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Abstract: This study investigated the interaction types of test-takers on English speaking tests (pair and group oral tests) and the effect of personality on the interaction types. 56 Korean university students were paired or grouped according to their personality. The students performed once in a pair oral test and once in a group oral test. Their performances were videotaped, rated on a six point rating scale, and transcribed following Conversational Analysis conventions for qualitative analysis. The investigation revealed two distinctive types of interaction, balanced and unbalanced interaction. Balanced interaction was likely to take place between the same personality participants, especially between high proficiency extroverts. The extroverted test-taker tended to lead unbalanced conversation when paired or grouped with the introverted test-taker(s). The introverted test-taker can, however, also be dominant when his/her proficiency was higher than the extroverted partner in a pair oral test. The extroverted test-taker seemed to be interactionally passive because of lack of proficiency. The similar unbalanced interaction also took place in a group oral test when more extroverted and more proficiency test-taker was grouped with less extroverted and less proficiency test-takers. The findings had implications for our understanding of the constructs of pair and group oral tests. However, it is necessary to conduct further research on the same topic over again, with more careful research design - controlling some potential variables such as oral proficiency.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A pair oral test (POT) or a group oral test (GOT) format in the classroom has been often considered for the use of the assessment of student's speaking abilities in the classroom due to its practicality[1,2], eliciting more communicative and authentic language samples[3,4], positive views of test-takers[5,6,7], and beneficial backwash effects into the classroom[8]. However, it has been questionable if test-taker personality influences on their language drawn by POT or GOT and results in damaging the validity of the test. For example, extroverted or talkative test-takers may obtain higher scores due to their amount of talk.

There have been several studies on the effect of test-taker personality in POT or GOT[9,10,11], but few studies have examined its impact on the discourse produced in POT or GOT. The important previous studies related to my study were as follows. Nakatsuhara investigated the effects of test-taker extroversion and oral proficiency levels on conversational styles between groups of three and groups of four[11]. 269 Japanese high school students took oral tests either in groups of three or four. Test-taker discourse was qualitatively analyzed after analyzing quantitatively. It was found the impact of extraversion levels was greater on groups of four than groups of three. On the contrary, the impact of oral proficiency levels was larger in groups of three.

Ockey investigated test-takers’ assertiveness and non-assertiveness on their performance in GOT[10]. 225 Japanese university students were involved in the study. After administering a personality questionnaire, they were divided into four types: all assertive, three assertive and one non-assertive, one assertive and three non-assertive. Their oral performance in GOT was rated by two trained raters. As a result of statistical analysis, it was found that assertive test-takers received higher scores when they were grouped with non-assertive test-takers and obtained lower scores when grouped with assertive test-takers, whereas non-assertive test-takers’ scores were not affected by their group members’ assertiveness.

Besides the two research above, there have been several more studies on personality, but only test scores were used for analysis in the most of the research except Nakatsuhara’s study[11]. Little research comparatively examined test-taker discourse (or language) elicited by both POT and GOT through qualitative analysis.

Discourse studies in language-testing help to develop innovative method of looking into test validity and prove to shed light on oral testing issues[12]. Discourse analysis would allow in-depth investigation of test-taker language and make up for the limitations of the statistical studies based on only scores awarded by raters. Thus, it would be informative to examine if test-taker personality influences the discourse produced by test-takers in POT and GOT using qualitative discourse analysis, and finally give some comparative results with those of statistical quantitative analysis in previous studies. Therefore, the findings of the current study would provide comparative and useful information about the impact of test-taker personality on interaction types in POT and GOT. This study examined the impact of test-taker personality on interaction types in POT and GOT. The research questions were as follows: 1) Are there any particular interaction types of test-taker discourse in POT and GOT? 2) How does the test-taker personality influence the interaction types of test-taker discourse in POT and GOT.
II. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Participants and procedure

Video recordings and scores of 56 students in researcher’s 2017 study on test-taker characteristics were used for analysis. The students were part of the total 174 Korean university students who participated in 2017 study. The 56 students majoring in English were chosen for the current study because it was assumed that many of them were in higher level of proficiency, which would help to see more clear effect of personality on the interaction types of test-takers. The students consisted of 29 males and 27 females; 30 extroverts and 26 introverts. The students were paired or grouped according to their personality. The students performed once in POT and once in GOT. Their performances were videotaped and rated on the six-point rating scale for pronunciation, fluency, grammar, vocabulary, and communication effectiveness. All of their performances were transcribed following Lazarraton’s transcription system and the transcripts were coded for the analysis.

