Almudena Otegui Carles / José A. Fraiz-Brea / Noelia Araújo Vila

The Ethical Attitudes of Generation Z in Spain Toward Animal-Based Tourism Attractions

Abstract

Research in animal ethics and Generation Z in the field of tourism is a little-explored topic. With a focus on the development of both research fields, the aim of this study was to determine if Generation Z in Spain justifies or rejects the use of animals in tourism attractions, and to establish which specific animal attractions are acceptable for Generation Z and which are not. The results indicated that Generation Z does not justify any of the animal attractions presented in the questionnaire. Generation Z does not accept any of the possible justifications for the existence of animal-based attractions, and all conditions under which animals must be treated at those attractions are important for Generation Z respondents. Females attach greater importance than males to all animal treatment conditions and express a greater rejection of all attractions as well as all justifications presented in the questionnaire.

Keywords: animal rights, animal-based attractions, ethics, Generation Z, sustainability

1. Introduction

1.1. Animal ethics

The first reference to animal rights goes back to the figure of Pythagoras (572– 497 BC. approx.), who forbade his disciples to kill and eat animals (García, 2019). However, there are countless philosophers who have justified the supremacy of humans over animals and who have argued that their interests must be respected and protected (Lucano Ramírez, 2018). The Universal Declaration of Animal Rights, proclaimed in 1978, states that species must be respected, and not mistreated, abandoned, or exploited; nor should they be subjected to pain or exploitation for the entertainment of humans (García, 2018). The use of animals for entertainment has been largely accepted (Winter, 2020) and currently, there are still animals forced to live in confined places and in conditions that deny their innate needs, where they are forced to perform unnatural behaviors (von Essen et al., 2020; Winter, 2020). Evidence for this consists in the fact that in 2019 there were 907 zoos and aquaria throughout the world (Fisken, 2019), and approximately 2.6 million animals are held captive in these zoos and aquaria in 80 countries (Winter, 2020). In addition, the range of captive-based sites is broader, including circuses, safari parks, animal theme parks, animal racing venues, rodeos, and bullfights (Shani, 2012). Despite a growing interest in animal welfare, the implications of the animal-based tourism industry, and the animal welfare risks related to such activities (von Essen et al., 2020; Winter, 2020), new modes of animal-based tourism proliferate (von Essen et al., 2020). In fact, the offer of encounters with wildlife, even animals in captivity, is likely to increase the likelihood that potential travelers will select a certain travel package (Shani, 2012).

Almudena Otegui Carles, Corresponding Author, Associate Professor, Universidade de Vigo - Facultade de Ciencias Empresariais e Turismo, Galicia, Spain. Universidad Complutense de Madrid - Facultad de Turismo y Comercio, Madrid, Spain;
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4112-8580 ; e-mail: almudena.otegui@uvigo.es

José A. Fraiz-Brea, Senior Lecturer, Universidade de Vigo - Facultade de Ciencias Empresariais e Turismo, Galicia, Spain;
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3190-6492

Noelia Araújo Vila, Lecturer, Universidade de Vigo - Facultade de Ciencias Empresariais e Turismo, Galicia, Spain;
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3395-8536

Original Research Article
Vol. 71/ No. 2/ 2023/ 285 - 300
UDC: 338.483.11:179.3(460); https://doi.org/10.37741/t.71.2.4

Animal rights movements refuse any conservation role of animal-based attractions and state that captivity is against animals' rights to liberty (Shani & Pizam, 2010). In contrast, the concerns of Agenda 2030 are the maintenance of species diversity, the prevention of species extinction, and the eradication of species trafficking (United Nations, 2015). There is no mention of the life conditions and/or treatment of animals in captivity in any of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals. A similar position can be found in sustainable tourism measuring initiatives, where the main concern is the preservation of species, and even a sustainable measuring tool includes as a sustainable indicator the use of carts or wagons pulled by animals (World Tourism Organization [UNWTO], 2004). The only measuring initiative where it is possible to find a reference to the quality-of-life conditions of animals is in the Statistical Framework for Measuring the Sustainability of Tourism, but this concern is for wildlife and the associated ecosystems, such as forests, wetlands, or savannas (UNWTO, 2018). Even the UNWTO Global Code of Ethics for Tourism only remark on the need to preserve endangered species of wildlife (Fennell, 2014), not including the welfare and respect of animals used in tourism activities.

Tourism development has been influenced by actions that have not taken into account ethical issues (López-González, 2018). For this reason, although ethics is a growing field, and the ethics of animal use for entertainment is being questioned (Winter, 2020), an increase in research related to animal ethics in the field of tourism is necessary. As evidenced by the article by Winter (2020), *A review of research into animal ethics in tourism: Launching the annals of tourism research curated collection on animal ethics in tourism*, in which only 74 articles published between 1970 and 2019 were identified that made specific reference to animal ethics in challenging existing thinking to advance the field of animal ethics in tourism. This review showed that there were up six ethical positions identified in the animal ethics in tourism research. These positions were influenced by cultural issues, and by a tourism-animal ontology that group animals into different categories. The ethical positions included anthropocentrism that positions humans as the preeminent species and uses other species as objects to satisfy human needs (Fennell, 2014; Winter, 2020). Deforestation, overpopulation, pollution, habitat loss, animal cruelty, ecological injustice, and animal diseases (Fennell, 2014; Kopnina, 2019) are some of the problems associated with this ethical position. Utilitarianism is a form of weak anthropocentrism (Yin et al., 2021) although it considers animals as moral sentients that suffer pain, this position does not reject the use of animals for human interest. However, this use must be made calculating the rate of interest to make it equal to both human and animals, optimizing the human outcomes and minimizing the animals' suffering (Winter, 2020; Yin et al., 2021). Welfare is also a form of weak anthropocentrism that recognizes the use of animals, as long as assuring the welfare of animals, by considering their feelings, their biological functioning, and keeping them in natural living environments (Cui & Xu, 2019; Fennell, 2014). Environmental ethics consider that there are no moral differences between animals and humans (Horsthemke, 2017), and the health and integrity of the ecosystem must be preserved and protected (Yerbury et al., 2017). Ecofeminism introduces the ethics of care into decision-making about animals (Winter, 2020) through the emotional and sympathy perception of animals (Yin et al., 2021). It is an ecological feminist response to the impacts of modernization and capitalism (Shiva et al., 2014) that advocates a caring approach to the anthropocentrism/non-anthropocentrism dichotomy (Cui & Xu, 2019). Animal rights is a non-anthropocentric animal ethics position that consider animals morally equal to humans. This position opposes the human use of animals and advocates the animals' right to justice, respectful treatment, a life to their desires, and the emancipation from human property (Cui & Xu, 2019; Winter, 2020; Yin et al., 2021). Winter (2020) reported, based on his review of research into animal ethics in tourism, that this position is unrealistic in today's world.

