

# Zoo Tourism: What Actually Is a Zoo?

**Lukáš Nekolný / Dana Fialová**

e-mail: lukas.nekolny@natur.cuni.cz, dana.fialova@natur.cuni.cz

**Department of Social Geography and Regional Development, Faculty of Science, Charles University,  
Prague, Czech Republic**

Nekolný, L., & Fialová, D. (2018). Zoo Tourism: What Actually Is a Zoo? *Czech Journal of Tourism*, 7(2), 153–166. DOI: 10.1515/cjot-2018-0008.

---

## **Abstract**

Zoos are one of the most visited tourist attractions worldwide - we should perceive them, therefore, not only as places where animals are kept, but also as places frequented by large numbers of people. This is why we talk of zoo tourism. However, there are different definitions of a zoo. This wide range of possible approaches to what actually the zoo is poses a major methodological problem for the research analysis as well as for the zoo management and related legislation. Zoos are historically and socially determined. We can talk not only about the evolution of zoos but also about the co-evolution of zoos alongside many types of zoos. Nowadays, there is no doubt that there is a large number of modern and naturalistic zoos oriented on conservation, but there are also many zoos designed as popular animal-based attractions where animals live in unsuitable conditions. The principal aim of this article is to introduce and discuss problematic approaches to what zoos are and to suggest a use of a wider zoo definition.

## **Keywords**

tourism, tourist attraction, animal-based attraction, zoo, zoo typology

**JEL classification:** Z3

## Introduction

Localisation preconditions are one of the basic principles of tourism. They apply also to tourist attractions that are the reason why tourists and same-day visitors come to a tourist destination (Kušen, 2010). Localisation preconditions may have various forms and many authors have attempted to classify them (e.g., Kruczek; 2014, Kušen, 2010; Swarbrooke, 2002). The easiest way to do so is to classify them as being either natural or anthropogenic/cultural-historical (Mariot, 2000). Today, zoos are an important segment of the tourism industry being one of the most frequented tourist attractions (e.g., Woods 2002; Baratay & Hardouin-Fugier, 2004; Fialová & Nekolný, 2015) as they combine both natural and anthropogenic features. Moreover, they can be viewed not only as tourist or visitor attractions, but also as leisure facilities (Turley, 1999).

Zoos are all over the world. Their significance for science is reflected in the existence and development of Zoo studies. These studies are an interdisciplinary scientific field, giving space to topics such as different forms of zoos, their development in relation to the evolution of the society, the relationship between man and animals, architecture, heritage or tourism (Holtorf, 2008). In addition, zoos are also subject to research, e.g., in archaeology as studying the material culture involves changes in the use of buildings over time (e.g., an animal pavilion is transformed into an educational one). Most studies see zoos as leisure-time and tourist destinations. Nevertheless, no one has paid attention to zoos as tourist attractions for a long time, as noted by Turley (2001) or Frost (2011). It was not until the 1970s when the first studies on zoos as tourist attractions were published in the United States (Turley, 2001). Mason (1999) even emphasized that most papers on tourist destinations and tourism in general, including urban tourism (most, especially traditional, zoological gardens are located in urban conglomerations), mentioned zoos only marginally. Hence, he published an article with a fitting title *Zoo Tourism: The Need for More Research* (Mason, 2000). It was in the early 2000s when a number of papers on this matter started to be published. They can still be taken as fundamental for the study of zoos (not only) in view of tourism. They include, among others, studies by Shackley (1996), Kisling (2001), Mizicko and Bell (2001), or Higginbottom (2004). One of the latest and more complex publications is *Zoo Tourism* (Frost, 2011). Many papers, however, would now need updating since they may, to a certain degree, be a product of their time. The system of zoos is developing fast and more and more facilities are being established.

## Methodology

The key research question is what exactly the zoo is? In other words, what is its definition or how can the zoo be described? It is a principal methodological issue for any research conducted with respect to this subject. It allows us to see the zoos more as a system, not merely as specific places. There are traditional zoos with a very high number of visitors, but smaller zoos can satisfy smaller demand. Therefore, it was necessary to review, evaluate and verify the interdisciplinary scientific literature on this issue and zoo databases,

especially from tourism point of view. In order to arrive at a wider understanding of what the zoo is, it was necessary to gain basic knowledge of related legislation. Visits (in some cases repeated) of 247 European zoos in the last 10 years by one of the authors of this article, which provided a fundamental basis for the methodological approach used in this paper. During these visits, approaches of these 'zoos' as well as their exhibits, including various presented topics, were identified and documented (incl. photo-documentation). The zoos were classified in order to find out basic differences between them and the different forms they can take. Their forms and names were then compared to check for possible discrepancies.