2.2 POT and GOT

In POT consisting of two members, test-takers had to talk or discuss about one of the given topics (e.g., sleeping, love, job, free time, etc.). They were encouraged to talk freely as much as they could with further or follow-up questions. The class professor was forbidden from participating in or cutting in on their conversation in the test. POT took roughly between 10 and 15 minutes. In the same way, GOT was administered, but four test-takers could talk about the topic in POT. That is, the only difference between POT and GOT was the number of test-takers taking the test. GOT took approximately 15-20 minutes. All of their performances were video-taped for later grading and analysis.

2.3 Personality and Oral Proficiency

Adapted from the work of researchers[13,14], the questionnaire was revised and developed to measure test-takers’ shyness. The reliability coefficient for the items was .746 Cronbach’s Alpha. The questionnaire items were as follows: I am rather lively; Other people think of me as being very lively; I usually let myself go and enjoy myself at a lively party; I am talkative; I am optimistic; I have many friends; I enjoy meeting new people and making friends; I enjoy going out; I am mostly quiet when I am with other people; I like being alone rather than mixing with people; I feel uncomfortable at a lively party; It is difficult to talk looking at the eyes of other people; I am intimidated in a meeting with a lot of people; I feel nervous and cannot talk well with unfamiliar people; I often hesitate and miss opportunities to talk; I talk more in a smaller group; I usually enjoy listening to other people; I am rather quiet; I am shy; I had trouble because of my shyness; and I feel embarrassed when I am with the opposite of gender.

The level of extroversion was devised from 1 (the lowest level of extroversion) to 10 (the highest level of extroversion). The level of extroversion from 1 to 5 was designated as an introvert and from 6 to 10 as an extrovert so that degree of extroversion can be seen. Thus, 1 was the most introverted test-taker and 5 was the least introverted test-taker; 6 was the least extroverted test-taker and 10 was the most extroverted test-taker.

In order to measure students’ oral proficiency, the same rating scale was used as that for the measurement of the students’ performances in POT and GOT. The average score of 174 test-takers’ oral proficiency in 2017 study was 2.53 out of the six-point rating scale. The lowest average score was 1 and the highest score was 6. The oral proficiency was divided into two levels: high (2.71-6.00) and low proficiency (1.00-2.70). In this study, 42 test takers were in high proficiency and 14 were in low proficiency. The impact of oral proficiency was not attempted to be investigated in this study, but it could not be ignored because test-taker oral proficiency seemed sometimes more influential and interrupted the impact of personality.

2.4 Qualitative Analysis

Conversation Analysis (CA) was employed for the analysis. The main goal of CA is to understand interaction, how the interaction is jointly carried out. The system seeks distinctive features of talk in interaction (e.g., pausing, turn-taking, and talk overlap). Thus, it was believed that CA would help to obtain a more precise picture of pair and group oral test discourse and provide an invaluable methodology for qualitative perspectives on the data[12]. The transcripts were repeatedly read to discover distinctive and recurrent interactional features in test-taker discourse, with attention to turn-taking, adjacency pair, and repair.

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

All of the turns were composed of questions and responses. Two distinctive features of interaction were found: Balanced and unbalanced interaction. The definition of each pattern of interaction was revised and developed based on those of the previous study[12]. Balanced interaction was defined here as an interaction displaying natural and balanced exchange of turns involving everyone in the conversation in the way of normal conversation, resulting in similar amount of talk of each test-taker. On the other hand, unbalanced interaction was described as an interaction showing unbalanced, unnatural, or weighted exchange of turns, where one person leads the interaction and his/her talk is dominant in the conversation. For better understanding of the interaction, the table for summary of test-taker characteristics and performances in each excerpt was presented. Test-takers’ scores of oral proficiency and percentages of amount of talk were also included.