Yerbury et al. (2017) considered three animal ethical positions: the animal rights perspective, which rejects captivity for any reason, except while they are being rehabilitated for release. The animal welfare perspective does not reject the use of animals for human interest, as long as there is a justifiable purpose, and suffering is not caused. Finally, there is the environmental ethics perspective which considers that animals are sentient and questions the ethics of keeping sentient and intelligent creatures in captivity. A similar approach to the animal ethical position can be found in Cui and Xu (2019), who identified three animal ethical theories:

animal rights, a non-anthropocentric position in accordance with the animal rights perspective of Yerbury et al. (2017); animal welfare that they considered a weak anthropocentric perspective, and that can be in place in the animal welfare position of Yerbury et al. (2017); and the ecofeminism ethics position that they named as relational caring ethics "to understand human–nature relationships 'in less oppositional and hierarchical ways'" (Cui & Xu, 2019). Yen et al. (2021) situated utilitarianism and ecofeminism as weak anthropocentrism; animal rights and ecocentrism as non-anthropocentrism. Similar to the classification of Yerbury et al. (2017), Shani and Pizam (2009) found that tourists' attitudes toward animal-based attractions are influenced by three aspects: agreement or disagreement with justifications for animal-based tourist attractions; the belief in the driving forces responsible for the ethical use of animals in tourist attractions; and the relevance of specific conditions for this ethical use.

1.2. Generation Z

Generations could be defined as groups of people that share the same temporal birth period, and unique economic, social, cultural, and political environments that have an influence in their values, attitudes, preferences, and consumption behavior (Chaturvedi et al., 2020; Dolot, 2018; Haddouche & Salomone, 2018; Robinson & Schänzel, 2019). For this study, those born between 1995 and 2010 have been considered Generation Z, following the data of birth specified for Generation Z by the European Parliament (Milotay, 2020).

The characteristic features of Generation Z are different from those of other generations (Özkan & Solmaz, 2017). There are many studies that analyze these unique features of Generation Z, also called "digital natives" because of their use of smartphones, laptops, internet, and other electronic equipment since they were children (Robinson & Schänzel, 2019). This intensive use could lead them to have acquired attention deficit disorder because of a high dependency on all this electronic equipment, as well as an impatient, instant minded, and demanding character (Dangmei & Singh, 2016). They are less resilient (Ang et al., 2021) than previous generations, having a great risk aversion because negative events lead them to frustration, humiliation, and low self-esteem (Sakdiyakorn et al., 2021).

On the other hand, they are highly educated, creative, and innovative (Robinson & Schänzel, 2019) and that makes them a more entrepreneurial generation, but less motivated by money (Dangmei & Singh, 2016) than previous generations. Many studies agree that they have global values and are increasingly conscious consumers (Corbisiero & Ruspini, 2018). It is a generation very concerned with sustainability and environmental issues, and also socially conscious, with a great respect for diversity, justice, and universal well-being (Chaturvedi et al., 2020; Dangmei & Singh, 2016; Sakdiyakorn et al., 2021). These characteristics have led them, in recent years, to be protagonists in various altruistic causes, through the voices of Malala Yousafzai, Greta Thunberg, or Billie Eilish (Bogueva & Marinova, 2020). They have even been named as "the most global and socially empowered generation in history" (Chen et al., 2019). In their travel they seek for adventure, conviviality, socialization, new friendships, and interactions with locals (Robinson & Schänzel, 2019). Escape rooms, bowling, climbing, hiking or adventure parks are some of the leisure activities that Generation Z demand while on holidays (Foris et al., 2020; Foris & Bangala, 2021). Considering Generation Z's concern for animals (Bogueva & Marinova, 2020) and the increase of intimate, active, diverse, and collaborative practices with animals (Danby et al., 2019), the expectation is that Generation Z could be placed closer to the ethical position of Yerbury et al. (2017), the perspective of animal rights, which rejects captivity for any reason.

Generation Z, and the use of animal in attractions, are still little-explored fields of research in tourism. With a focus on the development of both research fields, this study analyzes the ethical attitudes of Generation Z toward the use of animals in tourist attractions with the objective of determining if Generation Z in Spain justifies or rejects the use of animals in tourist attractions and to establish which specific animal attractions are acceptable for Generation Z and which are not. Then, the justifications in the views of members of Generation Z for having animal-based attractions; the conditions they find necessary for the ethical operation

of animal-based attractions; and the driving forces for ethical operation of animal-based attractions will be analyzed. To achieve the objective, the authors distributed a questionnaire among members of Generation Z. The results obtained from the questionnaire are presented along with the discussion, the conclusion, and the main limitations of this research.

This research will have substantial academic, managerial, and marketing implications. In the academic field, Generation Z is a great challenge for researchers. Previous studies have demonstrated the importance of targeting and studying this group, especially regarding their sustainable behavior (Corbisiero & Ruspini, 2018; Goh & Jie, 2019; Haddouche & Salomone, 2018; Kamenidou et al., 2019). Moreover, studies related to the use of animals in tourist attractions are limited, so this study would add knowledge in this field. It will have also managerial and marketing implications because, to attract Generation Z as consumers and as workers, organizations need to know them well and know what organizational characteristics they prefer, to adapt working conditions for them (Özkan & Solmaz, 2017). Managers should adapt their strategies for recruiting, motivating, and retaining (Dangmei & Singh, 2016) their talent. Moreover, they will soon be the leaders of organizations (Robinson & Schänzel, 2019) , and will make the decisions on the organizations. Distinguishing Generation Z in terms of their traits, values, and beliefs as consumers can lead to important implications for tourism destinations (Li et al., 2013) that may have to adapt tourist offers to their likes and dislikes. Generation Z is the tourist generation of the present and the future, therefore it is essential for tourist organizations to adapt to their conscious consumerism tastes. They give their opinion in 94 percent of the purchasing decisions of their families (Haddouche & Salomone, 2018; Robinson & Schänzel, 2019), and will become a major consumer segment (Robinson & Schänzel, 2019) that try to consume from companies they consider ethical (Tracy & Hoefel, 2018).

2. Materials and methods

The review of research into animal ethics in tourism by Winter (2020) shows that most of the articles published relate to conceptual research methods if animal ethics and case studies; there are only four that used a questionnaire as a research method. For the present research, a questionnaire from a previous study conducted by Shani in 2012 in the article, *A quantitative investigation of tourists' ethical attitudes toward animal-based attractions*, was distributed. The authors decided to use that questionnaire considering that their questions remain valid today and cover a wide range of issues related to the use of animals in tourist attractions. Furthermore, Shani based the theoretical framework of that research on previous qualitative research and developed Likert scale survey questions rated from 1 to 5, which were tested for validity and reliability.

