

VISITOR'S SATISFACTION MEASUREMENT IN ANIMAL PARKS: THE CASE OF PARC SAFARI IN QUÉBEC, CANADA.

Mohamed Reda KHOMSI, Ph.D

Professor

*École des sciences de la gestion
Université du Québec à Montréal*

Dominic Lapointe Ph.D

Professor

*École des sciences de la gestion
Université du Québec à Montréal*

The measurement of visitor satisfaction of a zoological park, where wildlife is free and not in captivity, is an issue that receives growing interest in recent decades. The postmodern lifestyle we adopt causes this type of park to be considered as a last stand against the urbanization of the area. Through this study, we attempted to measure visitor satisfaction of a zoological park located in Quebec that provides a circuit where visitors can get direct contact with wildlife in its natural environment.

The results of the study demonstrated the importance of the proximity to the animals in the assessment of visitor satisfaction. However, the price remains the main explanatory component of satisfaction, followed by the overall appearance and park cleanliness.

Keywords: zoo, satisfaction measurement, quantitative analysis visitors.

© University of the Aegean. Print ISSN: 1790-8418, Online ISSN: 1792-6521



Except where otherwise noted, this work is licensed under
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

INTRODUCTION

Visitor satisfaction of a tourist attraction is an issue that has been widely studied by researchers, particularly those from the management sciences. Nevertheless, changing consumer behavior and the characteristics of the visited object requires a continuous updating of knowledge in order to clearly define the evolution of the concept of satisfaction on the one hand, and on a more operational level, to adapt the tourism product to the expectations of visitors on the other. As such, this study focuses on measuring Parc Safari's visitor satisfaction. Parc Safari is an important tourist attraction in Hemmingford, in the province of Québec in Canada. The park is in operation since 1972 and located 65 km south of Montreal, a few kilometers from the border with the United States.

Despite the large number of research conducted on the subject, this study presents some specific characteristics. First, it is, to our knowledge, the first to deal with the subject of animal parks in Quebec and, on the other hand, it is spread over several years which allow to observe the evolution of the main trends in the time.

Amusement parks, an evolving research topic

The popularity of amusement parks, especially zoos, has interested many authors over the last five decades. Indeed, in the 1960s, Conway (1969) analyzed the growing importance of the recreational function in the zoos at the time where they were mostly seen as a place for education and learning. Subsequently, other authors as Kasmar (1970) Kuehl (1976) and Jones et al (1976) studied the evolution of the attitude of zoo visitors in view of the growing interest of the recreational dimension of these new destinations. From then on, the question of satisfaction became one of the main concerns of researchers.

Lee (2015) identifies three subjects in the amusement parks literature, which have attracted the interest of the scientific community. The first issue is that of visitor's motivation, which was one of the most studied topics since it evolved from learning to

entertainment, followed by recreation (Morgan & Hodgkinson, 1999). In this sense, Falk et al (2007) concluded that motivations condition how visitors proceed in the parks and therefore, a focus on this issue in order to improve the visitor's experience is inevitable.

The second issue identified by Lee (2015) as important to researchers is that of the behavior of visitors. Indeed, several authors (Coe, 1985; Finlay et al 1988 and Davey, 2006) observed a change in the behavior of visitors in zoos, due mainly to changes in the relationship between humans and nature in general, and animals in particular. In a context of postmodernity, zoos, especially those where the wildlife is not in captivity, are considered a last stand against the urban sprawl.

Finally, Lee (2015) refers to visitors attitudes towards animals that were in turn influenced by the human presence (Davey, 2007). In a context where the primary purpose of amusement parks is geared more towards recreation, the impact of this change on animal welfare has become an interesting problem for researchers. Authors like Finlay et al (1988), conducting comparative field studies in Georgia, have established a relationship between the perception of the species by the visitor and the attitude of the latter once in contact with the wildlife.

Visitor satisfaction, a complex problem

Consumer satisfaction is at the heart of corporate strategies (Pizam and Ellis, 1999), making it one of the most discussed subjects in the literature (Yuksel and Yuksel, 2001). Despite the wealth of research on the subject, there is no consensus on the best way to measure it, or even define it. The main theories that have addressed this issues are the expectation gap theory (Parasuraman et al., 1985; Duke and Persia, 1996; Luk and Layton, 2002), the expectation disconfirmation theory (Oliver, 1980;1997; Pizam and Milman, 1993) and the performance only theory (Tse and Wilton, 1998; Pizam et al., 1978). This study will focus particularly on the latter. Indeed, the measurement of gaps between expectations and perceptions is not sufficient to understand the customer's satisfaction with the performance in a tourism context (Bowie and Chang, 2005). It is the performance of the product and its by-products that make up the overall tourism experience, which is at the heart of satisfaction.

