

Copyright © 2017 by Academic Publishing House *Researcher*

Published in the Russian Federation  
European Researcher. Series A  
Has been issued since 2010.  
ISSN 2219-8229  
E-ISSN 2224-0136  
2017, 8(3): 224-235

DOI: 10.13187/er.2017.3.224  
[www.erjournal.ru](http://www.erjournal.ru)



UDC 37

## Willingness to Communicate in English as a Foreign Language in Bosnian-Herzegovinian EFL Context

Emina Rizvić<sup>a,\*</sup>, Senad Bećirović<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> International Burch University, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

### Abstract

Willingness to communicate (WTC) has recently been extensively investigated in the field of language study, especially in second language acquisition studies and communication studies. Studies suggest that WTC is an important tool that can facilitate language learning. Hence, the aim of instructors when teaching a language should be to increase the students' WTC. The aim of this study is to explore the Bosnian-Herzegovinian university students' willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language in different situational and interpersonal contexts. For that purpose, the Willingness to Communicate Questionnaire (McCroskey, Richmond, 2013) was utilized. The instrument consists of seven sub-scales: group discussion, meetings, interpersonal, public speaking, friend, acquaintance, stranger and it consists of 20 items. The research sample consists of 193 students from three universities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, two public universities and one private university. The results show that students' grade level, type of university and GPA significantly affect their willingness to communicate, while gender, nationality, or the number of foreign languages that students speak do not affect their WTC. Since this concept has not been studied broadly in the Bosnian-Herzegovinian EFL context, findings of this quantitative study might facilitate the process of setting pedagogical aims in English language instruction in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with special emphasis on WTC.

**Keywords:** WTC, communication, foreign language, achievement.

### 1. Introduction

The concept of willingness to communicate (WTC) has been more significantly investigated since 1998, when MacIntyre, Clement, Dörnyei, and Noels (1998) presented a formulation of a mixture of psychological, linguistic, educational, and communicative dimensions of language that underlies an individual's willingness to use the target language (Mystkowska-Wiertelak, Pawlak, 2016). Since then, a significant number of studies have been conducted to shed light on this concept. It has been proven that many situational factors and personality traits drive the learner's desire to communicate in a foreign language (Sinanović, Bećirović, 2016). A great deal of studies on WTC has been conducted in second language contexts of China, Japan, and Iran. Many researchers have actually tried to test the model of willingness to communicate proposed by MacIntyre and associates (1998) or they try to elaborate on different factors that influence the WTC and try to

\* Corresponding author

E-mail addresses: [emina.rizvic@stu.ibu.edu.ba](mailto:emina.rizvic@stu.ibu.edu.ba) (E. Rizvić), [senad.becirovic@ibu.edu.ba](mailto:senad.becirovic@ibu.edu.ba) (S. Bećirović)

make connections between willingness to communicate and specific outcomes of the language learning process, such as achievement.

The importance of interacting in the foreign language during the learning process is not negligible (Bećirović, 2016). In order to fully engage in the process, learners must be willing to give their absolutely best to immerse themselves in the language learning experience. One way to do so is by accepting every opportunity for communication that arises. Many language specialists, teachers, experts, and even learners have recognized the importance of interaction as a mechanism which facilitates language learning. Developing the ability to speak well, if not fluently, and the ability to successfully perform in a variety of communicative situations is today seen as one of the main aims of language instruction, due to the globalization of the present society and the fact that the world is becoming a global village.

However, WTC does not only depend on one's knowledge about language, but also on an amalgam of psychological, linguistic, educational, and communicative variables. When studying the willingness to communicate, researchers must pay special attention to these different variables, explore them in detail, and then draw connections between them, thus making these variables a firm foundation for the concept of WTC.

The concept of WTC was first developed by McCroskey and associates (McCroskey and Baer, 1985; McCroskey and Richmond, 1987, 1990, 1991), while MacIntyre and associates (MacIntyre, Charos, 1996; MacIntyre et al., 1998) were those who applied the concept of WTC in the second language context.

With the rise of communicative language teaching approaches and the increasing amount of attention that is being given to authenticity of language instruction materials (Brown, 2001), one of the pedagogical goals nowadays should definitely be to increase learners' willingness to communicate (Delić, Bećirović, 2016) in order to facilitate the learning of language, primarily for communicative purposes. The accent should not be on language competence only, but also on language performance. According to MacIntyre and Charos (1996), communication is more than a means of facilitating language learning, it is an important goal itself.