Based on that questionnaire, the present study was divided into two sections. In the first one, it was possible to determine if there were justifications in the views of members of Generation Z for having animal-based attractions, and what these justifications were. This section also examined conditions for the ethical operation of animal-based attractions according to Generation Z, as well as the driving forces for ethical operation of animal-based attractions. A total of 18 dimensions and 44 items were analyzed in this section. In the second section, the aim was to establish participants' ethical attitudes toward specific animal-based attractions, and the association between these specific attitudes and the ethical evaluation of the previous section.

Knowing how difficult it would be to get a sufficiently large number of answers, given the age of the population chosen for this study and the high number of questions the survey contained, the authors decided to focus the study on only one country, to have as many surveys as possible from a single country, instead of having a few responses from different countries. It was decided to focus the study on the Generation Z of Spain, which is where the authors had greater possibilities of gathering a larger number of responses.

It was not necessary to adapt the questions from the original questionnaire since they were written in a quite understandable way even for teenagers. It was only necessary to modify some words, with more specific

synonyms of the Spanish language. In this regard, where it said "safe and secure", it was translated to a single word: "seguras". Similarly, "affordable and cheap" were translated as: "económica". Two questions were deleted from the original questionnaire, previously there were 46 instead of 44 items analyzed. The phrase "That the animals receive a 'fair chance' in sport or contest situations" was deleted, as the authors failed to make sense of it by translating it into Spanish. The phrase "That animals are 'doing natural things'" was also deleted, as translating it into Spanish would take on the same meaning as the following question "That the animals express natural behavior". The questionnaire was presented in the Google questionnaire tool and distributed through three methods, to try to reach as many participants as possible through a snowball sampling methodology (Etikan, 2016). To reach the first members of Generation Z, who were requested to respond to the questionnaire, and also to share it with others, the following actions were carried out:

(1) The questionnaire was sent to university colleagues and relatives, as well as through social media groups related to tourism and tourism research, asking them to send the questionnaire to as many members of Generation Z as they knew.

(2) The questionnaire was sent directly to 260 Instagram profiles, who had already received a survey for a previous study by Otegui Carles (2021). In that study, from the 260 profiles, 89 responses were obtained, with ages between 11–23 years, therefore, members of Generation Z.

(3) A Facebook page was created to publish and advertise the survey and reach more people. The ad was set up to be published on Instagram and Facebook, with two different images, one for stories and one for feeds. The target audience was those between 13–26 years old who are registered in Spain. Thirteen years is the minimum age allowed to register on Instagram and Facebook, so it was not possible to configure the ad to people between 11–26 years old. The advertisement was in operation from October 21 to November 4 (2021).

Overall, 481 answers were obtained, and four answers removed because the participants did not live in Spain. There were a total of 477 validly answered questionnaires. According to data from the National Statistical Institute of Spain (INE), the population of people born between 1995 and 2010 amounts to 7,762,692 (data from 2020) (INE, 2021), the age and gender distribution are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Distribution of Generation Z in Spain by year of birth. Data 2020

Population by date of birth	Male and female	Percent	Female	Percent	Male	Percent
2010	500,483	6.45%	242,269	6.42%	258,214	6.48%
2009	523,350	6.74%	253,923	6.72%	269,427	6.76%
2008	504,624	6.50%	245,122	6.49%	259,502	6.51%
2007	502,414	6.47%	244,224	6.47%	258,190	6.48%
2006	492,627	6.35%	240,325	6.36%	252,302	6.33%
2005	490,340	6.32%	238,070	6.30%	252,270	6.33%
2004	481,883	6.21%	234,527	6.21%	247,356	6.20%
2003	467,166	6.02%	225,718	5.98%	241,448	6.06%
2002	470,699	6.06%	227,477	6.02%	243,222	6.10%
2001	478,933	6.17%	230,663	6.11%	248,270	6.23%
2000	472,029	6.08%	229,507	6.08%	242,522	6.08%
1999	462,371	5.96%	224,064	5.93%	238,307	5.98%
1998	473,491	6.10%	231,515	6.13%	241,976	6.07%
1997	473,128	6.09%	232,292	6.15%	240,836	6.04%
1996	479,648	6.18%	235,387	6.23%	244,261	6.13%
1995	489,506	6.31%	240,937	6.38%	248,569	6.24%
Total	**7,762,692**	**100.00%**	**3,776,020**	**49%**	**3,986,672**	**51%**

Considering the size of the study population (7,762,692) and the number of valid responses obtained (477), this represents a sample with a 5% margin of error and a 97% level of confidence (Levy et al., 2011). The data obtained were exported to SPSS to conduct the necessary statistical operations, with the support of Excel to organize the data and format the tables obtained in SPSS.

Gender/sex constitutes a key explanatory variable in the shaping of identities, of social relations, access to resources, or the constitution of societies (Díaz, 2021). Therefore, considering the great importance of introducing the gender perspective in the publication of scientific manuscripts, the results are presented by the total of responses collected and disaggregated by gender, to be able to analyze the differences.

3. Results

The study participants' profile is shown in Table 2. Respondents from all ages answered the questionnaire, except those born in 2010, who were only 11 years old, so they were more difficult to reach, and regarding the length of the questionnaire, with few options to respond to it.

Table 2
Study participants' profile

Year of birth		
	Frequency	**Percent**
1995	9	1.9
1996	9	1.9
1997	11	2.3
1998	15	3.1
1999	15	3.1
2000	14	2.9
2001	18	3.8
2002	30	6.3
2003	77	16.1
2004	140	29.4
2005	66	13.8
2006	43	9.0
2007	22	4.6
2008	7	1.5
2009	1	.2
Total	**477**	**100.0**
Current occupation		
	Frequency	Percent
No work or study	17	3.6
Study	384	80.5
Study and work	60	12.6
Work	16	3.4
Total	**477**	**100.0**

Sex		
	Frequency	***Percent***
Male	68	14.3
Female	409	85.7
Total	**477**	**100.0**
Region of residence in Spain		
	Frequency	Percent
N/A	9	1.89
Andalucía	90	18.87
Aragón	9	1.89
Asturias	13	2.73
Baleares	13	2.73
Canarias	38	7.97
Cantabria	3	0.63
Castilla la Mancha	25	5.24
Castilla y León	23	4.82
Catalunya	42	8.81
Valencia	57	11.95
Extremadura	9	1.9
Galicia	37	7.76
La Rioja	3	0.63
Madrid	58	12.16
Murcia	30	6.29
Navarra	3	0.63
País Vasco	15	3.14
Total	**477**	**100.0**

3.1. Justifications for having animal-based attractions

Table 3 presents a series of items to analyze the arguments for justifying/rejecting the use of animals in attractions. There are a total of 24 items representing eight dimensions: conservation, family experience, education, alternative to nature, scientific research, entertainment, benefits for individual animals, and wildlife regulations. The arguments do not point toward a specific attraction, but rather serve as an ideological basis for justifying (or rejecting) the use of animals in entertainment in general (Shani, 2012).

