This work is licenced under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
Ovaj rad dostupan je za upotrebu pod licencom Creative Commons Imenovanje 4.0. međunarodna

IZVORNI ZNANSTVENI RAD
UDK: 811.111:811.112.2]:378.147:159.947.5
DOI: https://doi.org/10.22210/strjez/55-1/3
Primljen: 1. 9. 2026.
Prihvaćen: 13. 10. 2026.

Motivational dynamics in learning English and German among tourism and hospitality students: A comparative study of L2 and L3 motivation

Iva Barić Hodžić
iva.baric@fthm.hr
Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Opatija, Croatia

Nikolina Vaić
nikolina.vaic@fmtu.uniri.hr
Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Opatija, Croatia

Foreign language education in tourism and hospitality management increasingly presupposes multilingual competence, yet the motivational underpinnings of learning a second (L2) versus a third (L3) language within this professional field remain comparatively underexplored. This study examined the motivational, affective, and socio-psychological factors underlying the learning of English (L2) and German (L3) among 225 undergraduate and graduate students of tourism and hospitality management in Croatia. Drawing on the L2 Motivational Self System and the construct of International Posture, parallel questionnaires assessing motivation, self-confidence, anxiety, and perceived usefulness were administered for English and German. Paired-samples *t* tests revealed significantly higher overall motivation and confidence, and lower anxiety, for English than for German, with large effect sizes. Exploratory factor analysis identified four consistent motivational dimensions across both languages, and regression analyses showed that years spent studying German did not significantly predict

confidence or anxiety, whereas frequency of informal German use and self-rated proficiency were associated with a narrower English-German motivational gap. The findings suggest that the L2-L3 motivational asymmetry observed in this sample is rooted less in the duration of formal instruction than in differential exposure, informal engagement, and identity investment. Implications for multilingual curriculum design in tourism and hospitality higher education are discussed.

Keywords: *L2 motivation, L3 motivation, L2 Motivational Self System, foreign language anxiety, multilingualism, tourism and hospitality education*

1 INTRODUCTION

Tourism and hospitality are among the most inherently multilingual and intercultural professional fields, in which foreign language competence functions not merely as an academic requirement but as a form of professional capital. Croatia, whose economy is strongly dependent on inbound tourism, illustrates this dependence clearly: in the first six months of 2026, official eVisitor registration data recorded more than 7.6 million tourist arrivals and over 29.5 million overnight stays, with German visitors constituting the single largest group of overnight stays (Hina, 2026). In May 2026, German tourists accounted for almost a third of all foreign tourist overnight stays in Croatia (32.3%; 1.9 million), followed by tourists from Austria (10.2%), the United Kingdom (7.5%), Slovenia (6.4%), Poland (5.5%), the United States (5.0%), and Italy (3.4%) (Državni zavod za statistiku, 2026). While English continues to function as the global lingua franca of tourism (Blue & Harun, 2003), German remains a professionally indispensable language in the Croatian tourism sector, valued for enhancing guest communication, customer satisfaction, employability, and the competitive positioning of tourism businesses and destinations.

Despite this practical importance, the two languages appear to play distinctly different roles in students' motivation for learning languages. In Croatia, undergraduate and graduate programmes in tourism and hospitality management typically require students to study a first and a second foreign language, with English almost universally chosen as the first and German frequently chosen as the second. This curricular arrangement effectively places English in the position of an established second language (L2) and German in the position of an additional, third language (L3) for the majority of students.

The present study starts from the observation that motivation to learn a foreign language is not a fixed or language-general trait but a dynamic,

language-specific, and identity-related construct that develops differently depending on a learner's prior linguistic experience, the perceived status of the language, and the opportunities available for authentic and informal engagement with it. Building on this premise, the study investigates whether, and how, the motivational, affective, and socio-psychological profiles of tourism and hospitality students differ between English, learned as an L2, and German, learned as an L3. The overall goal is to contribute empirical evidence, from a professionally oriented and comparative L2-L3 perspective, to the broader discussion of how multilingual motivation develops in higher education, and to translate these findings into concrete implications for the design of foreign language curricula in tourism and hospitality education.