This performance would be twofold: an emotional dimension and an instrumental dimension (Swan and Combs, 1976 in Pizam et al., 1978). According to these authors, the emotional dimension is central to the tourist experience e.i. comfort, reputation, sensory experience; and the instrumental dimension corresponds rather to physical and operational aspects such as price, availability and cleanliness. This approach is particularly interesting for us to address the issue of satisfaction as part of a theme park (Milman, 2010), the emotional dimension being at the very forefront of the experiential turn of the tourism Industry (Pine and Gilmore, 1999; Milman, 2010).

The tourist experience is hybrid and complex (Neal and Gursoy, 2008), because it is composed of multiple sub-products and multiple vendors. In the case of theme parks, the different dimensions of the experience are found inside the premises (Milman, 2010; Bigné et al, 2005, Baron-Yelle and Clavé, 2014). These different dimensions, whether emotional or instrumental, combine in a confined space to create the feeling of satisfaction of the theme park experience (Milman, 2009). In this context, research on the theme parks and zoos have already identified a number of predictors of satisfaction.

Anderreck and Caldwell (1994), in an evaluation of the satisfaction of the North Carolina Zoological Park, identified the following as a predictors of visitor satisfaction: staff, amenities of the zoo, accessibility of exhibits, ability to view the animals, educational aspects of the visit, recreational features of the visit, environment of the zoo and the animals. The research concludes that visitor's satisfaction differed little in various identified segments (out of state vacationers and in state visitors).

Milman (2009) focuses on the importance given to different aspects of the theme parks of Central Florida by visitors. It identifies seven constructs that theme parks visitors use to evaluate their experience: (i) quality and variety of entertainment; (ii) courtesy, cleanliness, safety and security (fundamental operational issues); (iii) food variety and value for money; (iv) quality of theming and design; (v) availability and variety of family-oriented activities; (vi) quality and variety of rides and attractions; and (vii) pricing and value for money.

Finally, Geissler and Ruck (2011) use a ten years customer satisfaction trackingsurvey at a major US theme park to identify predictors of satisfaction of the customers with their experience in the park. Their finding stresses the importance of three main factors: overall experience park / value, park's food quality / value / variety, and park's cleanliness / atmosphere. Their research, whichusedan expectation gap model, identified significant predictors of met expectations that include satisfaction with total cost, variety of attractions available, and previous visit of the customer to the park.

Furthermore, Geisler and Ruck (2011)research focused on classical theme parks (Geisler and Ruck, 2011; Milman, 2009) or zoos (Anderek and Caldwell, 1994). The question of theme parks with wildlife freedom appears to be in need of assessment, including issues concerning the experience of contact with animals with special emotional charge.

Authors who have studied the question of satisfaction in zoos,identified several issues. As such, it is important to distinguish between zoos where animals are in captivity and thosewhere wildlife is free in its natural environment. According to Dengate (1993), the experience is quite different; therefore the context should be taken into account in the evaluation. For this author, zoos where animals are free in their natural environment are an ideal. Indeed, combining in the same space recreational, educational and conservation goalsallows visitors a memorable experience. Tribe (2001) goes in the same direction, and believes that the possibility of coming into contact with animals, and also with the staff, offers the opportunity for visitors to use the park in a different manner, and therefore enjoy the experience differently. Besides Luebke and Matiasek (2013) confirm this fact, finding intheir study that there is a strong correlation between seeing the animals and the level of satisfaction. These researchers also suggestthat zoo promoters promote visibility and contact with the animal as vital elements in their communication strategy.