Table 3
Justifications for having animal-based attractions

Dimensions and items	1 Strongly disagree		2 Disagree		3 Neither agree nor disagree		4 Agree		5 Strongly agree		Total	
	n	N%	n	N%	n	N%	n	N%	n	N%	N	Mean
Conservation												**2.10** (Female 2.07 Male 2.23)
Animal attractions play an important role in preserving endangered species	178	37.3%	146	30.6%	65	13.6%	69	14.5%	19	4.0%	477	2.17
Animal attractions allow people to see wildlife without destroying their natural habitat	178	37.3%	145	30.4%	59	12.4%	74	15.5%	21	4.4%	477	2.19
Animal attractions are important places for conserving wildlife	219	45.9%	164	34.4%	43	9.0%	38	8.0%	13	2.7%	477	1.87
We must support animal attractions so they can develop breeding programs	203	42.6%	114	23.9%	76	15.9%	55	11.5%	29	6.1%	477	2.15
Family-oriented experience												**2.15** (Female 2.08 Male 2.39)
Animal attractions are important places for adults to share something with children	269	56.4%	95	19.9%	51	10.7%	44	9.2%	18	3.8%	477	1.84
Animal attractions play an important recreational role for families	172	36.1%	80	16.8%	98	20.5%	90	18.9%	37	7.8%	477	2.45
Education												**2.16** (Female 2.12 Male 2.40)
Animal attractions are important educational sites for children	177	37.1%	126	26.4%	71	14.9%	74	15.5%	29	6.1%	477	2.27
Animal attractions are important sites to learn about animals	170	35.6%	105	22.0%	75	15.7%	92	19.3%	35	7.3%	477	2.41
Animal attractions promote environmental awareness	217	45.5%	121	25.4%	64	13.4%	51	10.7%	24	5.0%	477	2.04
Using animals in tourist attractions is beneficial for educational purposes	201	42.1%	128	26.8%	81	17.0%	45	9.4%	22	4.6%	477	2.08
Animal attractions demonstrate how to treat animals responsibly	256	53.7%	107	22.4%	61	12.8%	42	8.8%	11	2.3%	477	1.84
Animal attractions contribute to "softening" the negative image of certain animals and making them less intimidating	187	39.2%	100	21.0%	74	15.5%	88	18.4%	28	5.9%	477	2.31
Alternative to nature												**2.52** (Female 2.49 Male 2.73)
Without animal attractions many people would not have the opportunity to see wildlife	145	30.4%	87	18.2%	64	13.4%	114	23.9%	67	14.0%	477	2.73
Animal attractions are a safe and secure alternative to seeing wildlife in their natural habitat	173	36.3%	95	19.9%	87	18.2%	86	18.0%	36	7.5%	477	2.41
Animal attractions are an affordable and inexpensive alternative to seeing wildlife in their natural habitat	161	33.8%	101	21.2%	90	18.9%	96	20.1%	29	6.1%	477	2.44

Table 3 ***(continued)***

Scientific research												**2.24** (Female 2.19 Male 2.49)
The research conducted in animal attractions is vital in order to save species from becoming extinct	163	34.2%	111	23.3%	96	20.1%	73	15.3%	34	7.1%	477	2.38
Animal attractions play an important role in scientific research	174	36.5%	107	22.4%	95	19.9%	72	15.1%	29	6.1%	477	2.32
Conducting research in animal attractions is sometimes the only way scientists can learn about wildlife	226	47.4%	114	23.9%	68	14.3%	43	9.0%	26	5.5%	477	2.01
Entertainment												**2.23** (Female 2.21 Male 2.35)
Animal attractions play an important role in entertaining visitors	179	37.5%	104	21.8%	66	13.8%	97	20.3%	31	6.5%	477	2.36
Animal attractions are places where visitors can see animals entertaining them	225	47.2%	98	20.5%	59	12.4%	71	14.9%	24	5.0%	477	2.10
Benefits to individual animals												**1.73** (Female 1.71 Male 1.87)
Animal attractions provide a safe and secure environment for wildlife	222	46.5%	131	27.5%	57	11.9%	49	10.3%	18	3.8%	477	1.97
Animals in attractions are better off than animals in the wild, since they are free from predators	311	65.2%	95	19.9%	45	9.4%	17	3.6%	9	1.9%	477	1.57
Animal in attractions are better off than animals in the wild, since they have no food concerns	287	60.2%	112	23.5%	47	9.9%	21	4.4%	10	2.1%	477	1.65
Regulations of wildlife												**1.90** (Female 1.88 Male 2.06)
Keeping animals in attractions is an important way to regulate and supervise the natural environment and the wildlife	232	48.6%	124	26.0%	72	15.1%	34	7.1%	15	3.1%	477	1.90

In all the items, the score indicates that the respondents disagree with the justifications presented in the questionnaire. The alternative to nature received the highest mean among the justifications (2.52), followed by scientific research (2.24) and entertainment (2.23). Lower importance was attributed to benefits to individual animals (1.73), regulation of wildlife (1.90), and conservation (2.10). In each dimension, there were differences between females and males, all the arguments to justify/reject the use of animals in entertainment attractions obtained a lower mean from female respondents. The largest difference was presented in the dimension family-oriented experience, where the mean of females was 2.08 and the mean of males 2.39.

3.2. Conditions for ethical operations of animal-based attractions

Table 4 presents the ethical evaluation of the conditions under which animals must be treated at those attractions. In this case, there were a total of 14 items representing eight dimensions: treatment of animals, zoo keepers' background and behavior, training methods, visitors' behavior, natural environment, natural behavior of animals, safety, and displayed animals' origin.

