Торайғыров университетінің
ҒЫЛЫМИ ЖУРНАЛЫ
НАУЧНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ
Торайгыров университета

ТОРАЙҒЫРОВ УНИВЕРСИТЕТІНІҢ ХАБАРШЫСЫ

Экономикалық сериясы
1997 жылдан бастап шығады

TORAIGHYROV UNIVERSITY

ВЕСТНИК ТОРАЙГЫРОВ УНИВЕРСИТЕТА

Экономическая серия
Издается с 1997 года

ISSN 2710-3552

№ 3 (2026)
Павлодар

НАУЧНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ
Торайгыров университета

Экономическая серия
выходит 4 раза в год

СВИДЕТЕЛЬСТВО
о постановке на переучет периодического печатного издания,
информационного агентства и сетевого издания
№ KZ93VPY00029686

выдано
Министерством информации и коммуникаций
Республики Казахстан

Тематическая направленность
публикация материалов в области экономики, управления,
финансов, бухгалтерского учета и аудита

Подписной индекс – 76133

https://doi.org/10.48081/BTOUEcon3.2026/ISSN2710-3552

Бас редакторы – главный редактор
Давиденко Л. М.
доктор PhD

Заместитель главного редактора — Гребнев Л.. С., *д.э.н., профессор*
Ответственный секретарь — Шеримова Н. М., *доктор PhD*

Редакция алқасы – Редакционная коллегия

Шмарловская Г. А.,	*д.э.н., профессор (Беларусь);*
Кунязов Е. К.,	*доктор PhD, доцент;*
Алмаз Толымбек,	*доктор PhD, профессор (США);*
Мукина Г. С.,	*доктор PhD,ассоц. профессор, доцент;*
Дугалова Г. Н.	д.э.н., профессор
Алтайбаева Ж. К.,	*к.э.н.*
Мусина А. Ж.,	*к.э.н., ассоц. профессор, доцент;*
Титков А. А.,	*к.э.н., доцент;*
Искакова З. С.	*технический редактор.*

За достоверность материалов и рекламы ответственность несут авторы и рекламодатели
Редакция оставляет за собой право на отклонение материалов
При использовании материалов журнала ссылка на «Вестник Торайгыров университета» обязательна

© Торайгыров университет

SRSTI 06.61.33

https://doi.org/10.48081/BTOUEcon3.2026/248-266

D. D. Yessimova[1], Kutay Oktay[2], Mahmut Vural[3], Kurtuluş Tuncer[4], B. N. Isabekov[5]
[1]L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University,
Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana;
[2,4]Kastamonu University,
Türkiye, Kastamonu;
[3]Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University,
Kyrgyzstan, Bishkek;
[5]K. I. Satbayev Kazakh National Research Technical University,
E. Turkebaev Institute of Project Management,
Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty.
[1]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3824-875X
[2]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0552-0913
[3]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8946-2540
[4]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5367-5509
[5]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9745-3756
*e-mail: esimova1973@gmail.com

TÜRKIYE'S STRATEGIC TOURISM DEVELOPMENT: KEY IMPLICATIONS FOR KAZAKHSTAN'S PAVLODAR REGION

Tourist destinations, in their simplest sense, are recognized today as key contributors to regional development and to the diversification of economies in emerging countries. With the increased competition among destinations driven by digitalization, branding, and sustainability concerns, the role of national tourism policies in shaping destination performance has been reconsidered. It is possible to mention that, despite this renewed interest, a synthesis of how strategic development frameworks have transformed tourist destinations into vehicles for regional growth over a long period has not been adequately presented in the literature. The purpose of this study is to examine how such frameworks have been applied to tourist destinations in Türkiye by addressing (i) the conceptual evolution of tourist destinations, (ii) Türkiye's strategic profile as a tourist destination,

and (iii) Türkiye's national tourism policy through the twelve National Development Plans prepared between 1963 and 2028. In this research, document analysis technique, one of the qualitative analysis methods, was used and the obtained data were gathered from primary sources such as the National Development Plans, the sectoral objectives of the Twelfth Development Plan, the World Heritage, Creative Cities and Cittaslow designations, the national parks inventory, and the relevant peer-reviewed literature. It has been determined that the development of tourist destinations in Türkiye has followed a centrally planned direction over sixty years, with the focus moving from a post-war emphasis on infrastructure to more recent concerns regarding branding, sustainability, and digitalization. In this context, it is recommended that emerging tourism economies, including those of the Pavlodar region in Kazakhstan, consider Türkiye's regional planning experience rather than adopting its practices directly.

Keywords: Tourist destinations, Strategic development, Tourism policy, Türkiye, Regional development, Development plans.

Introduction

A significant transformation has been underway in the global tourism industry in an age where destinations compete through their natural and cultural assets, as well as through digital visibility, brand strength, and sustainability credentials. The tourist destination, as a concept, is defined as an amalgam of tourism products that offers an integrated experience to consumers [5]. From this definition, it is understood that the tourist destination is not regarded only as a geographical unit of tourism activity. It has also been recognized as an instrument of regional economic policy in countries where tourism is treated as an important means of development.

In this context, the relationship between national strategic development frameworks and destination performance has become a question of practical importance for tourism authorities, planning bodies, and regional administrations. Türkiye, with its long-standing role as one of the leading tourist destinations in the world, offers a suitable case for the examination of this relationship. With the beginning of the Planned Period in 1963, an economic approach in which the public and private sectors were handled together was introduced in Türkiye. Since that time, twelve Development Plans have been prepared in order to direct the country's growth in different sectors, including tourism. With the Twelfth Development Plan (2024–2028), the target of placing Türkiye among the top three countries of the world in tourism revenues by 2053 has been set. For the

achievement of this target, it is thought that the bringing together of destination assets, policy instruments, and regional capacities is necessary.

