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Abstract
This study explores the relationships among cultural identity, accentedness, and the attitudes that native Greek speakers hold towards English pronunciation. Advanced Greek speakers of English responded to a questionnaire and completed three pronunciation tasks related to Greek identity and pronunciation. Subjects’ performance on pronunciation tasks was evaluated by three native English speakers. Findings indicate that Greek speakers dissociate their cultural identity from their preference for standard native/native-like models of English pronunciation.
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1. Introduction
Effective foreign language learning is determined by instructional, neuropsychological, sociological and attitudinal factors. Pronunciation learning, in particular, is influenced by age, gender, formal instruction, exposure to L2, L1 interference, aptitude, motivation, etc. Firstly, the neuro-biological effects associated with age explain its interrelationship with the Critical Period Hypothesis (Lenneberg 1967; Scovel 2000). Moreover, age is viewed as a social phenomenon, justifying why young learners, clinging less to their own identities in comparison to adults, are more open to immersing with the new language with which they come into contact (Dörnyei 2009; Ellis 1994). Regarding gender, studies have shown that women tend to outperform men in pronunciation (Ellis 1994), while intensive phonetic training (Elliot 1995), length of exposure to the L2 culture (i.e. Asher & Garcia 1969) as well as L1 use (Flege & Frieda 1997) also play a role in pronunciation performance. Lastly, aptitude (Purcell & Suter 1980), motivation (Elliot 1995) and attitudes towards L2 (i.e. Bialystok & Hakuta 1994) have a relationship with the type of L2
pronunciation that learners adopt. Research on attitudes and phonological variation in EFL has been inconclusive and controversial. Findings range from a steady preference among teachers (i.e. Sifakis & Sougari 2005; Timmis 2002) and learners (Georgountzou & Tsantila 2016; Jenkins 2007; Pilus 2013) for standard native English (NE) accents to high levels of tolerance of English language learners towards non-native English (NNE) accents as long as communication is achieved (He & Zang 2010).

Attitudinal factors, being socially dependent, often link the L2 learners’ pronunciation choices with their socio-cultural setting. Thus, as pronunciation reveals one’s identity (Jenkins 2007), attempting to adopt a native-like accent often raises ethical dilemmas to L2 learners, who may regard that this type of accent jeopardises their cultural cohesiveness with their mother tongue (Dalton & Seidlhofer 2001).

2. Identity, Culture and Language
Identity is defined as those distinguishing characteristics, “feelings, beliefs and ideas” that make a particular person, people or a group of people different from others (Collins Cobuild 1990: 718).

Cultural identity, according to Hall (2003: 234), is defined as “one, shared culture, [...] which people with a shared history and common ancestry hold in common.” Bausinger (1999) and Mackridge (2008) regard identity as a two-fold state: how we view ourselves in relation to the others and how others view us. This bidirectional relationship is achieved through communication. Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004: 19) regard identities as “social, discursive, and narrative options offered by a particular society in a specific time and place” which individuals use in order to “self-name, to self-characterise, and to claim social spaces and social prerogatives.”

Other definitions (Block 2007: 27) view language identity as “socially constructed, self-conscious, ongoing narratives that individuals perform, interpret and project in dress, bodily movements, actions and language”. Lastly, Bialystok and Hakuta (1994) claim that our identities are partly determined by the language we speak. This view becomes particularly prevalent in globalised, multilingual and multicultural societies

---

1. The term ‘standard’, “a ‘confusing and confused’ territory” (Coupland 2000), has been widely discussed and argued among linguists (i.e. Trudgill 1999). Although different from native, in this study, it is used along with it (standard native) and refers to accents mainly spoken in the UK and US, lacking localizable sound features.
such as that of contemporary Greece. In such contexts, an individual’s identity may suffer a crisis since individuals frequently encounter different cultures and languages.

2.1 Greek Identity
As identity, culture, and language are closely related to one’s own national group, a brief discussion on Greek identity is provided. According to relevant studies (i.e. Γιαβπίμηρ, Τζαγκάηο & Πολςσπόνη 2014; Σηπαηοςδάκη 2005), Greek identity or “Greekness” (Efstathiou 2003) is defined as the omnipresent relationship, in the mind of most Greeks, between the ancient and modern times (Frangoudaki 1997; Mackridge 2008), the common ancestry, cultural and Christian heritage (Τριανταρέλλανδος 1998), the national continuity, homogeneity and values (Efstathiou 2003), patriotism, bravery and the long history (Σηπαηοςδάκη 2005), education (Φραγκουδάκη & Δραγάνα 1997) and language (i.e. Μπαμπινιώηηρ 1984).

