

2021

Socioeconomic Effect of Tourism in Nur-Sultan After EXPO-2017

Dana Kurmasheva
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [International Relations Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Dana A. Kurmasheva

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Anne Hacker, Committee Chairperson,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Victoria Landu-Adams, Committee Member,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Kristin Dailey, University Reviewer,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2021

Abstract

Socioeconomic Effect of Tourism in Nur-Sultan After EXPO-2017

by

Dana A. Kurmasheva

MA, Washington University, 2011

BS, Eurasian National University, 2006

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Administration

Walden University

August 2021

Abstract

Experts have studied tourism as an economic or social phenomenon but have overlooked its dual socioeconomic nature, which prevents public administrators from understanding the industry's impact on local communities. This qualitative study conducted in a city in Central Asia addressed this problem by considering the views of tourism stakeholders related to the industry's socioeconomic impact on the city's local community in 2017. The theoretical framework included corporate social responsibility theory and organizational economics theory. Open-ended interviews with 15 tourism stakeholders from the city's business, NGO, and government sectors provided data that were analyzed using two-cycle coding. Themes related to business, cultural and national identity awakening, educational revival, spatial greenification, proliferation of business and services, tourism's multiplier effects, economic safety valve mechanisms, and boosted country name recognition. Findings may promote social-oriented officials and policies to improve the quality of tourism-development strategies, budgeting, and real-life projection. Findings may also help the city's authorities define the pros and cons of tourism development to ensure responsible and sustainable development leading to positive social change.

Socioeconomic Effect of Tourism in Nur-Sultan After EXPO-2017

by

Dana A. Kurmasheva

MA, Washington University, 2011

BS, Eurasian National University, 2006

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Administration

Walden University

August 2021

Dedication

This PhD journey would not have been possible without the support of my beloved father, Abyl Khussainov. It was you who stayed behind the words of encouragement, patience, and determination, with which my momma, Khussainova Venera, inspired each of the steps on the road toward the degree. It was you who first incited the light of scientific curiosity and extended it into a fire that guided my persistence during this challenging yet exciting process. I want to thank my mother, Venera Khussainova, for making me contend and focus, not “to split the bowl with water” by being emotional and distracted. I will forever be humbled and appreciative of both of you. I dedicate this dissertation work to my family, especially to all my beautiful kids, Ayana, Aysulu, and Aydar, for their endurance and courage to stay alone while momma was overwhelmed with the research and writing. I also would like to dedicate this dissertation to my husband, soul mate, friend, and everyday inspirer for continuous multilevel support and encouragement. You stayed with me during ups and downs and reminded me of my PhD dream in critical times. You allowed me to face all the fears and proceed through them toward success.

Acknowledgments

I want to take this opportunity to thank several important people who ensured this dissertation's success. I very much appreciate all the efforts made by my ever-patient doctoral chair, Dr. Anne Hacker. She has been a driving force of positive encouragements that moved my intellectual ability toward completing this dissertation, framing my ideas into theories and methods to make this research valid and reliable. Dr. Hacker's willingness to always be available and provide timely, transparent, and concise feedback has encouraged my progress on this journey full of uncertainties, challenges, and concerns. This is the reason why my family calls Dr. Hacker Dana's PhD guardian angel. I also would like to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Victoria Landu-Adams, my second committee member, for providing feedback to advance my efforts along the way. Lastly, I would like to extend my appreciation to Dr. Josh Ozymy and Dr. Kristin Dailey, my university research reviewer committee members, for reviewing my dissertation and making valuable and needed suggestions.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Background	4
Problem Statement	9
Purpose of the Study	11
Research Question	12
Theoretical Framework.....	12
Nature of the Study	15
Definitions.....	15
Assumptions.....	18
Scope and Delimitations	18
Limitations	20
Significance.....	21
Summary	23
Chapter 2: Literature Review	24
Literature Search Strategy.....	25
Theoretical Foundation	27
Corporate Social Responsibility	29
Organizational Economics	33
Literature Review Related to Key Concepts.....	35
Summary and Conclusions	42

Chapter 3: Research Method.....	45
Research Design and Rationale	45
Role of the Researcher	48
Methodology	50
Participant Selection	51
Instrumentation	53
Procedures for Recruitment	55
Data Analysis Plan	56
Issues of Trustworthiness.....	64
Ethical Procedures	67
Summary	68
Chapter 4: Results.....	70
Settings.....	71
Demographics	72
Data Collection	72
Data Analysis	75
Evidence of Trustworthiness.....	77
Results.....	78
Corporate Social Responsibility Theory’s Codes and Themes	79
Organizational Economics Theory’s Codes and Themes	92
Summary	102
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	103

Interpretation of the Findings.....	103
Limitations of the Study.....	110
Recommendations.....	111
Implications.....	111
Conclusion	114
References.....	115
Appendix A: Letter Request to Stakeholders’ Organizations.....	143
Appendix B: Participant Invitation Letter With Consent Form.....	145
Appendix C: Letter Request to Tourism Department of the National Chamber of Entrepreneurs of the Republic of Kazakhstan With Interview Questions	148
Appendix D: List of Interview Questions.....	150
Appendix E: Tourism’s Socioeconomic Themes and Codes.....	152

List of Tables

Table 1. Examples of Parent and Secondary Codes 59

Table 2. Organization of Parent Codes and Themes Between the CSR and the OET 79

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Tourism is a dynamic industry that generates potential for economic growth and transforms social and economic environments of host populations. As the world's largest economic sector, tourism is third on the list of top industries after oil and automobile (United Nations World Tourism Organization [UNWTO], 2018a). The industry builds roads and new destinations, opens national borders, creates jobs, and drives export and investment inflows. Tourism fuels national economies and budgets with currency and becomes a lucrative source of government revenues. These benefits have attracted increased attention by experts and international organizations who continue intensive studying and analysis of the field and its effects on global and national levels (UNWTO, 2018a).

Tourism's economic effect has been well researched by experts and international organizations, including the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), UNWTO, World Economic Forum (WEF), and many others. These organizations have reached agreement on the list of tourism's economic impacts, but which one affects local communities and to what degree remains unknown and varies among destinations (Apostolopoulos et al., 2001). Tourism's social effects have been partially researched due to their sensitivity and vulnerability to human perceptions and behavior (Apostolopoulos et al., 2001). Moreover, the social effects of tourism are provoked by the expansion of tourism in the economic domain. This interrelationship between tourism's economic and social effects (socioeconomic effects), in which the first generates the second by directly impacting local communities, has been understudied and

varies among countries and destinations. These socioeconomic effects are even less understood in Nur-Sultan (capital of the Republic of Kazakhstan), the city that hosted a significant tourism booster event, the international exhibition EXPO in 2017 (EXPO-2017).

The current study was designed to address understudied areas of socioeconomic effects of tourism by applying the qualitative methodology to understand the industry's impact on the local community in Nur-Sultan after it hosted a significant tourism booster event, the international exhibition EXPO-2017. This city was selected as an appropriate place for data collection for several reasons that are discussed in Chapter 3. This study's results might create an original contribution to the body of knowledge on sustainable development of tourism by defining its socioeconomic impacts that are to be managed by public administrators and contribute to social change by promoting social-oriented tourism policies. Policies that consider socioeconomic implications of decision making in the tourism field could improve the quality of tourism development strategies, budgeting, and real-life projection. The results of this study may help Nur-Sultan authorities define the pros and cons of tourism development to ensure responsible tourism policy. Such management efforts might be made by reducing adverse effects on prices, wages, employment, environments, and culture. This approach is supported by supported by Mason (2008), Moterrubio et al. (2011), and MacNeil and Wozniak (2018). Avoiding hostility and public resentment against foreigners and tourism development is another factor that should be addressed (Adrian, 2017; Caric, 2018; Hritz & Cecil, 2019; Z. Liu et al., 2018; Lukasz & Michal, 2015). Finally, preserving tourism as a profitable industry

that drives the economic well-being of various social groups, including vulnerable people, is essential, as noted by Han and Haiyan (2018), Kozak and Kozak (2011), Kozhokulov et al. (2019), Lwoga (2018), MacNeill and Wozniak (2018), Moterrubio et al. (2011), and Nejati et al. (2014).

In Chapter, I discuss the background of tourism's socioeconomic effects by providing international context around tourism development in Kazakhstan after hosting the EXPO-2017 in its capital of Nur-Sultan. I also describe the scientific gap that this research filled and discuss the positive social change that it entailed. The purpose of the study was to explore the perception of stakeholder groups regarding the socioeconomic effects of tourism that impact Nur-Sultan local communities for local authorities to make informed decisions while managing the industry's development in the area. The research question addressed the problem that was rooted in the lack of knowledge on tourism's stakeholders' perception of the industry's socioeconomic effects and its impact on Nur-Sultan's local community. The study included a dual theoretical framework aligned with the qualitative nature of the study designed to conduct open-ended individual interviews with tourism stakeholders from business, NGOs, and government in Nur-Sultan. In Chapter, I also provide definitions that were unique as applied in this study, as well as assumptions, scope, delimitations, and limitations to clarify aspects on which this qualitative study was conducted. In the significance section, I explain how this research was conducted with consideration for the real-life and scientific demands surrounding the socioeconomic effects of tourism.

Background

Tourism plays a significant role as an international driver of world development. Tourism creates jobs, attracts export revenues and investments, and increases the domestic value-added depicting the industry's contribution to the country's economic growth (OECD, 2018). The sector generates 10% of the world's gross domestic product (GDP), 7% of global trade, and creates 1:10 jobs (UNWTO, 2018b). Annually, more than one million international tourists cross national borders to visit destinations and spend their money, and this number is increasing (UNWTO, 2018a).

In 2017 international tourist arrivals had increased by 7% and reached 1.3 billion despite global security and economic crisis-related challenges (UNWTO, 2018b). According to the UNWTO (2018a), 51% of visitors came from Europe, 24% from Asia and the Pacific, 16% from the Americas, and the rest from Africa and the Middle East. The tourists spent 1,340 billion U.S. dollars in 2017, which was a 4.9% increase in the international tourism-related paycheck (UNWTO, 2018a). The increase in tourists' spending entails higher expectations from tourism-related services.

International tourists prefer traveling by air and roads for leisure purposes. They are ready to pay more for comfortable and safe transportation (UNWTO, 2018b). This fact creates additional income to the industry that comes from passenger transportation services and hit the level of 240 billion U.S. dollars in 2017 (UNWTO, 2018a). If income from international tourists' paychecks is added to the income from their transportation expenditures, then in 2017 the tourism economy generated 1.6 trillion U.S. dollars in export and ranked third after chemicals, fuel, and automotive industries (UNWTO,

2018b). The economy of the tourism industry might be doubled if the UNWTO forecast is correct that there will be an increase in visitors by 40% by 2030 (UNWTO, 2018a). This potential for tourism-related growth has spurred the proliferation of tourism-related policies.

Almost all governments of Europe, Asia, the Pacific, Africa, and the Americas have recognized tourism as one of the top 10 drivers of national economies (OECD, 2018). This recognition comes with tourism-related policy changes, budget increases, and infrastructural development (UNWTO, 2018b). Such trends have incited the growth of tourism's economic and social impact on local communities. These trends increased the number of experts and international organizations, including the United Nations, the UNWTO, and the WEF to agree that there is a gap in governments' efforts to manage the industry by creating a relatively new phenomenon known as overtourism (UNWTO, 2018a; WEF, 2019). The term *overtourism* is used to highlight the adverse side effects of tourism development when it is not adequately managed. The UNWTO believes that all tourism destinations have a carrying capacity or the maximum number of visitors that may visit without destroying the place. The UNWTO (2019) presented the following definition of the term: "Overtourism is an impact of tourism on a destination, or parts thereof, that excessively influences perceived quality of life of citizens and quality of visitor experience in a negative way" (p. 6).