1.1 From socio-educational to self-based models of language motivation

Research on foreign language learning motivation has undergone a substantial theoretical shift over the past four decades. Early and highly influential work by Gardner (1985, 2010) conceptualised motivation within a socio-educational model centred on learners' attitudes toward the target language community and on the distinction between integrative motivation, understood as a genuine interest in the target language group and culture, and instrumental motivation, understood as the pursuit of practical or professional advantages. Although this framework has remained foundational, it was developed primarily with reference to bilingual contexts and does not fully account for the position of English as a global language learned by millions of people with no identifiable single target community.

In response to this limitation, Dörnyei (2005, 2009) proposed the L2 Motivational Self System, one of the most widely used contemporary frameworks in language motivation research. The model reconceptualises motivation in terms of possible selves and comprises three components: the Ideal L2 Self, representing the learner's own image of themselves as a competent future user of the language; the Ought-to L2 Self, representing perceived external obligations, expectations, and duties, largely oriented toward avoiding negative outcomes; and the L2 Learning Experience, referring to motivation generated by the immediate learning environment, including teachers, peers, materials, and classroom atmosphere. The strength of the Ideal L2 Self has consistently been shown to be one of the most powerful predictors of sustained motivated learning behaviour across diverse

educational and cultural contexts (Csizér, 2019). Choi (2025) further argues that learners' interest, curiosity, and future self-concept constitute the key psychological foundations underpinning current learning motivation. Recent syntheses likewise confirm the model's substantial and consistent explanatory power for L2 achievement and engagement (Al-Hoorie, 2018).

A closely related construct, International Posture, was introduced by Yashima (2002, 2009) to capture learners' interest in international affairs, willingness to communicate across cultures, and openness to global engagement. Unlike Gardner's integrative orientation, which presupposes an identifiable target-language community, International Posture is particularly well suited to describing motivation for English as a delocalised, globally distributed lingua franca rather than a nationally bound language. The present study draws directly on the work of Ryan (2009), who investigated English learning motivation among Japanese university students using constructs from both the L2 Motivational Self System and International Posture; Ryan's questionnaire design, itself informed by earlier motivation research by Csizér and Dörnyei (2005), Dörnyei and Clément (2001), Dörnyei and Csizér (2002), and Dörnyei, Csizér, and Németh (2006), served as the direct methodological basis for the instrument used in this study.

1.2 Attitudes and motivation as a dynamic system

Contemporary language motivation research increasingly treats attitudes not as a static antecedent of motivation but as part of a dynamically evolving system, in which attitudes and motivation continuously shape one another over time (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Ushioda, 2011). Positive attitudes tend to increase motivation, which in turn increases engagement, which produces more successful learning experiences and further reinforces positive attitudes; the same cycle can operate in reverse, with negative attitudes leading to disengagement, poorer outcomes, and further negative attitudes. However, this reciprocal relationship is not necessarily deterministic, as more positive current attitudes and beliefs about language learning may mitigate the influence of unfavourable past learning experiences (Brady, 2019). This dynamic-systems perspective is directly relevant to the comparison at the centre of this study, since it implies that any observed gap between attitudes toward English and German is unlikely to be attributable to a single fixed cause and more plausibly reflects an accumulation of differential experiences, exposure, and outcomes over years of language contact.

1.3 Motivation for third and additional languages

While L2 motivation, and English learning motivation in particular, has been extensively researched, motivation for third and additional languages (L3/Ln) remains comparatively underexplored, despite growing recognition that multilingual learners cannot be adequately described by models developed for a single target language (De Angelis, 2007). Henry (2011) demonstrated that L2 and L3 motivational systems are not independent of one another: a strongly developed English self can compete with, and in some cases suppress, the development of a learner's self-concept in an additional language, a phenomenon with direct relevance to the English-German comparison undertaken here. Subsequent work by Henry (2017) introduced the notion of an ideal multilingual self, suggesting that multilingual experience can itself become a motivational resource, though this resource develops unevenly and depends on the relative status and exposure associated with each language in a learner's repertoire.

Comparative and multilingual-motivation research more broadly indicates that motivation differs systematically across L2 and L3 contexts, that prior language-learning experience shapes subsequent motivation, that the perceived status of a language affects the effort learners are willing to invest, and that opportunities for authentic use are a key driver of sustained engagement (Busse, 2017; Lasagabaster, 2017; Thompson & Erdil-Moody, 2016). Busse's (2017) longitudinal study of foreign language motivation in European higher education similarly found that motivation for languages other than English tends to decline over the course of study unless sustained by concrete opportunities for use, a pattern consistent with the L3-status effect described in multilingual acquisition research, whereby languages learned after an established L2 are approached with comparatively lower confidence and a weaker anticipated identity investment (De Angelis, 2007).

