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Towards understanding tourist revisit of zoo attraction: Evidence from the Czech Republic
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Abstract: This study assesses the important driving constructs influencing the tourists’ revisit decision of the famous Zlín-Zoo in the Moravian region of the Czech Republic. The relatively overlooked segment of the hospitality sector, particularly, the recreation segment has been addressed by taking the case of the aforementioned zoo to analyze the constructs impacting the tourists’ revisit decision. Hence, the present study seeks to ascertain and fill this research gap and also incorporates some control-variables related to the socio-demographic characteristics for having exhaustive look over the researched issue. Based on the primary data and together with a quantitative research approach, a structured questionnaire has been used to survey for data collection. Through the non-random sampling technique, precisely convenience sampling, a total of 390 valid responses were received and the application of PLS-SEM gives interesting discernments. The results reveal that positive emotion at the tourist place, safety measures, and tourist satisfaction significantly impacts the decision of tourists to revisit. However, service quality and corporate image is not a matter of much concern for tourists. Regarding control variables; age and category of respondents also play a significant role in the decision of revisit. Theoretical implications for researchers and academic community are in the form of highlighted driving constructs and offer a deeper insight of the proposed conceptual model, whilst the practical implications for managers of recreational units as well as policymakers would help to ensure sustained growth and
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1. Introduction

Travelling and Tourism has become an enchanting and lovely aspect of our lives. Tourism as a dynamically growing industry has a significant share in the global gross domestic product (GDP) and employment. According to the World Tourism Organization (2020), international tourist arrivals reached up to 1.4 million while international tourism receipts have also touched the peak level of $1451 billion. Owing to this, tourism is also considered as a backbone of the service industry (Robinson et al., 2013) and therefore the issues within tourism industry needs considerable attention for sustainability and competitiveness (Tučková & Jurigová, 2014) because of the diverse nature of services in the hospitality industry. The hospitality industry with better-provided services plays an important role in the competitiveness of tourist destinations in Hungary (Attila, 2016). Consequently, higher competitiveness leads to economic growth (Mihaela, 2016).

In the course of developing tourist attractions in the hospitality sector, the mere focus on prices and promotion is not enough and more focus and stress should be on the novel approaches and quality-oriented policies (Eraqi, 2006). Therefore, issues like tourist satisfaction, quality of delivered services, and steps to entice tourists to revisit should be considered for the success of the tourism industry (Neal & Gursoy, 2008; Stevens et al., 1995; Wu, 2007). Extant literature reveals that tourist satisfaction is a much-studied factor with reference to tourism and hospitality (Neal & Gursoy, 2008). Tourist satisfaction also plays a key role in the selection of a tourist destination and attraction (Artigas et al., 2014). Therefore; tourist satisfaction is an important factor that puts an impact on the decision-making of tourists to revisit any tourist destination and attraction.

Moreover, tourist repetition towards some tourist attraction has great importance for the sustainability and on this note previous research provides enough evidence of this fact (Chen & Gursoy, 2001; Hung et al., 2016; Kozak, 2001; Quintal & Polczynski, 2010; Stylos et al., 2017). Um et al. (2006) explained that tourist repetition of some destination and attraction is also cheaper for visitors due to better information and past experience than the first-time visit so in this context tourist repetition also plays role in the sustained growth of any destination and attraction. The higher importance of tourist repetition makes it necessary to consider the factors impacting on making revisit decisions seriously for sustained growth, competitiveness, and long-term sustainability.

Previous studies have focused a lot on tourist satisfaction and their antecedents while analyzing the success, competitiveness, and sustainability of any destination and attraction (Chen et al., 2011; Chen & Chen, 2010; J. S. Lee et al., 2011). Interestingly, Gálvara and Saura (2006), and Chi and Qu (2008) considered positive emotions, expectations, and feelings as a representation of tourist satisfaction. Some other authors also focused on the relationship among perception and image of a tourist attraction as well as the quality of the provided services with the resulting impact on the level of tourist satisfaction (Bigne et al., 2001; Chen & Chen, 2010; Chen & Tsai, 2007; De Rojas & Camarero, 2008). In light of this, while studying antecedents about tourist revisit and forming constructs for analyzing the relationships, tourist satisfaction cannot be ignored and should be considered as an important antecedent of tourist revisit.