Overtourism has spurred public resentments around the world and pushed global experts and international organizations to urge governments to develop effective tourism policies for promoting inclusive growth and development (OECD, 2018; UNWTO,

2018a; WEF, 2019). Global experts and international organizations have argued that an in-depth understanding of tourism's socioeconomic effects will transform the logic of economic development by moving it from a mass-consuming culture toward sustainability and protection of local communities' interests (WEF, 2017). Growth of tourism's profitability with pervasive governments' mismanagement has impacted countries around the world, including Kazakhstan.

Kazakhstan's government acquired international experience and studied the best practices of tourism's development. In 2016 Kazakhstan's government decided to include tourism in the top six industries to drive diversification of the national economy. One year later, the government framed Kazakhstan's policy on tourism development in a document entitled *The Concept on Tourism Development in the Republic of Kazakhstan* (Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2017). After the World EXPO-2017, the government decided to support tourism-related policy documents by practical steps with allocated governmental funds. In 2019, Kazakhstan adopted *The State Program on Tourism Development until 2025*. The programs' budget equals 1.3 trillion tenges (Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2019). Such tangible changes in Kazakhstan's tourism development boosted by the World EXPO-2017 brought new opportunities to fuel the national economy.

The World EXPO-2017 was an international exhibition of manufactured products that traditionally influence art, design, international trade, intergovernmental relations, and tourism (Seitzhanova, 2018). By producing the most significant impact on tourism development, the exhibition joined the range of top three international tourism-gearing-

up events after the Olympic Games and the FIFA World Cup (Seitzhanova, 2018). The first World EXPO was held in France, followed by other exhibitions in Europe, Asia, and the United States. Kazakhstan's capital, Nur-Sultan, was selected to host EXPO in 2017. The event left a visible imprint on Kazakhstan's economy and revealed the need to generate new knowledge on forms and methods of tourism's development in the country.

The World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC, 2018) stated that the direct contribution of tourism to the national GDP increased from 1.6% in 2016 to 1.9% in 2017. That same year the total contribution of tourism to the economy had reached a historic high of 6.0% (WTTC, 2018). Employment's direct input reached 2.1% (180,500 jobs), and the total exceeded 5.9% (502 500 jobs). Visitor exports generated around 2 million U.S. dollars and accounted for 3.6% of the total export. Total investment constituted 5.6% of total investment (WTTC, 2018). Such outstanding numbers of service industry in oil-dependent Kazakhstan entailed strategic changes in the government's policy brain.

The World EXPO-2017 success changed Kazakhstan's development priorities by strengthening the focus on the service economy centered on tourism and the economic tools of its development. Both strategic documents, the Concept on Tourism Development and the State Program, have proved this predominant economic focus. The documents allocated all governmental funds on building tourism infrastructure, strengthening tourists' security facilities, and advertising on domestic and international markets (Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2019). Kazakhstan's new tourism-

related policy did not consider tourism's socioeconomic impact on local communities, although some governments around the world took it as the main indicator.

Many countries have made the mistake of declaring tourism as one of their economic priorities without considering its socioeconomic effect on local communities. This fact has been recognized in the latest report by the UNWTO in which tourism's disproportional impact was underlined when its macroeconomic effects did not lead to improvements in indigenous societies (UNWTO, 2018b). Tourism has increased interaction with local communities by producing positive and negative impacts on their social and economic constructs (Andereck & Jurowski, 2006). Such ambivalence in the absence of socioeconomic tourism-related policies has provoked various forms of resentment against foreigners and the tourism industry itself (Alberti & Giusti, 2012; Caric, 2018; Moterrubio et al., 2011; Narendra & Riann, 2017). Ambivalence also undermines tourism's potential to generate socioeconomic progress (H. Liu & Song, 2018; Lukasz & Michal, 2015). This maladaptive administrative type can be addressed by defining a qualitative approach to understand tourism's socioeconomic effects (Diaz-Bone & Didier, 2016; Miller & Auyong, 1991; UNWTO, 2018a) in Nur-Sultan.

The problem exists for various reasons. The first reason is that some researchers have studied tourism's social, ecological, and economic effects separately (Adrian, 2017; Estevao et al., 2017; Han & Haiyan, 2018; Lukasz & Michal, 2015; Moterrubio et al., 2011; Narendra & Rianna, 2017; WEF, 2017; UNWTO, 2018b). The second reason is that some researchers have focused on qualitative analysis for social effects while using quantitative analysis for economic effects (Adrian, 2017; Assaf & Tsionas, 2019;

Cooperrider et al., 2008; Han & Haiyan, 2018; Kozak & Kozak, 2015a; Lukasz & Michal, 2015; Mason, 2008; Mitchell & Murphy, 2006; Moterrubio et al. 2011; Narendra & Rianna, 2017; Nejati et al., 2014; UNWTO, 2018a; WEF 2017). The third reason is that study on joint socioeconomic effects of tourism is rare and relatively new for the field. All of these facts have created a gap in the knowledge on tourism's effects and how it should be studied for public management purposes (Lusticky & Musil, 2018).

The current qualitative study addressed this gap in the absence of a comprehensive framework to understand socioeconomic effects of tourism and its impact on Nur-Sultan's local community. I used tools of qualitative analysis to generate a list of the effects to provide central and local authorities with information to reconsider tourism-related policies through the prism of sustainability (see Adrian, 2017; Estevas et al., 2017; Han & Haiyan, 2018; UNWTO, 2018a) This study was needed to provide public tourism managers in Nur-Sultan with a list of tourism's socioeconomic effects after the EXPO-2017. Findings may enhance their abilities to understand the impact and craft meaningful policies for further tourism management purposes.

Problem Statement

The problem of this study was a limited understanding of tourism's socioeconomic effects (see Kriegler et al., 2012) as vital policymaking consideration in the tourism field (see Butler & Russell, 2010; Kozak & Kozak, 2015b; Miller & Auyong, 1991; Muller, 2014). I proceeded from the fact that each study on the effects produced distinctive lists of tourism's socioeconomic themes indicative of the social and economic needs of a researched population (see Ateljevic, 2014; Balazik, 2016; Barca, 2012;

Brauer et al., 2019; Gillen & Mostafanezhad, 2019; Gwenthure & Odhiambo, 2017; Monterrubio et al., 2018; Njoroge et al., 2017; Sawant, 2017; Tazim & Robinson, 2010). These facts had defined the following research problem: It is unknown how various stakeholder groups perceive the socioeconomic effects of tourism in Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan, following EXPO-2017.

Understanding tourism's socioeconomic effects on host communities was one of the pillars in the system of industry's negative side effects' management, which provoked public resentment against tourism and its development (Butler & Russell, 2010; Kozak & Kozak, 2015a; OECD, 2018; UNWTO, 2018a; WEF, 2017). In the latest reports, some international organizations considered the absence of national tourism management systems as one of the most significant challenges to the industry's development and advised national governments to establish one (OECD, 2018; UNWTO, 2018b). Experts studied the social and economic effects of tourism for decades and proposed approaches to understand and measure them. Mathieson and Wall (1982) were among the first who considered tourism as a public event with direct economic and social impacts. Later Cole and Morgan (2010) reported diversification and sophistication of tourism-related impacts and divided them into economic, environmental, social, cultural, and political and together with Monterrubio et al. (2011) and Caric (2018) grouped them into negative and positive categories. The UNWTO (2019) and the WEF (2017) defined a universal list of economic effects and the technique of its statistical measurement. Uysal et al. (2019) built on the UNWTO and the WEF findings and set up a list of social and economic

impacts. Understanding of tourism's socioeconomic effects started emerging recently with a few reliable studies on the subject.

The current study addressed the problem and contributed to the body of knowledge on the socioeconomic effects of tourism in Nur-Sultan after EXPO-2017 through open-ended interviews to identify socioeconomic themes that were indicative for tourism stakeholders in Nur-Sultan. Findings may contribute to local authorities' efforts to develop sustainable people-oriented policies by considering tourism's power to change socioeconomic constructs of Nur-Sultan's community.

Purpose of the Study

This qualitative study addressed the perceptions of stakeholder groups on the socioeconomic effects of tourism in Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan, following EXPO-2017. The transformative power of tourism's socioeconomic impacts had been recognized in studies conducted by Kozak and Kozak (2015b); UNWTO (2016); WEF (2017); Murphy (2015); Howell (2002); Monterrubio, Osorio, and Benitez (2018); Sawant (2017); Njoroge et al. (2017); and Balazik (2016). Researchers also agreed that tourism's socioeconomic effects are not universal and vary among destinations by being unique for each case study. These facts remained relevant for Kazakhstan, where some research on tourism's socioeconomic impacts was conducted with the latest one in East Region (Aliyeva et al., 2019). However, the research had not produced a list of socioeconomic effects of tourism indicative of the region and themes recommended by the UNWTO.

The absence of an internationally recognized list of tourism's socioeconomic effects proceeded from tourism's continually evolving nature that had been shown in

research conducted by MacNeil and Wozniak (2018), Gursoy et al. (2019), Lwoga (2018), Bernardo and Jorge (2019), Hritz and Cecil (2019), Suleyman et al., (2019), Tembi and Sakhile (2019), and Ramgulam and Singh (2017). Therefore, I concluded that the current study's contribution would be twofold. First, it would produce a list of socioeconomic themes developed in interviews with tourism stakeholders unique and applicable for Nur-Sultan. Second, it would extend borders of existing knowledge on the subject and create an original contribution to the body of knowledge on tourism's socioeconomic effects.

Research Question

The following research question guided this study: How do business leaders, leaders of tourism, and government officials perceive the socioeconomic effects of tourism in Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan, following EXPO-2017?

Theoretical Framework

In the absence of theories and methods to understand and to list tourism's socioeconomic effects (Ateljevic, 2014; Barca, 2012; Brauer et al., 2019; Butler, 2004; Gillen & Mostafanezhad, 2019; Gray, 1982; C. Hall & Page, 2009; Jafari, 2003; Kozak & Kozak, 2011; Lew, 2001; Mitchell & Murthy, 1991; Tribe, 1997; Xiao & Smith, 2005), a multidisciplinary theoretical framework was selected to conduct this study. The framework included two theories from social and economic studies. First was the corporate social responsibility theory (CSR) that played the role of umbrella theory that considered the social responsibilities of socioeconomic developments in public domains (O'Sullivan et al., 2017). The second was the organizational economics theory that

aligned with the CSR and utilized macroeconomic tools to study organizational processes using structural analysis, moving parts, and the way they organized (Shafritz et al., 2016).

The CSR has various definitions and interpretations (Carroll, 2015; Kitzmueller & Shimshack, 2012; Szegedi et al., 2016). The CSR is a system of universally applied norms that are governed by laws and national or international standards and regulates profit maximization processes by minimizing negative impacts on societies (Bakan, 2005; Sheehy, 2015). The theory affirms that organizations are entitled to responsibilities to ensure the sustainable development of industries. The CSR considers public administrators as agents obliged to promote sustainable development by shaping and implementing policies and controlling the implementation of those policies during economic development (O'Sullivan et al., 2017). Such control is enforced throughout five stages of business development that include planning, actuating, and controlling the business, as well as controlling or checking the market (Mulej & Dyck, 2014). The CSR's focus on social responsibilities in economic and social processes constituted a theoretical foundation for the current study. The CSR's central goal is to ensure governments' ability to understand the impact that tourism has on socioeconomic constructs of local communities. One of the ways that the theory is used is interviewing individuals and groups for data collection (O'Sullivan et al., 2017). This method of open-ended interviews was used in the current study.