1.4 Foreign language anxiety and self-confidence

A further construct central to this study is foreign language anxiety, first systematically defined by Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) as a distinct, situation-specific form of anxiety arising from the unique demands of formal language learning, rather than a simple transfer of general classroom anxiety. Foreign language anxiety has since been shown to be closely, and often inversely, related to self-confidence and to learners' willingness to communicate, and it interacts with motivational self-constructs such as the

Ideal L2 Self, typically dampening motivation and engagement when anxiety is high. Because the present study measures confidence and anxiety separately for English and German, the Horwitz et al. (1986) framework provides an essential lens for interpreting differences in the affective, as opposed to the purely cognitive or instrumental, dimensions of L2 versus L3 learning.

1.5 Informal exposure and the role of popular culture

A substantial body of research on what Sundqvist (2009) termed extramural English, meaning English-language contact occurring outside the walls of the classroom through media, gaming, streaming, and online communication, has demonstrated that informal exposure exerts a strong and largely independent influence on learners' proficiency, confidence, and motivation, often rivalling or exceeding the effect of formal instruction (Sundqvist & Sylvén, 2016). Because English currently occupies a uniquely saturated position in global digital and entertainment media, whereas German, in the Croatian context, is encountered far more rarely outside formal educational settings, the extramural exposure literature offers a plausible explanatory mechanism for asymmetries in motivation, confidence, and anxiety between the two languages that cannot be reduced to curricular factors alone.

1.6 Foreign languages in tourism and hospitality education

Within English for Specific Purposes (ESP) research, English for tourism and hospitality purposes has been recognised as a distinct and rapidly growing subfield, reflecting the sector's dependence on multilingual and intercultural communicative competence (Zahedpisheh et al., 2017). This literature consistently emphasises that tourism and hospitality students must be prepared not only linguistically but also interculturally for professional environments in which language functions simultaneously as a communicative tool, a marker of service quality, and a form of employability capital. However, comparative studies examining how motivational profiles differ across the multiple foreign languages required in such programmes, rather than focusing on English in isolation, remain scarce, which constitutes the specific gap the present study addresses.

1.7 Aims, research questions, and hypotheses

Building on the theoretical and empirical foundations outlined above, the present study pursues the following overarching goal: to compare the mo-

tivational, affective, and socio-psychological profiles of tourism and hospitality students learning English as an established second language (L2) and German as an additional, third language (L3), and to identify the factors that account for differences between the two profiles.

This goal is operationalised through the following research questions:

RQ1. Do tourism and hospitality students differ in their overall motivation, self-confidence, and language anxiety when learning English (L2) compared to German (L3)?

RQ2. Which motivational dimensions (e.g., integrative interest, instrumental/career orientation, travel and global usefulness, effort and enjoyment, anxiety) show the largest English-German differences?

RQ3. Does the duration of formal instruction (years of learning German) predict students' confidence and anxiety in German, or are these better explained by informal exposure and self-rated proficiency?

RQ4. Which background variables (e.g., frequency of German use, self-rated German proficiency, years of study, gender) are associated with a narrower or wider English-German motivational gap?

Based on the theoretical and empirical starting points reviewed above, the following hypotheses were formulated:

H1. Students will report significantly higher overall motivation and self-confidence, and significantly lower anxiety, for English than for German, consistent with English's status as an established L2 with high global and media exposure and German's status as a less internalised L3 (Dörnyei, 2009; Henry, 2011; Horwitz et al., 1986).

H2. The English-German gap will be most pronounced in motivational dimensions linked to informal exposure and identity (integrative interest, travel/global usefulness, enjoyment) and comparatively smaller, though still present, in instrumental/career-oriented dimensions, reflecting German's continued professional relevance (Sundqvist & Sylvén, 2016; Zahedpisheh et al., 2017).

H3. Years of formal German instruction will not significantly predict confidence or anxiety in German, whereas informal use and self-rated proficiency will be associated with a smaller motivational gap, consistent with extramural-exposure and usage-based accounts of language confidence (Sundqvist, 2009).

These hypotheses are explicitly revisited in the Discussion section in relation to the obtained results.

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Research design

This study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional, comparative research design. Motivational, affective, and background data were collected once, via self-report questionnaires, and the same respondents provided parallel ratings for both English and German, allowing within-subject (paired) comparisons between the two languages while avoiding the confound of comparing different learner populations.