Criteria taken into consideration play an important role when searching for the zoo definition. The following questions arise: What should facilities with only local or primarily domestic species be called? What different forms do the zoos take and why? What terminology is used? How many zoos is it possible to identify? Trying to answer these questions is a complex system of tasks and goals.

## What does the word 'zoo' mean?

The word 'zoo' originated as an abbreviation of the word 'zoological'. According to Kisling (2001), this abbreviation was first used in Britain just as a popular nick-name. What made the word really popular was the song 'Walking in the Zoo on Sunday' (Kisling 2001). Today, we can talk about a shift in terminology. While in titles to keep things simple (at least for marketing purposes), the word 'zoo' is used for major zoological gardens, from a professional point of view a difference should be made between the zoo and the zoological garden. Generally speaking, we can say that the zoo is a facility that breeds, keeps, and displays animals (Habel & Mroczkowski, 2015). Based on this definition, it is clear then that the zoo is an exhibition facility open to the public, and this distinguishes it from non-public domestic animal breeding. However, Hosey, Melfi, and Pankhurst (2013) claim that the zoo is a collection of exotic animals in captivity. We have to ask then: should there be only exotic animals in the zoo? This could spark a discussion on why the zoos should only be a place for exotic animals, that is, species kept away from their original habitat. An ordinary visitor may see the zoo as a facility where exotic species are kept. For an expert, however, this is not true, or rather, it should not be. The meaning of 'an exotic animal' differs from region to region. Facilities with species common in Central Europe (e.g., wild parks in German speaking countries or 'forest zoos' in Czechia) keep animals that may be considered exotic, for example, in Latin America. Moreover, there are also zoos with mostly local species of animals that are comparable in many ways (in terms of acreage, number of species, or number of visitors) with facilities that keep species considered exotic in the particular area. The American Association of Zoological Gardens (AZA, 2018) states that the zoo is a permanent institution, which owns and maintains captive wild animals under the direction of a professional staff. In this case, neither is there a difference made between 'exotic' and 'non-exotic' animals. In terms of tourism, the zoo is a "primary institutional location of wild animal presentation" (Beardsworth & Bryman, 2001, p. 87).

Next issue that arises is how to classify the facilities that endeavour to present domesticated species and/or conserve rare species of domestic animals. The Worldwide Zoo Database (WZD), for instance, defines the zoos as “expert scientific or educational facilities of long-term character, which breed species of wild animals or domesticated animals by exposure way for reasons of education or for preservation and conservation of animal species“ (WZD, 2018).

### **Zoo definition and related legislation**

The law also may define zoos in many different ways. Therefore, what experts consider to be the zoo does not necessarily need to be the zoo as defined by the law. For instance, in Czechia the zoos are defined by the Act 162/2003 Coll. on the conditions for the operation of zoological gardens and amendment to some laws (The Zoological Gardens Act). Under this Act, “the zoo means a permanent establishment in which wild animals or also domestic animals, are kept and displayed to the public for at least 7 days in a calendar year”. The key stipulations follow this basic definition – e.g., that circuses or pet shops are not considered zoos, just as “aquariums and terrariums, expositions or other exhibition facilities, that breed and keep fewer than 20 species of wild mammals and birds, which are part of a facility whose chief goal is not to display wild animals for the public” and “facilities to breed and keep animals that serve special purposes, especially rescue stations, rescue centres, facilities for breeding game animals and farm-breeding facilities”. According to this Act 162/2003 Coll., the zoo is neither “a facility for breeding and keeping wild animals that keeps fewer than 20 species of wild mammals and birds while displaying these animals to the public free of charge, especially for the purposes of educating or enlightening the public by providing information on the species displayed, on their habitats and their role in the ecosystem”.

Therefore, an aquarium, terrarium, or a crocodile zoo, establishments that have nothing in common with a garden (in terms of its external premises) can be named a zoological garden. This would be the broader sense of the word ‘zoo’ (although with clearly stipulated norms). From a professional point of view, some licensed zoos should not be considered zoological gardens but rather zoos, or animal-based attractions or facilities. On the other hand, the Czech law does not include such facilities as rescue centres/sanctuaries that frequently display valuable species among zoos (e.g., Makov near Písek in Czechia). Moreover, usually a group of ‘better zoos’ that meet certain criteria are selected for purposes of a legal definition. There are many facilities in Czechia, however, that meet similar criteria to those that are licensed and yet do not have an official licence (e.g., Přírodovědecké centrum Hradec Králové – namely Natural Science Center, in fact terrarium without a licence, vs. Terarium Praha, licensed – yet both facilities dispose of a similarly-sized exhibition area and specialise in reptiles). For this reason, similar selection of zoos for the purposes of the legal definition is of little scientific value and zoos should be defined using generally applicable abovementioned professional definitions.