Despite the importance of tourist revisit towards sustainability and long-term growth, relatively fewer studies have been explored regarding the related constructs with tourist revisit. Some
researchers found tourist satisfaction as the major determinant for the tourists to revisit (Seetanah et al. (2020); while, Zhang et al. (2017) found that the experiences of tourists play important role in the revisit decision of any destination and attraction. This experience of tourists refers to other constructs as well which require consideration during the development of conceptual model and hypothesis formulation.

Keeping in view the existing literature, this study aims to explore the driving constructs, such as emotion, service quality, safety, tourist satisfaction, and corporate image regarding their positive impacts on tourists’ revisit about the famous Zlin-Zoo in the Czech Republic. The study takes the case of Zlin-Zoo which is a famous zoological garden. Zoos fall in the recreation segment of the hospitality industry and often overlooked by researchers. This segment is also important to consider because many zoological gardens not only provide recreation but also participate in the conservation of wildlife and offer captive wildlife tourism (Adetola et al., 2016). Hence, a famous Moravian zoological garden Zlin-zoo has been selected for this study. Additionally, the partial goal of this study is to analyze the impact of control variables, like age, marital status, and category of respondents on tourist repetition (revisit). This study will contribute towards theory and practice in a significant manner. Theoretically, this study will highlight the important constructs influencing tourists to revisit. In addition, the study shows novelty in terms of the impact of control variables on tourist revisit. Whilst, practically, this study offers valuable and insightful policy options for managers and stakeholders of the zoo sector in the tourism and hospitality industry.

The remaining sections of the paper have been organized as follows. The second section explains the theoretical background and hypotheses development with a brief description of constructs used in the study and their mutual relationship with the tourist repetition (revisit). This section also includes the diagrammatic representation of the conceptual model for a better understanding of the readers. The third section gives a description of the data and methodology part with the information about data sources and statistical methods applied. The fourth section comes up with empirical results and discussion. Finally, the last section deals with the conclusion, limitations, and future research directions.

2. Theoretical background and hypotheses development

2.1. Emotion

Emotions refer to positive or negative thoughts or feelings related to some concept, thing, or situation. Emotions as a construct in the literature are noted as very important as it plays a role in the decision of revisiting some tourist attraction or destination. Many previous studies explored this relationship of emotions and the tourist revisit; Magnini et al. (2011) found that emotions related to customer delight significantly impacts and motivates the customers for a revisit. The evidence of Richard and Zhang (2012) is also worthwhile to mention, in their study, they used the data of different countries and found the existence of strong relationships between emotions and tourist revisit. In view of the aforementioned relationship, we hypothesize that;

\[ H1: \text{Positive emotions/feelings at a tourist place directly predicts tourist revisit.} \]

2.2. Service quality

Service quality is generally perceived as the difference between expected and actual performance in terms of service delivery. Usually, a multi-dimensional scale is used to measure service quality. Several authors pointed out that tangible and intangible dimensions are linked with the service quality, especially in the tourism and hospitality industry (Choi & Chu, 2001; Faullant et al., 2008; Gupta et al., 2007; Radojevic et al., 2015). In the literature, many studies came with the findings that service quality leads to tourist revisit of a particular destination/tourist attraction or use of the
particular service (Campo-Martinez & Gorau-Vadell, 2010; Wan & Cheng, 2011; Yuksel, 2001). In view of this relationship, we propose that;

\[ H2: \text{Service quality at a tourist attraction directly leads to tourist revisit}. \]

2.3. Safety

The feelings of safety and security is an important driver for tourist satisfaction and also leads the tourists to revisit. Previous studies mentioned the same fact and explored related relationships. Buckley et al. (2014) highlighted the importance of safety in tourism and concluded it as a crucial factor in tourism services delivery for enhancing tourist satisfaction, as well as leads to revisiting. A study conducted on five-star hotels also pointed out the issue of safety to be considered significant for competitiveness. Generally, the studies exploring the direct relationship of safety and security on tourist revisit is lacking and, Yuksel (2001) points out the same and found a significant impact of safety on repeated visitors. In view of this, we propose that;

\[ H3: \text{Sufficient safety measures at the tourist attraction positively impacts on tourist revisit}. \]