2.2 Participants

The sample consisted of 225 undergraduate and graduate students of tourism and hospitality management (152 female, 73 male; 67.6% and 32.4%, respectively), enrolled across all years of study, with the largest proportions in the first (45.8%) and second (26.2%) undergraduate years. At the time of data collection, participants had a mean age of 21.13 years (SD = 2.02), with ages ranging from 19 to 32 years (N = 214), indicating a predominantly young, traditional-age student population. The majority of participants (56.9%) had graduated from secondary schools specialising in hospitality and tourism prior to enrolment. Regarding language-learning history, most participants had studied English for 10-12 years prior to entering university (83.6%), whereas exposure to German was considerably shorter, with most participants reporting either 0-4 years (44.4%) or 5-9 years (40.9%) of prior German study. Most participants had not learned either language outside formal education (70% for English, 88% for German). Consistent with this asymmetry in exposure, 89% of participants rated their English proficiency as *very good* or *good*, while 64% rated their German proficiency as *poor* or *basic*.

2.3 Instrument

Data were collected using two parallel, structurally equivalent motivation questionnaires, one for English (L2) and one for German (L3), developed based on the questionnaire used by Ryan (2009) in his study of English learning motivation in Japan, which itself draws on earlier motivation instruments by Csizér and Dörnyei (2005), Dörnyei and Clément (2001), Dörnyei and Csizér (2002), and Dörnyei, Csizér, and Németh (2006). Using two parallel language-specific versions of the same instrument enabled direct comparison between L2 (English) and L3 (German) motivational profiles while ensuring construct equivalence across both language ver-

sions. The items were translated into Croatian and adapted to the higher education and tourism/hospitality context; two items relating to fear of assimilation and ethnocentrism, included in some source instruments, were excluded as not relevant to the Croatian educational context.

The final questionnaire comprised 124 closed-ended items rated on five-point scales, using a *Strongly agree/Strongly disagree* format for attitudinal and motivational items and a *Very likely/Very unlikely* format for willingness-to-communicate items. In addition, an 18-item demographic and language-background section collected information on year of study, age, gender, educational background, years of learning English and German, use of language-learning applications, use of English/German outside formal education, and previous language-learning experience.

2.4 Procedure

The questionnaire was administered online. Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and respondents completed the survey individually, without time constraints, outside regular class time to minimise social-desirability and peer-influence effects. Informed consent was obtained before participation, and no personally identifying information was collected, in line with standard ethical requirements for anonymous educational survey research.

2.5 Data analysis

Open-ended responses were removed prior to analysis, and Likert-type items were numerically coded. Data were analysed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, frequencies) were calculated for all subscales and background variables. Exploratory factor analysis was conducted separately for the English and German item sets to examine the latent dimensional structure of the questionnaire; item groupings are reported at the level of interpretable motivational dimensions rather than as a formally validated factor model. Internal consistency of the resulting scales was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Paired-samples *t* tests were used to compare matched English and German items and composite indices, given the within-subject design. Linear regression analyses examined whether years of learning German predicted self-reported confidence and anxiety in German, and supplementary analyses examined the association between background variables (frequency of German use, self-rated German proficiency, years of study, gender, English proficiency) and the magnitude of

the English-German motivational gap. All analyses were conducted using standard quantitative procedures for survey data; alpha was set at .05 for significance testing, and effect sizes (Cohen's *d*) were reported alongside significant *t* tests.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Overall motivation: English versus German

Using a broad overall motivation index built from matched Likert-type items, students reported significantly higher motivation for English (M = 3.59) than for German (M = 3.02), $t(224) = 13.58$, $p < .001$. Both language-specific motivation scales showed excellent internal consistency (English α = .937; German α = .975), indicating that the composite indices used in subsequent comparisons are highly reliable.

A parallel paired-samples *t* test on the general attitude items likewise showed English rated significantly more positively (M = 3.72) than German (M = 3.14), $t(224) = 13.50$, $p < .001$, with a large effect size (Cohen's d = 0.90).

3.2 Confidence and anxiety

Students reported significantly higher self-confidence in English (M = 4.20) than in German (M = 3.38), $t(224) = 15.10$, $p < .001$, and significantly lower anxiety in English (M = 2.63) than in German (M = 3.12), $t(224) = -7.17$, $p < .001$. The confidence and anxiety subscales showed acceptable to excellent internal consistency (English confidence α = .70; English anxiety α = .91; German confidence α = .85; German anxiety α = .90).