## Zoo as part of cultural tourism

In addition to the relatively obvious and general definitions provided above, another concept that goes deeper and that can capture the essence of the existence of zoos and their basic functions may be mentioned. Vobruba (1998) states that zoos are specialised cultural and educational facilities, which have four principal tasks, while their performance may differ. They are: conservation of endangered species, science and research, education, and recreation of people. Axelsson and May (2008) claim that while historical monuments present and interpret our past in a certain way, zoos present and interpret animals and nature. Zoos, however, are social constructs. Anderson (1995) understands zoos to be cultural institutions that do not represent nature as such. He believes that they are man-created landscapes that pass on social and cultural messages by presenting live animals. Hallman and Benbow (2006) talk about a type of a cultural landscape that reflects changes in the relationship among human beings, animals and nature as such. This idea is important as it contains development dynamics of the human-nature relationship, which also appears in a number of zoo development typologies (e.g., Rabb, 1994; 2004) and changing numbers of visits. Polakowski (1989), on the other hand, compares zoos to theatres as they are both tied to a specific place, and rely on actors (animals in the zoo) and the audience. What is more, they both endeavour to provide an entertaining and memorable experience, crucial for tourism demand. Despite the fact that zoos display nature, these facilities have been formed by man and can therefore be defined as man-created, cultural or anthropogenic, attractions, part of cultural tourism, as perceived by Vaníček (2012) or Zelenka and Pásková (2002).

## Zoo as theme parks

Some authors perceive zoos as theme parks because zoos, too, present specific themes. These authors, therefore, look at a historical relationship of zoos and theme parks (e.g., Bryman, 1999; Gelná & Fialová 2011). The number of various topics that are presented – live animals being only one of them – is continuously increasing. Naturally, some of these topics are very close to each other. Thus, the borders between them may start to blur. Zoos exhibit extinct animals, plants, and nature, the history of the zoo area, development of zoos in general, culture and architecture, or people from other countries. Therefore, we can say that some zoos create a specific type of an open-air museum (see Figure 1 with an example from Germany). Typically, it is the case of the most developed zoos that display the highest number of these additional topics. This implies that zoos are socio-cultural institutions (Hallman & Benbow, 2007) that combine natural (or naturalistic), human, cultural, and social elements; and that are, furthermore, dynamic and can appeal to the public at large.

**Figure 1** Example of zoo ‘open-air museum’ exhibit – Tibetan village in Görlitz Zoo (D)

Source: Lukáš Nekolný

## Zoo diversity

Gregory et. al. (2009) indicate that the development of zoos from menageries (zoological facilities physically separating animals into cages, a principle of superiority over nature) into modern zoos has shifted from displaying a wide range of species towards a certain specialisation, thanks to which it is now possible to keep and breed socially natural groups of selected species. This is connected with a differentiation and diversification of zoos in the 21st century. From the tourism point of view, zoos are defined as an animal-based attraction or animal attraction (e.g., Mason, 2000). Woods (1998) uses the term captive environments, and within this category, she differentiates between zoos, sanctuaries, and wildlife parks. Woods (2002) uses the term captive wildlife settings, wildlife settings stressing their importance as a segment of wildlife tourism, which is mentioned also by Higginbottom (2004). Tribe (2004) claims that, despite their variation in composition and naming, it is appropriate to use the term zoo for all captive wildlife institutions. According to Higginbottom (2004, p. 39), the zoo is also “the most widespread and available form of wildlife tourism in the world being marketed across all cultures and socio-economic levels”. The whole segment of displaying animals in captivity with respect to tourism is called zoo tourism (Frost, 2011). The specific label of this segment

is a proof of high importance of zoos in tourism. This term is also used, for example, by Tribe (2004), Mason (2000), or Catibog-Sinha (2008).

The zoo definition presented by the South East Asian Zoos Association (SEAZA) shows how wide the segment is: zoological gardens, safari parks, bio-parks, public aquariums, bird parks, terrariums, insectariums, and other collections of animals primarily intended for the public, with educational, scientific, and conservationist functions (Catibog-Sinha, 2008). In former Czechoslovakia, the following classification by Dobroruka and Šír (1984) was used and also taught at schools specialised in the field: mini-zoos, zoological gardens – where they give a list of their specialisations, zoological parks, safari, aquariums, and dolphinariums. The above mentioned WZD (2018) database has its own typology, a simple classification according to given criteria into zoos and the so-called semi-zoos. It also specifies which zoos may be included in the database – “zoological gardens, zoo parks, mini zoos, public aquariums, terrariums, vivariums, bird or reptile parks or houses, dolphinariums, safari, butterfly houses, insectariums, and specialised facilities for displaying animals”. Inspiration can also be found in the classification on the website concerning zoos in the German-speaking countries – Zoo-infos.de (2017), Petzold and Sorge (2012), or the database Les Zoos dans le Monde (2018). Based on their nature, policies and functions, zoos can be put into a number of categories or types. A well-arranged graphical description of typology was presented by Schackley (1996). Nonetheless, he does not explicitly mention certain types of zoos, such as sanctuaries; these are referred to by Woods (1998), e.g., not only the seal sanctuaries, but also other types. Braverman (2011) emphasizes that only some zoos are gardens but that, on the other hand, there are zoological gardens with a status of a botanical garden (Chytrá, Hanzelka, & Kacerovský, 2010; Sheridan, 2016).