It is possible to mention that Türkiye's tourism sector has been examined in the literature from different angles, including destination marketing [1], heritage tourism positioning [2] destination branding [3], strategic SWOT positioning, and policy analysis at the level of individual development plans [4]). On the other hand, a synthesis that connects the conceptual examination of tourist destinations with the long-term course of Türkiye's strategic planning has received limited attention. Such a synthesis would also be useful in drawing practical lessons for emerging tourism economies in the surrounding region. Concerning this, the present study has been designed to address such a gap.

The purpose of this study is to examine the strategic development of tourist destinations through the case of Türkiye, with reference to (i) the conceptual evolution of the tourist destination, (ii) the strategic profile of Türkiye as a destination, and (iii) the course of Türkiye's national tourism policy as it has been formed within its successive Development Plans. It is aimed to derive a set of policy-relevant observations applicable to other emerging tourism economies. Particular attention is given to the situation of the Pavlodar region of Kazakhstan, where comparable destination development efforts have recently been initiated.

The Pavlodar Region in Kazakhstan is among the regions where the tourism economy is in a developing stage. The Bayanaul National Park, which was established in 1985, is one of the earliest protected areas of the country. Both Kazakhstan and Türkiye have been shaped by a centralized planning tradition, and tourism has, in both contexts, been used as a tool of regional diversification. In Türkiye, tourism policies gained an institutional character with the establishment of the State Planning Organization in 1960 and the beginning of the planned development period in 1963 [4]. In this context, the Türkiye experience has been handled in the present study as a comparative reference for the Pavlodar case. The aim is to draw transferable strategic lessons rather than to imitate the Turkish model.

Tourism destinations: a conceptual examination

As a concept, a tourist destination is defined as the place to which a traveller temporarily moves and within which the touristic product is consumed [5]. Mengü [14], on the other hand, expressed the destination as the place where all touristic products and services are offered to tourists during temporary travels within the definition of tourism. Cerdá-Mansilla et al. [7] approach the destination not as a simple geographic entity, but as a system consisting of many interconnected parts within a holistic framework. From these definitions, it is understood that the tourist destination is not regarded only as a geographic point. It has also been

considered as a structure formed through the relations between supply, demand and stakeholder activity.

It is possible to mention that the demand structure within the tourism sector has been characterized by elasticity and by sensitivity to the tourist's perception [7]. Concerning this, promotional activities that influence consumer preferences may lead to increased visitor flows to a particular destination [8]. For demand to be attracted in a sustainable way, the tourist destination must contain elements that ensure and increase the tourist's satisfaction during the trip. These elements have been listed as accessibility, price, planned tours and activities, facilities offered, image, human resources, attraction centres, and supporting services [8].

Such complexity in the structure of destinations carries implications for destination management. Çakar [6] has indicated that the successful implementation of any tourist activity depends largely on a well-established stakeholder structure, which should be considered a fundamental element within the tourist destination system [6]. In this context, destinations should focus on sustainable destination issues in order to provide a competitive advantage appropriate to the conjuncture [9]. It has been understood that destination management and marketing constitutes an important factor for sustainable tourism activities [8], and that destination management organizations are expected to develop dynamic capabilities in order to achieve their own goals [10].

Another dimension of the destination concept has been brought forward through branding studies. It is important to provide a brand advantage to the destination in order to promote it and make it marketable. Destination branding has been described as a process that aims to promote the uniqueness of a tourist destination [3]. In this respect, it is possible to mention that destination branding connects destination uniqueness with international competitiveness.

With the rise of information and communication technologies, the conceptualization of destinations has shifted toward smart and technology-mediated forms. Developments in information and communication technologies have changed the traditional framework of tourism development and have brought a different feature to destinations [11]. Smart destinations have developed from the concept of smart cities, with which they share common elements and goals such as better governance within the region and a higher quality of life for residents. Such destinations use advanced technologies in the infrastructure of a geographical area in order to improve the urban experience. Their defining features have been listed as technology and digitalization, sustainability, accessibility, destination management, cultural heritage and creativity [7].

When these conceptual developments are considered as a whole, it is seen that the destination has moved from a traditional, supply-centred geographical

understanding toward a systemic and smart formulation. In this new understanding, digital and physical components are treated together, the cooperation of public, private and consumer parties is taken as a norm, and participatory governance is considered necessary. In other words, the strategic development of a country's destinations cannot be considered only in terms of its natural and cultural assets. It must also be addressed as the planned coordination of policy, technology, branding and stakeholder participation.

Türkiye as a tourist destination: strategic profile

Türkiye is located at the intersection of the European and Asian continents, and thanks to its unique geographical position, it functions as a bridge between these two continents. The country is a large peninsula geographically surrounded by seas on three sides and, having four seasons, is considered suitable for many types of tourism. In addition, many ancient civilizations such as the Ionian, Phrygian, Lydian and Hittite settled in Anatolian lands and left behind ruins that continue to create attractive historical areas for tourists [12]. Concerning this, Türkiye is a tourist destination not only regionally but also nationally, with different natural and cultural beauties in each region - a condition that requires specific tourism planning for each region [13].

It has been determined in studies on Türkiye's destination marketing that the country generally operates with a central structure, and the relative weakness of destination marketing management has been identified as an important deficiency of the Turkish tourism sector [14]. Özdemir and Demirel [15] have stated that Türkiye's rich cultural and natural beauties, the simultaneous availability of all four seasons, the geographical location and the young population stand as strengths in terms of tourism, while the rapid development of world tourism, ease of accessibility and the relative price advantage compared to European competitors have been identified as opportunities. Although Türkiye is progressing mostly with coastal tourism or 3S (sea, sun, sand) tourism, it also has destinations that allow alternative tourism types [15].