Due to many factors, including politics, English language teaching is seen as very important in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Bosnia and Herzegovina is a multiethnic, multilingual country where three major nations live and speak three major languages, all very similar to each other. With the country moving toward the international community, the preeminence of the mastery of English language is more and more emphasized (Bećirović, 2017). In addition, the pervasive role of English language in science, business, and intercultural communication (Wu, 2001) poses a challenge for students in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Since there are more and more international universities in the country, and given this ubiquitous role of English language in many different fields, it is not surprising that students in Bosnia and Herzegovina are increasingly expected to become proficient and competent in English language, especially in tertiary education.

Despite the abundance of findings from previous research, willingness to communicate in English language is a low-studied concept in the Bosnian-Herzegovinian EFL (English as a foreign language) context. Only recently the researchers started conducting WTC studies in EFL contexts where learners do not experience the immediate need to use English in their daily life, as the case is in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the function of describing the relatively uninvestigated WTC of Bosnian-Herzegovinian students and international students who study in Bosnia and Herzegovina, quantitative methods have been used to collect and analyze information about WTC in different situational and interpersonal contexts.

## **2. Review of literature**

### **2.1. The concept of WTC**

Willingness to communicate (WTC) is a concept that assumes that students who are willing to communicate in the second language/foreign language they are learning have more opportunities to learn the language because they actively seek for occasions in which they can use the second/foreign language. Hence, whenever an opportunity for communication arises, the students who possess higher willingness to communicate actually engage in the communicative act, thus practicing their language. According to MacIntyre and associates, the aim of the learning process should be to bring about this willingness to communicate in language students (MacIntyre et al., 1998).

The concept of willingness to communicate was first developed by McCroskey and associates in the 1980s. In fact, the concept of WTC was developed from Burgoon's (1976) concept of "unwillingness to communicate". This concept was initially hypothesized as a personality characteristic that accounts for individual differences in L1 communication. Based on Burgoon's findings, McCroskey and Richmond (1982, 1987, 1990, 1991) suggested that willingness to communicate is a personality variable representing a general tendency to approach or avoid communication in situations where speakers have a free choice to engage in communication or not. Since WTC is a trait-like tendency, it is not surprising that a significant amount of research proved statistically significant correlation between WTC and many other trait-like orientations of people. For instance, it was found that willingness to communicate is statistically negatively correlated with communication apprehension, introversion, derangement, and alienation, while it is statistically positively correlated with self-confidence (Zakahi, McCroskey, 1989). Sallinen-Kuparinen, McCroskey, and Richmond (1991) conducted a study that examined the relationship between WTC, communication apprehension, and introversion, and McCroskey (1997) studied WTC, communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence.

## 2.2. WTC as a situational variable

In 1998, MacIntyre, Clement, Dörnyei, and Noels argued that willingness to communicate should not be necessarily limited to a trait-like variable. Their conceptualization of willingness to communicate assumes that WTC is a situational variable with transient and enduring variables (Zarrinabadi, Abdi, 2011). They defined WTC in L2 as "a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using a L2" (MacIntyre et al., 1998). Furthermore, they presented a pyramid-like model of variables that affect willingness to communicate. Their pyramid consists of six layers, first three of which are concerned with variables that have situation-specific effect on one's willingness to communicate, and the other three concerned with variables that have abiding influence on willingness to communicate. The first layer in the pyramid is the use of L2. This includes activities that contain authentic information, such as reading a book in L2 or speaking L2 in the classroom, writing a letter to a pen friend in L2, or listening to a conversation between native speakers. This first layer reflects individual's communication behavior. In the second layer, willingness to communicate is presented as the immediate variable behind the communicative use of language. It stands for the behavioral intention of the L2 speaker. The third layer of the pyramid includes the desire to communicate with specific persons and state communicative self-confidence as antecedents of communication in L2, where state communicative self-confidence depicts the feeling of having the ability to communicate effectively in a particular situation and at a particular moment. The fourth layer contains motivational propensities such as interpersonal motivation, intergroup motivation, and L2 self-confidence. In fact, interpersonal motivation and intergroup motivation are the basic factors that affect individual's desire to communicate with specific persons (Zarrinabadi, Abdi, 2011). In the fifth layer, MacIntyre et al. presented variables that are secluded from the language learning and communication context. Those are variables in the affective and cognitive context, and they include intergroup attitude, social situation, and communicative competence. The link between these variables and willingness to communicate can be found in the influence they exert on variables that were mentioned in the previous layers. Finally, the sixth layer of the pyramid is the layer of social and individual context. Social context refers to intergroup climate and individual context refers to personality variables related to communication. Based on this situational perspective, researchers have found that WTC is contingent on some situational variables as well (Baker, MacIntyre 2000; Clement et al. 2003; MacIntyre et al. 2001). From the top to the bottom, the layers represent a move from the most immediate, situation-based contexts to the more stable, enduring influences on L2 communication situations (Modirghameneh, Firouzmand, 2014).