According to the WZD (2018), all zoo facilities must meet not only the basic definition but also a number of additional fundamental criteria, e.g., a permanent place and long-term (permanent) character, which excludes travelling animal shows and circuses. The zoo should keep animals and also be open to the public; zoology serving the purpose and displaying being the method. This leaves out game preserves. The term has proven to be difficult to translate into other languages: e.g., from Czech to German when ‘Wildgehege’ is translated as ‘obora’ (a game preserve or a deer park) although the site might be a small zoo with local species of animals. In Czech language, out of a variety of zoos, ‘Wildgehege’ would de facto be a mini-zoo or a ‘forest zoo’ (meaning a wildlife park). Although in this case a facility referred to as ‘obora’ in Czech may in fact be termed a zoo. These translation problems can also cause difficulties on an international level. All the above mentioned definitions state that animals are kept and displayed in zoos. The WZD (2018) and AZA (2018) elaborate further on this basic description even though each of them understands it differently.

Moreover, new zoos emerge and they are not only in form of the traditional parks (zoological gardens) but also in form of the mentioned aquariums or other animal houses. The attendance of these institutions and facilities as of new tourist attractions has been rising. Their attendance rate as they are often smaller sites is lower than the attendance rate of large sites with higher capacities. Nevertheless, they also constitute an important

part of zoo tourism and in some regions, these new zoos are among the most visited with more than 50,000 visits per year; although in the ranking list of CzechTourism (2018), they are not included at all. In Czechia, this segment is reaching one to two million of visits. These new zoos, however, do not have to enter into a direct competition with the traditional zoos as they want to offer something else than a large space and many animals – they offer closer contact with animals or specific collections (e.g., butterflies, fish or reptiles). ‘Smaller’ zoos, and especially mini zoos, do not change their displays much and are mostly located in the countryside (not in large cities). It can be expected, therefore, that the percentage of the repeated visits in these facilities would be lower. An example of the zoo typology is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1** Typology of zoos

Type of zoo	Examples
<b>Zoological institutions</b>	
Big (traditional) zoological garden (in international associations)	Prague Zoo (CZ), Dublin Zoo (IRL)
Zoological garden / zoological park – primarily exotic animals	Na Hrádečku Zoo (CZ), Hirschfeld Zoo (D)
Safari Park	Dvůr Králové Safari Park (CZ), Beekse Bergen Safaripark (NL)
Wildlife Park – primarily local fauna	Obora Žleby (CZ), Saarbrücken Wildlife Park (D)
Farm Park – primarily farm animals	Soběhrdy Farmapark (CZ), Hof Palace farm (A)
Aquarium – primarily fish	Hradec Králové Giant Aquarium (CZ), Aquarium Nausicaá (F)
Dolphinarium – primarily dolphins	Varna Dolphinarium (BG)
Reptile zoo / Terrarium / Tropicarium – primarily reptiles and amphibians	Terarium Praha (CZ), Helsinki Tropicario (FIN)
Bird Park – primarily birds	Bošovice Parrot Zoo (CZ), Wunsiedel Birds of Prey Park Katharinenberg (D)
Butterfly Park (Butterfly House or Insectarium) – primarily butterflies	Papilonia Prague (CZ), Jonsdorf Butterfly House (D)
Sanctuary / Rescue Centre – primarily handicap animals	Makov Sanctuary (CZ), Wareham Monkey World (UK)
(Other) special Parks (e.g., Bear Park, School zoo)	Teplice Biopark (CZ), Hel Fokarium / Seal exhibit (PL)
<b>Other institutions with animal exhibits</b>	
Botanical garden with animal exhibits	Liberec botanical garden (CZ), Gliwice Palm House (PL)
Museum with animal exhibits	Fishing museum Vodňany (CZ), Museum of Natural History, Görlitz (D)



Type of zoo	Examples
Science centre with animal exhibitions	Klimahaus Bremerhaven (D)
Theme or Amusement Park with animal exhibits	Mirakulum (CZ), Legoland Billund (D)

Source: own research through zoo visits – inspired by Dobroruka and Šír (1984), Tribe (2004), Petzold and Sorge (2012), *Les Zoos dans le Monde* (2018), and WZD (2018)