We find these same conclusions in Hughes and Macbeth (2005) who studied Barna Mia, a site located in south-western Australia, in which people can observe wildlife in its natural habitat. These authors conclude that the contact of visitors with animals gives a feeling of unmatched satisfaction. In the same vein, Packer and Ballantyne(2002) estimate that the emotional charge felt while

visiting zoos where wildlife is in its natural environment is more important than that of places where animals are in captivity. Based on a study of four marine sites, of which two includes wildlife that is free to roam, the authors estimate that visitors arrive to similar levels of learning about the environment. However, in the experiment, the results are conflicting. Thus, visitors to parks where wildlife are free give importance to learning aspects of their visits. In contrast, visitors to parks where wildlife is in captivity are more interested in fun and social aspects of their visits. This difference reflects the perception that each category of visitors has towards wildlife. Visitors of zoos and aquariums consider these as a space for social interaction with family and friends, while they regard wildlife tours as an opportunity to learn about nature. According to the authors, this is due to close contact with the animals in the wildlife tour. Five months after their visit, visitors still remember those moments.

For other authors, contact with animals is not the only indicator in the assessment of visitor satisfaction in zoos where wildlife can be observed in its natural environment. For Roest et al (1997), the feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction results from the comparison between the costs and benefits of the act of purchase made by the visitor. As such, Churchill and Surprenant (1982) consider that it is the benefits gained through experience that will be decisive in the construction of satisfaction, while Ross and Iso-Ahola (1991) and Geva and Goldman (1991) believe that the cost is the determining factor in the definition of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the visitor. Other authors, such as Oliver (1981) and Tse and Wilton (1988), emphasize the regularity of the service throughout the visitor experience in the park. In contrast, Darby and Kani (1973) point out that the feeling of satisfaction should not be summed up as including only field experience. According to these authors, the construction of an opinion begins with the research phase (construction needs and expectations), continues with the field experience, and remains until after the end of the visit park. Other authors have studied elements that are often considered as accessories in the evaluation of customer satisfaction. These especially include the cleanliness of the toilets, the availability of parking spaces and the quality of food available on site. Even if they may seem secondary, these services can help alter the overall

satisfaction vis-à-vis the park in those cases where the benefit of the service is below the expectations of visitors (Jensen, 2007).

Methodology

Measurement of the the satisfaction variable

Especially in a zoo where wildlife lives in its natural environment, studies that have addressed the issue of satisfaction have identified several indicators to measure visitor satisfaction of the park. In this vein, based on the work of Roest et al (1997), Hughes (2005), Packer and Ballantyne (2012) and Lee (2015), a clustering of measurement indicators in three dimensions was performed. According to the results, the first dimension includes all the emotional indicators insofar they represent the visitor's experience in the park. As such, it is necessary to distinguish the indicators that fall within the contact with staff on the one hand, and those under the contact with the animals. Concerning this last point, visitors will assess the level of closeness with the animals, the ability to touch them, the possibility of viewing wildlife, the appearance of the animals and ultimately the quality of the natural environment in which animals evolve. In terms of the quality of contact with staff, visitors will assess the quality of care, the communication skills, the support and assistance provided by the staff, and the moments of interaction with the park's personnel.

The second dimension refers to the indicators of accessibility to the park. Indeed, the price and the distance before arriving at the zoo are the two main indicators to measure the visitor's satisfaction with the accessibility. The price variable is composed of park entry fees, expenses incurred in traveling to the park, and eventually all the money spent onsite. In terms of visit planning, visitors will analyze the convenience of the observation route, the quality of facilities, the quality of infrastructure and visitor services (including toilets, catering and parking) and finally the security for the visitors.

The last dimension in the measurement of satisfaction is the informational aspect. It refers to the communication efforts put forth by the park through displays, the staff, promotional materials, or any other communication medium intended to disseminate information among visitors. In particular, visitors will be sensitive to news that

expose the park's efforts for wildlife conservation, natural environment, animal welfare and the species specificity.

The analysis confirmed the emotional and instrumental dimensions of satisfaction found in other studies, although the latter is relabeled as accessibility dimension. Furthermore, a new aspect is added that takes into account the informational and educational aspects of animal parks, which according to the literature on animal parks are central to the experience.

Method

The study conducted with the Safari Park was designed to identify the satisfaction components of visitors to the park, with the aim to improve the visitor's experience. A web questionnaire consisting of 45 questions grouped into three themes was designed based on the literature. The first conventional theme was aimed at obtaining the profile the visitors in order to understand who is the typical park visitor. The second part of the questionnaire was intended to evaluate the visitor's satisfaction vis-à-vis their experience in the park, with particular relevance to the main attraction, Safari Adventure. The last topic that was submitted to the respondents was related to the identification of elements that could enhance the visitor's experience, by asking respondents to rate a list of projects under development in the Safari Park.