Since 1998, when MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, and Noels (1998) presented a combination of psychological, linguistic, educational, and communicative dimensions of language that affect an individual's willingness to communicate, the study of WTC has gained substantial momentum. Incipiently, willingness to communicate was gestated as a concept reflecting people's tendencies to engage in communicative acts in the first language, when they are given free choice (McCroskey, Baer, 1985). Since people differ in their personalities, so their communicative tendencies differ.

Some people feel comfortable only when talking to certain persons, while they prefer to be silent in other occasions. On the other hand, there are people who engage in communication with all people alike, regardless of the nature of their relationship or the communicative context.

### **2.3. WTC and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)**

Presently, language instructors increasingly prefer the implementation of communicative language teaching methods. In such methods, the aim is to develop learners' communicative competence before anything else, i.e. the focus is on fluency, not accuracy. The crux of communicative language teaching is the engagement of language learners in communication to allow them to develop their communication competence (Savignon, 2005). Under such circumstances, it is quintessential to identify and understand the interests and needs of students, as well as their personalities, in order to improve the language learning experience and overall language teaching and learning process. MacIntyre and Charos (1996) have claimed that communication is not only a means of facilitating language learning but also an important goal itself. Skehan (1989) proposed that learners have to talk in order to learn. The belief that language learners must use the language to develop their language proficiency is the rationale behind the focus on the active use of L2 in language classrooms.

Given the abundance of evidence available for reference, it is reasonable to conclude that willingness to communicate is of high interest in the field of communicative language teaching, since CLT emphasizes learning of language through communication. One thing that language researchers seem to agree in is the fact that language learners who actively participate in language use possess greater potential for developing communicative competence, since they have more opportunities to interact with others (Ellis, 2008). Hence, learners with higher willingness to communicate are more likely to benefit from communicative language teaching methods (Qiuxuan, 2011).

Due to the obvious importance of willingness to communicate, MacIntyre and associates (1998) claim that it is essential for L2 educators to design the L2 teaching pedagogy and programs that can enhance language learners' willingness to communicate. In order to do so, the L2 educators must understand the factors that affect language learners' diversity in the levels of willingness to communicate (Qiuxuan, 2011). If students understand the importance of WTC and if they are aware of the variables that determine their degree of WTC they could become more successful in language learning and improve their achievement in L2 (MacIntyre et al., 1998). A significant number of second language acquisition studies suggest that affective factors such as attitude, anxiety, and motivation have an important role in language achievement and proficiency (Yashima, 2002). Willingness to communicate is considered to be one of these factors; it is a variable that affects authentic communication in the second language and it is considered a good predictor of frequency of communication.

In summary, WTC has gained considerable attention in L2 research (Ellis, 2008), and given the important role that WTC plays in second language learning, it is necessary for L2 instructors to understand the variables underlying WTC in the second language (Kim, 2004). MacIntyre et al. (1998) believe that WTC is a crucial component of modern language instruction. Kang (2005) claims that students with high WTC are more likely to use L2 in authentic communication contexts and function as autonomous learners by making independent efforts to learn language. Furthermore, Kang believes that students with high WTC will have more opportunities to use language and become involved in learning activities both inside and outside classrooms. Consequently, it could be suggested that such learners achieve more in language classes.