3.1 Balanced Interaction

Through the analysis, it was found that the balanced interaction generally occurred when the same personality students were paired or grouped with the same proficiency (e.g., extrovert-extrovert or introvert-introvert-introvert-extrovert). Excerpt 1 shows the interaction between an extrovert and an extrovert. The two participants (Hyun-jin, Su-hee), who were both in high proficiency, talked about sleeping. The interaction revealed approximate equality in terms of turn-taking and amount of talk. Their conversation was by balanced exchange of turn-taking, short turns,
Excerpt 1: Discussion about sleeping
1 Su-hee: Oh, so you need a [alarm].
2 Hyun-jin: [Yes.] (.)
3 Su-hee: alarm or? %or (something)?% 
4 Hyun-jin: Yes. I almost(.2) need an alarm because(.3) I don't wake(.1) myself.
5 Su-hee: Yourself!
6 Hyun-jin: Yeah(.) but I'm an early bird, I'm an early [bird] 
7 Su-hee: [Okay]
8 Hyun-jin: When my(,), when my phone ringing 
9 Su-hee: um(.3)
10 Hyun-jin: ≤ 1 : easily(,) get up(.) in the mor-ning.
11 Su-hee: Okay, so when you don't have a phone alarming^, you just sleep(.), > a sleep, a sleep, a sleep, a sleep? 
12 Hyun-jin: No, I use(,) a computer alarm. 
13 Su-hee: %Nope?% 
14 Su-hee: Oh(,), you (,) have a computer alarm?! 
15 Hyun-jin: Y'es 
16 Su-hee: [What is, what is a computer alarm?<] 
17 Hyun-jin: Computer alarm is (. ) same (. ) as my phone. 
18 Su-hee: Oh, then you.. 
19 Hyun-jin: but, computer : (.2) is : running^.
20 Su-hee: Ah~ all day? 
21 Hyun-jin: Yes, all day.
22 Su-hee: Ah~ Okay. [I think..] 
23 Hyun-jin: [How about you?] You need alarm?! 
24 Su-hee:: Ah : >actually< I don't need an [alarm]. 
25 Hyun-jin: [un~] 
26 Su-hee: I can wake up ear[ l..] early on myself. 
27 Hyun-jin: [yeah((surprising))]?! 
28 Hyun-jin: Yourself!! Alone?> Eh, eh. Yourself wake up?!< 
29 Su-hee: Yeah, [yeah because] I don't have any long-time sleeping^.
30 Hyun-jin: [Oh, I envy.] 
31 Su-hee: So, don't need that, so, so(,), I don't need an alarm(,), but sometimes when I'm really= really=stir[ed], I need an alarm.
32 Hyun-jin: [uh, yeah]
In Turn 1, Su-hee initiated a topic, ‘alarm’ and the topic was developed by both speakers, lasting more than 32 turns. Beyond the excerpt 1, they got back to the topic “alarm” after going through three topics and lasted 17 turns more. The test-takers showed supportive, positive, or responsive attitudes to each other. Acknowledgement tokens (e.g., “okay” in Turn 7, “um” in Turn 9 and Turn 25, “yeah” in Turn 27 and Turn 32) indicated listener support, and frequent overlaps (Turns 1 and 2, Turns 6 and 7, Turns 15 and 16, Turns 22 and 23, Turns 24 and 25, Turns 26 and 27, Turns 29 and 30, and Turns 31 and 32) and repetitions (Turn 5 and Turn 28) suggested high engagement. They also gave prompt responses or follow-up questions after each speaker’s utterance. They actively interacted with each other by changing turns in a natural conversational way. Topics were developed from the previous topic of conversation (Turn 1, “alarm” → Turn 12, “computer alarm” ). In the beginning, Su-hee was usually gave questions, but later they shifted their roles and Hyun-jin gave sequence opener (Turn 23) with a follow-up question (Turn 28).

Overall, their interaction was balanced revealing similar amount of talk (see Table 1) even though Su-hee initiated more topics (topic initiation=75%). In the judgement of the types of interaction, the number of topic initiation was little considered because topics were sometimes initiated mechanically with the questions memorized before the tests. The POT scores were close to their oral proficiency. In short, it was concluded that this kind of balanced interaction tended to take place especially between high proficiency extroverts. The discussion task might be easier for high proficiency extroverts to complete because they are generally more positive and likely to talk more. They seem to give positive influence on each other. Berry also support this view reporting that extroverts were likely to get higher scores when paired with another extrovert, while introverts’ scores did not tend to be influenced by their partners[15].

In GOT, the balanced interaction was also seen when the personality of test-takers were mixed half and half (e.g., extrovert-extrovert-introvert-introvert) or the same (e.g., extrovert-extrovert- extrovert- extrovert or introvert-introvert- introvert- introvert). Table 2 and Excerpt 2 reveal that there was balanced exchange of turn-taking and similar amount of talk even though two test-takers talked a little more compared to the other two. The conversation atmosphere was supportive, cooperative, and positive. Two participants (Jin-ju and Hyun-jin) were extroverts and the other two (Mi-hyun and Ha-na) were introverts. They talked about love.