The inconsistency of terminology in current situation is a little frustrating. It is always necessary to distinguish whether the zoos at hand are those in the narrower sense of the word (zoological gardens), or in the broader sense of the expression (all facilities displaying animals that meet at least a minimal standard). The research methods should be chosen and results interpreted with this dichotomy in mind. It also needs to be taken into account that the name of a facility often does not reflect its purpose (e.g., the zoo called Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum). Some facilities even stopped using the term ‘zoo’ in their name intentionally; e.g., the zoo in Bronx (Hosey, Melfi, & Pankhurst, 2013). The whole magnitude of the problem with definitions, conceptions, and terminology can only be understood after investigating facilities in more detail and putting them into appropriate categories. Further discussion on this topic is needed. It is necessary to note global similarities as well as regional specificities (e.g., the abovementioned seal sanctuaries). This is definitely a task for future research, including investigation of what role local and international tourism has.

### How many zoos can be identified and where?

The hierarchic diversity of the system is illustrated by the fact that scientific literature considers exclusively the so-called ‘core’ zoos only, e.g., those facilities that are members of international, regional (in the sense of regionally supranational), and national associations. There are only about 1,200 of these zoos, while the overall estimated figures point at the existence of some ten thousand zoos around the world (Schackley, 1996; Higginbottom, 2004). Most of them can be found in Europe, then in North America and Australia. In Germany itself, over 800 zoos have been counted (zoo-infos.de, 2017). Their number is also growing in developing countries (Mason, 1999). It is not possible to say how many zoos there are exactly because of their continuously rising number and the fact that this necessary information is difficult to find. Another reason is that it is very difficult to say what exactly the zoo is and what is not. In addition, the quality of the facilities differs a lot (WAZA, 2005). There is a wide range of different approaches to assessing such quality. The situation may be well illustrated by the fact that in Czechia:

- 11 zoos are members of the World Association of Zoological Gardens and Aquariums (WAZA, 2018);

- 14 zoos are members of the European Association of Zoological Gardens and Aquariums (EAZA, 2018);
- 14 zoos are listed in the International Zoo Yearbook (International Zoo Yearbook, 2017);
- 15 traditional zoological gardens were founded before 1989 (Nekolný, 2018);
- 16 zoos are associated in the Union of Czech and Slovak Zoological Gardens (UCS-ZOO, 2018);
- 28 zoos have been licensed by the Czech Ministry of the Environment (Czech Ministry of the Environment, 2018);
- approx. 140 zoos – in the broader sense of the term zoo (WZD, 2018).

Zoos are among the most visited tourist attractions and they are very typical of Czechia (Fialová & Nekolný 2015). As it can be seen from the ranking list of the most visited tourist places Czechia published by CzechTourism, five zoological gardens were listed in the top 20 tourist places of 2017 (CzechTourism, 2018). Despite the fact that this ranking list is very problematic and does not include many of important and visited places, the significance of zoos is shown in a realistic manner. In Czechia and in Slovakia, the trend is clear; the attendance rate is increasing in the long term (Nekolný, 2018). Zoos are typical representatives of cultural attractions with repeated visits (Vaníček, 2012). Annual passes, therefore, are very popular (especially in the United Kingdom and Belgium). Thanks to them, the attendance increases. The attendance rate of new zoo facilities, which are not direct competitors of traditional zoos, also increases (Nekolný, 2018).

Another important element in zoo tourism is location. It is very closely related to the frequency of repeated visits, as well as to the zoo attendance rate (Vaníček, 2012). Zoos in capital cities, other big cities, and areas with high population density can be visited by a higher number of people than zoos (or any tourist attraction) in the countryside where a smaller number of people live. Traditionally, zoos founded in the 19th or in the first half of the 20th century are located mostly in cities. Newer zoos, however, can be found in the countryside, typically safari parks in the United Kingdom since 1960s. These zoos are often very important for the employment and the whole economy of some regions (Tribe, 2004).

## Conclusion

The zoo is a kind of a tourist attraction. It is a social construct and, as such, a cultural tourism site that presents nature. Historical as well as current forms of zoos clearly reflect the relationships between man and animals within the society or, more specifically, within the societies and cultures of a given era (Gippoliti, 2011). Zoos and their visitors have always been dependent on contextual conditions, whether social, cultural, or historical. Zoos' current status is the result of a long institutional evolution (Braverman, 2011), or co-evolution, according to Coe (1986). In other words, as also mentioned by WZD (2018), the forerunners of today's zoos had diverse names (e.g., menageries), but many of current facilities look very much the same. On the other hand, some zoos are now

often actual gardens and are often also officially listed as botanical gardens (Sheridan, 2016). A garden or a park is not just a framework for some zoos. Zoos across the world differ in their concept and/or arrangement and this framework must always be taken into account within the geographical context (Holtorf, 2008). Zoos try to change in order to reach a higher level of attractiveness and to gain more visitors. They shift more and more toward theme parks because they present many other themes than only live animals. There are, however, considerable differences between publicly owned zoos and private ones. Commercialisation is one of the most current topics nowadays.