### **3. The present study**

As previously noted, not much, if any, research on willingness to communicate has been conducted in the Bosnian-Herzegovinian English-as-a-foreign-language context. Therefore, the aim of this research is to investigate the WTC of students in the Bosnian-Herzegovinian EFL context and determine how different variables such as gender, nationality, GPA, type of university, number of foreign languages that a student speaks and grade level affect students' willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language and how willingness to communicate varies depending on situational context and type of relationship with the collocutor or collocutors. In addition, the study aims at investigating whether students who speak several foreign languages

demonstrate higher levels of willingness to communicate in English as one of their foreign languages. In accordance with these aims, the following research questions have been posed:

1. Is there any statistically significant difference in willingness to communicate based on the type of university?
2. Is there any statistically significant difference in willingness to communicate between students who study at different grade levels?
3. Is there a statistically significant difference in willingness to communicate based on students' achievement?
4. Is there a statistically significant difference in willingness to communicate between students based on their nationality?
5. Is there a statistically significant difference in willingness to communicate based on gender?
6. Is there any statistically significant difference in willingness to communicate between students who speak only one foreign language and students who speak more than one foreign language?

The following hypotheses have been tested:

$H_{o1}$  There is no statistically significant difference in willingness to communicate between students from private and state universities.

$H_{o2}$  There is no statistically significant difference in willingness to communicate based on students' grade level.

$H_{o3}$  There is no statistically significant difference in willingness to communicate based on students' GPA levels.

$H_{o4}$  There is no statistically significant difference in willingness to communicate between local and international students.

$H_{o5}$  There is no statistically significant difference in willingness to communicate based on students' gender.

$H_{o6}$  There is no statistically significant difference in willingness to communicate based on the number of foreign languages that a student speaks.

### 3.1. Participants

The sample for this study consists of 193 students who study at three different universities in Bosnia and Herzegovina; two universities in Sarajevo and one university in Zenica. One university in Sarajevo is private and participants study at different faculties and departments, but they are all using English as a medium of instruction. The other university in Sarajevo and the university in Zenica are state universities and all participants from those universities study English language and literature. The convenience sampling method has been employed for the purpose of this research. Participants in this study have been divided into multiple groups, depending on the type of analysis conducted. They have been divided into groups on the basis of the type of university that they attend (105 students from state universities, 88 students from a private university), their overall GPA (39 students with GPA of 6.9 or less, 70 students with GPA of 7.0 to 7.9, 43 students with GPA of 8.0 to 8.9 and 38 students with GPA from 9.0 to 10.0), grade level (40 freshmen students, 38 sophomores, 51 juniors, 64 senior students), their nationality (163 local students and 29 international students) etc. The research sample is composed of 68 male and 125 female students, with the age span from 18 to 28 years ( $M = 21.4$ ,  $SD = 1.910$ ).

**Table 1.** Descriptive analyses of participants

		N	Percent
Nationality	Local	163	84.5
	International	29	5.5
Other languages	One FL	117	60.6
	More than one FL	75	38.9
Gender	Male	68	35.2
	Female	125	64.8
University type	Private	88	45.6
	State	105	54.4
Grade level	Freshman	40	20.7
	Sophomore	38	19.7
	Junior	51	26.4
	Senior	64	33.1
GPA	6.9 or less	39	20.2
	7.0 – 7.9	70	36.2
	8.0 – 8.9	43	22.2
	9.0 – 10.0	38	19.6

### 3.2. Instruments and procedure

For the purpose of collecting data on students' willingness to communicate, a questionnaire constructed by McCroskey and Richmond (2013) has been used. The instrument consists of two parts; the first part containing general information about participants' nationality, native language and other languages, gender, age, socio-economic status, university, and GPA; the second part containing of items that measure students' willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language. The second part of the questionnaire consists of 20 items/statements. Data collected through the questionnaire was interpreted against seven different sub-scales: four context-type sub-scales ( $\alpha = 0.91$ ) and three receiver-type sub-scales ( $\alpha = 0.81$ ). The context-type subscales are group discussion ( $\alpha = 0.56$ ), meetings ( $\alpha = 0.75$ ), interpersonal ( $\alpha = 0.67$ ), and public speaking ( $\alpha = 0.68$ ). Receiver-type subscales are friend ( $\alpha = 0.76$ ), acquaintance ( $\alpha = 0.85$ ), and stranger ( $\alpha = 0.81$ ). Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis was performed for all items ( $\alpha = 0.91$ ). The questionnaire was administered to students at one private university and two state universities. After getting adequate consent the participants were asked to read the questionnaire carefully, presume they have completely free choice, and indicate the percentage (from 0 to 100) of times they would choose to communicate in English in each type of situation. Participants' achievement (overall GPA) was not measured specifically; it was self-reported by the students.