Lastly, since the 20th century, the Greek national identity has been closely connected with the European identity, the conflict between modernity and adherence to traditions (i.e. Gropas & Triantafyllidou 2009) stemming from Greece’s geographical and cultural setting between East and West.

2.2 Identity and Pronunciation
Identity and pronunciation research has been conducted mainly in ESL, that is, naturalistic contexts (i.e. Lambert et al. 1963). Fewer studies refer to EFL (Borlongan 2009; Rindal 2010) and even fewer to English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) and English as an International Language (EIL) contexts (i.e. Jenkins 2007; Sifakis & Sougari 2005). Nevertheless, to our knowledge, little research has been conducted on the relationship between cultural identity and the degree of foreign accent in EFL settings (Pullen 2012), which justifies this study in Greece.

3. Purpose of the study
The present study explores the relationship among cultural identity, the degree of accentedness (namely, deviation from the standard NE accents) and attitudes that

---

2 The complexities and contradictions of Greek identity make its definition a challenging task. Thus, some distinctive aspects of Greek identity, such as religion, were deliberately excluded from the questionnaire due to the negative connotations that some subjects attributed to it, after the first pilot.
Native Greek Speakers of English (NGSE) hold towards English pronunciation in the Greek EFL setting.

4. Methodology
4.1 Participants
A total of 180 advanced (C1 to C2), first and second year, undergraduate students (86 males and 94 females, aged 18-25, \( M = 21.5 \)) of various disciplines-studying in two Higher Education institutions in Athens, (the foreign language centre-Athens University (UOA) and DEREE College) responded to a questionnaire. All participants were taking English language classes. DEREE students, although studying in an English as a medium of instruction institution (EMI), attended English language courses to cope linguistically with the demands of their discipline. Twenty-nine (9 male, 20 female) subjects were further selected from the questionnaire pool to participate in the second stage of the study.

4.2 Measures and procedure
The study was conducted in 2 stages; in stage 1, a questionnaire, pilot-tested with 30 participants and revised accordingly, gathered data about the aforementioned relationships. Items that were found weakly related to CI were eliminated in this stage. In stage 2, three pronunciation tasks, measuring participants’ pronunciation ability, were implemented.

4.2.1 Stage 1: Questionnaire and procedure
A two-part questionnaire, most of which was taken from Pullen (2012) and adapted to the needs of this study, was administered. Part I had 11 open-ended questions on demographics (not included for practical reasons). Part II consisted of two sections; section A, with 19 Likert-type \textit{(agree-disagree)} questions, investigated the extent to which aspects of Greek identity, derived from Greek history, education, language, patriotism and culture (media, music, food, values and traditions) are prominent in the mind of modern Greeks as per the relevant literature on the Greek context (see section 2.1 above). Section B, with 7 Likert-type questions, investigated NGSE perceptions towards NE or NNE accent, their pronunciation ability in English, and the relationship between identity and pronunciation. Two questions (24 and 26) were open-ended and
the responses received from these questions, confirmed results of quantitative analysis (see section 5.1 below), but for brevity reasons, are not reported here.

The responses to the first nineteen questions were averaged and taken to represent cultural identity (CI) whereas the responses to questions 20-26 were averaged and represented participants’ views about pronunciation (henceforth Perceived Pronunciation) (PP) (see Appendix A).

To ensure participants’ understanding, the questionnaire was administered in Greek. It was distributed in classrooms in the presence of teachers who had been previously informed and agreed for their class to participate in the survey. Students who wished to participate provided their informed consent (not attached here due to word limitations) acknowledging the aim of the study, the benefits yielding from it, the procedure and their right to refuse or withdraw from participating. The process lasted 20 minutes.

Data were processed and analysed using SPSS. Correlations of the different variables were investigated through the Pearson product-moment coefficient test and preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. The CI section of the questionnaire had a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of .767, whereas the PP section .615. The statistical significance level for all questionnaire data was set at $p<.05$. Many of the correlations investigated (i.e. CI/PP and attitudes against age, gender, etc.) proved non-significant. So, only the significant results are discussed below.