The organizational economics theory is used to study the effectiveness and management of institutions, including governments, by using methods of economic analysis (Shafritz et al., 2016). The organizational economics theory translates

macroeconomic tools into organizational processes and applies managerial approaches to optimize organizational performance (Gibbons & Roberts, 2013). The dual theory approach strengthened the current study's focus on sustainability and improvement of public administrators' performance in shaping tourism-related policies by following the correspondent principles.

Both theories aligned with the notion of describing, analyzing, and predicting social and economic processes that interlinked with the government's role of political manager and its performance in a public domain. Both theories provided a theoretical and methodological foundation to conduct this qualitative study and helped in defining tourism-related socioeconomic effects through data collected from individual open-ended interviews with Nur-Sultan tourism stakeholders (see Muller, 2014). The stakeholders included three groups of organizations: business (hotels and hostels, tourism and entertainment services), NGOs (tourism associations), and government (Nur-Sultan tourism authorities). All were involved in EXPO-2017 and its tourism-related effects on Nur-Sultan's local community. Tourism businesses arranged events for tourists and provided hotels, food, beverages, and logistics. Tourism-related NGOs helped companies and people working in tourism by communicating their needs to the central government, local authorities, and people of Nur-Sultan. The government and local authorities involved in tourism's policy crafting and policymaking before and during the EXPO-2017 tried to ensure the best possible macroeconomic effects. I expected that the chosen theoretical framework, the research design, and the stakeholder groups would ensure the quality of this study and assist in finding the answer to the research question. The dual-

theory framework united economic and social contexts of tourism's development into integrated research with methods of social and economic analysis and paved the way for future research of tourism effects by methods of quantitative analysis.

Nature of the Study

In the absence of universal knowledge on tourism's socioeconomic effects, established tourism-related methods and theories, and universal knowledge on tourism's socioeconomic effects, I decided to conduct a qualitative study to understand the industry's socioeconomic impact on Nur-Sultan's local community following the EXPO-2017. The purpose was to explore the perceptions of three stakeholder groups (tourism-related business, NGOs, and officials) on tourism's impacts in 2017. I conducted individual open-ended interviews with five business representatives, five NGO representatives, and five government officials to collect data on the effects that impacted Nur-Sultan's host community after EXPO-2017. I followed the methodological guidelines presented by Onwuegbuzie et al. (2009). Data analysis included two steps of coding using In Vivo and focused coding technique to identify themes from the collected data. All codes and themes were grouped between parent codes aligned with the theoretical framework and split between two sets, guided by the CSR and the organizational economics theory.

Definitions

The following definitions are industry specific with criteria uniquely defined in a broader context of this study:

Economic effect of tourism: Lack of scientific consensus on appropriate terms to describe the phenomenon prompted the use of the UNWTO definition on tourism economic impact (UNWTO, 2013). Tourism's economic impact is a sum of direct and secondary effects that include value-added, employment, labor compensation, and gross operating surplus from taxes from 14 directly and indirectly tourism-related economic activities (hotels, accommodations, sport, museums, theaters, public transportation, gambling, and others). However, the economic impact is unique for each destination (UNWTO, 2013).

MICE-tourism: MICE-tourism represents one of several forms of tourism that develops around Nur-Sultan's infrastructure to host international, regional, and national meetings, incentives, conferences, and exhibitions (UNWTO, 2019).

Nur-Sultan tourism authorities (NTA): NTA is the primary local authority's agency in Nur-Sultan for establishing and upholding tourism policy, marketing plans, visitors' programs, and long-term strategic plans. The group also includes Kazakhstan's government authorities responsible for tourism policy; the reason for that is the geographic location of the government is Nur-Sultan and its direct involvement in arranging and hosting the EXPO-2017 in Nur-Sultan in 2017.

Overtourism: Overtourism is a relatively new concept that frames one of the tourism phenomena when uncontrolled demand for tourism products destroys tourism destinations and local communities (Capocchi et al., 2019). The term highlights the adverse side effects of tourism mismanagement that negatively impact both the quality of

life on destinations and the quality of visitors' experience (UNWTO, 2019). However, the UNWTO did not define any related theories.

Social effect of tourism: There is no established and framed definition of the social effect of tourism. Thus, I decided to take the universal definition of social impact and adapt it to the purposes of this qualitative study. Social impacts are tourism-related changes of a social and environmental nature that are produced by governmental investments and bring positive or negative results (Epstein & Yuthas, 2014),

Socioeconomic effect of tourism: Tourism development connects with political, economic, social, and natural environments and generates an effect on each of them (Lyon & Wells, 2012). The socioeconomic impact of tourism is defined as a transformative power that changes residents' lives (Kozak & Kozak, 2015a; UNWTO, 2016; WEF, 2017).

Tourism: An integral effort by main stakeholders to attract, host, and manage visitors to produce social and economic goods (Franklin, 2003). It is also considered as a field for scientific inquiry by considering its global impact and multidisciplinary nature (Tazim & Robinson, 2010).

Tourism management: Tourism management correlates with the definition of tourism marketing and refers to an effort or execution of policies by tourism-related organizations including governments at international, national, and local levels to optimize the satisfaction of all stakeholders from tourism growth (Singh, 2008).

Tourism stakeholders: Among the wide range of definitions, Friedman's definition (Friedman & Miles, 2006) addressed the goals of the current study and

explained stakeholders as groups of people with a specific relationship with organizations. Friedman assigned stakeholders into two groups: narrow and wide. I took the narrow definition and adapted it to the tourism field including government (Nur-Sultan tourism authorities), tourism associations (NGOs), and business.

Assumptions

Assumptions guided the environment and controlled the research process (see Simon, 2011) of this study. Assumptions involved the quality of stakeholders' knowledge on tourism's effects (see Marshal & Rossman, 2016) and included the following statements. I assumed that stakeholders' experience in tourism and their direct or indirect participation in EXPO-2017 in Nur-Sultan created a sufficient knowledge base for collecting data on the economic and social effects of tourism. I also assumed that stakeholders participating in individual open-ended interviews would provide honest and comprehensive answers to ensure data saturation, credibility, and reliability. Next, I assumed that the collected data would produce meaningful results to shape the list of socioeconomic effects of tourism that impacted the Nur-Sultan's local community after hosting EXPO-2017. These assumptions guided this research process including interviews with stakeholders to understand and to list tourism's economic and social effects. The assumptions also helped to frame recommendations for future tourism-related research and Kazakhstan's government.

Scope and Delimitations

Scope and delimitations, like borders on a political map, define margins of a study. These margins consist of elements that make the study unique, like the research

problem, purpose statement, research questions, variables, theoretical perspectives, population, criteria of participants, and region of the research (Simon, 2011). Scope and delimitations locate the research on the science field by limiting the power of findings' generalizability while increasing the validity and reliability of collected data (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2018). This qualitative study included the following delimitations that made this research on tourism's socioeconomic effects unique, valid, and reliable.

This research was conducted in Nur-Sultan, the city that experienced the tourism booster effect after hosting the World EXPO-2017. The study's focus was tourism's economic and social effects to understand tourism's socioeconomic impact on the local community. The research problem defined the socioeconomic nature of the study and limited the theoretical framework by merging social and economic theories to understand the effects. Participants' selection criteria included stakeholders from the tourism field who experienced the EXPO-2017. I assumed that although the limitations reduced the power of generalizability, they increased the quality of the study.

The quality of this research was ensured by following the four criteria of trustworthiness (Guba, 1981). The credibility was established by conducting 10 open-ended interviews from each of four groups of stakeholders who were Nur-Sultan officials, businesses, associations (NGOs), and experts. The goal was to obtain their insights regarding what economic effects of tourism incited positive or negative social posteffects. The chosen approach ensured the highest possible saturation of data (see Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016). The collected data were triangulated with international, official, and peer-reviewed documents and articles on tourism's socioeconomic effects.

Tactics to ensure participants' honesty included iterative questions, the right to refuse from participating in interviews at any time, the encouragement of being frank, and the independent status of the researcher (see Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016). Peer-review debriefing sessions with my chair and the Committee members, as well as interview reports checked by participants, were accompanied by the full description of the socioeconomic phenomenon of tourism. The examination of previous research findings was also applied to constitute a detailed and verifiable context for the research subject and process of data collection. The participants' variety, data collection methods, interview analysis results, and my inferences were documented to create an opportunity for other practitioners to assess the thickness of the results. Such detailed explanations significantly increased the level of research transferability (see Firestone, 1993). Dependability was ensured by explaining the design and its careful implementation for each interview (see Shenton, 2004). The credibility of data collection was ensured by preserving the list of questions and prompts. However, considering various perspectives on the same issues, the collected data varied. The overall design of this qualitative study ensured that the results would be based on the collected data and information rather than on my preferences. Confirmability was guaranteed by the data triangulation technique.

Limitations

Any study possesses some limitations that are out of the researchers' control (Simon, 2011). Limitations may undermine the research quality (Brutus et al., 2013) if they are not addressed to reduce a negative impact (Simon, 2011). The current study's design, location, scope, participants, and researcher's bias created limitations.

The chosen design of the study limited the results' transferability and validity across Kazakhstan and internationally. This qualitative study produced a list of unique socioeconomic impacts for Nur-Sultan that may not be the same for other Kazakhstan regions and other UNWTO countries. This study was strictly defined its scope, thereby limiting data collection and analysis to the area of Nur-Sultan.

The other limitation was that some interviewed stakeholders were less motivated to share all their insights on the tourism effects. This might have impacted the richness and depth of the data but was addressed by creating a comprehensive list of questions and plan to guide the interview process. Researcher's bias might also have posed some limitations to the study. This was addressed by acknowledging my professional and personal predisposition toward the issue. As a former Deputy Chairman of the Committee on Tourism Industry in Kazakhstan and the Deputy of Provost of the International Institute of Tourism and Hospitality, I was interested in understanding tourism's socioeconomic impacts on Nur-Sultan's local population to inform tourism-related decisions by public administrators. However, such a predisposition might have impeded an objective assessment and analysis of data. I conducted an audit trail using a field journal and memos to ensure objective collection and analysis of data with reflective commentary (Shenton, 2004).

Significance

Tourism study is an evolving field of scientific inquiry that generates knowledge by using theories and methods of other disciplines in the absence of its methodological toolbox to answer research questions (Barca, 2012; Tazim & Robinson, 2010). Tourism

study includes economic theory to understand and measure economic effects and social theory to understand social impacts in the absence of methodological efforts to understand and measure the socioeconomic effects of tourism that tangibly change the social constructs of local communities (OECD, 2018; UNWTO, 2018a). The current study may contribute to tourism study by exploring the socioeconomic effects of tourism and promoting public administration practices that have implications for social change.

This study was an effort to conduct a qualitative analysis in the form of open-ended interviews to understand and list the socioeconomic effects of tourism to inform the decision-making process of public administrators in shaping sustainable tourism-related policies. The study results added to the tourism management field that followed the rules of market economy and business (Moutinho, 2000; Singh, 2008). The findings of the study extended the knowledge on tourism effects with the goal of increasing its understanding.