The questionnaire administration was done online to visitors who had agreed to participate and provided their email address. These individuals received three days after their visit a message containing a link to the questionnaire developed with the platform SurveyMonkey. The study began at the end of May 2014 and spanned until the second week of October. To improve the representativeness of the sample, the emails of individuals who visited the park early in the week, in the middle of the week or on the weekend were collected, since the traffic level is significantly different in various days of the week, with a peak on weekends, especially if the weather conditions are appropriate. In total, 4072 email addresses were collected, of which 3599 were valid. At the end of the survey 1203 completed questionnaires were received, which equals a response rate of 33%.

The sample consists of 67% women and 33% men. In most cases, the respondent's mother tongue is French (85%), followed by English and Arabic. Demographically, 70% of the respondents are in the age group between 25-44 and half of them(50%) have a university degree. As for the income level, 31% of the sample earn a household income of over \$100,000, followed at 20% by those recording a family income between \$60,000 and \$80,000. In terms of geographical origin, 68% of the visitors make a trip of less than 2 hours to get to the park, against 18% who require more than two hours. Only 9% of the respondents choose to take a tourist accommodation in the region. The following table summarizes the main characteristics of the sample.

Table 1: Respondent's demographic Characteristics

Demographic characteristics	Percentage
<u>Gender</u>	
Male	33 %
Female	67 %
<u>Mother tongue</u>	
French	85 %
English	3 %
Other	12 %
<u>Age group</u>	
18-24 years old	7 %
25-34 years old	34 %
35-44 years old	36 %
45-years old or more	23 %
<u>Last diploma obtained</u>	
Elementary school	1 %
Secondary school	12 %

Professional training	13 %
University Diploma	49 %
<u>Family income</u>	
Less than 20.000 \$	4 %
Between 20.001 \$ and 40.000 \$	10 %
Between 40.001 \$ and 60.000 \$	17%
Between 60.001 \$ and 80.000 \$	20 %
Over80.001 \$	49 %

As for the visit, 83% of the respondents came with their family, 73% represent parents with their children and 10% are grandparents with their grandchildren. Of these families, 87% visited the park with at least one child, 59% with at least two children, and 21% with at least three children. The main motivation of park visitors (38% of the respondents) is being close to the animals and being able to touch them. However, 31% chose the park to benefit in the same day from three activities offered by the park (animals, water games and rides).

3. Analysis of Results

To measure visitor satisfaction, respondents were requested to answer two questions. First, visitors were asked to rate their satisfaction with various attractions and services offered by the park using a measurement scale ranging from unacceptable to excellent. The reliability of the satisfaction scale was assessed using Cronbach Alpha considered the first tool to define the strength of the analysis (Hair et al, 2009). The value of this coefficient is .883, which is above the minimum threshold of 0.70 generally accepted in the scientific community (Université de Sherbrooke, 2015).

The next step was to conduct a principal component factor analysis using a Varimax orthogonal rotation on the variables measuring satisfaction. The review of the index Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) indicates a high level of significance (KMO = 0.852), the results show that 12 components can explain 60% of the variance, as seen in Table 2. These are: food, the various sites where

animals can be seen (with the exception of safari Adventure), cleanliness, the different shops in the Park, the various services offered, entertainment activities available, information presented to visitors at different times during the visit, aquatic areas, variable prices, signage in the park, the staff's provision of service to the visitors and contact with animals.

Table 2: Components to assess Parc Safari's visitor satisfaction

Components	Factor	Eigenvalue
	loading	
Component 1 : Food		
Food price	.858	
Value food	.847	7.893
Variety of menus	.810	
Resto de la Savane	.638	
Restaurant l'Explorateur	.522	
Component 2: Visibility of animals in captivity		
Farm five continents	.719	
Deer Trail	.711	
Tunnel lions	.686	3.511
Terrace Afrika	.656	
Olduvai Gateway	.654	
Plain cheetahs	.643	
Component 3: cleanliness		
Cleanliness of park	.813	2.379
General appearance	.729	