### Table 1: Test-taker Characteristics and Performance Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Personality (extroversion level)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Oral proficiency (score)</th>
<th>POT Score</th>
<th>Amount of talk (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyun-jin</td>
<td>Extrovert (8)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>High (4.1)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>42.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-hee</td>
<td>Extrovert (6)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>High (4.5)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>57.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Test-taker characteristics and performance summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Personality (extroversion level)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Oral proficiency (score)</th>
<th>GOT Score</th>
<th>Amount of talk (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jin-ju</td>
<td>Introvert (4)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Low (2.7)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>20.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyun-jin</td>
<td>Extrovert (8)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>High (4.1)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>27.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi-hyun</td>
<td>Extrovert (6)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>High (3.4)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>22.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na-mi</td>
<td>Introvert (5)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>High (4.3)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>30.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 2: Discussion about love
1 Hyun-jin: How about your first love?
2 Jin-ju: I.(2) I similar to you
3 Hyun-jin: Ah 20?
4 Jin-ju: Yes, 20 years old when I.(2) got a job?
Interactivity Types of Students in English Speaking Tests: Focused on the Impact of Personality

5 Hyun-jin: Ah-
6 Mi-hyun, Na-mi, Hyun-jin: [Job? job?]
7 Jin-ju: [I, I]
8 Mi-hyun: Job,(.)((nod))
9 Hyun-jin: Job? part time [job?]  
10 Jin-ju: [No]
11 Mi-hyun: Yeah=yeah her(.) [her(.)]
12 Jin-ju: [I, I]
13 Na-mi: %She%
14 Mi-hyun: Ah she
15 Jin-ju: I work hard at hotel (.2)
16 Na-mi: And then came here
17 Mi-hyun: For one year
18 Jin-ju: %One year, just one year(.)% And I met first love. boyfriend
19 Mi-hyun: Yeah
20 Jin-ju: And
21 Mi-hyun: I, I know him I know him
22 Hyun-jin: Ah, I know him:
23 Na-mi: I know him, too(.) Hhh
24 Hyun-jin: So her(.) her majors
25 Jin-ju: No, no before that boy
26 Mi-hyun: Second(,) second man
27 Hyun-jin: Why did youbreak up with him?
28 Jin-ju: (tch) [umm(.3) umm(.3)] his home...
29 Na-mi: [Far here?]  
30 Jin-ju: Yeah, but [he is um...]
31 Hyun-jin: [He live away from here? longer?]
32 Jin-ju: Yes, he’s here and I was, live in here.
33 Hyun-jin, Mi-hyun, Na-mi: Ah:

They talked about first love, and now it was Jin-ju’s turn to talk about her first love. Before her turn, two of the speakers already talked about their first love. The turn-taking was natural and sequential. Their conversation about Jin-ju’s first love lasted 52 turns, which went longer beyond the excerpt. They developed and supported each other’s ideas. She was the only speaker who had low proficiency in the group, but she could continue her talk with help of other speakers. Whenever Jin-ju faced difficulties in completing the utterances (Turns 15, 28, and 30), other speakers cooperatively provided language to help her (Turns 16, 17, 29, and 31). This may have worked as scaffolding behaviors to involve her more into the interaction[11], resulting in balanced conversation. The topic was developed with topic extension (Turn 4, “ job” → Turn 18, “ boyfriend” → Turn 27, “ break-up”). The speakers also showed prompt interest or reaction to Jin-ju’s utterances (Turns 3 and 6), acknowledgement tokens (“ ah” in Turn 5; “yeah” in Turn 19), overlaps (Turns 6 and 7, Turns 9 and 10, 11and 12, Turns 28 and 29, Turns 30 and 31), indicating supportive and positive interaction.

In short, the test-takers seem to generally balance their exchange of turn-taking and amount of talk showing strong interest in and reaction to one another’s utterances. Even a low proficiency introvert, who was expected to be less interact and less talk, did not get in the way of making conversation with the help of higher proficiency extroverted speakers. Previous studies back up this finding. Berry claimed that introverts could perform better when they were grouped with more extroverted test-takers[9]. Egyud and Glover argue that higher proficiency test-takers try to aid lower proficiency test-takers constructing language cooperatively[16]. Iwashita also found that lower proficiency test-takers performed better when they were with higher proficiency test-takers[17]. It seems that low proficiency introverted test-takers get more benefits when they work with high proficiency extroverted test-takers.