International experts from the OECD (2018) and the UNWTO (2018b) stressed to national governments the importance of understanding tourism effects to improve governance and public management of the field to ensure its sustainability. The current study provided such understanding but was limited to Nur-Sultan. However, this qualitative study created opportunity for analogous inquiries in other places with dynamic tourism development.

Implications for positive social change included potential improvements in the quality of people's lives affected by tourism development. The results may contribute to

governments' efforts by informing public administrators on tourism effects and providing effects-related data for managing the tourism industry.

Summary

In Chapter 1, I introduced the problem of tourism development that was rooted in lack of knowledge of tourism's stakeholders' perception of the industry's socioeconomic effects in Nur-Sultan following EXPO-2017. This fact posed multiple threats of damaging the livelihood of local communities and tourism destinations that undermined the industry. I conducted a qualitative study that consisted of open-ended interviews designed to understand and to define tourism's socioeconomic effects in Nur-Sultan for decision makers to develop sustainable policies by considering tourism's power to change socioeconomic constructs of Nur-Sultan community. This study's theoretical framework was shaped by two theories: the corporate social responsibility and the organizational economics theory. Both enhanced my ability to conduct this research using qualitative methods of interviewing. In this chapter, I defined assumptions, delimitations, and limitations to the study emanating from the chosen research design and factors that were out of my control. Tourism's structural incongruence, ongoing theoretical and methodological debates, existing practices, and strategies to research and understand tourism-related impacts are discussed in Chapter 2.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The focus of this qualitative research was to explore the perceptions of tourism-related stakeholders on the industry's socioeconomic effects that were unique for each tourism destination due to its sensitivity to human perceptions and tourism development process (see Apostolopoulos et al., 2001). These facts prevented the tourism field from creating a universally applied list of socioeconomic effects of tourism that were vital in the efforts to sustainably and responsibly manage the industry affecting people's daily lives (Stergiou & Airey, 2018). The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the perceptions of stakeholder groups on the socioeconomic effects of tourism in Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan following EXPO-2017.

Intensive discussions by decision makers and international tourism-related organizations were reflected in various studies. Researchers reviewed theoretical foundations related to tourism and the socioeconomic nature of tourism, and its social and economic impacts (Stergiou & Airey, 2018). The field of tourism started experiencing a broader theoretical debate on the degree, to which tourism businesses and privately funded development initiatives benefit or damage local communities (MacNeil & Wozniak, 2018). This debate involved three groups of advocates. The first group believed in the free-market concept grounded in the equal benefits that tourism brings for businesses and locals (Cowen, 2004). The second group adhered to the world-systems theory of inequalities grounded in the unequal distribution of benefits (Veltmeyer, 2016). The third group believed that the benefit distribution system depends on various factors and may follow principles of equality or inequality (Stiglitz, 2012). The current study and

its method of qualitative inquiry contributed to this debate by providing a better understanding of the socioeconomic effects of tourism that directly impact the Nur-Sultan local community and by drafting a list of those effects. The theoretical framework and research design emerged from previously conducted studies, in which the socioeconomic effects of tourism and other industries were researched. In this chapter, I present tourism-related discussions, theoretical and methodological deficiencies, and efforts to understand and list tourism's socioeconomic effects.

Chapter 2 begins with a literature review focused on academic, governmental, international, and statistical resources that outline existing practices and strategies to research and understand tourism-related impacts. The material details the theoretical foundation of tourism's socioeconomics in the absence of the traditional knowledge of tourism-related theories and research methods. Due to the theoretical immaturity of tourism's field, a particular focus of this chapter is two theories that were chosen as a theoretical foundation for this research. The first theory was the CSR, which reflects the social nature of tourism's effects. The second theory, organizational economics theory, reflects the economic nature of tourism's effects. In-depth discussions on key variables of this qualitative research are included in this chapter's literature review.

Literature Search Strategy

The leading search engine for this study was Google Scholar with extended search capabilities and access to peer-reviewed journals. Access to some articles was denied, so I retrieved them from the Walden's Thoreau database. I also used the Walden University library with the ProQuest, Science Direct, Sage Premier, and ABI/Inform databases. The

research strategy was strengthened by databases of tourism-related international organizations such as the UNWTO, the OECD, and the WEF. The list was added by Nur-Sultan local government statistical data, official tourism websites, tourism-related media sites, and tourism-related academic books. Key search terms and combinations of search terms included *tourism study*, *tourism theory*, *tourism impacts*, *tourism social and economic impacts*, *tourism stakeholders*, *tourism development*, *tourism management*, *sustainable tourism development*, *tourism management methods*, *tourism management matrix*, *corporate social responsibility and tourism*, *organizational economics theory*, and *tourism*.

Considering the Walden University academic standards, more than 85% of peer-reviewed articles were dated within 5 years from the date of this study, which means that priority was given to articles published from 2014 until today. Since 2014, the tourism field has experienced a growing interest that boosted the publication of articles, books, and reports with the focus on tourism sustainability and responsible development. All of the materials gathered improved and contributed to the quality of the current study. However, some literature on tourism-related impacts and theories dated back to the 1970s and 1980s. This material established a historical foundation of tourism development and helped to align the knowledge of tourism and its effects presented in this research since the 1970s. More than 100 articles, 20 books, and 15 policy papers were reviewed; over 85% of the sources were peer reviewed.

Theoretical Foundation

The knowledge base for tourism's field includes theories and methods from other disciplines, the list of which was first compiled by Kozak and Kozak (2011) who questioned the fullness of the tourism-defined discipline, noted its insufficiency, and documented its multidisciplinary nature. Tourism's multidisciplinary inquiry was first stated by Tribe (1997) and restated by Jafari (2003), Xiao and Smith (2005), Tazim and Robinson (2010), Barca (2012), and Gillen and Mostafanezhad (2019) who brought geopolitics to the list (earlier presented by Kozak and Kozak) that shaped tourism and further extended the field. Some experts believe in the scientific duality of the tourism field and consider geography and economy as dominant disciplines that define tourism. Gray (1982) was the first who brought the thesis and adhered to the disciplines as a scientific foundation of the industry. Mitchell and Murthy (1991), Lew (2001), Butler (2004), and C. Hall and Page (2009) agreed with Gray's vision and research of tourism as a phenomenon that is geographic in nature and economic in operation. Such duality, in the view of the mentioned experts, helped to study tourism's environmental impact, define its geographical locations, and understand the rules of leisure economics that tourism maintains.

Some experts rejected tourism's multidisciplinary nature. Pulido-Fernandez et al. (2013) insisted that tourism is an economic phenomenon and should be studied using economic theories, tools, and methods. Pulido-Fernandez et al. applied economic analysis to study and manage tourism's economic growth, utilized economic logic, and considered tourism through the prism of consumer, production, and market theories, as well as cost-

benefit and multiplier analysis. The economic-centered approach to tourism study was questioned by Gwenthure and Odhiambo (2017) who doubted the causal link between tourism and economic growth by arguing that this link was not granted and differed among destinations. Transitioning from the discussion on tourism as a purely economic phenomenon, Brauer (2019) proved the social nature of tourism that changes the social and economic constructs of tourism destinations.

Debate on the field of tourism continued to grow by moving consensus on its theoretical and methodological base even further. Lamer et al. (2017) and Stergiou and Airey (2018) asserted that the extensive use of theories in tourism would endanger the field and become meaningless from a scientific point of view. The absence of scientific agreement on tourism field's architecture pushed Ateljevic (2014) to argue for its structural incongruence, which created theoretical and methodological gaps in the body of tourism science. This fact was reconfirmed by Uysal et al. (2019) who stressed the importance of consensus on tourism's theories, methods, and approaches to manage its dynamic development and streamline its effects with stakeholders' demands and expectations.

Some theories were applied in tourism studies to measure economic and social effects of tourism by methods of qualitative and quantitative analysis, but those theories did not explain tourism's socioeconomic effects to measure it for management purposes by leaving the phenomenon understudied. This fact undermined tourism's development with unpredictable social consequences (Butler & Russell, 2010). The demand for a comprehensive system of tourism's effects management was vocalized by Kozak and

Kozak (2013, 2015a), the UNWTO (2016), and the WEF (2017) who pushed academia to study the evolving field.

The qualitative design of the current study included two theories that allowed me to study the complexity of tourism and to guide the research thinking toward a better understanding and definition of its socioeconomic effects through the prism of sustainability. These theories were the CSR and the organizational economics theory. I determined that both theories would facilitate a greater understanding of tourism's effects using the concept of sustainability as an umbrella for the concept of organizational performance.

Corporate Social Responsibility

The CSR has been applied in various studies on tourism development. Lovelock et al. (2019) used the theory to define encouragements and discouragements for the tourism business to engage in corporate social responsibility. For this purpose, Lovelock et al. used semi-structured interviews with 40 managers from tourism companies. Thanh et al. (2018) used the theory to test the relationship between corporate social responsibility, firm reputation, and performance by surveying primary stakeholders. Kamaga and Bello (2018) used CSR to assess the effectiveness of corporate social responsibility's practice adopted by tourism companies using semi-structured interviews.

The same goals were pursued by other researchers who studied tourism, prospects of its sustainable development, and successful business models in top destinations including Africa, Turkey, China, and the Middle East. Some researchers focused on the restaurant business (Jung et al., 2016; S. Park et al., 2019) or tourism destinations

including world heritage sites (Chi et al., 2019), hotels and casinos (Farmaki, 2019), conference sector (Whitfield & Dioko, 2012) and sport tourism events (Huang et al., 2015). Others, including Lanfranchi et al. (2015), focused their research on issues of sustainable development and corporate social responsibility's contribution to the phenomenon of tourism development. Li et al. (2019) used the CSR to understand residents' attitudes toward tourism projects that were being developed or were already operational.

Chaudhary (2019) used the theory to examine the impact of corporate social responsibility on employee engagement in tourism destinations. The same approach but for human resources management purposes was used by Horng et al. (2018). The CSR has been used to study equity-holder risks (Kim et al., 2017). Researchers like Marin-Pantelescu et al. (2019), Paskova and Zaelenke (2019), and Su et al. (2017) studied the CSR's effect on tourism sustainability and green consumption behavior. Burcin et al. (2019) used the theory to understand tourism-related effects with social implications by conducting qualitative research of a single company using content analysis of its significant tourism-related documents, as well as compiling questionnaires for tourism project coordinators with the follow-up interviews organized with the company's directors and managers. The collected secondary data generated information on projects and programs the company conducted for tourism development. The primary data provided information on company priorities, management mechanism, and challenges of tourism program development. Geng-qing Chi (2019) also applied CSR to examine tourism's impact on the local community. Geng-qing Chi conducted a survey before

conducting interviews from the sample of 10 managers who operated tourism destinations. Qualitative data collected from the interviews were used to design the questionnaire for the survey with respondents collected through the snowball sampling technique. The collected survey data were analyzed by the method of descriptive statistics.

The CSR affirmed that organizations were entitled to responsibilities to ensure the sustainable development of industries. O'Sullivan et al. (2017) strengthened the concept by inducing public administrators among agents with responsibilities for promoting sustainable development by shaping and implementing policies and controlling its implementation in business and other business-related organizations in the real-life economy. This managerial concept of public administrators was expanded by Mulej and Dyck (2014) who elaborated on an integrated administrative process to enable public administrators to enforce sustainability in practice through following five stages of control and monitoring: planning the business, planning the organization, actuating the organization, controlling the organization, and controlling/checking the market. These new approaches to ensure the sustainability of economic development empowered the concept by governmental participation to enforce practical mechanisms. Such evolution allowed CSR to be used in the current study as an overarching approach to guide the research process through the lens of government policies and sustainability.