In this context, culture and heritage have been considered important opportunities for the development of a positive destination image. Heritage tourism can help destinations create a more positive image, and the interest of destinations in promoting their heritage and historical sites to visitors has increased over time [2]. UNESCO legally protects areas or landmarks of cultural, historical, scientific or other importance through an international agreement and designates these areas as World Heritage Sites in accordance with various criteria. Being on the heritage list makes the destination both recognized and distinctive, and the visibility of the areas designated as World Heritage continues to increase. Türkiye, at present, has twenty-one sites on the World Heritage List distributed across its different regions, ranging from Göreme National Park and the Rock Sites of Cappadocia to the Wooden Hypostyle Mosques of Medieval Anatolia.

The Creative Cities Network represents a complementary form of international recognition for tourist destinations. The UNESCO Creative Cities Network is a programme launched in 2004 to promote cooperation between cities that recognize culture and creativity as strategic drivers of sustainable urban development. Being included in the network makes the destination both recognized and differentiated. In this context, Türkiye has eight cities participating in the network across different categories, including music (Şanlıurfa, Kırşehir), crafts and folk art (Bursa, Kütahya), gastronomy (Afyonkarahisar, Hatay, Gaziantep) and design (İstanbul).

The Cittaslow network, founded in Italy in October 1999 in Chianti, Tuscany, presents a third recognition track. Türkiye is the third country in the world with the largest number of cities included in the Cittaslow network, with twenty-five cities currently participating. Being a Cittaslow, in addition to being on the World Heritage List and in the Creative City network, has been considered as another form of differentiating recognition that allows a destination to communicate a distinctive identity.

Beyond these international recognition tracks, Türkiye has natural assets that constitute the basis of nature-oriented destination development. In order to prevent the deterioration of the natural texture and to keep the region under control, historical and natural areas began to be determined through legal regulation in 1956 and are declared as «national parks». At present, forty-nine national parks have been listed as the best examples of Türkiye's natural beauties, distributed across provinces ranging from Yozgat to Afyonkarahisar–Denizli, and including such well-known sites as Uludağ, Köprülü Kanyon, Nemrut Dağı and Küre Dağları.

When this profile is examined, it is seen that Türkiye carries the asset base of a major tourist destination across multiple registers - heritage, creative urbanism, slow-city positioning and natural conservation. In this respect, the question is no longer whether Türkiye possesses the resources of a competitive destination, but whether the strategic-planning architecture under which these resources are coordinated produces the destination performance that is targeted.

Tourism policy and strategy in Türkiye: from the planned period to 2028

Politics, in its institutional sense, is the whole of the principles by which the activities of the state are regulated and realized in terms of purpose, method and content, and countries pursue the development of the country and its citizens through the policies they adopt in political and economic terms. Development, on the other hand, is a method for states to change the economic and sociocultural structure, with the increase in production and per capita national income standing as one of its principal expressions [17]. Concerning this, strategies are selected in line with policy and development goals, and plans are constructed in line with these strategies,

with the strategy outlining the general approach to achieve the set goals and the plan covering detailed actions for effective implementation.

National development plans have been designed to increase the common benefit of society. With the development of mass tourism, tourism planning has become a field of expertise and has developed its own technique by making use of the general planning methodology. It has been observed that the policy-making process in developing countries tends to be centralized [18] and in Türkiye, the central government has functioned as the sole decision-making authority in future planning. Without taking into account local conditions, central plans that include the tourism sector – a sector that requires operational decisions from day to day and from season to season – may be inadequate to meet basic needs [18]. It is possible to mention that the central planning approach to the development and management of tourism may be insufficient for a large country like Türkiye to meet the basic needs of many unique tourist destinations in different regions. In this context, regional planning has been considered the link between national and local development planning and has been described as having a more spatial dimension than national planning. In general, a regional planning approach is required for the integration of tourism into national development in Türkiye [18].

Community participation forms another dimension of tourism planning that has been emphasized in the literature. Community participation leads to positive attitudes towards tourism, and to ensure community support, community participation should be encouraged during the planning phase; having social support for tourism can have positive effects for the tourism industry and will also help achieve guest satisfaction [16].

The planned period in Türkiye started in 1963. Twelve Development Plans have been prepared, each of which is a written document that enables the state to determine its forward-looking five-year goals, strategies and sectoral priorities across every field from the economy and health to trade and tourism, with the most recent plan covering the years 2024–2028. With the Development Plans, it has been aimed to carry out the development of the country in a planned manner and to increase competitiveness and efficiency in every field [4]. When the chronological succession of plans is examined, the following sequence is observed:

1st Development Plan (1963–1967): Initiation of the planned period in Türkiye, with infrastructure-oriented priorities forming the basis of subsequent tourism considerations.

2nd Development Plan (1968–1972): Continuation of the foundational planning framework, with tourism positioned among the developing service sectors.

3rd Development Plan (1973–1977): Consolidation of sectoral planning under a maturing state-planning tradition.

4th Development Plan (1979–1983): Continued sectoral expansion within a difficult macroeconomic period.

5**th Development Plan (1985–1989):** Period of accelerated tourism investment under broader economic liberalization, with the tourism sector recognized as a strategic growth area.

6th Development Plan (1990–1994): Continued emphasis on tourism-led development and on capacity expansion.