2.4. Tourist satisfaction

Tourist satisfaction is based on feelings and opinions and this complexity and multi-dimensionality hinder its straightforward definition (Smith, 1994). According to Chen and Chen (2010), tourist satisfaction is the difference between the expectations and experiences of travelers leads to satisfaction or gratification or dissatisfaction or displeasure. Some previous studies explored the impact of tourist satisfaction on tourist revisit, however, these impacts are in different contexts like S. Lee et al. (2011) analyzed the impact or tourist satisfaction on customers’ loyalty using the data of Chinese tourists entering Korea through airline survey. Similarly, Seetanah et al. (2020) found a relationship between satisfaction and tourist revisit intention based on the quality of airports in Mauritius. However, this relationship is overlooked in the Zoo sub-sector of the tourism industry. Therefore, we hypothesize that;

\[ H4: \text{Tourist satisfaction directly and positively leads tourists to revisit}. \]

2.5. Corporate image

The corporate image is considered an intangible asset of a tourism company or business and this image and goodwill also entice and motivates tourists to revisit a particular tourist attraction. Several studies emphasized the dynamic significance of the corporate image and goodwill. Jalilvand et al. (2012) used an integrated approach to examine the structural relationships of the word of mouth, destination/attraction image, attitude, and intention for a revisit. Some other authors also explored the influence of destination image on the choice of destination and future revisit intentions and similarly the image of a tourist attraction also impacts the choice and revisit decision (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Chon, 1990). In light of these studies, the following hypothesis is proposed;

\[ H5: \text{Corporate image/goodwill directly and positively leads to revisit}. \]

Furthermore, the present study also considers some control variables to explore their possible impact on the tourist revisit based on their age, marital status, and category of respondents (local or foreign tourists). Therefore, in light of this, we propose three more hypotheses for this as, as follows;

\[ H6: \text{Age as a control variable significantly leads to tourist revisit}. \]
Figure 1. A proposed conceptual model. Source: Authors’ own.

H7: Marital status as a control variable significantly leads to tourist revisit.

H8: Category of respondents as a control variable significantly leads to tourist revisit.

Hence, based on the aforementioned literature and explained hypotheses, the present study proposes a research model depicting all the constructs exploited in this study as well as the complementary control variables (see, Figure 1). All the constructs have also been connected through arrows to show the direction for analyzing relationships as well as the corresponding hypothesis for quicker understanding.

3. Methodology

3.1. Sample and data collection

This study exploratory in nature, which is based on the approach of deducting conclusions from propositions. The model and proposed hypotheses related to the tourist revisit have been tested in the case of Zlin-Zoo, which is a famous and popular zoo in the Moravian region of the Czech Republic. In this vein, a survey-based research design has been used to collect data from the students and staff of the Tomas Bata University in Zlin. The structured questionnaire comprising a hard copy and online survey have been used as a method to collect data with the distribution of 514 questionnaires to students and staff of the university. The hard copy questionnaire was used to intercept visitors (students and staff) on the field by the researchers. Whilst the online survey (soft copy of questionnaire) was sent to respondents who were not ready at the time when they were intercepted by the field officials. Out of the total 514 distributed questionnaires, 390 questionnaires were found to be useable and valid for proceeding ahead towards statistical analysis, hence, representing 76 percent. The respondents include both local and international students, as well as the staff who visited the aforementioned zoo in the meantime. Precisely, the snowball sampling method in the category of non-probability sampling has been used to select the respondents. According to Etikan et al. (2016) and Jibril et al. (2019), this sampling method is convenient and suitable because of participants’ accessibility to the researcher, willingness to participate, proximity, and cost-effectiveness. Therefore, initially, the questionnaire has been distributed and sent to the students and staff of the Tomas Bata University who subsequently referred to their acquaintances to participate in the research. In this study, SmartPLS 3 has been used for data analysis and a bootstrapped resampling method with 999 repetitions.
To better understand the characteristics of respondents, Table 1 shows a summary of the demographic profile of study respondents with details related to gender, age, educational level, occupational status, category of respondents, and marital status.

### 3.2. Construct measurement

In this study, all the items of the constructs have been adopted from the existing literature. The summary of the construct indicators used in the questionnaire has been shown in Table 2. Here, it is worthwhile to mention that all the items were measured on the Likert-scale anchored with five points (strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, natural = 3, disagree = 2, and strongly disagree = 1).