There was, however, also the case of balanced interaction when the group was made up of the same personality test-takers except one (e.g., extrovert-extrovert-introvert or introvert-introvert-extrovert-introvert). This is the case when the extroversion level of the speaker was not notably higher than the other speakers. The example is as in the Excerpt 3 below.

Excerpt 3: Discussion about love
1 Min-su: So what do you think about advantages about having a boyfriend?
2 Ju-hee: Having a boyfriend?
3 Min-su: yeah, having a boyfriend.
4 Ju-hee: um: maybe I’m not lonely^, and: I can,(2) go,(2) where,(.) I want % %, and,(.) they,(.) they,(.) enjoy,(.) and happy. But,(.) this disadvantage is,(.) I,(.) I don’t have my time.
5 Min-su: Yeah, I ag[ree.] (nod)
6 Jung-woo: [I, I think so.] (nod)
7 Ju-hee: Yes, and,(2) I can’t so, I can do my work,(2) because I,(.) I fall in him,(.) %So,(.) I can’t% take care of mytime.
8 Min-su: Also maybe we can’t save money.
9 Ju-hee: Yeah= yeah=yeah:
10 Jung-woo: Ah:
11 Jun-chul: That’s true.
12 Jung-woo: %That’s exactly.%
13 Ju-hee: % (Took) much money. So,(.)% and,(.) when I have boyfriend,(.) I get,(.) very(to explain body language))% saltzida? (fat in Korean)%
14 Jung-woo: %ob[ese]?%
15 Min-su: [you] being fat?
16 Ju-hee: Yeah, being fat. When I broke up,(.) I lose my weight. Hhh, I enjoy.
17 Jung-woo: I, I agree your opinion. Because (.1) sometimes (.1), sometimes

Table 3: Test-taker Characteristics and Performance Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Personality (extroversion level)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Oral proficiency (score)</th>
<th>GOT Score</th>
<th>Amount of talk (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jung-woo</td>
<td>Introvert (3)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High(3.2)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>21.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ju-hee</td>
<td>Extrovert (6)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>High(3.0)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-su</td>
<td>Introvert (5)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High(4.5)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-chul</td>
<td>Introvert (4)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High(4.3)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>20.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(1) girlfriend, having a girlfriend have many advantage. umm, for example,(3), I'm not lonely,(1) and I, I can feel to love. So, I'm very happy. But sometimes, very tired and (1) struggle. Because of my girlfriend, example, to fight. And,(1) enough time,(1) not enough time, so,(2) but,(2) that’s ok,(3) (nod) I’m,(1) I’m very good.

18 Everyone: Yeah: (nod)

It was expected that an extroverted test-taker, Ju-hee, would talk more and lead the conversation, but as seen in Excerpt 3 the overall interaction seems balanced. Min-su initiated a topic in Turn 1 ("advantages about having a boyfriend"). The topic is developed by Ju-hee raising the other aspect of the topic "disadvantage" in Turn 4, and subtopics were initiated by Ju-hee ("time" in Turn 4, "fat" in Turn 13) and by Min-su ("money" in Turn 8) through the conversation. There were frequent supportive agreements (Turns 5, 6, 11, 12, and 17) with acknowledgement tokens (Turns 9, 10, and 18) and overlaps (Turns 5 and 6, Turns 14 and 15) indicating high engagement.

When Ju-hee had difficulties to complete her utterance in Turn 13 she used Korean for help. Ju-hee could complete her utterance with Min-su’s help ("being fat") in Turn 15. Jung-woo also tried to help her in Turn 14 ("obese") by providing a word. Jun-chul’s engagement seemed less than the other speakers in this excerpt, but took long turns and agreeably interacted with them when he took his turns beyond this excerpt.

Ju-hee was not dominant even though she was the only extrovert in the group. They had a quite balanced interaction. This may be because the gap between her extroversion level and those of other speakers was not very big. In other words, it seems that the balanced interaction could occur, similarly to that of the group which was composed of the same personality speakers with the same proficiency because her levels of extroversion (and proficiency) was not distinguishably higher among the speakers in this group.