Table 4
Conditions for ethical operations of animal-based attractions

Dimensions and items	1 Very unimportant		2 Unimportant		3 Neither important nor unimportant		4 Important		5 Very important		Total	
	n	N%	n	N%	n	N%	n	N%	n	N%	N	Mean
Treatment of animals												**4.81** (Female 4.83 Male 4.74)
That the exhibited animals receive sufficient food and medical care	13	2.7%	7	0.015	1	0.002	14	0.029	442	0.927	477	4.81
Zoo keepers' background and behavior												**4.77** (Female 4.79 Male 4.66)
That the zoo keepers are educated and are sensitive to the animals	13	2.7%	7	1.5%	1	0.2%	33	6.9%	423	88.7%	477	4.77
Training methods												**4.71** (Female 4.72 Male 4.62)
That animals are not abused during training	13	2.7%	10	2.1%	2	0.4%	12	2.5%	440	92.2%	477	4.79
That animals are trained gently	17	3.6%	10	2.1%	16	3.4%	50	10.5%	384	80.5%	477	4.62
Visitors' behavior												**4.76** (Female 4.77 Male 4.74)
That the visitors to the attraction display respectful behavior towards the animals	12	2.5%	11	2.3%	1	0.2%	23	4.8%	430	90.1%	477	4.78
That there is supervision of the visitors' behavior toward the animals in the attractions	14	2.9%	9	1.9%	0	0.0%	36	7.5%	418	87.6%	477	4.75
Natural environment												**4.72** (Female 4.73 Male 4.68)
That the animal enclosures are of a 'good size'	15	3.1%	10	2.1%	2	0.4%	30	6.3%	420	88.1%	477	4.74
That animal enclosures replicate native habitats	12	2.5%	10	2.1%	8	1.7%	56	11.7%	391	82.0%	477	4.69
That animals are kept in their natural environment/habitat	13	2.7%	9	1.9%	6	1.3%	33	6.9%	416	87.2%	477	4.74
Natural behavior of animals												**4.34** (Female 4.36 Male 4.21)
That the animals express natural behavior	18	3.8%	14	2.9%	25	5.2%	65	13.6%	355	74.4%	477	4.52
That the animal enclosures contain stimulating materials	27	5.7%	26	5.5%	63	13.2%	87	18.2%	274	57.4%	477	4.16
Safety												**4.28** (Female 4.29 Male 4.23)
That the animal shows and exhibits do not constitute any risk for the audience	20	4.2%	20	4.2%	50	10.5%	122	25.6%	265	55.6%	477	4.24
That the animal shows and exhibits do not constitute any risk for staff/performers	20	4.2%	14	2.9%	48	10.1%	107	22.4%	288	60.4%	477	4.32
Displayed animals' origin												**4.55** Female 4.56 Male 4.51)
That the attraction displays rescued wildlife, rather than animals that were simply captured in the wild	22	4.6%	15	3.1%	20	4.2%	41	8.6%	379	79.5%	477	4.55

All the conditions were rated at more than four, this means that all the conditions presented in the questionnaire were rated as important by the respondents. Furthermore, all averages were close to five, which indicates

that conditions were valued as very important. The highest mean was for treatment of animals (4.81), followed by zoo keepers' background and behavior (4.77), and visitors' behavior (4.76). The lowest mean was for safety (4.28) and natural behavior of animals (4.34), but still with a high rate. In this table, there were also differences between females and males, it was possible to observe that in all dimensions females rated higher than males. The mean for the natural behavior dimension had the greatest difference between genders with a mean of 4.73 for females and 4.68 for males. The lower difference was in the visitors' behavior dimension with a mean of 4.77 for females and 4.74 for males.

3.3. Driving forces for ethical operation of animal-based attractions

Table 5 shows the importance that respondents gave to the dimensions of public opinion, and legal system and institutional supervision as driving forces for the ethical operation of animal-based attractions. There were six items, three for each dimension.

Table 5
Driving forces for ethical operation of animal-based attractions

Dimensions and items	1 Strongly disagree		2 Disagree		3 Neither agree nor disagree		4 Agree		5 Strongly agree		Total	
	n	N%	n	N%	n	N%	n	N%	n	N%	N	Mean
Public opinion												3.65 (Female 3.54 Male 3.75)
Increasing public awareness regarding animal welfare made animal attractions more sensitive in their treatment of animals	24	5.0%	52	10.9%	110	23.1%	173	36.3%	118	24.7%	477	3.65
The concern of negative public relations has made animal attractions more sensitive in their treatment of animals	28	5.9%	52	10.9%	101	21.2%	178	37.3%	118	24.7%	477	3.64
Animal attractions have an interest in being more sensitive in their treatment of animals because it is good for business	57	11.9%	51	10.7%	116	24.3%	137	28.7%	116	24.3%	477	3.43
Legal system and institutional supervision												**3.58** (Female 3.41 Male 3.71)
Animal rights organizations have led to improvements in the welfare of animals in attractions	26	5.5%	49	10.3%	102	21.4%	178	37.3%	122	25.6%	477	3.67
Today there are much more regulations to ensure the welfare of animals in attractions	37	7.8%	64	13.4%	105	22.0%	167	35.0%	104	21.8%	477	3.50
Today there is much more governmental control over the way animals are treated in attractions	55	11.5%	79	16.6%	139	29.1%	131	27.5%	73	15.3%	477	3.18

The results showed that respondents neither agreed neither disagreed with the statements that public opinion, and legal system and institutional supervision were driving forces for more ethical animal-based attractions. In this case, differences between females and males were larger, but both neither agreed nor disagreed with the statements. In both cases, respondents opined that the power of the media and public opinion have a major impact on the ethical operations of animal-based attractions compared to the legal system and institutional supervision.

3.4. Participants' ethical attitudes toward animal-based attractions

In Table 6 the ethical attitudes toward eight specific animal-based attractions: safari or wildlife park; aquarium; zoo; animal theme park; animal circus; rodeo; animal racing, and bullfighting, can be seen.

Table 6
Participants' ethical attitudes toward animal-based attractions

Dimensions and items	1 Strongly disagree		2 Disagree		3 Neither agree nor disagree		4 Agree		5 Strongly agree		Total	
	n	N%	n	N%	n	N%	n	N%	n	N%	N	Mean
Safari or wildlife park	31	6.5%	25	5.2%	55	11.5%	206	43.2%	160	33.5%	477	3.92 (Female 3.89 Male 4.07)
Aquarium	123	25.8%	75	15.7%	92	19.3%	141	29.6%	46	9.6%	477	2.82 (Female 2.75 Male 3.19)
Zoo	172	36.1%	98	20.5%	91	19.1%	83	17.4%	33	6.9%	477	2.39 (Female 2.33 Male 2.75)
Animal theme park	168	35.2%	113	23.7%	101	21.2%	61	12.8%	34	7.1%	477	2.33 (Female 2.28 Male 2.65)
Animal circus	337	70.6%	72	15.1%	42	8.8%	13	2.7%	13	2.7%	477	1.52 (Female 1.47 Male 1.78)
Rodeo	320	67.1%	67	14.0%	52	10.9%	19	4.0%	19	4.0%	477	1.64 (Female 1.58 Male 1.97)
Animal racing	329	69.0%	64	13.4%	45	9.4%	19	4.0%	20	4.2%	477	1.61 (Female 1.53 Male 2.07)
Bullfighting	390	81.8%	37	7.8%	16	3.4%	13	2.7%	21	4.4%	477	1.40 (Female 1.37 Male 1.59)