For many decades, tourism was managed as an economic business-oriented industry that served as a valuable source of profit maximization (Hollensbe et al., 2014; UNWTO, 2018a). Such an approach resulted in unethical and irresponsible conduct of

tourism-related businesses and policies neglecting the welfare of stakeholders involved (Caric, 2018; Narendra & Rianna, 2017; Valenti et al., 2014). The CSR theory addressed this imperfection. Its four pillars relied on the long-term profitability of business decisions, responsible application of business social power, consideration of social demands in business's daily operations, and ethical conduct. The CSR established a framework that redirected the logic of economic egocentrism to principles of sustainability (Bakan, 2005).

In the absence of a universal definition of corporate social responsibility (Chandler, 2015), the term developed various interpretations depending on the field it studies (Carroll, 2015; Kitzmueller & Shimshack, 2012; Szegedi et al., 2016). This research studied tourism as a public phenomenon that decided the term's political interpretation following the Hobbesian argument on the government's involvement in industries' regulation (Garriga & Mele, 2004). The political interpretation of corporate social responsibility defined it as a system of universally applied norms that were governed by laws and national or international standards that regulated the profit maximization process by minimizing negative impacts on societies (Crowther & Rayman-Bacchus, 2016). Such interpretation explains governments' involvement in tourism's regulation to project social and economic impacts on local communities (Garriga & Mele, 2004; Sheehy, 2005), and to study social responsibilities of economic and social developments in public domains. The interpretation created a conceptual background for this study, and its central goal was to ensure governments' ability to list impacts that tourism emanates on socioeconomic constructs of the local community. The

theory and its method provided the answer to this study's research question: What is the understanding of stakeholders in the tourism field regarding tourism socioeconomic effects and its social responsibility on Nur-Sultan's local population after hosting EXPO-2017?

Organizational Economics

The organizational economics theory is relatively new, utilizing economic logic and methods to study regulatory institutions and policies to improve their performance. The theory was considered as an analytical paradigm (Hesterly et al., 1990) to research strategic aspects of organizational development. Hesterly et al. (1990) defined three axioms explaining theories take on organizations and their nature. The first axiom considers organizations as governance constructs to support human interaction of assets, services, and goods to avoid illegal, destroying, or criminal actions. In such interactions, the organizational economics theory focused on authority and systems of sanctions and incentives to ensure and influence the exchange process. The second axiom stated that organizational constructs' typology depends on diversity and typology of social exchange. The third axiom stated that any type of organizational constructs was economically sustainable and depends on cost-effectiveness. These axioms explained the reason for organizations' existence and their role in societal development.

The axioms created tools to study organizational phenomena by merging social and economic theories (Hesterly et al., 1990). The integration addressed the need for this study with a methodological approach to understand and then to compile a list of socioeconomic effects of tourism in Nur-Sultan. Theory's methodological rigor

strengthened by its ability to study organizations and its processes (Hesterly et al., 1990) that was precisely the goal of this study, in which tourism affects were the process to be managed by local managers who were Nur-Sultan local government. The organizational economics theory utilized both the qualitative and the quantitative research methods, including surveys and interviews as a mechanism to study organizational settings and to address managerial issues (Shafritz et al., 2016). Such tools significantly strengthened the theoretical frame of this study by adding the economic and organizational dimensions to this sociological inquire of public administration (Bloom et al., 2010).

Both theories aligned with the notion of describing, analyzing, and predicting social and economic processes that interlinked with the government's role of political manager. The theories put the government and tourism at the center of this study. The government presented an organizational form, in which actions should be first understood to be managed appropriately. Tourism presented a commercial industry with a government role in shaping policies for its development. Both theories provided a theoretical foundation for defining tourism effects and place them within Nur-Sultan socioeconomic structure in a sustainable way (Muller, 2014). The chosen theoretical foundation had considered economic and social contexts of tourism development (Shafritz et al., 2016) and created an ideal space for a better understanding of tourism's socioeconomic impacts by conducting open-ended interviews with stakeholders in the tourism field.

Literature Review Related to Key Concepts

Some reliable studies measured tourism-related impacts using various approaches and focusing on its economic, social, ecological, or cultural dimensions. For decades, until the 1990ths, tourism-related effects were considered economic effects due to specifics of tourism's development (as a pure economic industry). But even then, some experts, including Mathieson and Wall (1982), studied tourism as a public event of economic and social impacts. A growing number of experts followed Mathieson and Wall approach by exploring tourism's multidimensional nature. The researchers established significant evidence suggesting an increasing complexity of tourism's effects on economic, social, cultural, and ecological niches of human development. Such complexity was stated by Apostolopoulos et al. (2001), Caric (2018), Cole and Morgan (2010), Hall and Lew (2009), Moterrubio et al. (2011), Uysal and Sigry (2019), and many others. These experts believed in tourism's multidimensionality, arguing that the industry's economic impact went together with other effects and could not be studied independently. The experts also believed that tourism's related effects were not only multidimensional but varied among destinations. This study followed this multifaceted approach toward tourism-related effects and contributed to the field by framing an understanding of tourism's socioeconomic impact on Nur-Sultan's local community in the year of EXPO-2017.

Tourism effects were not static. The effects acted as agents of change with unpredictable consequences evolving by modifying the social constructs of local communities. Once tourism established itself as an independent industry with the ability

to bring profits and to change the quality of people's lives, experts were trying to find a coherent definition of tourism's socioeconomic effects. Franklin (2003) was among the first to explain the effects as an integral effort by tourism's main stakeholders to attract, host, and manage visitors to produce social and economic goods. Hall and Lew (2009) defined the effects as integrated socio-cultural and economic dimensions of tourism effects. Hall and Lew (2009) framed it as a two-way impact that changes income distribution and the industry itself. Such a definition was extended by Kozak and Kozak (2013; 2015b) and experts from the UNWTO (2016) and the WEF (2017), who framed it as a transformative power affecting residents' lives. This rather broad definition left researchers to study tourism's socioeconomic effects, group them, and understand the nature of their development.

Following Hall and Lew's (2009) approach to explain tourism's socioeconomic effects, I reviewed the literature on tourism's economic and social impact to conclude with a review of its integrated socioeconomic effects. Tourism's *economic effects* were the most researched but, as Kozak and Kozak (2015b) emphasized, were still changing with the industry's development. Despite this fact, in 2008, the WEF (2017), together with experts from UNWTO's think tank, the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC, 2019), grouped tourism's economic effects. Experts of the mentioned organizations proposed a statistical system of tourism's effects measurement (approved by the UN Statistical Division in 2008) and recommended it for the international application. In the system, the WTTC (2020a) split tourism economic impacts into four categories (direct, indirect, induced, and total). It included revenues from the accommodation,

transportation, entertainment, and attraction, food and beverage services, retail trade, cultural, sports, and recreational facilities into the first category (direct) by adding spending from domestic tourism, domestic business travel, foreign and government visitors. Tourism's indirect economic effects included investments, government spending on tourism, and purchases from suppliers. Induced effects went from food and beverages, recreation, clothing, housing, and household goods. Tourism's total economic effect was measured by GDP and employment. Kazakhstan partially accepted proposed by the WTTC (2020b) approach and statistically measured tourism's contribution to the GDP (5.2% or 8,866.1 million U.S. dollars in 2019), to employment (429 800 jobs in 2019), and international visitor impact (USD 2.2883.5 million U.S. dollars).

Tourism's *social effects* provoked changes in local societies and their value systems, quality of life, and patterns of behavior. This fact was recognized by the United Nations Organization in the decoration of the Manila Conference on World Tourism in 1981 (UN, 1981). As Murphy (2015) explained in his book *Tourism: a community approach* until recently social effects of tourism were overshadowed by its economic performance. Growing signs of tourism's social effects have created stress in some systems and pushed governments to consider tourism's economic effects through the prism of its social consequences (Murphy, 2015). Hall and Lew (2009) were among the first who started compiling the list of tourism's social effects. The list includes a level of economic security, employment, health, personal safety, housing conditions, and physical environment. Murphy (2015) added to the list the host population's hostility toward visitors, changed cultural values, and the degradation of native language and customs.

Caric (2018), Moterrubio et al. (2011), Uysal and Sigry (2019) divided social effects of tourism into positive and negative by including into first group such indicators as improved community services, leisure recreation, and release of social tension, job creation, and support of cultural activities. Group of negative effects enlisted increasing crime, illegal prostitution, the use, and traffic of drugs, social conflict, and crowding. (There is no research on tourism's social effects in Kazakhstan). Overall, tourism's social impacts revealed tourism's internal conflict, in which the industry's successful economic development might create destruction of unique social qualities.

The socioeconomic effect of tourism was defined by Kozak and Kozak (2015a), the UNWTO (2016), and the WEF (2017) as a transformative power that changed residents' lives. Murphy (2015) considered the effect as an integrated form of tourism's social and economic impacts by multiplying their cumulative power. Howell (2002) believed that population growth, changing employment patterns, level of income, and rising poverty constituted the list of tourism's socioeconomic themes. Monterrubio et al. (2018) conducted a survey and defined a list of socioeconomic effects of tourism in three state-planned destinations of Mexico. The study identified the following variables for tourism's socioeconomic benefits: employment opportunities, quality of life, and improved family living conditions, jobs offer, leisure opportunities, and construction of schools, medical clinics and airports, community integration, better public service. Socioeconomic costs of tourism included the increased price of goods and services, enhanced security issues, decreased traditional economic activities, decreased community's participation, reduced time spent with families, increased social problems,

reduced public leisure space, divided society. Sawant (2017) also split the list into positive and negative impacts. The researcher added the following indicators to the list of the positive socioeconomic effects: investments, entrepreneurship development, increase in the standard of living, increase in foreign exchange, public facility development, infrastructure development, cultural conservation, social relation development, heritage conservation, increase in cultural activity, increase in pride, and cultural exchange.

Sawant also added the following indicators to the list of negative socioeconomic effects: increase in property prices, absence of benefits by residents, increase in the cost of living, commercialization of activities, dilution of the local language, increase in crime, increase in social conflicts, social dislocation, environmental damage, increase in litter and garbage, and increase in crowding and congestions. Some other experts studied the socioeconomic effects of tourism, including Balazik (2016) and Njoroge et al. (2017),. Each study on the socioeconomic impacts of tourism defined a list of indicators or themes that were unique and characterized the social and economic needs of local populations.

In Kazakhstan, the research on the socioeconomic effect of tourism was conducted by a group of experts Aliyeva et al. (2019) in East Kazakhstan Region. The study was quantitative and utilized socioeconomic indicators on social and economic effects of tourism recommended by the UNWTO. The list for economic effects included the following signs: number of accommodation units, number of guests, number of transfer passengers, the revenue of accommodation unites, the income of tourists, the receipt of transport, the revenue of catering unites, Gross Regional Product. The social effects included the following indicators: population, employed population, population

engaged in the tourism industry, number of domestic tourists, the revenue of catering, number of domestic tourists. The research did not produce a list of socioeconomic effects of tourism in the region. The list was recommended by the UNWTO and did not reflect the entire picture of tourism's socioeconomic imprint.