It should be noted that the increasing differentiation in zoos' concept and management goes hand in hand with their development, progress in their functions (Grzimek, 1972), as well as the evolution of all different forms they can take (Lemke, 1987). Yet divergence between zoos is great (Tribe, 2004). Hosey, Melfi, and Pankhurst (2013) emphasize that this is why it is almost impossible to talk about a present-day zoo, a fact often overlooked by scientific literature. Attention tends to be paid to the best and largest zoological facilities where development trends can be followed. However, there are many high-quality 'smaller' facilities as well as facilities that are not so good at exhibiting and breeding animals, but provide entertainment and recreation. These zoological facilities are perceived almost exclusively by zoo databases.

It is thus difficult to define exactly what the zoo is and what is already not. Such a definition cannot be either objectively or realistically determined. Nonetheless, it should be suggested that the scope of the word 'zoo' is broader than usually presented in scientific articles. Moreover, today's small zoos may become important in the future. The fact that in the past some of the currently major zoos were of smaller dimensions and that they, too, had to go through a certain process should not be forgotten. This deserves more attention and a good-quality synthetic approach. Research on the zoos, apart from the 'core zoos', is an underestimated section of the zoo studies and tourism studies. There are many other interesting topics in connection with the zoos and tourism, especially trends such as commercialisation, sustainable tourism, visitors' behaviour, or their motivation to visit zoos. It is still not clear what proportion of the zoo visitors is made up of tourists and how many of them are locals (Higginbottom, 2004). This notion is crucial for tourism. The exact proportion, however, differs from zoo to zoo. It is determined by location and the number of inhabitants living in the municipality where the zoo is situated.

All of these issues are closely connected to the particular society in which the zoo is located but they depend primarily on the type of the zoo itself, as it was mentioned above. The answers to these fundamental questions can be found through further discussions and can help us gain an insight into the evolution of zoos. Not as something unique or isolated, but as one of many elements of a broader system of tourist attractions (Frost, 2011), and/or more extensive systems, including processes such as industrialisation, urbanisation or transformation of values and attitudes in the society. According to Frost (2011), zoos can be understood as dynamic institutions whose position in the society is changing in time. Although a detailed analysis of the development of zoos and their typology is beyond the scope of this paper, it has been at least attempted to take related trends into sufficient consideration.