### 3.3. Selection of the analytical method

In order to achieve the objectives of this study, partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) has been used for evaluations and statistical analysis. The aforementioned constructs have a lack of explanation for this research theme. The work of eminent scholars, like Reinartz et al. (2009), and Hair et al. (2014) showed that the use of SEM is suitable and appropriate when there is the involvement of perceptions and opinions about certain issues. Furthermore, PLS-SEM is preferable due to the focus on the maximization of explained variances when the exact nature of the data is not known. Until 2010, covariance-based structural equation modeling (CB-SEM) was dominant many researchers used CB-SEM in their articles published in social sciences journals (Hair et al., 2019). From the previous few years, PLS-SEM is more popular and being used by many researchers due to certain advantages, such as analysis and testing related to predictive perspective, complex interrelationships, and data distribution with a lack of normality (Hair et al., 2016). Again, PLS-SEM is also preferable due to its high degree of statistical power over CB-SEM (Hair et al., 2017a; Reinartz et al. 2009).

### Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

| Variable          | Details          | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------|------------------|-----------|------------|
| Gender            | Male             | 150       | 38.5       |
|                   | Female           | 240       | 61.5       |
| Age (years)       | 15-25            | 273       | 70         |
|                   | 26-35            | 102       | 26.2       |
|                   | 36-65            | 9         | 2.3        |
|                   | 46 & above       | 6         | 1.5        |
| Educational Level | Bachelor diploma | 225       | 57.7       |
|                   | Master diploma   | 78        | 20         |
|                   | PhD              | 27        | 6.9        |
|                   | Others           | 60        | 15.4       |
| Occupational Status| Student         | 294       | 75.4       |
|                   | Private employed | 54        | 13.8       |
|                   | Government employed | 21 | 5.4     |
|                   | Others           | 21        | 5.4        |
| Category of Respondents | Locals/Domestic tourists | 252 | 64.6 |
|                     | Foreign tourist  | 138       | 35.4       |
| Marital Status     | Single           | 330       | 84.6       |
|                     | Married          | 57        | 14.6       |
|                     | Divorced         | 3         | 0.8        |
| Total (n)          |                  | 390       | 100        |

Source: Authors’ field survey, Nov-Dec, 2019.
### Table 2. Cross loadings, and construct reliability and validity

| Construct      | Items (operationalization of construct)                                                                 | Loadings | VIF   |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Emotions       | EMO1: I felt excited, while visiting the Zlin-Zoo and experiencing their services.                     | 0.874    | 1.915 |
|                | EMO2: I think, I became happy after visiting Zlin-Zoo and experiencing their services.                 | 0.869    | 1.978 |
|                | EMO3: I think, I enjoyed the visit of Zlin-Zoo whilst seeing the nature around.                       | 0.837    | 1.735 |
|                | CR = 0.895, AVE = 0.740, CA = 0.824                                                                    |          |       |
| Service Quality| SerQual1: I think, the visit of Zlin-Zoo fulfilled my expectations in terms of service quality.         | 0.865    | 1.485 |
|                | SerQual2: I think, the physical appearance and apparent behavior of staff was good in terms of service quality/delivery. | 0.736    | 1.331 |
|                | SerQual3: I think, the provided guided tour is beneficial towards my sight-seeing in Zlin-Zoo.        | 0.576    | 1.169 |
|                | SeQual4: I think, the fee paid for the visit of Zlin-Zoo is quite appropriate for the provided services. | 0.583    | 1.169 |
|                | CR = 0.789, AVE = 0.50, CA = 0.653                                                                    |          |       |
| Safety         | Saf1: I think, the provided safety measures to protect tourists from wild animals is sufficient in the Zlin-Zoo. | 0.863    | 1.409 |
|                | Saf2: I think, the taken measures and provided guidelines for the safety of kids are quite appropriate. | 0.820    | 1.394 |
|                | Saf3: I think, the horse-riding is safe for kids due to the provided safety and precautionary measures. | 0.536    | 1.101 |
|                | CR = 0.792, AVE = 0.568, CA = 0.616                                                                  |          |       |

(Continued)
4. Empirical findings

4.1. Test of common method bias (CMB)

The literature gives sufficient evidence that validities of the indicators, its reliabilities, and the covariance between latent constructs get impacted by the method bias (MacKenzie & Podsakoff, 2012). All the important concerns and issues related to CMB have been checked and dealt with in this analysis. So, CMB is not a matter of concern. Further, the wording of the constructs used carefully and a statement related to anonymity and strict confidence has been given on the first page of the questionnaire for the satisfaction of the respondents (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). It has also been stated at the beginning of the questionnaire that no answer is right or wrong, by following the suggestion of Podsakoff (2003). Also, in order to address the concerns related to common method bias (CMB), suggestions of Kock and Hadaya (2018) have been followed by employing the full collinearity approach. In addition, the multinollneary is assessed using variance inflation factor (VIF), a measure assesses the multicollinearity of variables in the case of multiple regression.