3.3 Motivational dimensions

Exploratory grouping of the matched items yielded four consistent latent dimensions present for both languages: Motivation/Interest, Self-confidence/Competence, Anxiety/Difficulty, and Exposure/Usefulness. Comparing English and German across these dimensions revealed a consistent pattern of English advantage, with the size of the gap varying by dimension.

The largest English-German difference was observed in travel and global usefulness (English-German difference = 0.94), reflecting students' perception of English as more useful for travel, international communication, and functioning in a globalised environment. A similarly large gap was found for integrative interest (difference = 0.92), encompassing liking the language itself, enjoyment of English-language music and film, and willingness to seek

contact with speakers of the language. Effort and enjoyment also favoured English (difference = 0.78), as did career and instrumental motivation (difference = 0.70); notably, German remained clearly valued for professional purposes even though English retained an advantage on these items as well. The only dimension in which German scored less favourably in absolute anxiety terms, as expected given the direction of the scale, was Anxiety/Difficulty (difference = -0.52), with students reporting more nervousness, insecurity, and discomfort, and greater fear of sounding inadequate, when using German than English.

At the level of individual items, the largest English advantages were found for watching films and series (English M = 4.77, German M = 2.66; difference = 2.11), enjoying music from English-speaking countries (English M = 4.52, German M = 2.68; difference = 1.84), perceiving the language as important in today's world (English M = 4.87, German M = 3.43; difference = 1.44), general love for the language (English M = 4.30, German M = 3.09; difference = 1.21), imagining speaking with international friends (English M = 4.26, German M = 3.17; difference = 1.09), usefulness for future travel (English M = 4.60, German M = 3.58; difference = 1.02), and usefulness for future career (English M = 4.62, German M = 3.72; difference = 0.90). English therefore showed a clear advantage not only in enjoyment and media-related exposure but also in perceived prestige, future orientation, and career relevance, although the career-related gap was comparatively the smallest among the item-level differences reported here.

3.4 Predictors of German confidence and anxiety

Linear regression analysis showed that years of learning German did not significantly predict German confidence (β = .031, p = .077, R^2 = .014) or German anxiety (β = .007, p = .682, R^2 = .001). In both cases, the proportion of variance explained was negligible, indicating that simple duration of formal exposure to German was a weak predictor of students' affective outcomes in that language.

3.5 Background variables associated with the motivational gap

Supplementary analyses examined whether the size of the English-German motivational gap varied systematically with background characteristics. The strongest association was found for frequency of German use in students' free time: the English-German gap was substantially smaller among students who reported using German more often outside the classroom. Self-rated

German proficiency showed a comparable pattern, with students reporting better German proficiency showing a markedly smaller English-over-German advantage; in the highest German-proficiency subgroups, the gap approached zero. Years of formal German study showed a smaller, though still directionally consistent, association, with more years of study linked to a somewhat reduced English advantage. By contrast, gender, year of study, and self-rated English proficiency showed comparatively weak associations with the size of the motivational gap, explaining substantially less variance than the German-specific exposure and proficiency variables.

4 DISCUSSION

The results provide clear support for H1: Tourism and hospitality students in this sample reported significantly higher overall motivation, more positive attitudes, greater self-confidence, and lower anxiety for English than for German, with effect sizes in the large range for the general attitude comparison. This pattern is consistent with the theoretical expectation, derived from the L2 Motivational Self System (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009) and the L3-status research reviewed above (De Angelis, 2007; Henry, 2011), that a well-established L2 learned over a decade and reinforced through extensive informal exposure develops a stronger and more internalised motivational profile than an L3 learned later, over fewer years, and largely confined to the classroom.

H2 was also broadly supported, although with an important nuance. The largest English-German gaps emerged in the dimensions most closely tied to informal exposure and identity, namely travel and global usefulness and integrative interest, echoing Henry's (2011, 2017) argument that a strongly developed L2 self can outcompete an emerging L3 self, and aligning closely with the extramural-exposure literature (Sundqvist, 2009; Sundqvist & Sylvén, 2016): the item-level results showing enormous gaps for films, series, and music indicate that English functions for these students as what might be termed an internalised, lived language, continuously reinforced outside the classroom through global entertainment media, whereas German remains comparatively confined to institutionally mediated contact. Consistent with the hypothesis, the career/instrumental dimension showed the smallest English-German gap among the four dimensions, confirming that German retains genuine professional value in students' eyes even where its affective and identity-related value lags considerably behind English. This pattern supports a reading in which German is not rejected as useless

but is approached instrumentally rather than as a component of students' imagined future selves, in line with the distinction between Ideal L2 Self development and more externally driven, ought-to-oriented motivation (Dörnyei, 2009).