In short, the balanced interaction was found when the same personality students were paired or grouped, provided that they had the same proficiency. Especially, when higher proficiency extroverts were paired or grouped, more supportive, positive or cooperative interaction seemed to occur. On the other hand, the balanced interaction was also made when the test-takers with different personality were grouped in a balanced way (i.e. half is extroverts and half is introverts) or when the group was made up of one extrovert and three introverts (but not one introvert and three extroverts) so long as the extroversion level of the extrovert was not saliently higher than the other speakers.

3.2 Unbalanced Interaction

It was found that an extroverted test-taker usually tended to lead the conversation when paired with an introverted test-taker of the same level of proficiency in POT. To illustrate the salient points of this pattern of interaction, Excerpt 4 was considered in which Yun and Ju discussed about ‘sleeping’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Personality (extroversion level)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Oral proficiency (score)</th>
<th>POT Score</th>
<th>Amount of talk (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gi-hyun</td>
<td>Extrovert (6)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High (4.2)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>57.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ye-dam</td>
<td>Introvert (5)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>High (4.6)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>42.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 4: Discussion about sleeping
1 Gi-hyun: How long did you sleep yesterday?
2 Ye-dam: Psk For about six hours.
3 Gi-hyun: Six hours"
4 Ye-dam: Yes.
5 Gi-hyun: That's enough(.1) for you?
6 Ye-dam: Yeah, I usually sleep six hours a day.
7 Gi-hyun: Ah, six hours. Ah, you can get some (.3) get some(.1) energy from six hours enough? [I I]

8 Ye-dam: [Yeah, I] I often take a nap.
9 Gi-hyun: Ah: take a nap.
10 Ye-dam: Yeah.
11 Gi-hyun: How long time?
12 Ye-dam: Hmm: about 30 minutes.
13 Gi-hyun: 30 minutes.
14 Ye-dam: Yes.
15 Gi-hyun: Ah...it is it is good things(.1) I agree to take a nap is good.
16 Ye-dam: Do you take a nap?
17 Gi-hyun: Ah, I don't have enough time to take a nap. Cause, ah lots of classes and ah, have a part-time job. I need to go Seattle the things. Anyway, ah, I have a question. How do you think about the advantage of sleepingless time?
18 Ye-dam: Sleeping (.2) Uhh(.4) I think it depends on (.3) person?.
19 Gi-hyun: Person?
20 Ye-dam: I think it depends on persons. Some people, some people feel like (.5) Unim: 21 Gi-hyun: Feel like.
22 Ye-dam: Feel
23 Gi-hyun: Tired.

In the Excerpt 4, Gi-hyun clearly emerges as the more dominating speaker as he speaks more, leads the flow of the conversation, and encourages the other speaker to talk more even though he does not expand on his own ideas. Ye-dam takes on a passive role by giving some minimal responses (‘yes’ in Turns 4 and 14, ‘yeah’ in Turn 10) and no attempts of topic initiation. Gi-hyun dominates the questions acting like an interviewer. On the other hand, Ye-dam simply responds to Gi-hyun’s questions. Gi-hyun encourages Ye-dam to complete her talk in turn 21 and finally help her by filling the gap in turn 23.

In short, Excerpt 4 surely indicates that the extrovert (Gi-hyun) tended to lead the conversation and the introvert (Ye-dam) was quite passive by simply answering the questions. Gi-hyun often repeated Ye-dam’s utterances (Turns 3, 7, 9, 13, 19, and 21). This is the mark of high engagement encouraging
more interaction. It was noticeable that the difference in the amount of Ye-dam’s talk was not very big compared to that of Gi-hyun’s. This may be because Gi-hyun’s behavior played a role as scaffolding, resulting in involving Ye-dam into interaction more and inducing more talk. There was, however, also the case reversed.