Mohamed Reda KHOMSI & Dominic Lapointe

Clean toilets	.681	
Component 4 : Shopping		
Shop toys	.834	2.263
Arts shop	.811	
Beach shop product	.771	
Component 5: Services offered by the Park		
Safari Expédition	.639	
Information booth	.553	1,791
ATM Availability	.510	
Smooking area	.506	
Educational presentations	.372	
Component 6 : Entertainment activities		
Mechanical rides	.719	
Skill games	.591	1.558
Nairobi Park	.590	
Show	.511	
Component 7 : Information for visitors		
Radio Safari	.751	1.279
Safari Mag	.661	
Information on animals	.644	
Component 8 : Water sector		
Acquaparc Safari	.802	
Tube downhill	.672	1.239
Creameries	.460	
Availability Pikes picnic areas	.445	

Component 9 : Price		
Value of the day	.770	1.166
Admission price	.768	
Component 10 : Signage		
Map reading ease	.762	1.093
Signage	.625	
Component 11 : Quality of the service personnel		
Quality of information provided by the staff	.723	1.076
Courtesy of staff	.630	
Component 12 : Contact with animals		
Box of foods for animal	.712	
Ticketing Wait Times	.419	1.007
Tours of animals	.402	
Safari Adventure	.375	

Once the main components were identified, the weight of each component in explaining overall satisfaction was assessed. Accordingly, linear regression analysis of the 12 components with respect to the main variable was performed. For this test, 12 new variables that reflect the average of the attributes that formed each component were created. According to the results (see Table 3), 4 components explain 42% ($R^2 = .422$) of the variation of the satisfaction model. The integration of the other components does not significantly alter the performance of the model and therefore we limited the analysis to these components and their attributes. The results as seen in Table 3 show that the price component is the most important coefficient ($Beta = .666$), followed by cleanliness, contact with animals and the visibility of animals in captivity.

Table 3: Result of regression analysis of overall satisfaction / components

Components	Non-standardized coefficients (B)	standardized coefficients (Beta)	Sig.
Price	.666	.442	.000
cleanliness	.389	.197	.000
Contact with animals	.205	.154	.000
Visibility of animals in captivity	.178	.138	.000

To complete the statistical analysis, a textual data analysis was carried out using Nvivo in order to review the 694 comments recorded. The analysis was used to identify the words that come up most often, and from there, the creation of themes or groups that were linked to the concept of overall satisfaction. As such, the research identified three themes: the price, contact with animals and services and attractions offered by the Park. When compared with those components that emerged from the quantitative analysis, it is interesting to note that price and contact with animals appear to be common to both analyses.

In terms of price, the statistical analysis indicates that this factor has two attributes, which are the entrance fee to the park and the value of a day at the park. The correlation between these two attributes is also significant with a value of .721, which indicates the importance of this factor in explaining the overall satisfaction of park visitors. Accordingly, the visitors believe that the price paid is too expensive compared to the overall experience. This perception is more pronounced if we take into account the fees paid for access to certain rides and water park activities. This viewpoint is more

prevalent among those customers who visited the park at the beginning or end of the season, when some areas of the park were closed. On this topic, the visitors suggest that prices are modulated based on the time of the visit and on the attractions that visitors wish to access. For example, they suggest that visitors who wish to make only the Safari Adventure circuit could pay a different price, comparatively to those who wish to travel only to the water park or to benefit fully from their day with a tour of all the attractions offered by the park. With respect to the time of the visit, respondents felt that the visitors who come to the park at the beginning or end of the season must receive a discount, as water park areas and rides are closed, and only animal areas are open to visitors.

The second common issue that arose from the statistical analysis and the examination of textual data is the contact with animals. In the regression analysis, this factor is positioned in third place, just behind the cleanliness factor, with a non-standardized coefficient (B) equal to .205. The main component of this factor (B = 0.522) includes the observation circuit of wildlife in freedom that offers the opportunity for visitors to get indirect contact with animals that circulate in their natural environment, while the visitor is in the vehicle. This attraction is of paramount importance to developers since it is the main attraction of the Parc Safari and has a direct impact on the level of visitor satisfaction. As such, the analysis of textual data indicates that the time spent inside the circuit is an important factor for the visitors. In fact, 73% of those that spent over two hours at the Safari Adventure, ascribe a satisfaction score between 6 and 8, while 60% of those who spent less than an hour and a half on the circuit show a satisfaction score between 8 and 10. This is explained by the fact that if visitors spend a significant time on the circuit they no longer have the time to visit other areas of the park due to lack of time or fatigue.