Source: Authors’ processing from SmartPLS 3.2.9

Table 2. (Continued)

| Construct                  | Items ( operationalization of construct) | Loadings | VIF  |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------|------|
| Tourist Satisfaction       | TSat1: I think, I will revisit Zlin-Zoo anytime depending upon my free schedule. | 0.820    | 1.737|
|                            | TSat2: My last visit to Zlin-Zoo keeps me in a good memory for visiting again. | 0.866    | 1.818|
|                            | TSat3: In my opinion, the revisit of Zlin-Zoo is worthwhile and providing sufficient motivation for revisiting. | 0.882    | 1.965|
|                            | CR = 0.892, AVE = 0.733, CA = 0.819 |          |      |
| Corporate Goodwill/Image   | Corp1: I think, the Zlin-Zoo is popular in the Zlin region. | 0.836    | 1.505|
|                            | Corp2: I think, the Zlin-Zoo has very good reception capacity for tourists and guests. | 0.805    | 1.446|
|                            | Corp3: I think, the Zlin-Zoo has a better image than other zoos in the Czech Republic. | 0.765    | 1.351|
|                            | CR = 0.844, AVE = 0.644, CA = 0.724 |          |      |
| Tourist Revisit            | REV1: Anytime I have holidays, I will visit the Zlin-Zoo. | 0.933    | 2.179|
|                            | REV1: My past experience I had will enable me to visit the Zlin-Zoo again. | 0.930    | 2.179|
|                            | CR = 0.929, AVE = 0.868, CA = 0.848 |          |      |

Source: Authors’ processing from SmartPLS 3.2.9
Statistically, in a regression model a VIF signifies the ratio of overall variance of the model to the variance of a single independent variable of a model. By the recommendation, Any VIF between 5 and 10 depicts a problematic situation due to a high correlation. Whilst the problem of multicollinearity is of moderate nature if the value of VIF is below 5. However, there is not any issue of multicollinearity if VIF is equal to 1. In light of this, the estimated VIFs indicate the absence of multicollinearity (Alin, 2010).

Table 3. Test of discriminant validity—Fornell-Larcker criterion

| Construct              | Emotion | Service Quality | Safety | Tourist Satisfaction | Corporate Image | Tourist Revisit |
|------------------------|---------|-----------------|--------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Emotion                | 0.860   |                 |        |                      |                 |                 |
| Service Quality        | 0.662   | 0.700           |        |                      |                 |                 |
| Safety                 | 0.415   | 0.325           | 0.754  |                      |                 |                 |
| Tourist Satisfaction   | 0.718   | 0.504           | 0.427  | 0.856                |                 |                 |
| Corporate Image        | 0.134   | 0.383           | 0.343  | 0.518                | 0.803           |                 |
| Tourist Revisit        | 0.654   | 0.427           | 0.165  | 0.402                | 0.536           | 0.932           |

Source: Authors’ processing from SmartPLS 3.2.9

Statistically, in a regression model a VIF signifies the ratio of overall variance of the model to the variance of a single independent variable of a model. By the recommendation, Any VIF between 5 and 10 depicts a problematic situation due to a high correlation. Whilst the problem of multicollinearity is of moderate nature if the value of VIF is below 5. However, there is not any issue of multicollinearity if VIF is equal to 1. In light of this, the estimated VIFs indicate the absence of multicollinearity (Alin, 2010). The results in Table 2 show that CMB is not an issue of concern due to the absence of multicollinearity. Hence, potential concerns related to CMB are low and minimal.

4.2. Model assessment

The reliability and validity are necessary to consider for the robustness of a study. Hence, by following the recommendation of notable scholars, such as J. Hair et al. (2017b); Hair et al. (2014), we assessed the convergent validity as well as discriminant validity. The statistical software SmartPLS 3.2.9 version has been used to carry out these analyses. According to the estimations, almost all the loadings of the items are greater than 0.7 while two items are just close to the threshold level of 0.6 (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). As reported in Table 2, the Cronbach’s Alpha is almost exceeding the recommended threshold level of 0.7 as a measure of internal consistency (Hair et al., 2006; Kline, 2000). Composite reliability (CR) should be 0.5 or higher (Holmes & Smith, 2001), while all constructs meet this condition well by having values between 0.7 and 0.9. Average
variance explained (AVE) explains the percentage of variation that is explained by the items, is also above the recommended level of 0.5 (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Fornell & Larcker, 1981; see, Table 2).

