Introduction

In this essay, I will be critiquing Kachru's Three Circles of English, that was created by Kachru in the middle of the 1980s. This model splits the presence of English into three circles: the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle, and finally the Expanding Circle. Within this essay, I will be critiquing the grey area that lies between the inner and outer circles of Kachru's theory.

Kachru Theory

The "traditional base" of the English language refers to the nations that are considered to be part of the "inner circle" of the English language. These nations are the ones that have significantly contributed to the development of the English language. These nations are included among those that fall under the "most innermost" category. This organisation is comprised of several countries, the most notable of which are the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. Also falling under this category are Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, and anglophone Canada, to mention just a few. The phrase "first language" is synonymous with "mother tongue," and both terms relate to the fact that the majority of the population in each of these countries is fluent in English. Kachru calls the countries that make up the inner circle "norm-providing" countries since it is in these countries that the norms for the English language are created.

The edge of the most circumscribed circle - The countries that make up the outer circle are those in which native English speakers are difficult to come by. However, the English language is still recognised as an important mode of communication in these countries; this can

be as an official secondary language or as the nation's official language for business or political situations. This group of countries includes a variety of distinct nations, some of which do not speak English, including India, Pakistan, Malaysia, Tanzania, Kenya, and South Africa. Other countries in this collection include Nigeria, the Philippines, and Bangladesh. In addition, this also extends to Canada. These nations are referred to as "norm-developing" by Kachru, which means that the norms that were created by the countries that make up the inner circle are further polished and copied in the nations that make up the outer circle.

The ever-increasing distance that surrounds the circle, known as its circumference - The ever-expanding circle now incorporates a sizeable portion of the world's population that lives in countries that do not place a significant historical or political emphasis on the English language and instead view it as either a foreign language (EFL) or a lingua franca. This category covers a considerable chunk of Europe, in addition to sizeable sections of China, Russia, Japan, Korea, Egypt, and Indonesia, to name just a few examples of the countries that are included in this group. This category also covers a sizeable portion of the continent of Africa. These countries are said to be "norm-dependent," which implies that they are totally reliant on the norms that were first formed by the native speakers who are members of the inner circle. Because of this, these countries are referred to as being "reliant on norms.” They do not create any new "Englishes," nor do they mimic any of the Englishes that are currently in use. In general, they do not imitate any English at all.

The Importance of the Insights Obtained Through the Course of the Research

The ability to communicate fluently in English is becoming more important in a variety of fields, including the business world, the medical profession, and the field of telecommunications, to name just a few of these areas. In addition to its growing importance in the business and political realms, English also serves as a means of communication that helps to bridge the cultural boundaries that are present in a large number of different countries and areas; this could be argued to be one of its most significant roles. It is irrefutable to deny that English has become a global language; this is the language that is used in the field of science, as well as the language that is used in the field of media and the field of technology. In addition to this, it is the non-native language that the majority of people living in the contemporary world are able to speak well. David Crystal (2003) stated, "Statistics suggest that nearly a quarter of the world's population is already fluent or content in English"[1]. Because English is so widely used and because it is so important to be able to communicate in the language, there is an urgent need not only for a deeper comprehension of the connection between English and the culture of its original speakers but also for an intensive investigation into the most effective strategies for teaching English as a second, foreign, or international language in a variety of settings.

The problem

When it comes to the concept of Kachru, there are a few problems that could potentially occur. Researchers concentrate the majority of their efforts on the region that can be found between the inner and the outer rings of the structure. Kachru's method of presenting his theory excludes people from outside the inner circle who have English as their first language. The native people of the country have made the decision to speak English as their primary language, despite the fact that there are people in the country who speak other languages. The three-circle model does not take into account the fact that English is used domestically within the country in addition to its use for official reasons such as education, the legal system, and the administration of government. This means that the model does not take into account the fact that English is used in the country as the main form of communication. Nigeria is considered in Kachru theory to be a country where native English speakers are difficult to come by due to being within the outer circle; during his period, that may have been the case, but as it stands now, it does not clearly reflect the country; as English has become domestic for the country and is spoken in day to day life, and the native languages of the land are being lost/ greatly reducing in popularity. Another point is that English has become such a norm in Nigeria and is used so naturally that a subversion of the language has been created, known as pidgin English (also known as broken English).