Finally, beyond the common elements of the statistical and textual analysis, the cleanliness component is positioned as the second largest after the price. The latter has three attributes, the park's cleanliness, the toilets and the overall appearance of the park. However, it is the latter attribute that is most important to the visitor in the assessment of overall satisfaction (B = .526) even though the issue did not come out significantly in the respondents' comments. As explained above, this may be due to the fact that visitors consider acceptable the

appearance and cleanliness of the park, which is within the minimum expected from the park, and therefore does not represent a dissatisfaction factor.

Conclusions

The analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data determines that the price remains the central element in the assessment of visitor satisfaction. This echoes the findings of Roest et al (1997), Ross and Iso-Ahola (1991) and Geva and Goldman (1991), which noted that the cost is a determining factor in the definition of visitor satisfaction of a zoo. As such, the dimension of accessibility identified in the literature as one of the three dimensions of visitor satisfaction, can be recognized as the main dimension in this research. In this regard, it is necessary to note that this price factor does not only refer to the admission fees to the park, but it also includes all costs to get to and all the money spent on, the zoo site. Moreover, in their comments, visitors propose that the charges for access to the park are adjusted by taking into account the choices of the activities that visitors wish to practice. If it is generally admitted that in the 21st century consumption has taken a turn away from goods and services towards experiences (Pine and Gilmore, 1999), and that theme parks are a paramount example of this turn (Milman, 2010), the research's findings reified the importance of the instrumental dimension of the performance of a theme park, which in this study was labelled as the accessibility dimension of satisfaction. According to the research, no matter how good and satisfying is the experience obtained at the park, if the accessibility is not there, especially market accessibility via pricing, the customers may not be satisfied.

The question of the importance of price in the evaluation of the Parc Safari's visitors's satisfaction also follows the conclusions of Milman (2009). This author, who led a survey of Central Florida's residents, domestic and international tourists, concludes that price is a dimension more important to residents as compared to tourists. In our case, the same conclusion is reached, since 68% of the visitors make a trip of less than 2 hours to get to the park, compared to only 9% of the respondents who chose to take a tourist accommodation in the region. In this sense, the originality of this article lies in the redefinition of the attributes of satisfaction. Unlike many studies on the

same subject, this research has shown that the experiential dimension is not necessarily always the most important one. In our case, two functional attributes (price and cleanliness) are most significant for visitors, and especially the resident. For this reason, future studies should use the visitors' postcode in order to map the flow of people and to define a satisfaction attributes grid by segments of visitors.

In line with the literature, the starting assumption of this study was that the main motivation of park visitors is the will to make contact with the animals and to be able to touch them. This assumption was validated since, as we pointed out earlier, 38% of visitors choose the park for this reason. This reflects the importance of the emotional dimension that emerged in both the quantitative and qualitative analysis, since visitors consider this as an important dimension in assessing overall satisfaction. This is also the same point raised by several authors (Dengate, 1993; Tribe, 2001; Luebke and Matiasek, 2013; Hughes and Macbeth, 2005; Packer and Ballantyne, 2002), who felt that this emotional dimension is especially vital in the analysis of satisfaction in zoos where wildlife is free.

The findings confirm the importance of contact with the animals in the assessment of the overall visitor satisfaction and determines the weight that Safari Adventure holds, as the main attraction in the park to which developers should pay particular attention to. In the analysis of qualitative data, some areas for improvement that may enhance the customer experience and therefore satisfaction were identified. In this regard, the signaling within the circuit to encourage users to respect traffic rules was one of the proposals made by the respondents. In this spirit, some visitors even proposed that the park's staff be involved when some visitors slow traffic flow and impair the quality of the user's experience inside the circuit. The second element that recurs in visitor comments regarding the Safari Adventure is the lack of proximity to certain species. Indeed, some animals are less likely to approach the visitors, which accentuates the feeling of only very few animals being present in the circuit.