The anxiety findings align closely with Horwitz et al.'s (1986) account of foreign language anxiety as situation-specific and closely tied to perceived competence: students reported both lower confidence and higher anxiety in German, and these two patterns are conceptually and, in this sample, empirically linked, since limited exposure appears to suppress confidence, which in turn appears to heighten anxiety around performance and communication. This is consistent with theoretical models in which foreign language anxiety arises less from the inherent difficulty of a language than from learners' uncertainty about their own competence in social and evaluative situations (Horwitz et al., 1986).

H3 was directly supported by the regression results: years of formal German instruction were essentially unrelated to confidence or anxiety in German, explaining at most 1.4% of variance in either outcome. This finding is theoretically important because it indicates that the L2-L3 motivational gap documented here is not simply a function of "more years equals more confidence," but reflects the quality, frequency, and authenticity of language contact, a conclusion directly in line with usage-based and extramural-exposure accounts of language confidence (Sundqvist, 2009; Sundqvist & Sylvén, 2016) and with Busse's (2017) observation that motivation for languages other than English tends to erode without concrete opportunities for use, regardless of curricular duration. The strong association between frequency of German use, self-rated German proficiency, and a narrower motivational gap reinforces this interpretation: students who had, for whatever reason, achieved more contact with German showed motivational and affective profiles considerably closer to their English profiles, suggesting that the gap is not a fixed or immutable feature of German as a language but a reflection of unequal exposure conditions that are, in principle, pedagogically addressable.

Taken together, these findings are best interpreted through a dynamic-systems lens on attitudes and motivation (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Ushioda, 2011): early, extensive, and largely informal engagement with English appears to have entered a self-reinforcing cycle in which greater exposure produces greater confidence, greater confidence supports more positive attitudes and lower anxiety, and these in turn sustain continued engagement, including substantial voluntary media consumption. German,

introduced later, studied for fewer years, and encountered far less frequently outside the classroom, appears to occupy the early or interrupted stages of the same cycle for most students, remaining a valued but comparatively externally driven 'academic subject' rather than an internalised system, in the students' own conceptual language.

5 CONCLUSIONS

This study compared the motivational, affective, and socio-psychological profiles of tourism and hospitality students learning English as an established L2 and German as an additional L3. Across virtually every measured dimension, motivation, self-confidence, and low anxiety, English showed a clear and statistically robust advantage over German, with the largest gaps found in domains tied to informal exposure, identity, and enjoyment, and the smallest gap found in career-oriented instrumental motivation, where German retained clear and recognised professional value. Regression analyses indicated that this asymmetry is not primarily explained by the number of years students had formally studied German, but is more closely associated with the frequency of informal German use and students' self-rated German proficiency, pointing to exposure and communicative opportunity, rather than instructional duration alone, as the more decisive factors shaping L3 motivation in this population.

For applied linguistics as a field, these findings reinforce the value of treating language learning motivation as language-specific and identity-dependent rather than as a general trait applicable uniformly across a learner's entire linguistic repertoire, and they extend L2-L3 motivational research (Henry, 2011, 2017; De Angelis, 2007) into an underexamined professional and comparative context. For tourism and hospitality education specifically, the results carry direct practical implications. Because duration of instruction alone appears insufficient to build confidence and reduce anxiety in German, curriculum design should prioritise increasing the frequency and authenticity of students' contact with German, while also ensuring that such contact is embedded in meaningful and engaging learning experiences. Research on language learning interest suggests that classroom experiences and task characteristics play a crucial role in developing sustained interest, as the nature and relevance of learning activities may matter more than the mere quantity of exposure (Fryer, 2019). Accordingly, structured opportunities for real-world communicative practice, partnerships with German-speaking industry contacts, immersive or

media-based extramural tasks modelled on the informal channels through which students already engage with English, and classroom approaches that explicitly normalise error-making and reduce the evaluative pressure associated with performing in a less familiar language may be particularly valuable. Positioning German, and by extension other additional languages relevant to the sector, as professional capital rather than as a secondary academic obligation may help translate existing instrumental motivation into more sustained multilingual engagement, better preparing future tourism and hospitality professionals for increasingly diverse and linguistically demanding workplaces.

