in this way. In higher education, English remains dominant in Arts and Humanities even now. In the Intermediate level syllabus of 1975, compulsory English carries 15 hours whereas Nepali carries only 9 hours.

To summarize the facts from English in the Nepalese education presented above, English has been a compulsory subject of study in secondary and higher education receiving the highest priority among language subjects of study. The teaching of English as a subject of study followed historically the pattern of India, therefore the status of English in India should be treated as an interacting variable in determining its status in Nepal. The Indian ELT has effected the Nepalese in the general aims, objectives, methods and materials. The association of the Nepalese ELT with that of the Indian, I think, forces us to make a simple corollary that historically, since the Nepalese ELT has been effected by the Indian ELT, and India is taken to be an ESL country, the status of English in Nepal at least as the language is treated in the ELT- would be equivalent to that of the Indian.

Secondly, English was taught in Nepal at least up until 1971, not as a foreign but a second or even a first language. The aims of high scholastic attainment, the teaching materials comprising of classics indicate that the ELT was not aimed merely at a foreign language competence. There is some truth in Rathbone's comment (op. cit.) that the English courses, teaching methods, and examinations of the sixties presumed that English was not even the second but the first language in Nepal.

Thirdly, English has always been the medium of instruction in Nepal. It was the only medium until the fifties. It alternated with Nepali in the sixties and was completely replaced by Nepali in the seventies in the secondary education. In the higher education, English was unquestionably the medium of instruction until the sixties and alternated with Nepali in the seventies. It has continued to be the medium of instruction in the teaching of English as a subject. According to the medium criteria of EFL/ESL, thus we see that the status of English in Nepal is far from clear. It appears like it is going through a transition. In the secondary education, the transition from a second to a foreign language seems to have been complete whereas in the higher education the transition is in its progress.

Nativization of English in Nepal

The question whether English has nativized in Nepal or whether there is a variety of English which is recognizable as the Nepali

English has not received any attention as yet. The contention that English is nativized only in an ESL situation seems to dismiss the question as irrelevant in Nepal. However, I would like to argue that some degree and kind of divergence from the "parent" English language is discernible in the English spoken and written in Nepal. There is a particular Nepali-ness about the use of English by the Nepalese who use the language and it is noticeable in their sound system, accent and intonation, and selection and arrangement of words. Samples of these are widely available in the classroom lectures, seminars, examinations papers, journals, newspapers, and the growing body of literary writing in English, one can hear them in parties, hotels, and all kinds of interpersonal conversations.

Shrestha (1978) analyses some such written samples of Nepali English and shows that the Nepalese writer of English tends to use a marked style, that is, he uses a great deal of adjectives, longer sentences, uncommon words with the effect of learnedness and bombast, synonyms and euphemisms. The choice of style is regarded as a complex of the rules of social evaluation of a particular L2 style, the native rules of social setting, obsolete L2 model and false generalization. The educated variety of Nepali English is presented, using Richard's term (1971) as a case of "diaglossomania." Further, it may be noted that the style seems to be symbolic classifier of High English in the same way as it is observed in the Indian and African context. Malla (1977) also acknowledges that there are a number of marked style-feature in the Nepalese written English.

To say anything further on Nepali English will require research.

Critique of ESL/EFL distinction

The EFL/ESL distinction is based largely on functional/instrumental criteria. The functions that a language is made to serve are largely non-linguistic, matters having to do with national policy and practices. Any rigorous treatment of the term is therefore unlikely as it involves too many non-linguistic conditions. These conditions may serve as context for nativization of the language in the formal ways, but on their own, it is difficult to completely disambiguate them. There may be too many borderline cases, such as Burma, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka where English has some official status although undesignated in the constitution. Malaysia's situation appears equivalent to that of Sri Lanka in this instance and yet the former is often referred to as an ESL and latter as an EFL country.

Paul Christopherson's definition carries the unfortunate association of English with some kind of culture of "another nation" as does Richard's (1976) that ESL textbooks are about life and customs in the student's own country and EFL about the overseas. In the Nepalese case, the contents of English Readers cover a wide range of topics involving national and international themes. Furthermore the textbooks and materials prescribed for the higher education are produced abroad, in India, Great Britain, Australia, and the USA. English in Nepal is seen

not as a language through which the culture of another nation is absorbed but as a language through which it can express its own culture to a wider world. Sardar Rudar Raj Pandey, then the Vice-Chancellor of Tribhuvan University, put it succinctly as follows in his address to the National Conference of College teachers of English in 1968.