4.2.2 Stage 2: Pronunciation Tasks and Procedure

Stage 2 included three different tasks: reading of 6 short sentences, 10 words and production of a brief, impromptu monologue (see Appendix B). The aforementioned tasks were implemented because various discourse types may affect oral performance differently (i.e. Moyer 1999; Rindal 2010). The sentences and the words checked the pronunciation of phones such as: /ʃ/, /ʒ/, /ʃʃ/, /ŋ/, /ʌ/, /æ/, /ə/, /œ/ (or /ɤ/ and /aʊ/ that are difficult for NGSE (Antonopoulou & Tetlow-Pagoni 2004; Kanarakis 1974). The spontaneous speech task was adapted from Pullen (2012) and Moyer’s (1999), ‘guided communication task’ but targeted NGSE. Accordingly, participants were asked to select one topic from a given list and produce a short, two-three minute, impromptu narrative.
4.2.3 Pronunciation rating
Based on prior research (Flege et al. 2006), a nine-point rater scale, adapted from IELTS\(^3\), was used in this study. Since “linguistically experienced listeners are more reliable than inexperienced judges in estimating L2 learners’ speech” (Calloway 1980) three, trained oral examiners, native-speakers of English (one American, one Canadian, and one British), who had been living in Athens for approximately 10 years, evaluated the speech samples. They were instructed to score the samples as follows: 1-3 = very strong foreign/Greek accent, 4-6 = intermediate/noticeable foreign accent, 7-9 = native-like to native accent).

The samples were organised according to task, but a different sequence of the items within each task was followed. The recorded samples also included three native-speakers as a reference point for objective evaluation. The assessors listened to all three tasks, but were instructed to focus exclusively on speakers’ pronunciation and disregard grammatical or other types of mistakes (e.g. false starts, hesitations, etc.) in the free response task. The entire rating process lasted 2 hrs and all speech samples had a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient .985 reliability, an indication of a high degree of consistency among the raters. Pronunciation scores for each participant were the averaged scores of the raters.

5. Results
Results below are cumulatively analysed since the initial, separate analysis between the two groups (UOA and DEREE) indicated insignificant differences.

Given the purpose of this correlation study, each angle of the triangle, representing a component of the research question, was compared to each other, as illustrated in Figure 1 below:

\(^3\)https://takeielts.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/IELTS_Speaking_Assessment_Criteria_Public.pdf
5.1 Variables related to Cultural Identity

The relationship among CI, PP and NGSE attitudes, as measured by: i) the importance participants place on NE/native-like English accent and ii) the interconnection they see between Greekness and NE/native-like accent (see Table 1), was investigated. The CI scores ranged from one to five, with one reflecting a weak association with Greek identity, and five reflecting a strong association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Identity vs</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>Strength of relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Perceived Pronunciation (Qs 20-26)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>weak positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Importance of NE/native-like English accent (average scores of Qs 21,22,23)</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>strong positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Greekness and NE accent (Q 26)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>weak positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Cultural identity vs pronunciation and attitude variables

Firstly, the relationship between the average of CI scores and the average of PP scores was investigated. There was a weak positive correlation between the two variables [$r = .16, n = 180, p < .05$], with high levels of CI scores associated with high PP scores. Therefore, NGSE indicate some attachment to their culture without devaluing NE/native-like English accent.

Then, the interrelation between CI and the importance participants place on NE/native-like English accent (as measured by the average scores of Qs 21, 22, 23)
was investigated. There was a strong positive correlation between the two variables \( r = .50, n = 180, p < .01 \), with high levels of CI scores associated with high levels of importance the participants place on non-accented speech. This finding further confirms the above observation; although our subjects value highly their Greek culture, they still tend to place high importance on native-like pronunciation.

Thirdly, the relationship between CI scores and the association participants draw between CI/Greekness and NE accent (measured by Q26) was explored. There was a weak positive correlation between the two variables \( r = .15, n = 178, p < .05 \). It seems that NGSE don’t feel their Greekness is affected when they approximate NE speaker (NES) norms.

5.2 Variables related to Pronunciation

The interrelation of PP (average scores of Qs 20-26) and attitude factors, as measured by “the self-reported importance” (Pullen 2012: 75) participants place on NE/native-like English accent, was explored⁴ (see Table 2 below). Pronunciation scores ranged from one to five, with one reflecting a weak affiliation to NE/native-like accent, and five reflecting a strong one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of NE accent</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( p )-value</th>
<th>Strength of relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q21 against average of PP section (with 21 excluded)</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>&lt;.00</td>
<td>moderate positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21 against the average of Qs 22 and 23</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>strong positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Perceived Pronunciation and importance of NE accent

A moderate positive correlation, \( r = .46, n = 179, p < .00 \) between PP scores and subjects’ beliefs on importance of NE accent, was revealed. This positive correlation was further confirmed by the high positive correlation, \( r = .64, n = 180, p < .001 \),

⁴ In this correlation, Q21 had been excluded from the mean PP scores.
between Q21 and the average of Qs 22 and 23, with high levels of Q21 scores associated with high average of Qs 22 and 23. This result indicates that NGSE consider NE accent important and thus, they try to approximate it.