There were great differences between the most and the least ethically acceptable attractions. As shown, all of the animal-based attractions had a minimum of acceptance among the respondents. The highest mean was for safaris or wildlife parks (3.92) and the lowest mean was for bullfighting (1.40) and circuses (1.52). There were also great differences between females and males when considering whether each of the attractions was ethical por not. The greatest difference was found for aquariums and zoos with a mean of 2.75 and 2.33 for females, and 3.19 and 2.75 for males, respectively.

3.5. Pearson correlations between ethical evaluation of and attitudes toward animal-based attractions

Pearson correlations between ethical evaluation of and ethical attitudes toward each of the animal-based attractions were calculated.

Table 7
Pearson correlations between ethical evaluation of and attitudes towards animal-based attractions

	Safari or wildlife park	Aquarium	Zoo	Animal theme park	Animal circus	Rodeo	Animal racing	Bull fighting
Justifications for having animal-based attractions								
Conservation	**.409****	**.579****	**.590****	**.570****	**.400****	**.341****	**.321****	**.283****
Family-oriented experience	**.381****	**.499****	**.554****	**.539****	**.401****	**.356****	**.335****	**.263****
Education	**.416****	**.586****	**.620****	**.614****	**.416****	**.353****	**.321****	**.252****
Alternative to nature	**.410****	**.468****	**.466****	**.458****	**.317****	**.268****	**.271****	**.236****
Scientific research	**.376****	**.491****	**.500****	**.460****	**.293****	**.264****	**.222****	**.214****

Table 7 ***(continued)***

Entertainment	**.356****	**.441****	**.443****	**.434****	**.346****	**.306****	**.315****	**.250****
Benefits to individual animals	**.351****	**.501****	**.515****	**.489****	**.384****	**.323****	**.295****	**.292****
Regulations of wildlife	**.333****	**.469****	**.516****	**.512****	**.395****	**.327****	**.319****	**.320****
Conditions for ethical operations of animal-based attractions								
Treatment of animals	**.149****	0.013	0.001	0.038	0.029	0.028	-0.030	-0.037
Zoo keepers' background and behavior	**.135****	-0.020	-0.028	0.029	0.000	0.005	-0.071	-0.059
Training methods	**.133****	0.016	-0.005	0.042	0.007	-0.013	-0.081	-0.064
Visitors' behavior	**.133****	-0.006	-0.025	0.036	0.009	0.010	-0.073	-0.034
Natural environment	**.120****	-0.017	-0.035	0.023	0.013	0.006	-0.049	-0.049
Natural behavior of animals	0.084	-0.017	-0.034	-0.021	-0.024	-0.050	-0.057	-0.049
Safety	**.206****	**.137****	**.139****	**.147****	**.144****	**.106***	0.065	**.114***
Displayed animals' origin	**.182****	0.063	0.021	0.023	-0.030	-0.026	-0.066	-0.071
Driving forces for ethical operation of animal-based attractions								
Public opinion	**.264****	**.237****	**.210****	**.248****	**.214****	**.147****	**.096***	**.109***
Legal system and institutional supervision	**.337****	**.275****	**.270****	**.285****	**.218****	**.194****	**.133****	**.121****

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As shown in Table 7, all the dimensions of justifications for having animal-based attractions and driving forces for ethical operation of animal-based attractions were positively correlated with all the animal-based attractions. Apart from the dimension of public opinion, whose correlation was significant at the 0.05 level with animal racing and bullfighting, the rest of the dimensions had a significant correlation at the 0.01 level with each of the animal-based attractions. Regarding conditions for ethical operations of animal-based attractions, only safaris or wildlife parks were correlated with seven of the dimensions, the only dimension that was not correlated was natural behavior of animals. Animal racing was not correlated with any of the dimensions. Safety was the only dimension correlated with seven of the animal-based attractions (with the previously mentioned exception of animal racing).

4. Discussion and conclusion

The results indicate that Generation Z does not justify the existence of animal-based attractions, they disagreed or even strongly disagreed with each of the justifications presented in the questionnaire. These results, as might be expected given the characteristics of Generation Z and as presented in the introduction, would place Generation Z in the animal rights perspective of Yerbury et al (2017), which rejects captivity for any reason. This disagreement is valid for all genders, although females had a stronger disagreement than males. This could be due the more ecocentric and responsible attitudes and behaviors of females reported in other studies (Adongo et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2019; Media Subasi & Serap Gökbel, 2019; Müderrisoglu & Altanlar, 2011; Navrátil et al., 2016), which would place the findings in one of the eight ethical positions in animal ethics research analyzed by Winter (2020), that of ecofeminism. This is interesting, considering the reflection of Salleh in the book Ecofeminism (2014, p. 9) which says:

> Ecofeminism is the only political framework I know of that can spell out the historical links between neoliberal capital, militarism, corporate science, worker alienation, domestic violence, reproductive technologies, sex tourism, child molestation, neocolonialism, Islamophobia, extractivism, nuclear weapons, industrial toxics, land and water grabs, deforestation, genetic engineering, climate change and the myth of modern progress it is possible to expand all these fields to the tourism research, related them with ecofeminism.

There are two more points to highlight, one is that two of the justifications that obtained lower means were regulation of wildlife and conservation. This is in contrast with the concerns of the 2030 Agenda and other sustainable tourism measuring initiatives, where the main concern is the preservation of species, as stated in the introduction. The other finding to highlight is that the most valid justification for Generation Z was the existence of animal-based attractions as alternatives to nature. This justification was based on the alternative to people that cannot afford to see animals in their wildlife and to see animals in a safe and secure environment. So, there is a solidarity component on this justification, which is consistent with the description presented in the introduction on the characteristics of Generation Z. The second justification with a higher mean was scientific research, even higher than entertainment and education, and that is interesting because people from 11 to 26 years old are supposed not to be very interested in scientific research. Similarly, this applies not only to young people, but people in general, as stated in Shani's study, where the author stated that "Scientific research might also be viewed as an uninteresting and unexciting topic" (Shani, 2012). These two findings also open possible fields of research in the area of animal ethics. On the one hand, relating animal ethics to sustainability and analyzing why the 2030 Agenda has left out its concerns with the use of animals. On the other hand, broadening the knowledge about Generation Z and exploring those data obtained in this research that have been more surprising, such as how the solidarity of this generation could have an influence on their decisions.