Kachru's model also does not acknowledge or have room to take into account countries moving from EFL (English as a Foreign Language) to ESL (English as a Second Language). These countries include but are not limited to Denmark, Sudan, and Argentina. Many speakers around

the world are becoming bilingual or multilingual (knowing more than two languages), which makes it harder to classify their languages as L1, L2 or L3. Another argument that has been presented is that if a language is something that should be learned and used rather than something that can be owned, then English ownership has universal qualities. It is not a monopoly for native speakers to choose whether to keep for themselves or share it with others. A method in which Kachru used for his classification when creating his theory was countries' competence in the English language. Still, a growing number of academics who doubt the idea of native users' ownership of the language may argue that the inner circle has no control over how the language is developed around the world. Widdowson (1998) argues,

> *"How English develops in the world is no business whatever of native speakers in the United States, United Kingdom or anywhere else. It is not a possession which they lease out to others, while still retaining the freehold. Other people actually own it"*
>
> *.*[2]

Though there are researchers that agree with his views, for example, Crystal 1997

> *The present-day world status of English is primarily the result of two factors: the expansion of British colonial power […] and the emergence of the United States as the leading economic power of the twentieth century.*[3]

Another issue found within the grey area of the inner and outer circle was addressed by (2003) Bruthiaux

> *However, the model suffers from being based in a political/historical view of English worldwide and thus fails to capture transplantations of the language in locations*

not formally recorded by colonial history. Because it promotes specific varieties, the model also ignores variation within locales, especially where the gap between those who know English and those who do not is vast.

In short, the term Inner Circle implies that speakers from ENL countries are central, and may thus be interpreted as superior.

These shortcomings encouraged other academics to suggest other models that, in their view, more accurately represent the current state of English language transmission and use while still concealing considerable disparities across nations included in the same circle. For example, Rampton (1990)

The concepts of native speaker and mother tongue are often criticized, but they continue in circulation in the absence of alternatives. This article suggests some. The terms language expertise, language inheritance, and language affiliation sort out some of the mystifications, and they allow us to place educational questions of language ability and language loyalty alongside a broader view of society.[4]

In other words, Rampton believes that being a native English speaker does not automatically guarantee proficiency in the English language, especially if the person is involved in teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL or TESL). There is a stigma that one that teaches TEFL or TESL would be more proficient in the English language, but that is not always the case, also that a native speaker of English would be better than a none native speaker. I have found while teaching and interacting with second-language English speakers that they have a more deeper understanding of the English language, understanding the whys and hows it its use. As a native

speaker, it was never something I properly looked into until A-levels when I started studying English. I just knew how to speak and write but didn't know in depth why I was stringing the words together the way I did. The BBC posted an article on their worklife page explaining "why Native English speakers are the world's worst communicators." Morrison explains

> The non-native speakers, it turns out, speak more purposefully and carefully, typical of someone speaking a second or third language. Anglophones, on the other hand, often talk too fast for others to follow, and use jokes, slang and references specific to their own culture, says Chong. In emails, they use baffling abbreviations such as 'OOO', instead of simply saying that they will be out of the office. "The native English speaker… is the only one who might not feel the need to accommodate or adapt to the others,"[5]

Conclusion

According to what has been stated in this essay, a significant number of Kachru's issues originate from the excessively straightforward and unimaginative approach it takes to classifying its structure. ESL students are not accepted, as the Kachru believes that only native English speakers can truly be considered proficient in the language. Researchers and educators continue to regard the three circles as a valuable contribution to the development of the English language across the world, despite the fact that they have been called the theory into question.

Bibliography

1. Importance Of Language As A Global Language https://www.123helpme.com/essay/Importance-Of-Language-As-A-Global-Language-PJ77L2T8N6 [Accessed 12/12/2022]
2. Widdowson, H. G. “The Ownership of English.” *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 2, 1994, pp. 377–89. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/3587438. [Accessed 12/12/2022].
3. Crystal David, *English as a global Language* , page 53,
4. M. B. H. Rampton, Displacing the ‘native speaker’: expertise, affiliation, and inheritance, ELT Journal, Volume 44, Issue 2, April 1990, Pages 97–101
5. Morrison Lennox*, Native English speakers, are the world’s worst communicators* https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20161028-native-english-speakers-are-the-worlds-worst-communicators [Accessed 15/12/2022]