Now, however, we feel that in order to communicate our very culture, our own ideas to peoples of other parts of the world, an international language is absolutely necessary. As you know we are going to launch very shortly a scheme for the study of our Nepalese culture, our Nepalese language and literature, our art and architecture. ... Now we have to communicate the results of our achievements to the various parts of the world, and for that the English language is absolutely necessary.

One may argue that English serves in Nepal all the four functions of nativization proposed by Kachru (1978). It serves the INSTRUMENTAL function as an instrument of education at various stages. English serves the REGULATIVE function because a large number of government publications, advertisements are in English. It serves INTERPERSONAL function, in that English provides a code among the educated Nepalese and also symbolic elitism, prestige, and modernity. And lastly, it serves IMAGINATIVE/INNOVATIVE functions, a large body of writing in English in the journalistic, poetry, criticism, essays, and other genres are developing.

In the educational use of language, the distinction is more complex. It is shown above that in the secondary education in Nepal, English went through a transition from an ESL to EFL. In the higher education, English has consistently been receiving the highest priority among language subjects, and in the Nepalese ELT it has never been treated as a foreign language until perhaps a decade ago. English has consistently been the medium of instruction and will continue to be if the criteria for defining the medium of instruction were to include not just the language in which the lectures are delivered and answer books are written, but also the language in which and only in which textbooks, reference books, and journals are available.

Whereas the functional criteria of ESL/EFL distinction fails thus to carry us very far, the formal linguistic criteria, to be derived from the formal processes of nativization, too fail in this case. Kachru (1978) considers hybridization, collection, and style as some of the formal processes by which English is indigenized in India. Richards (undated, mimeo.) proposed two-pronged matrix of categorical, that is the linguistic features of the code at the level of phonology, syntax and semantics, and variable features, that is, the norm switching such as code-switching and switch within the local varieties. However, what is not clear is just how these processes could be ESL specific and not EFL. The features of high style in Indian, African and

Nepali English stem from similar sociolinguistic processes. It can be hoped that the future researches in Nepal would show that the hybridization, collocation, and style as processes of the indigenization of Indian English are available in the Nepali English and that the rhetorical and communicative norms and the norm-shifts that Richards proposes for Singaporean English context do also occur in that of the Nepalese.

It is pointed out that there is a difference in attitude towards English in an ESL from an EFL country. For example, there is no motivation to model one's speech on a foreign pattern in an ESL situation while there is in an EFL. The reason for this is that in an ESL, English becomes the language of national, ethnic identities whereas in an EFL it is associated with a foreign culture. As a result, in an ESL, a speaker who rejects the indigenous model in favour of British or American English is regarded as snobbish and affected. Once again, the attitude obtains for the Nepalese context. At the same time, it must be pointed out, that if the speaker is very far from either of the native varieties, he, too, will be ridiculed.

Pedagogical implication

Now, I shall try to argue that the pedagogical relevance of the ESL/EFL distinction too is untenable. I shall discuss this point specially in light of the Nepalese ELT.

It appears that what model of an overseas language a country decides upon is a result of such empirical factors as the functions the language plays in that country, use of the language, peoples' attitude towards it, teacher's competence teaching environment, financial resources, etc. It is important, therefore, to analyse the nature of the uses of English and the needs it fulfils in Nepal before we can come up with any viable answer to the model question. This will in turn also have implication in the ordering of skills.

ENGLISH NEEDS IN NEPAL

Unfortunately, again, there is a serious lack in any empirical study on what the national and international needs for English is in Nepal. The best approximation of the Nepalese needs for English may be subsumed under the internationally felt needs of English.

Conrad and Fishman (1977), in their search for evidence of English as a world language, note that English is the language of diplomacy, the predominant language in which mail is written, the principal language of aviation and radio broadcasting, the first language of nearly 300 million people, and an additional language perhaps that of many more. Further, from the British Council Report for 1968-69 (quoted in Denison, 1970) we learn that sixty percent of radio programmes and most television materials are in English, that a flood of newspapers, magazines and comics are in English, and that it 'covers the bookstalls of the world airports.' It seems that more educational materials are available in

English than in any other language in textbooks, films and other audio-visual aids. Furthermore, it is the only language which is used as the most common official language in the world. It is also the language of good jobs. Nepal will need English in all these respects.