### 3.3. Data analysis

In order to analyze the data collected from the participants in this study, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0 was used. Descriptive statistics in the form of means, standard deviations, and frequencies were conducted. Inferential tests were used for null hypotheses testing. An Independent samples T-test and One-way ANOVA have been performed, given that all assumptions have been met. For the measurement of the effect size Cohen's d and Eta have been computed.

## 4. Results

### 4.1. The relationship between WTC and the type of university

The first research question is focused on the relationship between willingness to communicate and the type of university that participants in the research attend: private or state university. A one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the level of willingness to communicate in students who study at three different universities: University of Sarajevo and University of Zenica are state universities, while International Burch University is a private university. Mean scores of all three universities are very adjacent. The mean score of the University

of Sarajevo was the highest ( $M = 71.4$ ,  $SD = 21.2$ ), followed by International Burch University ( $M = 66.9$ ,  $SD = 21.6$ ) and University of Zenica ( $M = 65.8$ ,  $SD = 20.1$ ). According to the results, there is no statistically significant difference at  $p < .05$  in willingness to communicate between these two groups of students  $F(2, 190) = .961$ ,  $p = .384$ ,  $\eta^2 = .103$ . Hence, there is no statistically significant difference between private ( $M = 66.9$ ,  $SD = 21.6$ ) and state universities ( $M = 68.1$ ,  $SD = 20.7$ );  $t(191) = -.371$ ,  $p = .711$ ,  $d = 0.05$ .

**Table 2.** Descriptive analysis of WTC at different universities

University	N	Mean	Std. deviation
IBU	88	66.9	21.6
UNSA	43	71.4	21.2
UNZE	62	65.8	20.1
Total	193	67.5	21.0

#### 4.2. The relationship between WTC and grade level

The second research question in this study aims at investigating the relationship between participants' grade level at the university and their WTC. According to one-way between subjects ANOVA, there is statistically significant difference in willingness to communicate between students who study at different grade levels  $F(4, 188) = 5.81$ ,  $p = .006$ ,  $\eta^2 = .110$ . Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicate that the mean WTC score of freshmen ( $M = 69.5$ ,  $SD = 22.5$ ) differs significantly from the mean scores of sophomores at  $p = .041$ . Mean score for sophomores' willingness to communicate ( $M = 57.0$ ,  $SD = 19.7$ ) significantly differs from mean scores of junior ( $M = 71.8$ ,  $SD = 20.9$ ) at  $p = .005$  and senior students ( $M = 69.1$ ,  $SD = 19.3$ ) at  $p = .023$ . Taken together, these results suggest that the grade level does have a significant effect on willingness to communicate. Specifically, it was shown that junior students are actually the most willing to communicate in English as their foreign language, while sophomores are the most reluctant to communicate in English.

**Table 3.** Descriptive analysis of WTC at different grade level

Grade level	N	Mean	Std. deviation
Freshman	40	69.5	22.5
Sophomore	38	57.0	19.7
Junior	51	71.8	20.9
Senior	64	69.1	19.3
Total	193	67.5	21.0

#### 4.3. The relationship between WTC and achievement

The third research question investigates the relationship between WTC and participants' achievement. A one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare WTC of students with different GPA. The research sample includes four groups of participants: first group with GPA 6.9 or less, second group with GPA 7.0-7.9, third group with GPA 8.0-8.9, and fourth group with GPA 9.0-10. There was a statistically significant difference at the  $p < .05$  for these four groups  $F(3, 186) = 8.965$ ,  $p = < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = .126$ . Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the first group's willingness to communicate ( $M = 60.1$ ,  $SD = 21.6$ ) was significantly different ( $p = .001$ ) from the mean score for the fourth group, students with the highest GPA ( $M = 81.8$ ,  $SD = 16.3$ ). The mean score for the second group's willingness to communicate ( $M = 64.6$ ,  $SD = 19.8$ ) also statistically differs from the mean score of the fourth group ( $p = .001$ ). Moreover, the mean score for the third group of students' willingness to communicate ( $M = 66.0$ ,  $SD = 20.8$ ) is statistically different from the mean score of the fourth

group of students ( $p = .003$ ). Correspondingly, the fourth group's mean score for WTC statistically differs from all other mean scores at the  $p < .05$ . Taken together, these results suggest that there is a statistically significant difference in willingness to communicate among groups of respondents with different GPA and therefore GPA significantly affects WTC.