The absence of an internationally recognized list of tourism's socioeconomic effects proceeded from tourism's continually evolving nature. MacNeil and Wonzniak (2018) proved this by conducting a qualitative study in various tourism destinations and gathering data on effects using semi-structured interviews. The method produced different lists of tourism-related impacts in multiple destinations. The research confirmed the volatility of tourism's effects. It validated qualitative method of this research to understand and define a list of tourism's socioeconomic effects in Nur-Sultan. The qualitative design of this study answered the research question that asks: How do business leaders, leaders of tourism, and government officials perceive the socioeconomic effects of tourism in Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan following EXPO-2017? This research's design focused on understanding and listing the socioeconomic impacts of tourism on Nur-Sultan's local population. The data were collected by conducting open-ended interviews with the tourism industry's stakeholders in Nur-Sultan. Previous studies on social and economic effects conducted by Balazik (2016), Njoroge et al. (2017), and Sawant (2017) validated this method of data collection.

Gursoy et al. (2019) and Lwoga (2018) utilized the social exchange theory to conduct a meta-analysis of previous studies' statistical findings to define a list of tourism-related effects. Lwoga (2018) also applied material cultural approaches to understand

residents' attitudes toward positive and negative impacts of tourism. Both used sociology, psychology, economy, and anthropology's theoretical base to explain the phenomenon using data collected from interviews with stakeholders and local communities. For the same purposes, Bernardo and Jorge (2019) applied interviews to collect data on tourism and its effects to prove the dependence between industry's development, efficient governance, and stakeholders' involvement in the tourism management process. During the study, they defined positive and negative impacts of tourism and found the statistical value. Hritz and Cecil (2019) conducted surveys distributed among representatives of small business to identify economic, environmental, social, and cultural effects of sport tourism. Some experts have applied the same technique, including Suleyman et al. (2019) and Tembi and Sakhile (2019), who collected data on tourism effects from local communities considering them as the main stakeholders in tourism development. Ramgulam and Singh (2017) applied a cross-sectional research design to study the relationship between tourism impacts and residents' attitudes to shape hospitality toward tourism. A variety of theories and methods to collect data on tourism's effects extended the theoretical and methodological base of this study.

The literature review validated the following arguments that support the theoretical and methodological frameworks of this study. First, it proved the validity of the chosen methodology to collect data from tourism-related stakeholders in Nur-Sultan by conducting open-ended interviews. Second, it verified that tourism-related effects that were not universal and varied among destinations by being unique for each case-study. Third, it defined potential themes of socioeconomic impacts of tourism that were

previously researched in other tourism destinations. Fourth, it confirmed the theoretical flexibility of the field to study effects.

Summary and Conclusions

Tourism study continues its evolution and expands the knowledge base by integrating and adjusting some theories and methods from social, economic, and other sciences. The ongoing discussions on tourism's multidisciplinary started by Tribe (1997) and questioned by Pulido-Fernandez et al. (2013) have prevented the field from the consensus on theoretical and methodological bases. In Ateljevic (2014) view, tourism's structural incongruence has created theoretical and methodological gaps that, as Uysal and Schwarts agreed (2019), have averted the field from defining its management mechanisms. This fact has caused occasional failures to manage tourism's multiple dynamics. Kozak and Kozak (2013; 2015a) reconfirmed the demand for a comprehensive management system of tourism's effects. International organizations, such as the UNWTO (2016) and the WEF (2017), urged academia to study the still-evolving field.

Some theories have been applied in tourism studies measuring tourism's economic and social effects by using qualitative and quantitative analysis methods. Those theories have explained tourism's socioeconomic impacts, but do not measure the effects for management purposes and leave the phenomenon understudied in that (managerial) context. Butler and Russell argued (2010) that tourism's theoretical and methodological incongruence has undermined the industry's development and increased the unpredictability of its social consequences.

Tourism's theoretical debates on the degree, to which tourism privately funded development initiatives impact local communities, involved three groups of advocates. The first group believes in the free-market concept (Cowen, 2004). The second group believes in unequal distribution of benefits (Veltmeyer, 2016). The third group believes that the benefit distribution system depends on various factors and may follow principles of equality or inequality (Stiglitz, 2012). Such debates have prevented the field from creating a universally applying list of socioeconomic effects of tourism that, as Stergiou and Airey suggested (2018), are vital to sustainably and responsibly manage the industry affecting people's daily lives.

This study's findings confirmed three vital conclusions for the tourism field. First, tourism's socioeconomic effects are not static. Second, the UNWTO (2016) and the WEF (2017) definition of tourism's socioeconomic effects (as a transformative power affecting residents' lives) proved to be relevant for Nur-Sultan and its people. In addition, tourism's socioeconomic effects vary among destinations and are unique for each one, as was discussed by Balazik (2016), Howell (2002), Monterrubio et al. (2018), Njoroget al. (2017), and Sawant (2017). Third, this research supported the idea that the industry's socioeconomic nature, as described by Brauer (2019), had changed both the social and economic constructs of Nur-Sultan as a tourism destination after the EXPO-2017.

This research chose two theories to understand and to list tourism's socioeconomic effects on Nur-Sultan's local population. The first theory was the corporate social responsibility. The theory represented social science with a broad methodological base, one of which were the open-ended interviews conducted to

interview 15 tourism stakeholders. The second was the organizational economics theory, which significantly strengthened the theoretical framework of this study by adding the economic and administrative dimensions to this sociological inquiry. The theoretical duality allowed to understand tourism's socioeconomic effects on Nur-Sultan's local population. The theories were aligned in describing, analyzing, and predicting social and economic processes interlinked with the government's role as a political manager.

Chapter 3: Research Method

This qualitative study addressed stakeholders' perceptions of tourism's socioeconomic effects on Nur-Sultan's local population following EXPO-2017. The goal was to understand the effects and to describe them for local authorities to be considered in the efforts to promote tourism's sustainable development. The study was designed to generate stakeholders' knowledge about the effects and ensure data saturation by conducting open-ended interviews with five representatives from each of the stakeholders' groups (business, NGOs, and government).

Secondary data were also considered. During the process of collecting qualitative interview data, some participants mentioned documents and reports on the subject that were publicly available. I reviewed these documents for triangulation purposes. The interview and secondary archival data extended the existing knowledge on the effects and helped me understand the socioeconomic nature of tourism's impact. The qualitative design yielded a deeper understanding of the subject.

In this chapter, I describe five reasons for choosing Nur-Sultan as a place to conduct this research. I discuss the qualitative design, including population, sample size, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis methods. I also address my role as the researcher, my biases, and the steps I followed increase the study's validity and trustworthiness.

Research Design and Rationale

This study addressed the following qualitative research question: How do business leaders, leaders of tourism, and government officials perceive the

socioeconomic effects of tourism in Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan, following EXPO-2017?

The research question was designed to generate themes on socioeconomic factors of tourism and to create a list of tourism's socioeconomic effects impacting Nur-Sultan's local population to inform the decision-making process by local authorities in the tourism field. The research problem, research question, and dual theoretical framework consisting of CSR (see Burcin et al., 2019) and organizational economics theory (see Shafritz et al., 2016) allowed me to conduct interviews with open-ended questions (see J. Park & Park, 2016). This method was explained by Yin (2017) as a valuable and valid tool for gathering data from stakeholders. Qualitative interviews allowed me to understand related trends that impacted Nur-Sultan's local community and build new knowledge (see Holter et al., 2019) in this subject.

Open-ended interview questions were used to probe participants' perceptions of economic and related social effects of tourism that were applicable for Nur-Sultan. Interviews were conducted in a way to generate rich data of sufficient quality relevant to the research question (see O'Sullivan et al., 2017). The number of interviews depended on the number of participants that exceeded the saturation threshold of 10 (see Weller, et al., 2018). The sample size also depended on participants' expertise and their ability to spend time talking in more significant details (see O'Sullivan et al., 2017) about the phenomenon that were central for the study, providing information that was rich in breadth and depth (see Holter et al., 2019).

The validity of the results was ensured by interviewing experienced experts in the tourism field with a background of 6 to 30 years in Nur-Sultan's tourism development.

Participants' insights on tourism-related effects laid a foundation for establishing valid themes and codes of tourism's socioeconomic effects. However, the results were not generalizable to other countries (see Yin, 2017). This study's design and its results were unique for Nur-Sultan.

Interview participants were representatives of Nur-Sultan and related to Nur-Sultan's tourism industry. The following selection parameters were applied. First, participants were stakeholders of the tourism industry representing one of the following groups: Committee on Tourism Industry (part of Kazakhstan Government) or Nur-Sultan tourism authorities, tourism associations (NGOs), or businesses. Second, participants lived in Nur-Sultan during and after the EXPO-2017 or were involved in tourism activities taking place around EXPO-2017. Third, participants had more than 6 years of experience in developing and promoting the tourism industry of Kazakhstan. Fourth, participants were aware of the government's role in managing the tourism industry. The goal of these criteria was to ensure an in-depth understanding of tourism effects from experts and practitioners to compile the most reliable list of tourism-related effects (see Tamariz et al., 2013). The criteria were explained in the consent forms (see Appendix A), as well as in the invitation letter to participate in the interviews (see Appendix A).

The design was considered as an effort to answer the research question that reflected the complexity of effects tourism produced on Nur-Sultan's local population. Tourism's development is a multidimensional process with enormous potential that requires socioeconomic thinking to analyze, monitor, and assess its positive and negative effects for management and decision-making processes to ensure local communities'

resilient and sustainable development (Tribe, 2008). The design of the current study included the qualitative method of data collection (see Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016) by conducting open-ended interviews to understand the socioeconomic effects of tourism and to define a list of socioeconomic effects of tourism that impact Nur-Sultan in the year of EXPO-2017. Data were collected by conducting 15 open-ended interviews with stakeholders in the tourism field to define socioeconomic themes of tourism-related effects.

The chosen design was justified by tourism's related effects of sensitivity and vulnerability to human perceptions and behaviour (Apostolopoulos et al., 2001) and ensured a high quality of data collection (Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016). The chosen design was driven by the desire to capture the strengths of open-ended interviews to understand social and economic factors and to create a list of socioeconomic effects (themes) of tourism that impacted local community Nur-Sultan. The design was aligned with the research problem and its theoretical framework and helped me to answer the research question.

Role of the Researcher

Researchers are the primary mediators in investigating unknown fields, framing and analyzing outcomes, and constructing new knowledge. Researchers play a crucial role at each stage of the research process by considering cultural, ethical, and political peculiarities of the researched phenomenon (Karagiozis, 2018). It was my responsibility to acknowledge my subjectivity to prevent its influence on the research, data collection, and data analysis process. Following this logic, I respected the rights of open-ended

interview participants, firmly adhered to a nonjudgmental attitude, and treated them as partners and individuals (not as subjects) in this study. I made my researcher's voice unique, reliable, and unbiased while collecting and interpreting data.

As a former Deputy Chairman of the Committee on Tourism Industry, I established professional relationships with various stakeholders in the tourism community in Kazakhstan. The list included representatives of tourism associations, the business community, officials, and experts. In June 2019, I changed my position to the Deputy Chairman of the International University on Tourism and Hospitality and went on maternity leave. The University, established in 2019 by President's decree, worked on establishing its physical infrastructure and getting its educational license. These facts excluded any supervisory, instructor, or power relationships that I might have had over participants while conducting this research (see Boyd et al., 1970).

Moreover, my experience in tourism administration contributed to the process of defining the research gap in understanding practical application by public policy practitioners in formulating tourism-related policies. At the same time, years in the tourism industry created professional bias and assumptions regarding social and economic effects tourism had on local communities. I followed several steps to minimize the impact of researcher bias in this study.