Also, contrary to what emerged in the literature review, visitors do not seem to pay attention to the informational dimension in the assessment of overall satisfaction with their experience at the park. Indeed, despite the actions of the Safari Park in recent years to

demonstrate its commitment to the protection of wildlife, this does not emerge as a significant factor of satisfaction, neither in the quantitative analysis nor in the qualitative one. In spite of this finding, it is not possible to conclude that park visitors are insensitive regarding this dimension and therefore further attention to this component should be given in the next survey. Furthermore, a line of research for the next study concerns what Jensen (2007) called secondary services. Indeed, in this research, the cleanliness of the toilets, the parking availability, the quality of food and the availability of picnic spaces only marginally influence the visitor's satisfaction. In this regard, authors such as Spreng and Mackoy (1996), Mittal, Kumar and Tsrios (1999) and Namkung and Jang (2010) estimate that one must distinguish between satisfaction and dissatisfaction that are completely opposed concepts. Indeed, the reaction of a satisfied or less satisfied customer will not be the same as that of a dissatisfied customer. In the latter case, a consumer will not repeat the purchase without talking about it. In contrast, the customer that is less satisfied with a product or service, but attached to a brand, will acknowledge it and talk about it. Accordingly, we believe that these secondary services raised by Jensen (2007) must be measured using the same grid as that used to assess visitor satisfaction in this research and therefore future studies should take this issue into consideration.

References

- Andereck, K.L. and L.L. CALDWELL (1994). Variable Selection in Tourism Market Segmentation Models. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 33 No.2, pp. 40-46
- Baron-Yelle, N. and S.A. Clavé (2014). Leisure parks: components and creators of the new urban landscapes? . *Loisir et Société / Society and Leisure*, Vol. 37 No.1, pp. 18-37
- Bigné, J.E. et al. (2005). The theme park experience: An analysis of pleasure, arousal and satisfaction. *Tourism Management* Vol 26, pp. 833–844
- Bowie D. and Chang, J.c. (2005). Tourist satisfaction: A view from a mixed international guided package tour. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, Vol. 11 No.4, pp 303-322
- Churchill, G. A., and C. Surprenant. (1982). An Investigation into the Determinants of Customer Satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Research*,

Vol.19, pp. 491-504.

- Coe, J. (1985). Design and perception: making the zoo experience real. *Zoo Biology*, Vol. 4 No.2, pp. 197-208.
- Conway, W. (1969). Zoos: Their changing roles. *Science*, Vol 163, pp. 48-52.
- Darby, M. R., and E. Karni. (1973). Free Competition and Optimal Amount of Fraud. *Journal of Law and Economics*, Vol. 16, pp. 67-86.
- Dengate, H. (1993). *Toronga Zoo Guidebook*. Sydney. Bartel Publication.
- Davey, G. (2006). Visitor behavior in zoos: a review. *Anthrozoos*, Vol, 19, No.2, pp. 143-157.
- Davey, G. (2007). Visitors' effects on the welfare of animals in the zoo: a review. *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, Vol. 10, No.2, pp. 169-183.
- Duke, C. R and Persia, A. M. (1996), "Performance-Importance Analysis of Escorted Tour Evaluations" in *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 5 (3) : 207-223
- Dunn Ross, E. L., and S. E. Iso-Ahola. (1991). Sightseeing Tourists' Motivation and Satisfaction. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol 18, pp. 226-237.
- Falk, J. H., Reinhard, E. M., Vernon, C. L., Bronnenkant, K., Heimlich, J. E., & Deans, N. L. (2007). *Why zoos and aquariums matter: Assessing the impact of a visit to a zoo or aquarium*. Silver Springs, MD: Association of Zoos and Aquariums.
- Finlay, T., James, L. R., & Maple, T. L. (1988). People's perceptions of animals: the influence of zoo environment. *Environment and Behavior* Vol 20, No.4, pp 508-528.
- Geissler, G.L. and C.T. Rucks (2011). The overall theme park experience: A visitor satisfaction tracking study. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, Vol.17, No.2, pp 127-138.
- Geva, A., and A. Goldman. (1991). Satisfaction Measurement in Guided Tours. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol.18, pp. 177-185.
- Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., and Anderson, E (2009). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Prentice Hall.
- Hughes, M. & Macbeth, J (2005). Can a Niche-Market Captive-Wildlife Facility Place a Low Profile Region on the Tourism Map? An Example from Western Australia. *Tourism Geographies*, Vol.7, No.4, pp. 424-443.
- Jensen, J. M. (2007). An empirical investigation of the relationships between hygiene factors, motivators, satisfaction, and response among visitors to zoos and aquaria. *Tourism Review International*, Vol 11, No. 3, pp. 307-316.
- Jones, G.R., J.C. Coe, and D.R. Paulson. (1976). *Woodland park zoo : long range plan, developpement guideline and exhibit scenarios*. Jones &