**Table 4.** Descriptive analysis of WTC for different GPA groups

GPA	N	Mean	Std. deviation
6.9 or less	39	60.1	21.6
7.0 – 7.9	70	64.6	19.8
8.0 – 8.9	43	66.0	20.8
9.0 – 10.0	38	81.2	16.3
Total	190	67.4	21.0

#### 4.4. The relationship between WTC and nationality

The fourth research question deals with the willingness to communicate of local and international students. A one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the willingness to communicate of students of different nationalities. For the purpose of analysis, they have been grouped into two main groups: locals (Bosnian students) and international students (including all other reported nationalities). There was no statistically significant difference at  $p < .05$  for the two groups  $F(1, 190) = 1.312, p = .253, d = 0.22$ .

**Table 5.** Descriptive analysis of WTC by different nationality

Nationality	N	Mean	Std. deviation
Local	163	68.3	21.1
International	29	63.5	21.0
Total	192	67.6	21.1

#### 4.5. The relationship between WTC and gender

The fifth research question investigates whether there is any difference in WTC based on participants' gender. An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare willingness to communicate for female and male participants. There is no significant difference in the scores for female ( $M = 67.2, SD = 20.2$ ) and male ( $M = 68.1, SD = 22.6$ ) participants;  $t(191) = .283, p = .778, d = 0.04$ . These results suggest that gender does not have a significant effect on willingness to communicate.

**Table 6.** Descriptive analyses of WTC by different gender

Gender	N	Mean	Std. deviation
Male	68	68.1	22.6
Female	125	67.2	20.2
Total	193	67.5	21.0

#### 4.6. Impact of the number of foreign languages a student speaks on their WTC in English

The last research question in this study deals with investigating whether the number of foreign languages that a participant speaks anyhow influences their WTC in English. An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare willingness to communicate for students who speak only one foreign language and students who speak more than one foreign language. According to the results, there is no significant difference in the mean scores for participants who speak only one foreign language ( $M = 67.5$ ,  $SD = 22.1$ ) and participants who speak more than one foreign language ( $M = 68.0$ ,  $SD = 19.3$ );  $t(190) = -.172$ ,  $p = .864$ ,  $d = 0.02$ .

**Table 7.** Descriptive analyses of WTC of groups who use one or more foreign languages (FL)

Other languages	N	Mean	Std. deviation
One FL	117	67.5	22.1
More than one FL	75	68.0	19.3
Total	192	67.6	21.1

#### 5. Discussion and conclusion

Willingness to communicate is a tool that can substantially facilitate language learning. It was already mentioned that WTC is a trait-like tendency and therefore it differs from one individual to another. People are different from one another in many ways, starting from the general ones like nationality and gender to more specific ones like the university they attend, their GPA score, the number of languages they speak, etc. This paper investigated whether WTC depends on the type of university that language learners attend. It was found that there is actually no significant difference in WTC between students who study at private and state universities, and therefore the first null hypothesis that suggests that there is no statistically significant difference in WTC between students who study at private and state universities is supported. These results are somewhat surprising as it was expected that students who study at a private university, where English language is used as a medium of instruction (EMI), will show higher levels of WTC because they are more accustomed to the language. There are several reasons that could justify this fact, but one of the most logical ones is that if students choose to study at an English-as-a-medium-of-instruction university, it can be assumed that they are not reluctant to speak in English language because during studies they have to use it all the time. On the other side, students at state universities do not use English language exclusively during studies, so lower levels of WTC were expected. However, the results refuted this assumption.

Another assumption made in relation with students' grade level is that students studying at higher levels will show higher levels of WTC. Higher WTC could be a result of practice and accustomization to English language through years. The results did not conform to the expectation. Surprisingly, freshmen students proved to be more willing to communicate than sophomores and seniors. In conclusion, these findings lead to the rejection of the second null hypotheses which stated that there is no statistically significant difference in WTC based on grade level.

Students whose GPA is in the highest range, above 9.0, are the most willing to communicate. Their mean score is substantially higher than the scores of all other students grouped according to their GPA. By and large, the final results showed that statistically significant difference in WTC based on GPA does exist. It was hypothesized that there was no statistically significant difference in WTC based on GPA and that null hypothesis has been refuted. Since the mean scores of the four groups increase in a linear manner, the results adhere to the expectation that students who are generally more successful in language learning are also more willing to communicate. This expectation is based on the claim that WTC is a powerful tool for facilitating language learning.