7th Development Plan (1996–2000): Refinement of tourism policy instruments and increasing concern with quality.

8th Development Plan (2001–2005): Continuation of sectoral planning under structural economic reform.

9th Development Plan (2007–2013): Strategic alignment of sectoral planning with European integration considerations.

10th Development Plan (2014–2018): Increased emphasis on the quality and diversification of tourism activities.

11th Development Plan (2019–2023): Sectoral consolidation, branding concerns and competitiveness orientation.

12th Development Plan (2024–2028): Repositioning of tourism around long-horizon targets, brand identity, qualified tourism activities and digitalization.

Considering the quantitative targets of Türkiye's 12th Development Plan (2024–2028):

Target revenue (by 2028): $100 billion.

Number of tourists (by 2028): 82.3 million.

Average expenditure per tourist: $1,215.

Calculating the tourism multiplier effect (Macroeconomic Analysis):

The classical tourism expenditure multiplier is used to assess the impact of tourism expenditure on GDP and employment. (Tourism Income Multiplier – TIM):

$$TIM = \frac{1}{1 - c \cdot (1 - t) + m}$$

Linear form: TIM = 1 / (1 − c·(1 − t) + m)

Where:

c – is the marginal propensity to consume (MPC, for Türkiye ≈ 0.72);

t – is the tax/contribution rate (≈ 0.20);

m – is the marginal propensity to import (MPI, ≈ 0.25).

Calculation example:

$$TIM = \frac{1}{1 - 0{,}72 \cdot (1 - 0{,}20) + 0{,}25} = \frac{1}{1 - 0{,}576 + 0{,}25} = \frac{1}{0{,}674} \approx 1{,}48$$

Linear form: TIM = 1 / (1 − 0.72·(1 − 0.20) + 0.25) = 1 / (1 − 0.576 + 0.25) = 1 / 0.674 ≈ 1.48

Every $1 of direct revenue from export tourism services in Türkiye generates approximately $1.48 of total (direct and indirect) growth in the gross regional product through related industries (catering, transport, agriculture, handicrafts).

In the Twelfth Development Plan, Türkiye's target for the tourism sector has been determined as being among the top three countries in the world in tourism revenues by 2053. In addition, it has been aimed to become a unique brand with innovative service delivery while preserving tourism values. It is planned to achieve this goal by diversifying tourism, spreading it over twelve months and across the entire country, and focusing on qualified tourism activities for the upper-income group. Concerning this, the sectoral targets articulated for the period 2024–2028 include the increase of tourism income towards USD 100 billion, the increase of the number of visitors towards 82.3 million, and the increase of the average spend per visitor towards USD 1,215.

Tourism action plans are made on a provincial basis in line with the Development Plans, with the aim of connecting the centrally framed strategy to regional destination realities. The literature on the regional impact of tourism in Türkiye has consistently emphasized that exports need to be increased in underdeveloped and developing countries in order to achieve economic development, and tourism can provide the foreign exchange input needed for such development [20]. Concerning this, the impact of tourism on regional development has been examined through the contributions of foreign currency inflow to non-exportable touristic values, of state tax revenues and the income of all goods and service providers, and of the employment-increasing feature of the sector [12]. It has been understood that tourism contributes to regional development by ensuring that all resources belonging to the region are used efficiently to eliminate the differences between regions of a country [13].

Materials and methods

In this research, document analysis technique, one of the qualitative analysis methods, was used and the obtained data were analyzed through thematic structuring. Document analysis is a qualitative technique that systematically examines written texts, visual materials and institutional discourses in order to identify recurrent concepts, events and thematic patterns.

The data for this study consist of (i) Türkiye's twelve National Development Plans (1963–2028) and the Twelfth Development Plan's sectoral tourism targets, accessed through the official portal of the Presidency of the Republic of Türkiye, Strategy and Budget Office; (ii) the UNESCO World Heritage List and Creative Cities Network records for Türkiye; (iii) the Cittaslow network membership records for Türkiye; and (iv) the national park inventory maintained by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry of the Republic of Türkiye. In addition, peer-reviewed studies on Türkiye's tourism policy, destination marketing and regional tourism development have been examined in order to support the thematic structuring.

The analytical procedure has been carried out in three steps. The first step was the extraction of policy-relevant statements from each data source. The second step was the thematic clustering of the extracted statements under three categories. These categories were determined as destination assets, strategic planning structure, and policy targets. The third step was the synthesis of the clustered themes through cross-checking with the academic literature on Türkiye's tourism sector. As the study is conceptual and based on publicly available official documents and published academic sources, no ethics-committee procedure was required.

Results and discussion

When the materials examined above are considered as a whole, it is seen that Türkiye's destination development course carries three observable characteristics.

The first finding concerns the gap between assets and coordination. It has been determined that Türkiye possesses a wide asset base of internationally recognized destinations. These assets consist of twenty-one World Heritage Sites, eight UNESCO Creative Cities, twenty-five Cittaslow members and forty-nine national parks. On the other hand, the literature on the country's destination marketing has emphasized that the central structure of destination governance, combined with the relative weakness of destination marketing organizations, has constrained the conversion of this asset richness into competitive destination performance [1;15]. Concerning this, it is possible to mention that the strategic development of tourist destinations cannot be considered only as a question of asset accumulation. It also requires a well-functioning governance structure.

To synthesize the asset base referred to above, Table 1 displays an inventory of Türkiye's internationally recognized tourism assets across four major categories.