Furthermore, as Malla (1975) points out English is needed in the country because 1. Nepali does not have access to the scientific and technical knowledge of the modern world, and 2. It is not enough for establishing effective channels of communication with the rest of the world. Malla (1968) also reports that the immediate English language needs of the undergraduate is a minimum comprehension of spoken English to understand lectures in English on their major subjects; an adequate comprehension of written English to understand and read the textbooks and reference materials in English, enough English to express their ideas in writing, simply and effectively. Adhikary (1977) points out the majors of non-technical subjects need English mainly for reading standard works and articles in their subjects. The majors on technical subjects need to acquire their knowledge through the medium of English, so they need English for both reading and writing.

To summarize the needs of English in Nepal, Nepal needs to make use of the English language both for international and national purposes. In both instances, English serves its instrumental function. Nepal needs English because it is the language of international diplomacy, aviation, etc. Within the country, English is needed for educational, commercial, and other systems. Within the education it is needed as the medium of teaching-learning in the sense of the medium of lecture as well as of reading materials.

PRIORITY OF SKILLS

Given the nature of needs, what should be the sequencing of the four skills in the Nepalese ELT? The English curriculum has emphasized speaking as the productive skill since 1971, Macafferty (1968); Malla (1977), Kansakar (1977). This is a natural offshoot of structural linguistics in which speech was considered the real level of language and a primary manifestation of language.

From the needs point of view, however, it is not speaking for which the Nepalese students need English? English is not a Language of Wider Communication in Nepal; a very microscopic minority of these students become diplomats, or even tourist guides, and even fewer ever have a chance to speak English to the transient American or British tourists. It is rather for the usefulness of English as the only "library language" that is for the ability to make use of the educational materials available in English that these students need English. The place of speech as a component of language teaching cannot be denied; but it is irrelevant to put too much emphasis on a skill which is not much in use.

Thus, the ordering of skills in the Nepalese ELT needs to be revised. Reading needs to be given the highest priority followed by writing, speaking and listening. This completely reversed reordering of skills has theoretical support from the advances in generative-transformational grammar and cognitive psychology (Lester, 1971).

The ordering in priority of skills as presented above has the advantage that it relegates the model question to a matter of lesser significance. Even then, the native British or American model as the goal of Nepalese ELT needs to be revised in view both of the needs and the practicalities of the ELT. As pointed out earlier, majority of our students seldom have a chance to speak English, more seldom to speak to the native speakers. In so far as their needs for English to understand the lectures in English go, again, the variety of English in which these lectures are delivered are seldom native. Secondly the native model is an impractical goal because of the actualities of our ELT the English teachers who speak English non-natively, their competence in the language, the quality and method of teaching, and the "impossible" (not difficult) situation in which English has to be taught. For all practical purposes, then, the native model cannot and need not be strictly maintained. Teaching a standard classless British or American accent may be a pious wish on the part of the curriculum planners, but never in the history of our ELT has this been achieved and there is no reason to hope that this will be achieved in future.

What then should the model be? I would suggest that the native model should be abandoned altogether and be replaced by a more realistic goal of fluency in the ideal Nepali English. The aim should be fluency in the educated Nepali English, the acrolect. This is not setting up a new goal, but a legitimatization of what is happening now and will continue to happen in future. The new model will also satisfy the needs criteria, in that, the educated Nepali English will be enough for the comprehension of classroom lectures, and for interpersonal communication. It is not unreasonable to believe that the educated Nepali English will be similar to the educated South Asian English, the reality of which will not take too long to be recognized, if South Asia as a linguistic and socio-linguistic area is a reality. Nepalese students will need to speak more to the South Asian speakers of English than to the British or the American, and if this hypothesis is correct, then proficiency in educated Nepali speech will be adequate. Furthermore, as Strevens and Smith (op. cit.) believe, educated Nepali English will be the "internationally high-valued form" and so will cut across the national boundaries.

The revision of goal in this way will be of great psychological relief to our English language teachers. It will help lessen the guilt and disappointment of teaching or rather failing to teach a language which is somehow not their own.

CONCLUSION

The recent emphasis on the legitimacy of non-native varieties of English has significant implication to ELT of these countries. The distinction between EFL and ESL countries however, is ambiguous. Whereas the functional parameters are sociopolitical and cannot be applied to any situation too rigorously, the formal ones are applicable to either of the situations. The pedagogy of the distinction that ESL follows a native model of ELT and EFL an external model in the ELT cannot therefore be strictly maintained.