It was also hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in WTC between local and international students. This hypothesis has been supported. The results showed that local and international students are almost equally willing to use English language as means of communication in the Bosnian-Herzegovinian context. Another aim of the research was to investigate whether males and females are equally willing to communicate in English. This null

hypothesis has also been supported as the mean scores of these two groups barely show any difference. One reason behind such a result could be that society in Bosnia and Herzegovina is relatively free of gender bias and males and females have equal chances of speaking (Bećirović, 2012), whereas in societies like Pakistan, with a strong male-dominated society, males show a more positive desire to communicate in English (Arshad, 2015).

The last null hypothesis that suggested that there is no statistically significant difference in willingness to communicate based on the number of foreign languages that a student speaks was very interesting to investigate. It could be assumed that because students were eager to learn several languages their willingness to communicate in all of those languages, including English, should be high. That depends on speaker's self-confidence and proficiency in a certain foreign language. However, in the Bosnian-Herzegovinian context English is taught as the primary foreign language and therefore it is expected that students are more proficient in English, as a result of more than ten years of English language instruction in primary and high school only. Results showed that there is no significant difference in WTC between students who speak only one foreign language (principally English) and those who speak two or more foreign languages, and this null hypothesis was supported.

According to McCroskey and Richmond (2013), if the total WTC score is above 82 we say that the WTC is high, but if the total WTC score is below 52, the WTC is low. These results altogether reveal that WTC of students in the Bosnian-Herzegovinian EFL context is in the medium range, with the WTC score of 67. It can be said that this is expected as people in Bosnia and Herzegovina are not normally expected to use English language in their everyday life, so it is usually their free will that determines whether or not they will speak English in certain situations. In terms of different situations, participants in this study were most willing to communicate in cases of group discussions (73) and interpersonal encounters (68), while in terms of different receivers they were expectedly most willing to communicate with friends (80) and acquaintances (64). They were the least willing to communicate in meetings (61) and public speaking events (62), and when the receiver is a stranger (59). All these results are in the medium range.

Many factors, including movements in political and educational systems, make the role of English language more and more important in Bosnia and Herzegovina. As members of a society in a country in transition, people need to understand and embrace the necessity of knowing how to communicate in foreign languages, especially in English as the lingua franca of the modern world (Yaman & Bećirović, 2016). In addition to that, the rise of communicative language teaching (CLT) approaches to English language instruction in Bosnia and Herzegovina also calls for students' increased motivation and willingness to communicate in English, especially in tertiary education. As Wu (2001) disclosed it, the prevalent role of English language in almost all fields of modern life is a provocation for people in Bosnia and Herzegovina who need to learn foreign languages in order to be global citizens. Willingness to communicate is one of the most important tools towards achieving that goal.

Parallels with similar studies in the Bosnian-Herzegovinian EFL context cannot be drawn, but further investigation can reveal exactly where the difference in WTC exists in terms of different subscales; it could be investigated how much students are willing to communicate in each of the specific situations: in group discussions, meetings, with several other people, in large public meetings, with friends, acquaintances and strangers. Further investigation might shed light on some other factors that might influence WTC in the Bosnian-Herzegovinian EFL context, such as motivation, language learning orientations, identity styles, emotional intelligence, and many others. Additional research can also determine whether WTC differs in speaking or writing.

## References

- Arshad, 2015 – Arshad, Z. (2015). Willingness to communicate in English: A gender based study. *International Journal of English and Education*, 4(4), 311-319.
- Baker, MacIntyre, 2000 – Baker, S. C., MacIntyre, P. D. (2000). The role of gender and immersion in communication and second language orientations. *Language Learning*, 50(2), 311-341.
- Bećirović, 2012 – Bećirović, S. (2012). The Role of Intercultural Education in Fostering Cross-Cultural Understanding, *Epiphany*, 5(1), 138-156.
- Bećirović, 2016 – Bećirović, S. (2016). Development of Intercultural Education through English language textbooks used in elementary schools in B&H, In A. Akbarov (Ed.). *Current*

*Research On Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 245-259). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

[Bećirović, 2017](#) – *Bećirović, S.* (2017). The Relationship between Gender, Motivation and Achievement in Learning English as a Foreign Language. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 6(2), 210-219. DOI: 10.13187/ejced.2017.2.210

[Buss, 1980](#) – *Buss, A.H.* (1980). Self-consciousness and social anxiety. San Francisco: Freeman.

[Daly, McCroskey, 1984](#) – *Daly, A., McCroskey, J.C.* (1984). Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications.