First, I deleted all emotional words from the list of questions for interviews (see Boyd et al., 1970). Second, I conducted all open-ended interviews to ensure consistency of questions (see Boyd et al., 1970). Third, I monitored my professional biases while summarizing the results (see Boyd et al., 1970). Fourth, I used an audit trail in the form

of a reflective journal and memos to prevent inadvertent biases from influencing data collection and analysis (see Shenton, 2004).

This study involved human participants in open-ended interviews. This required my adherence to high ethical standards by ensuring participants' and institutions' confidentiality by grouping them without naming the organizations represented (see Tamariz et al., 2013). Each participant was assigned an alphabetic code to ensure confidentiality. The data were stored in a password-protected computer that contained files with participants' signed consent forms, audio-files from interviews, and interview transcripts. The data will be kept for 5 years and then erased. During the recruitment process, I sent out consent forms with detailed information on the study, including its purpose and procedures. Potential risks were minimal because interviews focused on professional, not personal or sensitive, information on tourism-related effects (see Tamariz et al., 2013). The consent form included information on the role of participants and participants' withdrawal option at any stage during or after the interviews (see Tamariz et al., 2013). The consent form is included in this study (see Appendix A). I did not use any incentives in exchange for stakeholders' participation in the interviews.

Methodology

Open-ended interviews were conducted in Nur-Sultan. This city hosted an EXPO in 2017 and became a testing ground for Kazakhstan's tourism development. However, there was no publicly available information regarding the impact on the city's local community in the year of hosting the World Exhibition. This gap warranted the current study, in which qualitative data were collected from tourism industry stakeholders by

means of open-ended interviews. Participants represented various stakeholder groups with knowledge and experience in the social and economic effects of the tourism industry. Representatives from vulnerable populations were not interviewed.

Participant Selection

For this study, a definition proposed by Friedman and Miles (2006) was applied to define tourism stakeholders in Nur-Sultan. Nur-Sultan's tourism stakeholders included three groups of organizations: business (hotels and hostels, tourism and entertainment services), NGOs (tourism associations), and government (Nur-Sultan tourism authorities). These organizations' parameters were collected from the official website of Kazakhstan's Committee of Statistics (2020). The first category (business) was represented by 1,000 tourism organizations, 7,500 entertainment companies, and 213 hotels and hostels registered in Nur-Sultan. Among the mentioned residencies, five hotels had five stars, 24 hotels had three stars, and 138 hotels were without a star category. The rest were hostels. The second category (tourism-related NGOs) was represented by the National Association of Tourism Industry, the Association of Tourism of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the National Leisure Association of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Kazakhstan Association of Tourism Agencies, the Eurasia Tourism Association, and the Tourism Association of Nur-Sultan. The third category (government) was represented by two entities, one at the central government level named the Committee of Tourism Industry of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the other at the local government level named the Department of Tourism Development of Nur-Sultan Akimat. Both institutions had

their representatives at a quasi-state level named Kazakh Tourism National Company and Visit Nur-Sultan, which in 2021 was renamed Nur-Sultan Invest.

Interviews were conducted with five representatives from each of the stakeholders' group – business community, tourism NGOs, government officials (Onwuegbuzie et al., 2009). This number of interviews was considered as sufficient to produce data of thematic saturation (Weller et al., 2018) to produce a list of tourism's effects. Weller et al. (2018) noted that even small samples of ten participants produce 95% of salient items that construct sufficient data to ensure this study's thematic saturation.

I provided participants with consent forms sent by email (Appendix B), which they signed by sending confirmation in form of I-consent-emails before participating in interviews. I also briefed interviewees on the study and verified their eligibility and the professional background against the following criteria. First, participants represented stake-holders' organization. Second, all the participants lived in Nur-Sultan during and after the EXPO-2017 or were involved in tourism activities taking place around EXPO-2017. Third, the participants had more than three years of experience in developing and promoting the tourism industry of Kazakhstan. Fourth, the interviewees were aware of the government's role in managing the tourism industry. The goal of these criteria was to gain an in-depth understanding of tourism effects from in-the-field experts and practitioners to compile the most reliable list of tourism-related effects. These criteria were included into the letter request to stakeholders' organizations (Appendix A) and the consent forms (Appendix B).

The interviews were audio-taped and transcribed. In addition, I recorded in a field notebook all the information participants shared with me during interviews. It also helped to highlight my own thoughts to bracket personal biases at the later stage of analysis. The protocol for conducting the interviews included four parts:

1. Introduction
2. Warm-up questions
3. Questions on tourism-related effects
4. The participant's concluding statement.

The data that was collected during the interviews on tourism effects were compared against existing resources on tourism-related effects in recent reports issued by the UNWTO and the OECD for triangulation purposes. The chosen technique helped to support findings using multiple data sources (Yin, 2017). For the purpose of triangulation, the following type of data were used: International organization's data: UNWTO database on tourism-related effects, as well WEF database. In addition, the OECD, whose experts issue tourism-related reports annually, arrange correspondent conferences and publish data; articles from more than hundred tourism-related journals that cover tourism development and its effects. I also used official information on tourism posted by Nur-Sultan governance.

Instrumentation

Instrumentation of the open-ended interviews included open-ended semi-structured questionnaires, and interviews' protocols supported by the transcription of audio-taped interview discussions, as well as written notes and memos that were done

during and after the interviews. I compiled an open-ended semi-structured protocol for the interviews and tested its content saturation with the Tourism Department of the National Chamber of Entrepreneurs of the Republic of Kazakhstan named Atameken (O'Sullivan et al., 2017). The open-ended questions helped to uncover common tendencies in thoughts and opinions of interviewees (Yin, 2017). The goal of interviewing was to collect a list of the most salient social and economic effects of tourism development that impacted Nur-Sultan's population daily life after hosting EXPO-2017. I sent the list of interview questions by official letter (Appendix B) requesting Department's consideration of its content:

The goal was to collect qualitative data by engaging a small number of people in informal, open, and friendly discussions (Wilkinson, 2004) focused on tourism's social and economic effects. Data analysis uncovered codes and themes related to the effects that impacted social constructs of Nur-Sultan's locals. Open-ended interviews were less threatening to the research participants and stimulated in-depth analysis of issues that needed to be discussed through to identify salient dimensions of complex social problems (Lunt, 1996) like socioeconomic effect of tourism.

The interview protocol, transcript of audio taped interview discussions, and written notes ensured the accuracy of collected data and helped in conducting an extended and in-depth analysis of data provided by interviewees (O'Sullivan et al., 2017). The quality of the interview protocol, as well as the synthesis of participants' responses, increased the quality of collected data on tourism effects. The chosen approach helped to increase the credibility and trustworthiness of the research (Caretta, 2015; O'Sullivan et

al., 2017). The notetaking, audiotaping and transcribing were done only if participants granted the permission. All the interview transcripts were sent to interviews for consideration. Following the interviews, I conducted extensive research on international organization's reports, articles, statements, as well as official documents and records on tourism-related effects to establish triangulation (Fielding, 2012).

Procedures for Recruitment

I compiled the list of stakeholder-organizations and drafted the list of alternative stakeholder-organizations in case there were no interest from organizations included in the list. Both lists included tourism-related business organizations, NGOs, and government institutions responsible for tourism development. I sent official letters to the leadership of stakeholder-organizations with detailed information on the research, the rationale for choosing the organization and requested a kind assistance in recruiting representatives from each organization to participate in interviews (Appendix A). These letters helped to obtain the permission of leadership to outreach to the employees for this research, informed on previously discussed criteria for participation in interviews and my contact information for potential participants to contact me about this study. The letter helped to identify participants and to recruit them by follow-up emails and phone calls to conduct individual interviews that took place online using the ZOOM in a comfortable for participants' atmosphere to ensure open and sincere dialogue. During the process, participants were informed about possibility of a follow-up Zoom meetings or phone calls if more details on the subject and their responses were needed.

I compiled responses from stakeholder-organizations and listed those who agreed to participate in this research by grouping them as business representatives, NGO representatives, and government representatives. I sent an information letter (Appendix B) to all the participants with more essential details on the nature of the study, the reasons they were selected, potential risks and benefits, protection of personal information of the participants, and the informed consent. The letter also informed participants that no financial incentives were offered. I scheduled individual meetings with all participants via telephone calls. 15 interviews were conducting over 3 months following IRB approval.

Each interview lasted around 60 minutes in via the Zoom format (because of COVID-19 pandemic,). I provided participants with consent forms sent by email (Appendix B), which they signed by sending a confirmation I-consent-email before participating in interviews. I also briefed the interviewees on the study and verified their eligibility and the professional background against earlier established criteria. All interviews were audio-taped and transcribed. In addition, I recorded in a field notebook all the information interviewees shared with me during interviews. It also helped to highlight my own thoughts to bracket personal biases at the later stage of analysis.

Data Analysis Plan

The data analysis plan analyzed the data collected from industry's stakeholders during the open-ended interviews on tourism's effects in Nur-Sultan. Once all interviews were conducted and the data collected, I codified information (Leung & Chalupa, 2019), observe frequencies of themes that occurred within the data (no follow up phone calls or

Zoom meetings were needed). I formatted pages of interviews' records into four columns. Interview transcripts were formatted in double-spaced format and located on the left three-thirds of the page by keeping a wide a right-hand margin for writing preliminary, first cycle and second cycle codes with notes (Saldana, 2015).

The column for preliminary codes ensured a quality transit from raw data to actual codes. I separated the text of interviews into short paragraph units with a line break in between them whenever the topic on effects appeared to change. These units played a crucial role in formatting data for further data analysis (Saldana, 2015) that was handmade. I also aggregated all the records to get to the essence of tourism effects phenomenon and understand relationships between its economic and social parts. I did not plan to look into tendencies, but they appeared naturally during the interviews.

To ensure the trustworthiness of the coding, I checked my interpretations with participants of interviews, initially code during transcribing interview data and maintained a reflective journal on the research project with copious analytical memos. I organized, persevered, dealing with ambiguity, flexible, creative, ethical, and rigorous in vocabulary to ensure the quality of the research. I also wrote analytical memos as one of this project's cornerstones that helped to ensure good thinking and analysis of data related economic and social effects of tourism. It guided the coding process and significantly improved it.

Writing memos defined emergent patterns (Saldana, 2015). I used the memos as a framing device in the later coding process. In the analytical memo, I reflected on my relationship with participants, the study's research questions, code choice and potential

definitions, and emergent patterns. I also reflected on potential networks among the codes and any problem with the study if such a problem appears (Saldana, 2015). I wrote about an ethical dilemma, future direction for the study with transit conclusion to be considered in the first and second cycles of coding.

In the first cycle, I applied In Vivo coding to attune my analysis to participant language, perspectives, and worldviews on tourism effects. In Vivo Coding was a foundational method that drew from participants' language for codes to extract indigenous terms (Saldana, 2015) that comprehend the socioeconomic effects of tourism. The second cycle of coding required an astute questioning of collected datum on social and economic effects of tourism, as well as an accurate recall of information (Saldana, 2015). It transformed the first cycle analysis with yet invisible patterns into apparent conclusions. Thus, this process of verification required the Focused coding to link effects logically and fit them into categories (Saldana, 2015). The goal here was to develop a data corpus's coherent synthesis to extract from the bulk of interview information those social and economic effects that impacted well being of Nur-Sultan's local community. The Focus coding developed salient codes and helped to organize data on effects and assign them into categories by attributing appropriate meaning to the groups. The codes became logical outcomes of research questions answered during interviews and their analysis that took place considering duality of this study's theoretical framework. The alignment between two theories and expecting codes was presented in the Table 1 with examples of parent and secondary codes.