### Table 5: Test-taker Characteristics and Performance Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Personality (extraversion level)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Oral proficiency (score)</th>
<th>POT Score</th>
<th>Amount of talk (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sung-jin</td>
<td>Introvert (4)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High (3.8)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>53.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha-ju</td>
<td>Extrovert (7)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Low (2.4)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>46.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Excerpt 5: Discussion about sleeping**
1 Sung-jin: Long sleep or not sleep?
2 Ha-ju: Yes.
3 Sung-jin: What?!
4 Ha-ju: I...
5 Sung-jin: (Excited or angry..kk) You take a long sleep?!
or You don’t take a sleep?
6 Ha-ju: I don’t take a sleep.
7 Sung-jin: Oh, really? Why?
8 Ha-ju: I, I, I think I don’t sleep. I just think.
9 Sung-jin: Ah~ so,
10 Ha-ju: ah, so(
11 Sung-jin: When you don’t sleep, what you(. what’s you’re doing$$. What’s you’re doing%%.
12 Ha-ju: I think.
13 Sung-jin: Just think?
14 Ha-ju: Just think.
15 Sung-jin: Ah, ah, ah, meditation?!
16 Ha-ju: Yes, yes, yes.
17 Sung-jin: you, you don’t sleep
18 Ha-ju: done, done done. just. [just, just,]
19 Sung-jin: [And you just meditation.]
20 Ha-ju: You, you, you (.4) eotteoge (howin Korean), how, how, how, how are you doing,
21 Sung-jin: How long (.) do you take a sleep? (.)
22 Ha-ju: How long(.) Ah(.) eotteogesaegakha... (how do you thinkin Korean) How, how, how, how, how think a sleep? How are you think a sleep? (.2) How is it sleep? [How think you?]
23 Sung-jin: %about% [sleep? How about sleep?]
24 Ha-ju: [How, ah, how about sleep?]
25 Sung-jun: Ah, I think sleep is very necessary (.1) to (.1)

### Table 6: Test-taker Characteristics and Performance Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Personality (extraversion level)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Oral proficiency (score)</th>
<th>GOT Score</th>
<th>Amount of talk (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mi-na</td>
<td>Introvert (5)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>High (3.7)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>20.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sung-jin</td>
<td>Introvert (4)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High (4.1)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jong-chul</td>
<td>Extrovert (8)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High (3.7)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-hee</td>
<td>Extrovert (6)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>High (4.5)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>54.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Excerpt 6: Discussion about love**
1 Su-hee: See< our topic is love.(.1) so I wanna(.1) ask you guys who is your first love.
2 Jong-chul: First love?
3 Su-hee: Yes
4 Jong-chul: Ah: (.3) my first love is when I was(.1) in middle school(.2), middle school student(.2) umm: I met her(.1) at December[(.1) in] school(2), it’s too sad story, so.
5 Su-hee:[In school?] it’s one side love?
6 Jong-chul: No
7 Su-hee: Really?
8 Jong-chul: We were(.1) really love each other(.1) but(.3) there were many reasons. So(.3) we have to

9 Su-hee: Have to broke up?(.2) sorry[(.1)] But, that was really(.1) past things, right?
10 Everyone: [Hhh]
11 Jong-chul: Just past thing? Yeah:
12 Su-hee: Yeah, you’ve broke up.
13 Jong-chul: I loved very much, more than[(.1)] my first love.
14 Su-hee: [first love?] What about you, Sung-jin?
15 Sung-jin: Um, I met(.1) her in middle school and(.1) I met her about two years.
16 Su-hee: two years? Oh:
17 Sung-jin: And I broke up. Sad story.
18 Su-hee: It was first love?
19 Sung-jin: Yes
20 Su-hee: What about you?
21 Mi-na: I’m .. it’s my first love. I’m building a first love
and just(1) now, I love my boyfriend much that is ...
22 Su-hee: First love?
23 Mi-na: Yeah, first love my. How about you?
24 Su-hee: In my case, kind of sad story same as you, um, in
my high school student, I met him(1) in the classroom. He
and I were same class. I:(1) kind of love him, one side love.
But him didn’t know that. But I: secretly loved him. But, he
want, he wanted to connect, contact, text? Contact with my
friend. So, I had to, had to finish my one side love. But, that
was hard to finish my first love. But, now(1) we are friend.
So: actually, he is my idol. Because, he is really good at
singing, and he has husky voice, I love husky voice. And he
was really fashionable. So, everything(1) everything that he
got I really liked him. But now we are just friend. So, kind of
sad story.

In turn 1, Su-hee encouraged all test-takers to talk about
their first love. She was the only speaker who was making
efforts to expand the topic with follow-up questions (Turns 5,
9, 18, 22) and supportive response tokens (Turns 7 and 16).
She kept scaffolding the interaction by providing language
(Turn 9) and sequence openers (Turns 1, 14, and 20), acting
like an interviewer. In Turn 23, Mi-na asked Su-hee’s first
love, which was the first sequence opener directed to Su-hee.
It seems that this group interaction had become a little more
collaborative. Su-hee’s scaffolding behavior might have
resulted in producing greater amount of talk and getting each
of members’ ideas equally.