## References

- Act No. 162/2003. (2003). *Zákon o podmínkách provozování zoologických zahrad a o změně některých zákonů/zákon o zoologických zahradách* (Act on the conditions for the operating of zoological gardens and amendment to some laws/The Zoological Gardens Act). Czech Republic.
- Anderson, K. (1995). Culture and Nature at the Adelaide Zoo: At the Frontiers of 'Human' Geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 20(3), 275–294. DOI: 10.2307/622652.
- Axelsson, T., & May, S. (2008). Constructed Landscapes in Zoos and Heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 14(1), 43–59. DOI: 10.1080/13527250701712356.
- AZA. (2018). *The guide to accreditation of zoological parks and aquariums*. [online]. [cit. 30. 4. 2018]. Retrieved from [https://www.speakcdn.com/assets/2332/guide\\_to\\_accreditation.pdf](https://www.speakcdn.com/assets/2332/guide_to_accreditation.pdf).
- Baratay, E., & Hardouin-Fugier, E. (2004). *ZOO: a history of zoological gardens in the West*. London: Reaktion books.
- Beardsworth, A., & Bryman, A. (2001). The wild animal in late modernity: The case of the Disneyization of zoos. *Tourist Studies*, 1(1), 83–104. DOI: 10.1177/146879760100100105.
- Braverman, I. (2011): Looking at zoos. *Cultural Studies*, 25(6), 809–842. DOI: 10.1080/09502386.2011.578250.
- Bryman, A. (1999). The Disneyization of Society. *The Sociological Review*, 47(1), 25–47. DOI: 10.1111/1467-954X.00161.
- Catibog-Sinha, C. (2008). Zoo Tourism: Biodiversity Conservation Through Tourism. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 7(2-3), 160–178. DOI: 10.1080/14724040802140527.
- Coe, J. C. (1986). Towards a Co-Evolution of Zoos, Aquarium and Natural History Museums. In *AAZPA 1986 Annual Conference Proceedings*, American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums, Wheeling, 366–376.
- Czech Ministry of the Environment. (2018). *Seznam zoologických zahrad s licenci v roce 2018* (List of licensed zoological gardens in 2018). [online]. [cit. 30. 4. 2018]. Retrieved from [https://www.mzp.cz/C1257458002F0DC7/cz/Informace\\_o\\_zoologickyh\\_zahradach/\\$FILE/odoimz-zoo\\_licence\\_adresy\\_web-20180108.pdf](https://www.mzp.cz/C1257458002F0DC7/cz/Informace_o_zoologickyh_zahradach/$FILE/odoimz-zoo_licence_adresy_web-20180108.pdf).
- CzechTourism. (2018). *Návštěvnost turistických cílů 2017* (Most Popular Places 2017). [online]. [cit. 30. 4. 2018]. Retrieved from [https://czechtourism.cz/getattachment/Pro-media/Tiskove-zpravy/Navstevnost-turistickyh-cilu-v-CR-lakaji-historic/Czech\\_Tourism\\_nej\\_turisticke\\_cile.pdf.aspx?ext=.pdf](https://czechtourism.cz/getattachment/Pro-media/Tiskove-zpravy/Navstevnost-turistickyh-cilu-v-CR-lakaji-historic/Czech_Tourism_nej_turisticke_cile.pdf.aspx?ext=.pdf).
- Dobroruka, L., & Šír, Š. (1984). Chovatelství cizokrajných zvířat 1: Učební text pro 1. roč. stud. oboru chovatel cizokrajných zvířat (Breeding of Exotic Animals 1: study text for the 1st year of „animal keeper of foreign animals“ study program). Praha: SZN.
- EAZA. (2018). *Members of the European Association of Zoological Gardens and Aquariums*. [online]. [cit. 30. 4. 2018]. Retrieved from [https://www.eaza.net/#map\\_home](https://www.eaza.net/#map_home).
- Fialová, D., & Nekolný, L. (2015). Rub a líc turistické přitažlivosti (Two Sides of Tourist Attractiveness). *Geografické rozhledy*, 24(4), 8–9.
- Frost, W. (2011). *Zoos and Tourism: Conservation, Education, Entertainment?*. Buffalo: Channel View Publications, Aspects of tourism.
- Gelná, T., & Fialová, D. (2011). Zábavní komplexy a jejich využití v cestovním ruchu (Amusement complexes and their using in tourism). *Czech Hospitality and Tourism Papers: Hotelnictví, lázeňství, turismus*, 7(13), 115–135.
- Gippoliti, S. (2011). Zoos and conservation in the XXI Century: overlooked meeting points between ecology and social science? *Museologia Scientifica nuova serie*, 5(1–2), 168–176.

- Gregory, D., Johnston, R., Pratt, G., Watts, M., & Whatmore, S. (2009). *The Dictionary of Human Geography*. 5th ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Grzimek, B. (1972). *Grzimek's Animal life encyclopedia*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.
- Habel, A., & Mroczkowski, S. (2015). Cele i zadania ogrodów zoologicznych (The objectives and tasks of zoos). *Journal of Education, Health and Sport*, 5(8), 521–528.
- Hallman, B. C., & Benbow, M. (2006). Canadian Human Landscapes Examples. Naturally cultural: the zoo as cultural landscape. *The Canadian Geographer*, 50(2), 256–264. DOI: 10.1111/j.0008-3658.2006.00139.x.
- Hallman, B. C., & Benbow, M. (2007). Family leisure, family photography and zoos: exploring the emotional geographies of families. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 8(6), 871–888. DOI: 10.1080/14649360701712636.
- Higginbottom, K. (2004). *Wildlife Tourism: Impacts, Management and Planning*. Altona: Common Ground Pty Ltd.
- Holtorf, C. (2008). Zoos as Heritage: An Archaeological Perspective. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 14(1), 3–9. DOI: 10.1080/13527250701711994.
- Hosey, G. R., Melfi, V., & Pankhurst, S. (2013). *Zoo animals: behaviour, management, and welfare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd ed.
- Chytrá, M., Hanzelka, P., & Kacerovský, R. (2010). *Botanické zahrady a arboreta České republiky* (Botanical gardens and arboretums in the Czech Republic). Prague: Academia.
- International Zoo Yearbook*. (2017). Zoos and Aquariums of the World. The Zoological Society of London. 51(1), 278–440. DOI: 10.1111/izy.12165.
- Kisling, V. N. (2001). *Zoo and aquarium history: ancient animal collections to zoological gardens*. Boca Raton, Fla.: CRC Press.
- Kruczek, Z. (2014). *Frekwencja w atrakcjach turystycznych*. Kraków - Warszawa: Polska Organizacja Turystyczna.
- Kušen, E. (2010). A system of tourism attractions. *Tourism – An international Interdisciplinary Journal*, 58(4), 409–424.
- Lemke, K. (1987). *Tiergärten. Zoos, Aquarien, Wildgehege*. Berlin, Leipzig: VEB Tourist Verlag.
- Les Zoos dans le Monde. (2018). *Document database*. [online]. [cit. 20. 3. 2018]. Retrieved from <http://www.leszoosdanslemonde.com/>.
- Mariot, P. (2000). *Geografia cestovného ruchu* (Geography of tourism). Bratislava: Orbis Pictus Istropolitana.
- Mason, P. (1999). Zoo as heritage tourism attractions: A neglected area of research? *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 5, 193–202. DOI: 10.1080/13527259908722267.
- Mason, P. (2000). Zoo Tourism: The Need for More Research. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8(4), 333–339. DOI: 10.1080/09669580008667368.
- Mizicko, L., & Bell, E. C. (2001). *Encyclopedia of the World's Zoos*. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Nekolný, L. (2018). Vývoj návštěvnosti zoologických zahrad Česka, Slovenska a Německa po roce 1989 (Development in attendance rates at zoological gardens in Czechia, Slovakia and Germany after 1989). *Gazella*, 43, 190–215.
- Petzold, D., & Sorge, S. (2012). *Abenteuer Zoo*. L. Stocker Verlag, Graz. 2. Auflage.
- Polakowski, K. J. (1989). A Design Approach to Zoological Exhibits: The Zoo as Theater. *Zoo Biology Supplement 1*, (1), 127–139. DOI: 10.1002/zoo.1430080513.
- Rabb, G. B. (1994). The Changing Roles of Zoological Parks in Conserving Biological Diversity. *American Zoologist*, 34(1), 159–164. DOI: 10.1093/icb/34.1.159.