Concerning the conditions in which animals must be treated for Generation Z respondents, all the conditions presented in the questionnaire were important, with means touching the very important level. The most important for Generation Z was the treatment of animals and zoo keepers' background and behavior. However, there were few differences between the different conditions presented. The less important condition was safety, which was surprising because the most accepted justification was, as explained before, the animal-based attractions as alternatives to nature, which included the opportunity to see wildlife for people that cannot afford to see them in their natural habitat. This justification also included the animal-based attractions as an alternative to seeing wildlife in a safe and secure place. Nevertheless, from the three items that were included in the alternative to nature dimension, the item that obtained the lower mean was that animal attractions were a safe and secure alternative to seeing wildlife in their natural habitats. Therefore, it could reinforce the idea that the most accepted justification was based on solidarity. Once this justification was chosen for solidarity with people, Generation Z was less concerned about the safety of visitors and staff. There were no great differences between gender of Generation Z concerning the importance given to animal conditions, but in all cases, females gave a greater importance than males. It is worthy to point to the fact that the conditions in which animals must be treated were not significantly correlated with ethical attitudes toward animal-based attractions. Although Generation Z respondents thought that the conditions of animals in the attractions were important, they did not justify the attractions whatever the conditions were. Generation Z did not see as acceptable any of the animals' attractions presented in the questionnaire. There were four animal-based attractions totally unacceptable for the respondents, three unacceptable, and only one that was neither acceptable nor unacceptable. These results are consistent with Vrij et al. (2003), whose results revealed that there was no need to use animals for entertainment, and the only participants' support for animal activities occurred when participants perceived there to be no choice other than using animals. The results were also consistent with Shani and Pizam (2008), who proclaimed that tourist organizations could no longer ignore criticism of animal use.

Attitudes toward zoos, aquariums, animal circuses, safari parks, and animal theme parks were significantly related to each of the justifications for the existence of animal-based attractions and with driving forces for the ethical operation of animal-based attractions. Although correlations do not prove causation, these correlations show that justifications and driving forces could influence a more positive opinion of the animal attractions by Generation Z respondents, but not enough to justify any of the attractions.

Generation Z's ethical vision of the use of animals in tourist attractions will lead over time to significant changes to animal-based attractions in tourism, and to a change in the ethical attitudes toward the use of animals in tourist attractions for all of society. Consequently, based on this study, it does not seem too far-fetched to say that Generation Z's care for animals could lead, in the future, to the demise of animal-based attractions. If this happens, the application of the animal rights perspective, which Winter (2020) reports as unrealistic based on her review of research into animal ethics in tourism, could cease to be so and become the main position in the research of animal-based attractions. However, as indicated in the introduction, new modes of animal-based tourism are proliferating. That may be due to the approval by other generations of the use of animals in attractions, in fact differences between generations lead to a different behavior of Generation Z from earlier generations (Chen et al., 2019).

The results of this research present a challenge to managers of tourism organizations that would decide if trying to change Generation Z's mind about use of animals, by better treatment offered to animals and by better information concerning this treatment; or if trying to find an alternative to animal-based attractions into more educative, respectful, and ethical animal attractions, that create an emotional connection with Generation Z is worthwhile. The results are also a challenge for national and international organizations, which, considering the results of this study, should rethink the importance and place of animals in society in general, but in tourism particularly. Specifically, the UNWTO, which should raise to include the treatment of animals in sustainability tools, as well as in the UNWTO Global Code of Ethics for Tourism.

This article is itself a challenge to explore new fields of research related to the use of animals in tourist activities and animal ethics, as well as continuing with those fields already explored but that need an update or expansion. Therefore, this article is presented as a necessary boost for research on animal ethics applied to tourism, as well as a further contribution to the knowledge of Generation Z, the generation of the present and the future.

References

Adongo, C.A., Taale, F., & Adam, I. (2018). Tourists' values and empathic attitude toward sustainable development in tourism. *Ecological Economics, 150*, 251–263. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.04.013

Ang, W.H.D., Shorey, S., Lopez, V., Chew, H.S.J., & Lau, Y. (2021). Generation Z undergraduate students' resilience during the COVID-19 pandemic: A qualitative study. *Current Psychology, 41*, 8132–8146. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-01830-4

Bogueva, D., & Marinova, D. (2020). Cultured meat and Australia's Generation Z. *Frontiers in Nutrition, 7*, Article 148. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2020.00148

Chaturvedi, P., Kulshreshtha, K., & Tripathi, V. (2020). Investigating the determinants of behavioral intentions of generation Z for recycled clothing: An evidence from a developing economy. *Young Consumers, 21*(4), 403–417. https://doi.org/10.1108/YC-03-2020-1110

Chen, M.-H., Chen, B.H., & Chi, C.G. (2019). Socially responsible investment by generation Z: A cross-cultural study of Taiwanese and American investors. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 28*(3), 334–350. https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2019.1525690

Corbisiero, F., & Ruspini, E. (2018). Millennials and Generation Z: Challenges and future perspectives for international tourism. *Journal of Tourism Futures, 4*(1), 3–6. https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-03-2018-069

Cui, Q., & Xu, H. (2019). Situating animal ethics in Thai elephant tourism. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint, 60*(3), 267–279. https://doi.org/10.1111/apv.12221

Danby, P., Dashper, K., & Finkel, R. (2019). Multispecies leisure: Human-animal interactions in leisure landscapes. *Leisure Studies, 38*(3), 291–302. https://doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2019.1628802

Dangmei, J., & Singh, A. (2016). Understanding the Generation Z: The future workforce. *South-Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 3*, 1–5.

Díaz, C. (2021). *La inclusión del análisis de género/sexo en las ciencias sociales y humanidades y en las ciencias de la vida* [The inclusion of gender/sex analysis in the social sciences and humanities and in the life sciences]. Universidade de Vigo.

Dolot, A. (2018). The characteristics of Generation Z. *E-Mentor, 74*, 44–50. https://doi.org/10.15219/em74.1351

Etikan, I. (2016). Comparision of snowball sampling and sequential sampling technique. *Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal, 3*(1), 6-7. https://doi.org/10.15406/bbij.2016.03.00055

Fennell, D.A. (2014). Exploring the boundaries of a new moral order for tourism's global code of ethics: An opinion piece on the position of animals in the tourism industry. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 22*(7), 983–996. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2014.918137

Fisken, F.A. (2019). Index to list of zoos and aquariums of the world. *International Zoo Yearbook, 53*(1), 463–477. https://doi.org/10.1111/izy.12242

Foris, D., & Bangala, S.I. (2021). Improving the management of tourist destinations: A new approach to strategic management at the DMO level by integrating lean techniques. *Lucrări Ştiinţifice Management Agricol, 23*(1), Article 1.