Table 1 – Türkiye's Internationally Recognized Tourism Asset Base by Category

Asset Category	Count	Recognition Type	Examples
UNESCO World Heritage Sites	21	International cultural/ natural recognition	Cappadocia & Göreme, Hattusha, Ephesus, Göbekli Tepe
UNESCO Creative Cities	8	Network-based cultural recognition	İstanbul (Design), Gaziantep (Gastronomy), Kütahya (Crafts)
Cittaslow members	25	Slow-living urban network	Seferihisar (founding, 2009), Akyaka, Gökçeada, Vize
National Parks	49	National-level protected area	Köprülü Kanyon, Munzur Vadisi, Mount Nemrut, Olympos

Note – Counts compiled from the inventories referred to in the conceptual examination of this study; examples are illustrative and non-exhaustive.

The second finding concerns the long-term shift in policy emphasis. When the twelve Development Plans are examined in chronological order, it has been observed that the earlier plans emphasized infrastructural priorities and the building of a planning framework. The more recent plans, particularly the Tenth, Eleventh and Twelfth, have shifted emphasis toward branding, diversification, qualified tourism, sustainability and digitalization. This direction of change is consistent with the international literature on how mature tourism economies move from a traditional supply-centred approach toward systemic and smart destination models [7]. It has been understood that Türkiye's strategic planning record has reflected this direction at the level of stated targets. On the other hand, the operational coordination between the central plans and regional destination management remains a recognized constraint [18].

The chronological direction of this policy shift can be observed in Table 2, which groups the twelve Development Plans into three strategic phases.

Table 2 – Three Strategic Phases in Türkiye's Tourism Policy across the Twelve Development Plans (1963–2028)

Phase	Plans	Period	Dominant Strategic Theme
Foundation	1st–4th	1963–1983	Establishment of the state-planning framework; tourism positioned as a developing service sector; basic infrastructural priorities
Expansion	5th–8th	1985–2005	Recognition of tourism as a strategic growth area; accelerated investment and capacity expansion; introduction of quality concerns
Strategic repositioning	9th–12th	2007–2028	Alignment with European integration considerations; long-horizon targets; brand identity; qualified tourism; sustainability and digitalization

Note – Phase boundaries are interpretive; individual plans contain transitional features.

The third finding concerns regional implications. The literature has emphasized that a regional planning approach is required for the integration of tourism into national development in Türkiye [18]. The contribution of tourism to regional development, on the other hand, has been documented in different Turkish regional cases [7; 12; 13]. In this context, the tourism action plans that are made on a provincial basis in line with the National Development Plans have

been considered as one of the principal instruments through which the centrally framed strategy is connected to regional realities. On the other hand, the same literature also indicates that this connection has not always functioned as expected.

When these findings are considered together, it is possible to mention that Türkiye's experience offers a case in which a strong asset base, a continuous planning tradition and a changing policy emphasis appear together. On the other hand, the recurring difficulty of coordinating central plans with regional destination realities has also been observed in the same case. In the present study, this difficulty has been seen as the central constraint in Türkiye's destination development.

Consider Bayanaul National Park: a key recreational cluster in the Pavlodar region.

Problem: Pronounced seasonality (2-2.5 months in the summer) and low average receipts (primarily domestic weekend tourism).

Application of Turkish experience: In Türkiye, the 9th-12th Development Plans transitioned from a narrow-season 3S tourism (Sea, Sun, and Sand) to year-round models (ecotourism, ethnotourism, wellness, and winter tourism).

We propose a calculation of the revenue growth potential for the Pavlodar region with the implementation of the Turkish branding and clustering model.

Let the current tourist flow to Bayanaul State National Park be N_0 people per year, with an average expenditure of E_0 (tenge).

Implementation of Turkish practices (creation of a DMO - Regional Destination Management Organization, branding, digital infrastructure) allows us to calculate the projected direct economic effect ΔY:

$$\Delta Y = N_0 \cdot \left((1 + g_N) \cdot E_0 \cdot (1 + g_E) - E_0\right)$$

Linear form: $\Delta Y = N_0 \cdot (1 + gN) \cdot E_0 \cdot (1 + gE) - N_0 \cdot E_0$

Where:

g_N – is the target increase in tourist flow due to interregional and international promotion (forecast: +15...20%);

g_E – is the increase in average tourist spending due to service diversification (eco-trails, ethno-villages, winter activities) (forecast: +25...30%).

If we assume a baseline tourist flow to the Bayanaul district of 100,000 people per year with an average expenditure of 25,000 tenge per person, then direct income amounts to 2.5 billion tenge. Applying the Turkish experience of diversifying services (g_E = +25 %) and expanding the season (g_N = +15 %) will increase direct revenue to:

$$Y_1 = 100\,000 \cdot (1 + 0{,}15) \cdot 25\,000 \cdot (1 + 0{,}25) = 115\,000 \cdot 31\,250 = 3{,}593\,750\,000 \text{ тенге.}$$

Linear form: Y1 = 100,000 ·(1 + 0.15) ·25,000 ·(1 + 0.25) = 115,000 ·31,250 = 3,593,750,000 tenge

The increase in direct income will amount to +1.09 billion tenge (+43.7 %), and taking into account the regional multiplier (TIM≈1.35 for the regions of Kazakhstan), the total economic effect for the economy of the Pavlodar region will reach ~1.47 billion tenge of additional revenues to the GRP.

Economic Evaluation and Transferability to the Pavlodar Region:

The 60-year Turkish experience demonstrates that long-term strategic planning generates significant macroeconomic benefits through the tourism multiplier effect (TIM ≈ 1.48). For an industrial region like Pavlodar (Kazakhstan), tourism development - primarily centered around Bayanaul National Park - presents a strategic path toward regional economic diversification.