- Jones for Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation.
- Kasmar, J.V. (1970). The development of usable lexicon of environmental descriptor. *Environment and Behavior*, Vol 12, pp. 153-169.
- Kuehl, P.G. (1976). *An analysis of visitor socioeconomic Behavioral, and attitudinal Characteristics at the national zoological park*. Washington DC, National Zoological Park.
- Lee, H.S. (2015). Measurement of visitors' satisfaction with public zoos in Korea using importance-performance analysis. *Tourism management*, Vol. 47, pp. 251-260.
- Luk, S.T.K and R. Layton, (2002). Perception Gaps in Customer Expectations: Managers Versus Service Providers and Customers. *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 22, No 2, pp. 109-128.
- Luebke, J. F., & Matiasek, J. (2013). Design and perception: making the zoo experience real. *Zoo Biology*, Vol.32, pp. 407-416.
- Milman, A. (2009). Evaluating the Guest Experience at Theme Parks: An Empirical Investigation of Key Attributes. *International Journal OF Tourism Research* Vol. 11, pp. 373-387
- Milman, A. (2010). The global theme park industry. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, Vol. 2, No 3, pp. 220-237
- Mittal, V., P. Kumar, and M. Tsrios. (1999). Attribute-level performance, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions over time: A consumption-system approach. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.63, No. 4, pp. 88-101.
- Morgan, J. M., & Hodgkinson, M. (1999). The motivation and social orientation of visitors attending a contemporary zoological park. *Environment and Behavior*, Vol.31, No.2, pp. 227-239.
- Namkung, Y. Janng, S. (2010). Service Failures in Restaurants : Which Stage of Service Failure Is the Most Critical? *Cornel Hospitality Quarterly* Vol.51, No.3, pp. 323-343.
- Neal, J.D. and D. Gursoy (2008). A Multifaceted Analysis of Tourism Satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol.47, pp. 53-62
- Oliver, R. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequents of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 460-469.
- Oliver, R. L. (1981) Measurement and Evaluation of Satisfaction Processes in Retail Settings. *Journal of Retailing*, Vol.57, No.3, pp. 25-48.
- Oliver, R. (1997). *Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer*. New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Packer, J., & Ballantyne, R. (2002). Motivational factors and the visitor experience: a comparison of three sites. *Curator*, Vol.45, No.3, pp.183-198.
- Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. H. (1999). *The experience economy: Work is theatre & every business a stage*. Harvard Business Press.

- Pizam, A. and T. Ellis (1999). Customer satisfaction and its measurement in hospitality enterprises » *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol.11, No.7, pp. 326-339
- Pizam, A. and Milman, A. (1993). Predicting satisfaction among first time visitors to a destination by using the expectancy disconfirmation theory *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol.12, No.2, pp. 197-209.
- Pizam, A. et al. (1978). Dimensions of tourist satisfaction with destination area. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol.5, No.3, pp. 314-322.
- Tribe, A. (2001) *Captive wildlife tourism in Australia*. Gold Coast, Australia: CRC Sustainable Tourism.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. and Berry, L.L.(1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.49, pp.41-50.
- Roest, H. Pieters, R. & Koelemeijer, K.(1997). Satisfaction with amusement Parks. *Annals of tourism Research*. Vol. 24, No.4, pp. 1001-1005.
- Spreng, R. A., and R. D. Mackoy. (1996). An empirical examination of a model of perceived service quality and satisfaction. *Journal of Retailing*. Vol.72, No.2, pp. 201-14.
- Swan, J. E. and L.J. Combs(1976). Product Performance and Consumer Satisfaction: A New Concept. *Journal of Marketing*. Vol.40, pp. 25-33.
- Tse, D. K., and P. C. Wilton.(1988). Models of Consumer Satisfaction Formation: An Extension. *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol.25, pp. 204-212.
- Université de Sherbrooke (2015). Spss 17
[<http://spss.espaceweb.usherbrooke.ca/>] Accessed June 18, 2015.
- Yuksel, A., & Yuksel, F. (2001). The expectancy-disconfirmation paradigm: a critique. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*. Vol.25, No.2, pp.107-131.