- Rabb, G. B. (2004). The Evolution of Zoos from Menageries to Centers of Conservation and Caring. *Curator*, 47(3), 237–246. DOI: 10.1111/j.2151-6952.2004.tb00121.x.
- Shackley, M. (1996). *Wildlife Tourism*. London: Thomson Learning.
- Sheridan, A. (2016). *Europas Zoo unter der Lupe: Sheridans Handbuch der Zoos in Europa*. Münster: Schöningh, K. (Verlag).
- Swarbrooke, J. (2002). *The development and management of visitor attractions*. 2nd ed. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Tribe, A. (2004). Zoo Tourism. In K. Higginbottom (Ed.), *Wildlife Tourism: Impacts, Management and Planning* (pp. 35–56). Altona: Common Ground Pty Ltd.
- Turley, S. K. (1999). Conservation and Tourism in the Traditional UK Zoo. *The Journal of Tourism Studies*, 10(2), 2–13.
- Turley, S. K. (2001). Children and the demand for recreational experiences: the case of zoos. *Leisure Studies*, 20(1), 1–18. DOI: 10.1080/02614360122877.
- UCSZOO. (2018). *Czech and Slovak Zoological Gardens*. [online]. Košice: Union of Czech and Slovak zoological gardens. [cit. 30. 4. 2018]. Retrieved from <http://www.zoo.cz/>.
- Vaniček, J. (2012). Porovnání profilu návštěvníka vybraných zoologických zahrad v České republice (Comparison of visitors' profile in selected zoological gardens in the Czech Republic). *COT Business*, 70–72.
- Vobruba, M. (1998). *Charakteristika zoologických zahrad ČR*. (Characteristics of zoological gardens in the Czech Republic). Diploma thesis. Plzeň: University of West Bohemia, Faculty of Education.
- WAZA. (2005). *Building a Future for Wildlife – The World Zoo and Aquarium Strategy*. Bern, Switzerland: World Association of Zoos and Aquariums.
- WAZA. (2018). *Zoos and Aquariums of the World*. [online]. [cit. 30. 4. 2018]. Retrieved from <http://www.waza.org/en/site/membership-1457346806>.
- Woods, B. (1998). Animals on Display: Principles for interpreting captive wildlife. *The Journal of Tourism Studies*, 9(1), 28–39.
- Woods, B. (2002). Good zoo/bad zoo: Visitor experiences in captive setting. *Anthrozoös*, 15(4), 343–360. DOI: 10.2752/089279302786992478.
- WZD. (2018). *Worldwide Zoo Database*. [online]. [cit. 12. 4. 2018]. Retrieved from <http://wzd.cz/>.
- Zelenka, J., & Pásková, M. (2002). *Výkladový slovník cestovního ruchu* (Tourism – explanatory dictionary). Prague: Ministry for Regional Development.
- Zoo-infos.de. (2017). *Die Zoo-Datenbank für Deutschland*. [online]. [cit. 20. 3. 2018]. Retrieved from <http://www.zoo-infos.de/>.