Currently, the tourism sector in Pavlodar faces challenges of high seasonality and limited average spending per visitor. Applying Türkiye's policy instruments (evidenced in the 10th–12th Development Plans) allows for a shift from passive resource usage to active destination yield management. Quantitative projections show that implementing a structured Regional Destination Management Organization (DMO) in Pavlodar, alongside product diversification (all-season eco-tourism and cultural heritage routes), could increase average visitor spending by 25–30 % and extend the operational season, yielding an estimated 40 % + increase in direct tourism revenues for the local economy.

Conclusions

When the strategic development of tourist destinations in Türkiye is examined, it has been observed that it is based on policies such as long-term planned development, the diversification of recognized destination assets through World Heritage Sites, Creative Cities, Cittaslow membership and national parks, and a changing emphasis from infrastructure toward branding, sustainability and digitalization. From this, it is understood that the question regarding destinations in Türkiye is not whether the assets are sufficient. The assets are sufficient. The question is whether the strategic planning structure under which these assets are coordinated produces the targeted destination performance.

At this point, some suggestions can be made that can be recommended for inquiries regarding the strategic development of tourist destinations in emerging tourism economies and, in particular, the Pavlodar region of Kazakhstan. The scope of strategic destination development should point to a system in which national-level planning is complemented by regional-level destination management

organizations that have branding, digitalization and stakeholder coordination capacities. It is important that all parties, especially central planning authorities, regional administrations, destination management organizations and the local communities of host territories, act in harmony in line with a shared destination vision, in order for asset richness to be converted into competitive destination performance. It is recommended to ensure the active participation of regional administrations and local communities in plan formulation, while maintaining the long-term coherence that the centrally framed planning tradition provides. In addition, in this system, it is thought that it is necessary to place all kinds of mechanisms including digital destination platforms, sustainability indicators, brand-monitoring frameworks and community-participation channels, based on a certain vision that connects asset endowment, strategic intent and regional capacity.

When the recommendations articulated above are considered for the Pavlodar context, three implications can be drawn. The first concerns assets: the natural base of the region, including the Bayanaul National Park and the lake systems of the steppe, has to be brought together within a coordinated destination management framework rather than being approached as a collection of separate attractions. A second implication relates to governance: Pavlodar's centrally directed planning tradition may be channeled through a regional destination management organization charged with branding, digitalization and stakeholder coordination. The third concerns positioning: the diversification of the regional economy beyond its industrial profile would benefit from a long-term strategic frame, in line with the trajectory observed in the more recent Development Plans of Türkiye [7].

The findings of the present study open several directions for further research. It can be offered to those who are interested in this subject to conduct comparative studies between Türkiye and emerging tourism economies in Central Asia, including Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic, in order to test the transferability of specific planning instruments. A future study may also examine the role of digital destination platforms in connecting the centrally framed strategy with regional destination management. In addition, longitudinal studies that follow the implementation gap between the targets of successive Development Plans and the actual performance of selected destinations would contribute to the understanding of where the gap between assets and coordination becomes most visible. It is expected that such studies would contribute to the relevant literature by clarifying the conditions under which strategic development frameworks produce the targeted destination outcomes.

REFERENCES

1 **Alvarez, M. D.** Marketing of TÜRKIYE as a tourism destination / M. D. Alvarez // Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research. – 2010. – Vol. 21. – № 1. – P. 123–138. – https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2010.9687094

2 **Alvarez, M. D., Korzay, M.** TÜRKIYE as a heritage tourism destination: The role of knowledge / M. D. Alvarez, M. Korzay // Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management. – 2011. – Vol. 20. – № 3–4. – P. 425–440. – https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2011.539352

3 **Aziz, N., Kefallonitis, E., Friedman, B. A.** TÜRKIYE as a destination brand: Perceptions of United States visitors / N. Aziz, E. Kefallonitis, B. A. Friedman // American International Journal of Contemporary Research. – 2012. – Vol. 2. – № 9. – P. 211–221. [Electronic resource]. – http://www.aijcrnet.com/journals/Vol_2_No_9_September_2012/23.pdf.

4 **Batuhan, T.** On Birinci Kalkınma Planında turizm politikaları / T. Batuhan // Uluslararası Global Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi. – 2020. – Vol. 4. – № 2. – P. 77–84. – https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/1364404

5 **Buhalis, D.** Marketing the competitive destination of the future / D. Buhalis // Tourism Management. – 2000. – Vol. 21. – № 1. – P. 97–116. – https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(99)00095-3

6 **Çakar, K.** Critical success factors for tourist destination governance in times of crisis: A case study of Antalya, TÜRKIYE / K. Çakar // Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing. – 2018. – Vol. 35. – № 6. – P. 786–802. – https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2017.1421495

7 C**erdá-Mansilla, E., Tussyadiah, I., Campo, S., Rubio, N.** Smart destinations: A holistic view from researchers and managers to tourists and locals / E. Cerdá-Mansilla, I. Tussyadiah, S. Campo, N. Rubio // Tourism Management Perspectives. – 2024. – Vol. 51. – Art. 101223. – https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2024.101223

8 **Demirbaş, Ş., Bayram, M.** Destinasyon yönetimi ve pazarlaması araştırmaları üzerine sistematik literatür incelemesi / Ş. Demirbaş, M. Bayram // GSI Journals Serie A: Advancements in Tourism, Recreation and Sports Sciences. – 2022. – Vol. 5, № 2. – P. 223–241. – https://doi.org/10.53353/atrss.1099248

9 **Dinç, Y., Kömür, T., İlban, M. O.** Sürdürülebilir destinasyon yönetimi için bir model önerisi: Ayvalık örneği / Y. Dinç, T. Kömür, M. O. İlban // OPUS – Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi. – 2021. – Vol. 17. – № 37. – P. 4376–4399. – https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.896321