5.2.2 Perceived pronunciation and subjects’ pronunciation ability
Participants’ attitudes regarding the importance of NE/native-like pronunciation and their actual pronunciation ability was examined through language tasks. As Table 3 below illustrates, raters’ scores were correlated against mean pronunciation scores and importance of NE/(non-accented) speech (as measured by the average scores of Qs 21, 22, 23).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects’ pronunciation ability (raters’ scores)</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Strength of relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vs Importance of NE accents (Q21-23)(r)</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>strong positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Mean pronunciation scores (r)</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>moderate positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(average 20-26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Perceived pronunciation and pronunciation ability

There was a strong positive correlation \[ r = .50, n = 29, p < .01 \] between subjects’ pronunciation ability as measured by raters, and the importance participants place on NE accents and a moderate positive correlation \( r = .49, n = 29, p < .01 \) between subjects’ ability and mean PP scores. Therefore, our subjects not only place high value on NE pronunciation but they demonstrate a moderate to high degree of pronunciation accuracy.

6. Discussion
The findings of this study present both similarities but also differences with other studies.

First of all, regarding the association that participants drew between CI and pronunciation, this study revealed that NGSE still feel proud of their identity,
confirming previous research (Γενική Γραμματεία Νέας Γενιάς 2005), but dissociate their Greekness from their NE/native-like English pronunciation preferences.

These findings, however, challenge prior research on the area of SL (Lambert et al. 1963) and EFL (Pullen 2012). The latter found that those subjects who were more strongly affiliated with their Turkish culture laid little importance on native-like English pronunciation.

Regarding our participants’ perceptions on pronunciation, our findings corroborate other studies (Pilus 2013) indicating that pronunciation accuracy is still important and, thus, pursued by NGSE, as confirmed by both informants’ responses and the raters’ scores. This finding conflicts with Pullen (2012) whose results revealed a mismatch between subjects’ native-like pronunciation preferences and accuracy.

Possible explanations for the above findings are related to the Greek EFL learning context and respondents’ experience. Firstly, the strong positive correlation between cultural identity and participants’ attitudes towards NE/native-like pronunciation might be attributed to the fact that all informants were in the Greek EFL, a non-naturalistic context, and, thus, they do not feel threatened when trying to approximate English native-like norms. As Block (2007: 5) notes, “it is in the migrant context, more than other contexts, that one’s identity and sense of self are put on the line”.

Furthermore, learning experience is most probably a strong motivating factor towards native norm targets since NGSE are ‘shaped’ by the standardised/high-stakes exams (Loumbourdi 2014; Mattheoudakis 2007; Sifakis & Sougari 2005) mentality allowing them to form stereotypical judgments towards native accents and, thus, they insist on struggling to achieve a native or native-like pronunciation. Therefore, the participants’ EFL learning experience as well as their long and systematic exposure to NE/native-like pronunciation by their English teachers “who force students to be like that” (Jenkins 2005: 538) must have strongly affected their views (Q21), their motivation to achieve the targeted accents (Q22, 23), and their actual performance, as rated by the raters.

7. Concluding remarks
The assumption that triggered this study was that the subjects who had established closer bonds with their Greek identity would produce a more accented speech and rather disfavor native-like English pronunciation. However, this hypothesis was not confirmed by the findings. On the contrary, strong and weak positive correlations
were detected between cultural identity, non-accentedness and attitudes towards native-like English pronunciation. The informants’ views against accented speech and their motivation to approximate native-like English pronunciation have been systematically and continuously cultivated in the Greek EFL context by English teachers and ELT materials which almost exclusively promote standard NE models in the teaching of English pronunciation.

Among the shortcomings of the present study was that it was conducted only to two tertiary level institutions in Athens whereas a larger research would be worthwhile and allow for a wider, and possibly different, range of responses. Also, due to the sensitive nature of the study, and in order to achieve homogeneity in the age of the subjects, adolescents were excluded at this stage. Thus, further research attempting to include NGSE of a wider age gamut is advisable. Also, one cannot disregard the lack of reference to religion, closely related to identity issues, from the CI questionnaire. However, this aspect was consciously excluded after the controversial comments received from some participants during the pilot study. Additionally, this study was conducted in the Greek EFL context. Consequently, a similar study is certainly worth implementing in a ESL/non-Greek setting where participants may wish to maintain and project their Greekness through a NNE accent.