Several limitations qualify these conclusions. The study relied exclusively on self-report questionnaire data, which is susceptible to response bias and temporary mood states, and the cross-sectional design does not permit causal inferences about the relationship between exposure, confidence, and motivation. Participants differed considerably in proficiency levels, prior learning contexts, and exposure outside school, and years of learning English and German were measured only quantitatively, without capturing the intensity or instructional quality of that exposure. This omission is noteworthy because previous research suggests that learners' past experiences and the quality of their learning environments play an important role in shaping motivation and persistence in language learning (Minh Tuan, 2025). Furthermore, the motivational dimensions reported here were derived through exploratory, interpretive grouping of items rather than a formally validated factor-analytic model, and should therefore be read as an interpretable summary rather than a confirmed measurement structure. An additional limitation of the study is that it did not account for participants' previous visits to German-speaking countries or family ties in German-speaking countries. Such experiences may have provided participants with additional exposure to German outside the formal educational context and may therefore have influenced their self-reported German proficiency and/or motivation to learn the language. Future studies should consider these factors when examining students' language learning experiences, attitudes, and motivation.

Future research would benefit from longitudinal designs capable of tracking how L2 and L3 motivational profiles co-develop over the course of a multilingual study programme, qualitative interviews or classroom ethnography capable of capturing the lived, experiential distinction between English as an internalised system and German as an academic subject identified in this study, and comparative designs extending beyond the Eng-

lish-German pair to additional languages taught within tourism and hospitality curricula, such as Italian, French, or Chinese. Such work would help clarify whether the exposure-driven mechanisms identified here generalise across different L3s and educational contexts, and would further inform the design of multilingual pedagogy for professional fields, such as tourism and hospitality, in which linguistic diversity is not incidental but central to professional success.

REFERENCES

Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2018). The L2 motivational self system: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *8*(4), 721–754. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.4.2

Brady, I. K. (2019). A multidimensional view of L2 motivation in southeast Spain: Through the 'ideal selves' looking glass. *Porta Linguarum: Revista Internacional de Didáctica de las Lenguas Extranjeras*, *31*, 37–52. https://doi.org/10.30827/portalin.vi31.13821

Busse, V. (2017). Foreign language learning motivation in higher education: A longitudinal study of motivational changes and their causes. *The Modern Language Journal*, *101*(3), 566–582.

Choi, S. (2025). The effect of learners' psychological factors on motivational intensity in English language learning. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *12*, 102047. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.102047

Csizér, K. (2019). The L2 motivational self system. In M. Lamb, K. Csizér, A. Henry, & S. Ryan (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of motivation for language learning* (pp. 71–93). Palgrave Macmillan.

Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). Language learners' motivational profiles and their motivated learning behavior. *Language Learning*, *55*(4), 613–659.

De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition*. Multilingual Matters.

Dewaele, J.-M. (2013). *Emotions in multiple languages*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9–42). Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., & Clément, R. (2001). Motivational characteristics of learning different target languages: Results of a nationwide survey. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 399–432). University of Hawai'i Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2002). Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied Linguistics*, *23*(4), 421–462.

Dörnyei, Z., Csizér, K., & Németh, N. (2006). *Motivation, language attitudes and globalisation: A Hungarian perspective*. Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.

Državni zavod za statistiku. (2026, July 9). *Dolasci i noćenja turista u komercijalnom smještaju u svibnju 2026. (TUR-2026-1-1/5)* [Tourist arrivals and nights in commercial accommodation, May 2026]. https://podaci.dzs.hr/2026/hr/121593

Fryer, L. K. (2019). Getting interested: Developing a sustainable source of motivation to learn a new language at school. *System*, *86*, Article 102120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102120

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. (2010). *Motivation and second language acquisition: The socio-educational model*. Peter Lang.

Henry, A. (2011). Examining the impact of L2 English on L3 selves: A case study. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *14*(3), 235–255.

Henry, A. (2017). The ideal multilingual self: Validity, influences on motivation, and role in a multilingual education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *14*(4), 349–364.