10 **Font, X., Torres-Delgado, A., Crabolu, G., Palomo Martinez, J., Kantenbacher, J., Miller, G.** The impact of sustainable tourism indicators on destination competitiveness: The European Tourism Indicator System / X. Font, A. Torres-Delgado, G. Crabolu, J. Palomo Martinez, J. Kantenbacher, G. Miller // Journal of Sustainable Tourism. – 2021. – Vol. 31. – № 7. – P. 1608–1630. – https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1910281

11 **Güven, B., Aydın, Ş.** Türkiye'de en çok turist çeken 10 turizm destinasyonunun destinasyon tanıtımında kullanılan web sitelerinin incelenmesi / B. Güven, Ş. Aydın // Journal of Tourism Research Institute. – 2022. – Vol. 3. – № 1. – P. 49–58. – https://doi.org/10.56161/jtri.1077598

12 **Kavaklı, E., Karakaş, A.** Turizmin bölgesel kalkınmaya etkisi üzerine bir inceleme / E. Kavaklı, A. Karakaş // Bartın Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi. – 2022. – Vol. 13. – № 25. – P. 37–50. – https://doi.org/10.47129/bartiniibf.1062961

13 **Kızıldemir, Ö., Sarışık, M.** Turist harcamalarının bölgesel kalkınmaya ekonomik etkileri: Adana örneği / Ö. Kızıldemir, M. Sarışık // Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies. – 2018. – Vol. 6. – № 2. – P. 128–142. – https://doi.org/10.21325/jotags.2018.204

14 **Mengü, C.** Turizmde destinasyon yönetimi / C. Mengü // Social Sciences Studies Journal. – 2017. – Vol. 3, № 12. – P. 2137–2149. – https://doi.org/10.26449/sssj.246

15 **Özdemir, Y., Demirel, T.** Prioritization of tourism strategies in TÜRKIYE using a SWOT–AHP analysis / Y. Özdemir, T. Demirel // International Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing. – 2018. – Vol. 3, № 2. – P. 34–45. [Electronic resource]. – https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339435083_Prioritization_of_Tourism_Strategies_in_TÜRKIYE_Using_a_SWOT-AHP_Analysis

16 **Reindrawati, D. Y.** Challenges of community participation in tourism planning in developing countries / D. Y. Reindrawati // Cogent Social Sciences. – 2023. – Vol. 9, № 1. – Art. 2164240. – https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2022.2164240

17 **Savaş, V.** Kalkınma ekonomisi / V. Savaş. – 2. baskı. – İstanbul : İTİA Nihad Sayer Yayın ve Yardım Vakfı Yayınları, 1979. – 430 p. [Electronic resource]. – https://kasif.mkutup.gov.tr/OPAC/Details/458509

18 **Tosun, C., Timothy, D. J.** Shortcomings in planning approaches to tourism development in developing countries: The case of TÜRKIYE / C. Tosun, D. J. Timothy // International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management. – 2001. – Vol. 13, № 7. – P. 352–359. – https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110110403910

19 **Yaşar, İ., Çetinkaya, Ç.** Turizmde popüler ülkelerin turizm politikaları ve Türkiye ile karşılaştırmalı analizi / İ. Yaşar, Ç. Çetinkaya // Uluslararası Anadolu

Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. – 2022. – Vol. 6, № 3. – P. 1018–1036. [Electronic resource]. – https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/2513470

20 **Yüksel, F., Bramwell, B., Yüksel, A.** Centralized and decentralized tourism governance in TÜRKIYE / F. Yüksel, B. Bramwell, A. Yüksel // Annals of Tourism Research. – 2005. – Vol. 32, № 4. – P. 859–886. – https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2004.09.003

Received 07.07.26.
Received in revised form 17.08.26.
Accepted for publication 26.08.26.

**Д. Д. Есимова[1], Кутай Октай[2], Махмут Вурал[3],*
Куртулуш Тунҷер[4], Б. Н. Исабеков[5]
[1]Л. Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті,
Қазақстан Республикасы, Астана қ.;
[2,4]Кастамону университеті,
Түркия Республикасы, Кастамону қ.;
[3]Қырғыз-Түрік Манас университеті,
Қырғызстан Республикасы, Бішкек қ.;
[5]Қ. И. Сәтбаев атындағы Қазақ ұлттық техникалық зерттеу университеті,
Е. Түркебаев атындағы жобаларды басқару институты,
Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ.
07.07.26 ж. баспаға түсті.
17.08.26 ж. түзетулерімен түсті.
26.08.26 ж. басып шығаруға қабылданды.

ТУРИЗМДІ СТРАТЕГИЯЛЫҚ ДАМЫТУ: ТҮРКИЯНЫҢ ПАВЛОДАР ОБЛЫСЫНА АРНАЛҒАН ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ

Туризм бағыттары, қарапайым мағынасында, бүгінде аймақтық дамуға және дамушы елдердегі экономиканы әртараптандыруға негізгі үлес қосатындар ретінде танылған. Цифрландыру, брендинг және тұрақтылық мәселелеріне байланысты бағыттар арасындағы бәсекелестіктің артуымен, ұлттық туризм саясатының бағыттар өнімділігін қалыптастырудағы рөлі қайта қарастырылды. Осы жаңа қызығушылыққа қарамастан, стратегиялық даму құрылымдарының туристік бағыттарды ұзақ уақыт бойы аймақтық өсу құралдарына қалай айналдырғаны туралы синтез әдебиетте жеткілікті түрде көрсетілмегенін айтуға болады. Бұл зерттеудің мақсаты – туристік