Moreover, the discriminant validity which ensures that a construct measure is unique and truly represents the phenomenon of interest that others do not capture (Hair et al., 2006). According to the Fornell-Lacker’s criterion, the constructs are satisfying both, basic and stringent assumptions, hence, establishes discriminant validity. Particularly, the values are shown in the diagonal (in bold) of Table 3 are the AVEs, which are higher than the threshold level of the measured constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

4.3. Structural model
After the assessment of the reliability and validity analysis, we proceeded to assess the model fit. The indexes used to assess the model fit are the coefficient of determination ($R^2$), standardized root mean squared residual (SRMR), and normed fit index (NFI). All index values indicating that the model fit was good and highly satisfied (see, Table 4).

Concerning the hypothetical relationships; the empirical results reveal interesting insights about the behavior of tourists with reference to the revisit of the famous zoo in Zlin, the Moravian region of the Czech Republic. The results confirm the H1 hypothesis, indicating that positive emotions and feelings at a tourist place directly predicts tourist revisit ($β = 0.251$, t-value $= 2.672$). Similarly, the results also confirm Hypothesis 3 and 4, indicating that safety measures and tourist satisfaction impacts significantly on tourist revisit ($β = 0.130$, $t-value = 2.116$).
t-value = 2.116; $\beta = 0.284$, t-value = 3.121). However, the empirical findings do not confirm Hypothesis 2 and 5, mentioning that service quality at a tourist attraction does not lead to tourist revisit and Corporate image and goodwill also do not lead the tourists to revisit ($\beta = 0.039$, t-value = 0.525; $\beta = 0.115$, t-value = 1.517). This research study also put effort to analyze the impact of some control variables on the tourist revisit, the included control variables are age, marital status, and category of respondents. The results clearly indicate that the age and category of respondents significantly impact the decision of tourists to revisit the zoo. Whilst the other control variable marital status does not impact much the decision of tourist repetition (see, Table 5 & Figure 2).

5. General discussion
The study mainly focused on assessing the relevant antecedents and consequences impacting tourists to revisit the zoo, particularly the Zlin-Zoo, located in the Moravian region of the Czech Republic. Further, the study also considered some control variables to peep into the matter a bit deeper. The results are quite interesting to understand better about the factors impacting more on the decisions of tourist’s repetition (to revisit). The study is not having the issue of common method bias (CMB) and findings are robust due to higher reliability and validity. The model fit assessment has also been achieved based on the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) and standardized root mean squared residual (SRMR) (see, Table 4).

The results revealed that positive emotions and feelings at a tourist place directly predicts tourist revisit. This significant relationship is according to prior expectations and quite in line with the findings of previous scholars, like Wu et al. (2015), Han et al. (2009), and Han (2005). Specifically, Wu et al. (2015) found that emotions positively put an impact on customer satisfaction and tourist revisit intentions in the hot spring industry of China. Similarly, Han et al. (2009) also reported the existence of a significant relationship between emotions and revisit intentions of restaurant customers. Again, Han (2005) took up the case of the lodging industry by asking questions from the staff and students of Midwestern University and found positive emotions significantly impact the revisit decisions. A recent study by Zhang et al. (2020) also reported that autobiographical memory and positive emotions significantly impact the revisit intention. Hence, the assessment of the construct emotion as an antecedent to repeat visits of tourists is in harmony with the previous studies (Han, 2005; Han et al., 2009; Wu et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2020).

In this facet, another construct; “safety” impacts significantly on the behaviors of tourists to revisits the tourist site. A study carried out in Antalya, Turkey also found that safety measures matter significantly and risk measures are important to consider for re-visitation of the tourist site (Çetinsöz & Ege, 2013). On the same line, another study by Jariyachamsit (2015) revealed that safety is a significantly considerable factor for revisiting decisions by tourists visiting Bangkok, Thailand. Another important construct; “tourist satisfaction” impacting tourists to revisit a tourist site, the significant relationship is quite according to prior expectation and logic. The same has been reported by Hultman et al. (2015), by analyzing Taiwanese consumers based on their recently visited tourist destination or attraction. Another study explored the role of tourist satisfaction on tourist loyalty in terms of re-visitation by taking the case of Chinese tourists in Korea and reported a significant relationship (Chiu et al., 2016). Recently, Larsen and Wolff (2019) also found that satisfaction at the level of tourist level plays a significant role in revisiting by domestic tourists.