Interesting finding is that Su-hee was not a dominant
speaker in POT (see Excerpt 1). As seen earlier, she had a
balanced interaction with her extroverted partner. But in the
situation where she was grouped with less extroverted
test-takers (except Jong-chul), she became the most dominant
speaker giving more questions and talking more. It is
noticeable that Jong-chul was the only speaker in the group
whose extraversion level was higher than Su-hee, but his oral
proficiency was lower than hers. On the other hand, the
reverse case can also be seen in the above excerpt. Sung-jin
was a dominant speaker when paired with a lower proficiency
extroverted test-taker in POT (see Excerpt 5), but he talked
the least and took passive role in the above excerpt.

In the final analysis, an extroverted test-taker tended to be
dominant in POT when paired with the introverted test-taker
of the same level of proficiency. In general, high proficiency
introverted test-takers were likely to talk more with more
follow-up questions both in POT and in GOT. The introverted
test-taker could, however, also be more dominant in and lead
the conversation when his/her proficiency was higher than the
extroverted partner in POT. In GOT, the similar unbalanced
interaction came about when the more extroverted and more
proficiency test-taker was grouped with less extroverted and
less proficiency test-takers. In some sense, the impact of
proficiency may be bigger than personality because when they
have the different oral proficiency the impact of personality
seems lessened.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study explored the impact of test-taker personality on
interaction types in POT and GOT. The following results were
found. First, balanced conversation was likely to take place
between the same personality participants, especially between
high proficiency extroverts in POT. Secondly, the balanced
interaction was also found in GOT when the personality
of test-takers were mixed in the way of half and half personality
types (e.g. extrovert-extrovert-introvert-introvert) or the same
personality students were grouped, provided that they had the
same proficiency. Thirdly, an extroverted test-taker tended to
lead unbalanced conversation when paired or grouped with
(21) an introverted test-taker(s). An introvert can, however, also
be dominant when his/her proficiency was higher than the
extroverted partner in POT. The extroverted test-takers seem
be interactionally passive because of lack of proficiency.
Fourthly, the unbalanced interaction also took place in GOT
when more extroverted and more proficiency test-taker was
grouped with less extroverted and less proficiency test-takers.
Lastly, a low proficiency introvert benefited from high
proficiency extroverted test-takers in GOT. The balanced
interaction could also occur when test-taker’s level of
extraversion (and proficiency) was not distinguishably higher
than the other speakers in the group. The findings had
implications for our understanding of the constructs of POT
and GOT and for fairness of test formats.

On the basis of the findings, it is suggested that the best
efforts should be done to have test-takers balanced and
collaborative interaction in POT or GOT. It has shown that
Korean students were likely to have balanced or unbalanced
patterns of interaction. And unbalanced interaction may
reduce equality of opportunities for participating in the task.
Test-takers of more balanced and collaborative pairs or
groups tend to perform best and have higher test scores.
Therefore, in order to avoid threatening test fairness, pairing
or grouping the same or similar personality test-takers with
the same oral proficiency level is recommended because the
interaction between or among the same or similar personality
test-takers were more likely to be balanced, provided that they
have the same proficiency. Or test-takers might have benefits
from direct training for the ways of balanced interaction such
as initiating topics, ratifying the prior topic, extending the
topic, supportive responses, and giving agreement or
disagreement (or different opinions).

The results of the current study, however, conflict with
those of researcher’s previous quantitative statistical study
indicating no impact of interlocutor personality on discourse.
One of the possible reasons may be that the effect of
extraversion could not been accurately investigated under
uncontrolled the effect of oral proficiency in the quantitative
study. The effect of interlocutor personality seems to be
reduced by that of oral proficiency. Another reason may be
that the effect of extraversion seems not to be very influential
unless test-taker’s level of extraversion is distinctively higher
than those of his/her interlocutors in GOT.
That is, the effect of test-taker extroversion may not be statistically revealed when the difference of extroversion level between test-takers is not big enough.

Notwithstanding the assumptions about possible reasons for the differences between quantitative and qualitative results, it is not very obvious about the reasons for such differences in findings. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct further research on the same topic over again, with more careful research design: controlling some potential variables such as oral proficiency. In addition, qualitative analysis should be conducted along with quantitative analysis for more reliable and rigorous investigation.
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