English in Nepal is a case in point. Although Nepal has been presented as an EFL country, it is difficult to establish its status unambiguously. English serves almost all the functions of ESL in Nepal. Similarly, the formal processes of nativization are also operable in this context. In the ELT of Nepal, considering the needs for English, the external Britain/American is irrelevant and impractical. Fluency in the ideal Nepali English will be enough for all the communicational needs of the students. Priority in skills needs to be reordered in the sequence of reading, writing and speech.

REFERENCES

- Adhikary, R.P. 1977. The Teaching of English for Special Purpose. In: First National Convention of Tribhuvan University Teachers of English.
- Christopher, Paul, 1960. "Towards a Standard International English." English Language Teaching, XIV-3: 127-138.
- Conrad, A.W. and J. Fishman, 1977. English as a World Language: The Evidence, J. Fishman, R.L. Cooper and A.W. Conrad, ed.: Mass, Newbury.
- Denison, N. 1970. "The Use of English as a Medium of Communication in Europe," Paper given at the conference entitled "English- a European Language" organized by the Institute of Linguistics in Luxembourg.
- The First National Convention of Tribhuvan University Teachers of English, Kathmandu, Tribhuvan University, 1979.
- Kachru, Braj, 1978. "The Pragmatics of Non-native varieties of English." Preliminary version of an invited paper for the conference on EIAL, April 1-15, 1978, Honolulu.
- Kansakar, T.R. 1979. "The Teaching of Spoken English." In: The First National Convention of Tribhuvan University Teachers of English.
- Lester, Mark, 1971. "Transformational Grammar Has Message for Language Teachers." CLI Newsletter, 1-1.

- Macaulay, T.B. 1835. "The Necessity of English Education." In Christina E. Debbin, ed.: Basic Documents in the Development of Modern India and Pakistan, 1835-1947. Van Nostrand, 1970.
- Malla, K.P. 1968. "English at the Undergraduate Level." In: English in Nepalese Education, Kathmandu, Ratna Pustak Bhandar, 1977.
- _____. 1976. "English Language Teaching in Tribhuvan University." In: English in Nepalese Education, Kathmandu, Ratna Pustak Bhandar, 1977.
- _____. 1977. "The Teaching of Contemporary English." In: The First National Convention of Tribhuvan University Teachers of English.
- Marckwardt, A.H. 1963. "English as a Second Language and English as a Foreign Language." PMLA, May 1963: 25-28.
- The National Conference of College Teachers of English, 28th-30th October 1968, Report. Kathmandu, Tribhuvan University, 1969.
- Nemser, William, 1971. 'Approximate Systems of Foreign Language Learners.' IRAL, Vol. IX/2.
- Nepal, His Majesty's Government, Ministry of Education, 1961: Rastriya Sarbangin Samiti Report.
- _____. 1964. Development of Secondary Education in Nepal.
- _____. 1971. The New Educational System Plan.
- Pandey, Sardar Rudra Raj, 1968. "An Inaugural Address." In: National Conference of College Teachers of English.
- Rathbone, David, 1968. "Syllabuses." In: National Conference of College Teachers of English.
- Richards, J.C. 1971. "Error Analysis and Second Language Strategies." Language Sciences, October 1971: 12-21.
- _____. 1976. "Comments on Smith's paper." RELC Journal, Vol. 2. Undated Rhetorical and Communicative Norms in the New Variety of English. (Mimeo.).
- _____. and M.J. Tay, 1978. "Norm and Variability in Language Use and Language Learning." In: L. Smith, ed.: English for Cross-Cultural Communication. (Forthcoming).
- Selinker, Larry, 1972. 'Interlanguage.' IRAL, Vol. X/3.
- Smith, Larry, 1976a. "English as an International Auxiliary Language." RELC Journal, VII-2, 1976.

na
a
Smith, Larry, 1976b. "Smith's Response to Previous Comments." RELC Journal, VIII-2, 1976.

Shrestha, Ramesh, 1978. "Diglossomania in Nepali English." Occasional Papers in Humanities and Social Sciences, Kathmandu, Tribhuvan University, 1978.

Strevens, Peter, 1971. "The Teaching of English in Asia." How Can We Maximize Success and Minimize Failure? Paper presented to the Regional Meeting of Experts in Japan.

nal
____ 1977. "English as an International Language, when is a local form of English suitable (mimeo.)."

____ 1978. "International and Intranational forms of English: The Analysis of Diversity." Paper presented at the Conference of English in Non-native Context (mimeo.).

Tribhuvan University Act, 1959.