It is worthwhile to include control variables related to socio-demographic characteristics and the same has been included in this study. The control variables; age and category of respondents significantly impact the decision of visitors for re-visitation. Although a few researchers incorporated such socio-demographic characteristics yet some reported significant impacts. Chuchu et al. (2019) explored that age significantly matters in the decision of re-visitation, as younger age groups in their late-teens and early-twenties are more active. Similarly, another study came with the result that socio-demographic factors matter as they reported that age and country of
residence, in terms of the category of respondents influences significantly for their repeating visits (Saraithong & Chancharoenchai, 2017).

5.1. Theoretical implications
In the theoretical vein, this study highlighted some important driving constructs, specifically emotion, service quality, safety, tourist satisfaction, and the corporate image having an impact on the decision of tourist’s repetition (to revisit). These constructs and the proposed conceptual model in this study are helpful for other researchers and the academic community to deep in the matter deeply by conducting research on other recreational units of the tourism and hospitality sector. Further, the inclusion of some socio-demographic characteristics as control variables is a novel aspect of this study. This aspect also draws light on its importance as the results show that two socio-demographic characteristics, age, and category of respondents are significant, so control variables are important to consider for grasping a wider picture of the scenario.

5.2. Practical implications for managers
Practically, this study provides important implications for managers to better manage and improve the services in terms of quality, sustainability, and competitiveness. This study found that emotion, safety, and tourist satisfaction are the constructs with a significant impact on tourists to revisit. Therefore, the managers of the zoos should consider factors impacting emotions, take better safety measures, and put efforts to enhance the level of tourist satisfaction. Consequently, the visitors will feel better and visit again in the future based on their memorable and enjoyable experience.

In addition, the managers of zoos should also consider socio-demographic factors because the control variables; age, and category of respondents significantly impact on the tourists’ decision to revisit, so the managers should focus more on the relevant age-group and category of respondents.

5.3. Conclusion, limitations, future directions
Owing to the important driving factors of re-visitation, this study aimed to explore the constructs significantly impacting the revisit decision of tourists. Hence, important constructs and their indicators have been identified from different literature sources. The study also took different socio-demographic characteristics of respondents for assessing their impact on tourist re-visitation.

To achieve these objectives, a structured questionnaire has been designed to conduct a survey from the students and staff of Tomas Bata University in Zlin, Czech Republic. The application of partial least squares- structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) on the collected data gave important results about constructs influencing the decision of tourists for re-visitation. The constructs; emotion, safety, and tourist satisfaction are significant and hence Hypothesis 1, Hypothesis 3, and Hypothesis 4 have been supported for this study and provided important theoretical and practical implications as mentioned above. It clearly indicates that emotions entice tourists to visit a particular attraction again due to their excitement, happiness, and enjoyable visits. Tourists are also much concerned about safety issues because tourist attractions such as zoos need adequate safety measures, guidelines for the safety of kids, and precautionary measures from wild animals. Tourist satisfaction also a very important factor to motivate tourists for visiting again due to the worthwhileness and good memories attached to their zoo visitation. Whilst, Hypothesis 2 related to service quality, and Hypothesis 5 related to the corporate image have not been supported for this study indicating a matter of less concern for tourists. Moreover, the significant control variables about socio-demographic characteristics also provided guidelines that age and category of respondents need the attention of managers for better management of zoos and similar tourist attractions which is a relatively overlooked aspect in the literature. Hence, by targeting certain age-groups and respondents more tourists can be enticed for re-visitation.

Limitations are important to mention for a better understanding of the results, grasping implications comprehensively, and shedding light on the room for future researchers. Firstly, the empirical findings should be verified and validated for other zoos and recreational units to depict the actual ground situation and reality. Second, the study used a convenience sampling method and respondents were
the students and staff of Tomas Bata University in Zlin, therefore, the results only provide the prevalence and should not be generalized. Thirdly, this study only took the perspective of tourists and it will deem necessary to consider the viewpoint of administration and management. The inclusion of a management viewpoint will help to create a balance by reaching a better and more viable conclusion.
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