Foris, D., Florescu, A., Foris, T., & Barabas, S. (2020). Improving the management of tourist destinations: A new approach to strategic management at the dmo level by integrating lean techniques. *Sustainability, 12*(23), Article 10201. https://doi.org/10.3390/su122310201

Francis, T., & Hoefel, F. (2018). *Generation Z characteristics and its implications for companies*. McKinsey & Company. https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/consumer-packaged-goods/our-insights/true-gen-generation-z-and-its-implications-for-companies

García, F.M. (2018, June 22). *Declaración universal de los derechos de los animales* [Universal declaration of animal rights]. Mis Animales. https://misanimales.com/declaracion-universal-de-los-derechos-de-los-animales/

García, F.M. (2019, June 7). *Historia de los derechos de los animales* [History of animal rights]. Mis Animales. https://misanimales.com/historia-de-los-derechos-de-los-animales/

Goh, E., & Jie, F. (2019). To waste or not to waste: Exploring motivational factors of Generation Z hospitality employees towards food wastage in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 80*, 126–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.02.005

Haddouche, H., & Salomone, C. (2018). Generation Z and the tourist experience: Tourist stories and use of social networks. *Journal of Tourism Futures, 4*(1), 69–79. https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-12-2017-0059

Horsthemke, K. (2017). Biocentrism, ecocentrism, and African modal relationalism: Etieyibo, Metz, and Galgut on animals and African ethics. *Journal of Animal Ethics, 7*(2), 183–189. https://doi.org/10.5406/janimalethics.7.2.0183

Kamenidou, I.C., Mamalis, S.A., Pavlidis, S., & Bara, E.-Z.G. (2019). Segmenting the Generation Z cohort university students based on sustainable food consumption behavior: A preliminary study. *Sustainability, 11*(3), Article 837. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11030837

Kopnina, H. (2019). Anthropocentrism and post-humanism. In *The international encyclopedia of anthropology*. Wiley.

Levy, P., Lemeshow, S., & Ferketich, A. (2011). Sampling of populations: Methods and applications (4th ed.). Review. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series D (The Statistician), 42*(2), 199-200. https://doi.org/10.2307/2348995

Li, X., Li, X. (Robert), & Hudson, S. (2013). The application of generational theory to tourism consumer behavior: An American perspective. *Tourism Management, 37*, 147–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.01.015

López-González, J.L. (2018). Exploring discourse ethics for tourism transformation. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal, 66*(3), 269–281. https://hrcak.srce.hr/en/206161

Lucano Ramírez, H.N. (2018). A favor de los animales. Fragmentos filosóficos contra el especismo [In favor of animals. Philosophical fragments against speciesism]. *Derecho Animal. Forum of Animal Law Studies, 9*(3), 191-197. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/da.351

Media Subasi, B., & Serap Gökbel, S. (2019). Turkish nursing students' ecocentric, anthropocentric and antipathetic attitudes towards the environment. *International Archives of Nursing and Health Care, 5*(4), Article 138. https://doi.org/10.23937/2469-5823/1510138

Milotay, N. (2020). *Next generation or lost generation? Children, young people and the pandemic*. Think Tank. European Parliament. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document/EPRS_BRI(2020)659404

Müderrisoglu, H., & Altanlar, A. (2011). Attitudes and behaviors of undergraduate students toward environmental issues. *International Journal of Environmental Science & Technology, 8*(1), 159–168. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03326205

National Statistics Institute. (2021). *Población por comunidades, edad (año a año), Españoles/extranjeros, sexo y año* [Population by communities, age (year by year), Spaniards/foreigners, sex and year]. INE. https://www.ine.es/jaxi/Tabla.htm?path=/t20/e245/p08/l0/&file=02003.px&L=0

Navrátil, J., Pícha, K., & Gilliam, V. (2016). The interest of visitors to protected natural areas in 'green' accommodation. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal, 64*(2), 159–174. https://hrcak.srce.hr/en/160523

Özkan, M., & Solmaz, B. (2017). Generation Z - The global market's new consumers- and their consumption habits: Generation Z consumption scale. *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 2*(5), 150–157. https://doi.org/10.26417/ejms.v5i1.p150-157

Robinson, V.M., & Schänzel, H.A. (2019). A tourism inflex: Generation Z travel experiences. *Journal of Tourism Futures, 5*(2), 127–141. https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-01-2019-0014

Sakdiyakorn, M., Golubovskaya, M., & Solnet, D. (2021). Understanding Generation Z through collective consciousness: Impacts for hospitality work and employment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 94*, Article 102822. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102822

Shani, A. (2012). A quantitative investigation of tourists' ethical attitudes toward animal-based attractions. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal, 60*(2), 139–158. https://hrcak.srce.hr/en/84560

Shani, A., & Pizam, A. (2010). The role of animal-based attractions in ecological sustainability: Current issues and controversies. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes, 2*(3), 281–298. https://doi.org/10.1108/17554211011052212

Shiva, V., Mies, M., & Salleh, A. (2014). *Ecofeminism*. Zed Books.

United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development (A/RES/70/1). https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda

von Essen, E., Lindsjö, J., & Berg, C. (2020). Instagranimal: Animal welfare and animal ethics challenges of animal-based tourism. *Animals, 10*(10), Article 10. https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10101830

Winter, C. (2020). A review of research into animal ethics in tourism: Launching the annals of tourism research curated collection on animal ethics in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 84*, Article 102989. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102989

World Tourism Organization. (2004). *Indicators of sustainable development for tourism destinations. A guidebook*. (English version). https://doi.org/10.18111/9789284407262

World Tourism Organization. (2018). *Statistical framework for measuring the sustainability of tourism*. https://www.unwto.org/standards/statistical-framework-for-measuring-the-sustainability-of-tourism

Yerbury, R., Boyd, W., Lloyd, D., & Brooks, A. (2017). Right to leisure? Refocusing on the dolphin. *Annals of Leisure Research, 20*(3), 368–385. https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2017.1314190

Yin, D., Gao, Q., & Zhu, H. (2021). Rethinking wildlife tourism and conservation during the COVID-19 pandemic: An animal ethics perspective. *Society & Natural Resources, 34*(10), 1423–1429. https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2021.1961042

Submitted: March 07, 2022
Revised: October 11, 2022
Accepted: December 20, 2022