Lastly but very importantly, the informants’ desire for NE/native-like pronunciation confirms prior research on the relevant area in the Greek EFL context (Georgountzou & Tsantila 2016; Sifakis & Sougari 2005). This finding underlines the necessity for a needs analysis to be conducted by English language teachers so that they obtain crucial information about their learners’ pronunciation goals and adjust their materials accordingly. This way, learners will be left free to choose the type of pronunciation they consider best for them to adopt, be it native or not. Above all, in contrast to some researchers’ concerns (i.e. Dalton & Seidlhofer 2001; Jenkins 2005), who claim that attempting to change one’s pronunciation equals to interfering with one’s identity, this study indicates that NE/native-like English pronunciation does not seem to constitute a threat to NGSE identity. Therefore, pedagogical practices still call for pronunciation instruction in the Greek EFL classroom.
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APPENDIX A

STAGE 1 / QUESTIONNAIRE

PART II
SECTION A: CULTURAL IDENTITY

Answer the following questions by ticking the appropriate box.
(1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neither disagree, nor agree 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. | I feel proud of the history and civilization of my country. |
2. | As a citizen, I have a responsibility to work for the development and wellbeing of my country. |
3. | Some of the most important figures in world history are Greek. |
4. | The Greek language many times expresses complex ideas more precisely than other languages. |
5. | It bothers me that some Greek musicians copy other countries’ musical styles. |
6. | It is my responsibility to take care of a bereaved neighbor by offering food or keeping him/her company. |
7. | Preference to non-Greek cuisines will alter the identity of the Greek traditional cuisine. |
8. | I prefer foreign television programs over those produced by my own country. |
9. | I would gladly give my life to defend my homeland. |
10. | You don’t have to speak a country’s national language to really be a member of that country. |
11. | We should be more willing to try food from other cultures. |
12. | The shared language is one of the most important factors in the unity of a nation. |
13. | It is very important for young people to visit their grandparents and other relatives during holidays. |
14. | One of the most important functions of schools is the meticulous teaching of the language and the history of a country. |
15. | Every political decision in Greece should be made in line with the principles emanating from the Greek history. |
16. | I have devoted a significant amount of time in order to learn the history and the traditions of my country. |
17. | At schools, there must be organized celebrations for national holidays. |
18. | Within the school’s responsibilities are included visits to archeological sites and museums. |
19. | The Greek language has to be protected from distortion or “linguistic pollution”, resulting from the illogical, inconsiderate, unthoughtful and massive invasion of foreign words in it as it is formed after its contact with other languages (G. Babiniotis). |

SECTION B: PRONUNCIATION

On a scale 1-5 (1=not at all, 2=little, 3=moderately, 4=a lot, 5=very much) answer the questions below. Justify your answer where requested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
20. | How satisfied are you with your pronunciation of English? |
21. | How important is it to you to pronounce English like a native speaker, e.g., like a British or an American? |
22. | Do you try to pronounce English like a native speaker (e.g., British or American) even when your speech is intelligible? |
23. Do you insist on approximating accent of native speakers of English when pronouncing certain sounds?

24. Does it matter to you how your peers or your interlocutors perceive your English pronunciation (that is, if your English pronunciation shows that you are not a native English speaker?) Please justify your answer.

25. Do you feel comfortable when you speak English with obvious features of your Greek (native) language?

26. Do you feel that when you pronounce English like a native speaker your Greekness is affected? If yes, in which way?

If you wish to participate in the next stage, please write your contact details:

NAME:  
Email address:  
MOBILE:  

APPENDIX B
STAGE 2 / LANGUAGE TASKS

TASK 1
READ ALOUD THE SENTENCES BELOW:

1. Sheila takes pleasure from her job and finishes fast.  
2. Paula prefers not to tell lies.  
3. Mat’s flat is absolutely spectacular.  
4. Our swimming pool is full of sea water.  
5. She holds the First Certificate in English.  
6. Her father works in a pharmaceutical company in London.

TASK 2
READ ALOUD THE FOLLOWING WORDS:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. tall</td>
<td>4. love</td>
<td>7. lamb</td>
<td>9. cushion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. fool</td>
<td>5. bridge</td>
<td>8. capricorn</td>
<td>10. often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. keeping</td>
<td>6. creature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TASK 3
CHOOSE ONE OF THE QUESTIONS BELOW AND GIVE A SHORT (5 TO 10-SENTENCE) NARRATIVE:

1. Describe a typical weekend or a daily routine.
2. Describe an important life experience.
3. Describe a person who particularly influenced your life.
4. Describe a problem or a challenge you had to deal with.
5. Talk about an essential for you issue.