бағыттардың тұжырымдамалық эволюциясын, Түркияның туристік бағыт ретіндегі стратегиялық бейінін және 1963 және 2028 жылдар аралығында дайындалған он екі Ұлттық даму жоспары арқылы Түркияның ұлттық туризм саясатын қарастыру арқылы Түркиядағы туристік бағыттарға осындай құрылымдардың қалай қолданылғанын зерттеу. Бұл зерттеуде сапалық талдау әдістерінің бірі болып табылатын құжаттарды талдау әдісі қолданылды және алынған деректер Ұлттық даму жоспарлары, Он екінші даму жоспарының салалық мақсаттары, Дүниежүзілік мұра, Шығармашылық қалалар мен Циттаслоу белгілері, ұлттық саябақтар тізімдемесі және тиісті сараптамалық әдебиеттер сияқты бастапқы көздерден жиналды. Түркиядағы туристік бағыттардың дамуы алпыс жыл ішінде орталықтандырылған жоспарланған бағытты ұстанғаны, соғыстан кейінгі инфрақұрылымға баса назар аударудан брендингке, тұрақтылыққа және цифрландыруға қатысты соңғы мәселелерге назар аударғаны анықталды. Осыған байланысты, Қазақстанның Павлодар облысын қоса алғанда, дамып келе жатқан туризм экономикаларына Түркияның тәжірибелерін тікелей қабылдаудың орнына, оның аймақтық жоспарлау тәжірибесін ескеру ұсынылады.

Кілтті сөздер: Туристік бағыттар, Стратегиялық даму, Туризм саясаты, Түркия, Аймақтық даму, Даму жоспарлары.

**Д. Д. Есимова[1], Кутай Октай[2], Махмут Вурал[3],*
Куртулуш Тунцер[4], Б. Н. Исабеков[5]
[1]Евразийский национальный университет имени Л. Н. Гумилева,
Республика Казахстан, г. Астана;
[2,4]Университет Кастамону,
Турция, г. Кастамону;
[3]Кыргызско-Турецкий университет Манаса,
Республика Кыргызстан, г. Бишкек;
[5]Казахский Национальный технический исследовательский
университет имен К. И. Сатбаева, Институт управления
проектами имени Е. Туркебаева,
Республика Казахстан, г. Алматы.
Поступило в редакцию 07.07.26.
Поступило с исправлениями 17.08.26.
Принято в печать 26.08.26.

СТРАТЕГИЧЕСКОЕ РАЗВИТИЕ ТУРИЗМА: ОПЫТ ТУРЦИИ ДЛЯ ПАВЛОДАРСКОЙ ОБЛАСТИ КАЗАХСТАНА

Туристические направления в самом простом смысле сегодня признаются ключевыми факторами регионального развития и диверсификации экономики развивающихся стран. В условиях усиления конкуренции между туристическими направлениями, обусловленной цифровизацией, брендингом и вопросами устойчивого развития, роль национальной туристической политики в формировании эффективности туристических направлений была пересмотрена. Следует отметить, что, несмотря на этот возросший интерес, в литературе недостаточно полно представлен синтез того, как стратегические рамки развития превратили туристические направления в инструменты регионального роста на протяжении длительного периода. Цель данного исследования – изучить, как подобные концепции применялись к туристическим направлениям в Турции, рассматривая (i) концептуальную эволюцию туристических направлений, (ii) стратегический профиль Турции как туристического направления и (iii) национальную туристическую политику Турции в рамках двенадцати национальных планов развития, разработанных в период с 1963 по 2028 год. В данном исследовании использовался метод анализа документов, один из методов качественного анализа, а полученные данные были собраны из первичных источников, таких как национальные планы развития, отраслевые цели Двенадцатого плана развития, статусы объектов Всемирного наследия, креативных городов и Cittaslow, реестр национальных парков и соответствующая рецензируемая литература. Было установлено, что развитие туристических направлений в Турции на протяжении шестидесяти лет следовало централизованно-плановому направлению, при этом акцент сместился с послевоенного внимания к инфраструктуре на более современные вопросы, касающиеся брендинга, устойчивого развития и цифровизации. В этом контексте рекомендуется, чтобы развивающиеся туристические экономики, в том числе Павлодарская область Казахстана, учитывали опыт регионального планирования Турции, а не напрямую перенимали ее практику.

Ключевые слова: Туристические направления, Стратегическое развитие, Туристическая политика, Турция, Региональное развитие, Планы развития.

Теруге 07.09.2026 ж. жіберілді. Басуға 30.09.2026 ж. қол қойылды.
Электронды баспа
3,25 Mb RAM
Шартты баспа табағы 30,2
Компьютерде беттеген: З. С. Искакова
Корректоры: А. Р. Омарова, Д. А. Кожас
Тапсырыс № 4598

Сдано в набор 07.09.2026 г. Подписано в печать 30.09.2026 г.
Электронное издание
3,25 Mb RAM
Усл.п.л. 30,2
Компьютерная верстка: З. С. Искакова
Корректорлар: А. Р. Омарова, Д. А. Кожас
Заказ № 4598

«Toraighyrov University» баспасынан басылып шығарылған
Торайғыров университеті
140008, Павлодар қ., Ломов к., 64, 137 каб.

«Toraighyrov University» баспасы
Торайғыров университеті
140008, Павлодар қ., Ломов к., 64, 137 каб.
8 (7182) 67-36-69
e-mail: kereku@tou.edu.kz
www.vestnik.tou.edu.kz
www.vestnik-economic.tou.edu.kz