[Delić, Bećirović, 2016](#) – *Delić, H., Bećirović, S.* (2016). Socratic Method as an Approach to Teaching. *European Researcher*. 111 (10) 511-517. DOI: 10.13187/er.2016.111.511

[Dörnyei, 2005](#) – *Dörnyei, Z.* (2005). The psychology of language learner. Hillsdale, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[MacIntyre et al., 1998](#) – *MacIntyre, P. D., Dörnyei, Z., Clément, R., & Noels, K. A.* (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545-562.

[MacIntyre et al., 2001](#) – *MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Clément, R., & Conrod, S.* (2001). Willingness to communicate, social support, and language learning orientations of immersion students. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 23, 369-388.

[MacIntyre et al., 2002](#) – *MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Clément, R., & Donovan, L. A.* (2002). Sex and age effects on willingness to communicate, anxiety, perceived competence, and L2 motivation among junior high school French immersion students. *Language Learning*, 52(3), 537-564.

[MacIntyre et al., 2003](#) – *MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Clément, R., & Donovan, L. A.* (2003). Talking in order to learn: Willingness to communicate and intensive language programs. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 59(4), 589-607.

[MacIntyre, 1994](#) – *MacIntyre, P. D.* (1994). Variables underlying willingness to communicate: A causal analysis. *Communication Research Reports*, 11, 135-142.

[MacIntyre, Charos, 1996](#) – *MacIntyre, P. D., Charos, C.* (1996). Personality, attitudes, and affect as predictors of second language communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 15(1), 3-26.

[McCroskey, 1987](#) – *McCroskey, Richmond* (1987). Willingness to communicate. In J.C. McCroskey & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Personality and interpersonal communication* (pp. 129-156). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

[McCroskey, 1992](#) – *McCroskey, J. C.* (1992). Reliability and validity of the willingness to communicate scale. *Communication Quarterly*, 40(1), 16-25. doi: 10.1080/01463379209369817

[McCroskey, 1997](#) – *McCroskey* (1997). Willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and self-perceived communication competence: Conceptualizations and perspectives. In J. A. Daly & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

[McCroskey, Baer, 1985](#) – *McCroskey, J. C., Baer, J. E.* (1985). Willingness to communicate: The construct and its measurement. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, Denver, Colorado.

[McCroskey, Richmond, 1977](#) – *McCroskey, J. C., and Richmond, V. P.* (1977). Communication apprehension as a predictor of self-disclosure. *Communication Quarterly*, 25, 40-43.

[McCroskey, Richmond, 1990](#) – *McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P.* (1990). Willingness to communicate: Differing cultural perspectives. *Southern Communication Journal*, 56(1), 72-77.

[McCroskey, Richmond, 1991](#) – *McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P.* (1991). Willingness to communicate: A cognitive view. In M. Booth-Butterfield (Ed.), *Communication, cognition, and anxiety* (pp. 19-37). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

[McCroskey, Richmond, 2013](#) – *McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P.* (2013). Willingness To Communicate (WTC). *Measurement Instrument Database for the Social Science*. Retrieved from www.midss.ie

[Mystkowska-Wiertelak, Pawlak, 2016](#) – *Mystkowska-Wiertelak, A., Pawlak, M.* (2016). Designing a Tool for Measuring the Interrelationships between L2 WTC, Confidence, Beliefs, Motivation, and Context. *Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 19-37. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-30373-4\_2

[Peng, 2007](#) – Peng, J. E. (2007). Willingness to Communicate in an L2 and Integrative Motivation among College Students in an Intensive English Language Program in China. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, 2, 33-59.

[Sinanović, Bećirović, 2016](#) – Sinanović, J., Bećirović, S. (2016). The Determinants of Lifelong Learning. *European Researcher*. 103(2), 107-118. DOI: 10.13187/er.2016.103.107

[Skehan, 1989](#) – Skehan, P. (1989). Individual differences in second language learning. London: Edward Arnold.

[Warden, Lin, 2000](#) – Warden, C. A., Lin, H. J. (2000). Existence of integrative motivation in an Asian EFL setting. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(5), 535-547.

[Xie, 2011](#) – Xie, Q. M. (2011). Willingness to communicate in English among secondary school students in the rural Chinese English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom.

[Yaman, Bećirović, 2016](#) – Yaman, A., Bećirović, S. (2016). Learning English and Media Literacy. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 2(6), 660-663.