Hina. (2026, July 8). *Turistička sezona na testu! Objavljene detaljne brojke: "Napravili smo što smo mogli..."*. Dnevnik.hr. https://dnevnik.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/turizam-u-prvoj-polovici-godine-s-istim-fizickim-rezultatima-kao-lani---990220.html

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, *70*(2), 125–132.

Kormos, J., Kiddle, T., & Csizér, K. (2011). Systems of goals, attitudes, and self-related beliefs in second-language-learning motivation. *Applied Linguistics*, *32*(5), 495–516.

Lasagabaster, D. (2017). Language learning motivation and language attitudes in multilingual Spain from an international perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, *101*(3), 583–596.

Minh Tuan, T. (2025). Factors affecting motivation in learning English as a foreign language among non-English-major university students in Vietnam: A mixed-methods study. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *12*, 101995. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101995

Ryan, S. (2009). Self and identity in L2 motivation in Japan: The ideal L2 self and Japanese learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 120–143). Multilingual Matters.

Sundqvist, P. (2009). *Extramural English matters: Out-of-school English and its impact on Swedish ninth graders' oral proficiency and vocabulary* [Doctoral dissertation, Karlstad University]. Karlstad University Press.

Sundqvist, P., & Sylvén, L. K. (2016). *Extramural English in teaching and learning: From theory and research to practice*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Thompson, A. S., & Erdil-Moody, Z. (2016). Operationalizing multilingualism: Language learning motivation in Turkey. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *19*(3), 314–331.

Ushioda, E. (2011). Why autonomy? Insights from motivation theory and research. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *5*(2), 221–232.

Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *The Modern Language Journal*, *86*(1), 54–66.

Yashima, T. (2009). International posture and the ideal L2 self in the Japanese EFL context. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 144–163). Multilingual Matters.

Zahedpisheh, N., Abu Bakar, Z. B., & Saffari, N. (2017). English for tourism and hospitality purposes (ETP). *English Language Teaching*, *10*(9), 86–94.

Motivacijska dinamika u učenju engleskoga i njemačkoga jezika među studentima turizma i hotelijerstva: komparativna studija L2 i L3 motivacije

Iva Barić Hodžić
Fakultet za menadžment u turizmu i ugostiteljstvu, Opatija

Nikolina Vaić
Fakultet za menadžment u turizmu i ugostiteljstvu, Opatija

Obrazovanje u području stranih jezika u turizmu i hotelijerstvu sve više pretpostavlja višejezičnu kompetenciju, no motivacijski temelji učenja drugoga (L2) naspram trećega (L3) jezika unutar te struke ostaju razmjerno neistraženi. Ovim istraživanjem ispitali su se motivacijski, afektivni i sociopsihološki čimbenici koji su u podlozi učenja engleskoga (L2) i njemačkoga (L3) jezika kod 225 studenata prijediplomskih i diplomskih studija turizma i hotelijerstva u Hrvatskoj. Oslanjajući se na model motivacijskoga sustava L2 jastva i konstrukt međunarodne usmjerenosti, provedeni su paralelni upitnici kojima su se procjenjivali motivacija, samopouzdanje, anksioznost i percipirana korisnost za engleski i njemački jezik. T-testovi za zavisne uzorke pokazali su znatno višu ukupnu motivaciju i samopouzdanje te nižu anksioznost za engleski u odnosu na njemački jezik, uz velike veličine učinka. Eksploratorna faktorska analiza utvrdila je četiri dosljedne motivacijske dimenzije za oba jezika, a regresijske analize pokazale su da broj godina učenja njemačkoga jezika nije bio značajan pretkazatelj samopouzdanja ni anksioznosti, dok su učestalost neformalne uporabe njemačkoga i samoprocijenjena razina znanja bile povezane s manjim motivacijskim jazom između dvaju jezika. Rezultati upućuju na to da uočena L2-L3 motivacijska asimetrija u ovome uzorku manje proizlazi iz trajanja formalnoga učenja, a više iz razlika u izloženosti informalnome angažmanu i ulaganju u ini jezik. Raspravljaju se implikacije za oblikovanje višejezičnoga kurikula u visokoškolskome obrazovanju u turizmu i hotelijerstvu.

Ključne riječi: *L2 motivacija, L3 motivacija, motivacijski sustav L2 jastva, anksioznost pri učenju stranoga jezika, višejezičnost, obrazovanje u turizmu i hotelijerstvu*