Table 1*Examples of Parent and Secondary Codes*

Parent code	Secondary code	Interview
		question/s possibly related to code
Corporate Social Responsibility Theory (Sheehy, 1960-ish)		
Government social responsiveness	<p>Positive socioeconomic effects: population growth, changing employment patterns, level of income, employment opportunities, quality of life, improved family living conditions, jobs offer, leisure opportunities, construction of schools, medical clinics and airports, community integration, better public service, investments, entrepreneurship development, increase in the standard of living, increase in foreign exchange, public facility development, infrastructure development, cultural conservation, social relation development, heritage conservation, increase in cultural activity, increase in pride, and cultural exchange.</p> <p>Negative socioeconomic effects: rising poverty, increased price of goods and services, enhanced security issues, decreased traditional economic activities, decreased community's participation, reduced time spent with families, increased social problems, reduced public leisure space, divided society, increase in property prices, absence of benefits by residents, increase in the cost of living, commercialization of activities, dilution of the local language.</p>	2, 3, 10

Parent code	Secondary code	Interview
Tourism	<p data-bbox="505 451 1192 779">Positive social effects: cultural enrichment, local culture development, entrepreneurial opportunities, living standards, level of economic security, employment, health, personal safety, housing conditions, physical environment, improved community services, leisure recreation, job creation, support of cultural activities.</p> <p data-bbox="505 816 1192 1146">Negative social effects: cultural tension, ecological degradation, cultural degradation, violence against foreigners, inflation inciting social tension, hostility toward visitors, changed cultural values, the degradation of native language and customs. crime, illegal prostitution, use, and traffic of drugs, social conflict.</p>	2, 8, 10
Business social responsiveness	<p data-bbox="505 1184 1192 1818">Positive socioeconomic effects: population growth, changing employment patterns, level of income, employment opportunities, quality of life, improved family living conditions, jobs offer, leisure opportunities, construction of schools, medical clinics and airports, community integration, better public service, investments, entrepreneurship development, increase in the standard of living, increase in foreign exchange, public facility development, infrastructure development, cultural conservation, social relation development, heritage conservation, increase in cultural activity, increase in pride, and cultural exchange.</p>	2, 3, 10

Parent code	Secondary code	Interview
	<p>Negative socioeconomic effects: rising poverty, increased price of goods and services, enhanced security issues, decreased traditional economic activities, decreased community's participation, reduced time spent with families, increased social problems, reduced public leisure space, divided society, increase in property prices, absence of benefits by residents, increase in the cost of living, commercialization of activities, dilution of the local language, increase in crime, increase in social conflicts, social dislocation, environmental damage, increase in litter and garbage, increase in crowding and congestions.</p>	<p>question/s possibly related to code</p>
Theory of Organizational Economics (Arrow, 1969)		
<p>Government's tourism related policies</p>	<p>Economic effects: investments, government spending on tourism, purchases from suppliers. development of food and beverages, recreation, clothing, housing, household business. GDP; employment.</p> <p>Social effects: level of economic security, employment, health, personal safety, housing conditions, physical environment, hostility toward visitors, changed cultural values, the degradation of native language and customs, improved community services, leisure recreation, job creation, cultural conservation, social relation development, heritage conservation, increase in cultural activity, increase in pride.</p>	<p>4, 7, 9, 11</p>

Parent code	Secondary code	Interview
	<p>Socioeconomic effects: population growth, changing employment patterns, level of income, rising poverty. employment opportunities, quality of life, improved family living conditions, jobs offer, leisure opportunities, construction of schools, medical clinics and airports, community integration, better public service. increased price of goods and services, enhanced security issues, decreased traditional economic activities, decreased community's participation, reduced time spent with families, increased social problems, reduced public leisure space, divided society. investments, entrepreneurship development, increase in the standard of living, increase in foreign exchange, public facility development, infrastructure development, cultural conservation, social relation development, heritage conservation, increase in cultural activity, increase in pride, and cultural exchange, increase in property prices, absence of benefits by residents, increase in the cost of living, commercialization of activities, dilution of the local language, increase in crime, increase in social conflicts, social dislocation, environmental damage, increase in litter and garbage, increase in crowding and congestions.</p>	<p>question/s possibly related to code</p>
Public-privet partnerships	Positive socioeconomic effects: population growth, changing employment patterns, level of income, employment	5, 7, 9

Parent code	Secondary code	Interview
	<p>opportunities, quality of life, improved family living conditions, jobs offer, leisure opportunities, construction of schools, medical clinics and airports, community integration, better public service, investments, entrepreneurship development, increase in the standard of living, increase in foreign exchange, public facility development, infrastructure development, cultural conservation, social relation development, heritage conservation, increase in cultural activity, increase in pride, and cultural exchange.</p> <p>Negative socioeconomic effects: rising poverty, increased price of goods and services, enhanced security issues, decreased traditional economic activities, decreased community's participation, reduced time spent with families, increased social problems, reduced public leisure space, divided society, increase in property prices, absence of benefits by residents, increase in the cost of living, commercialization of activities, dilution of the local language, increase in crime, increase in social conflicts, social dislocation, environmental damage, increase in litter and garbage, increase in crowding and congestions.</p>	<p>question/s possibly related to code</p>
<p>Tourism's economic effectiveness</p>	<p>Positive and negative economic effects: investments, government spending on tourism, purchases from suppliers. development of food and beverages, recreation, clothing, GDP.</p>	<p>6, 9</p>

All the codes and their relationships were triangulated with multiple data resources to compile a table of economic and social effects. The chosen method increased the quality of the research; improved the internal and external validity and reliability of the data (Denzin, 2012). To this end also contributed my decision to go back to notes and memos took during the interviews (Moustakas, 1990) when the narrative of the analysis was ready. During the data analysis process, I also stepped aside from the collected data and come back to it with refreshed knowledge to raise the accuracy of the final paper (Patton, 2015). The validity of this research was strengthened by the coding framework that aligned the theory, the research question, interview questions, and the codification process. It helped to find the answer to the research question: How do business leaders, leaders of tourism, and government officials perceive the socioeconomic effects of tourism in Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan following EXPO-2017?

Issues of Trustworthiness

The qualitative part of this research was conducted by arranging open-ended interviews to answer the research question: What is the understanding of stakeholders in the tourism field regarding tourism socioeconomic effects and its social responsibility on Nur-Sultan's local population after hosting EXPO-2017? The goal was to understand socioeconomic effects of tourism on Nur-Sultan's local community and to compile a correspondent list. One of the challenges here was to ensure trustworthiness that was more difficult than establishing validity in the study's quantitative part (Rudestan & Newton, 2015). Thus, the decision was made to follow Guba's Four Criteria of Trustworthiness to increase the quality of this research (Guba, 1981). Following the

criteria, the credibility was established by conducting 10 to 15 interviews with stakeholders, including experts, the business community, government officials, NGOs in tourism. Participants of those interviews were selected by the decision of stakeholder organizations' leadership. Extended, in-depth interviews with open-ended questions ensured the highest possible saturation of data collection (Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016).

The datum corpus was triangulated with official and international documents on tourism's socioeconomic effects collected from national and international institutions. The tactic to ensure participants' honesty included open-ended and iterative questions, the right to refuse from participating in the interviews at any time, through the encouragement of being frank and independent in their judgments (Dilshad & Latif, 2013). Peer-review, debriefing sessions with the Chair, and the Committee members, as well as drafting interview reports that were checked by participants and accompanied by the full description of the phenomenon with an examination of previous research findings to constitute a detailed and verifiable picture on effects and process of data collection. Some researchers believed other practitioners decide the level of research transferability by assessing the thickness of the contextual factors' description (Firestone, 1993). Following this logic, this research outlined a detailed explanation of participants' variety, data collection methods, and decisions made in analyzing grouping results, and building inferences. I used a full and detailed description with extensive quotes from participants to avoid any research bias (Rudestan & Newton, 2015).

Dependability was ensured by a clear explanation of the design and its implementation for each interview (Shenton, 2004) with stakeholders in the tourism field. It slightly varied from one group of stakeholders to the other while the list of questions, as well as prompts for each interview, will remain the same. Such a tactic increased the level of credibility of data collection. However, because the study considered various perspectives on the same issues, the collected data was slightly varied in tone and accents.

Conformability of this study was ensured by findings neutrality from researcher's bias, interest and motivation (Patton, 2015). The overall design guaranteed the research results' to be defined by the collected data and information, rather than on my preferences. Detailed transcripts, extensive quotes from participants, as well as recognition of the researcher's bias, altogether contributed to this fact. I also showed positive and negative opinions on tourism effects and bracketed my thoughts during the interviews (Patton, 2015). I used elements of triangulation to compare and check collected data with information on tourism-related effects collected from national and international documents. All these steps ensured a high level of conformability. The researcher's bias was addressed by admitting professional and personal predisposition toward the issue. As a former Deputy Chairman of the Committee on Tourism Industry in Kazakhstan, I was interested in better understanding of tourism's socioeconomic impact in Nur-Sultan to create a list of unique themes or codes for decision makers to use them in tourism-management purposes. However, such a predisposition refrained from a completely objective assessment of collected data. Thus, drafting an audit trail in the

form of the data-oriented diagram was used to free analysis, data collection, and research design decisions from inadvertent biases by escorting each with reflective commentary (Shenton, 2004).

Ethical Procedures

The research involved human agents to conduct the open-ended interviews, thus required adherence to high ethical standards. The research secured the Walden's IRB approval before conducting open-ended interviews. The IRB application process included submission of the proposal (dissertation), proposed procedures, community research stakeholders, assessment of potential risks and benefits for participants, data integrity and confidentiality, the potential conflict of interest, data collection, description of the research participants, obtaining informed consent (Walden University, 2015).

It is expected that human subjects in this research provided insights on social and economic effects of tourism industry to provide an in depth understanding of socioeconomic nature of tourism impact on local community in Nur-Sultan as a tourism destination. It was also expected that the researched understanding would be unique for the tourism destination. No representative from the vulnerable population was interviewed. The target population was experts in tourism development, business, government officials, and NGOs in tourism field. I did not name organizations and interviewees to protect participants' confidentiality.

Before conducting interviews, the draft of the consent form (Appendix B) was sent for the IRB approval (# 11-23-20-0666359). The selection included detailed information on the research to allow potential participants to understand and decide on

further engagement with the research (Tamariz et al., 2013). It also included the purpose and the procedures of the study, potential risks that are minimal, the contact information of the researcher, the role of participants, and clauses to ensure participants confidentiality, especially during the research results disclosure. The draft provided information on participants' withdrawal option at any stage of the research.

No incentives were used in exchange for participating in interviews. Keeping confidentiality secure, each participant of the IRB was assigned by the alphabetic code and will store the data in a password-protected file. The file will be divided into sub-files for each participant to store a signed consent form, audio-files from interviews, interview transcripts, and other material if appropriate. The collected data will be kept for at least five years, after which it will be erased.

Summary

The purpose of this qualitative study is to understand social and economic impact tourism made on Nur-Sultan's local population after EXPO-2017 and define a unique list of socioeconomic effects to inform the decision-making process by public administrators, and the tourism field. For these purposes, I conducted qualitative research in the form of open-ended interviews with 15 participants representing three groups of stakeholders in the tourism field, including business representatives, tourism-related NGOs, and government officials. To ensure the validity of data collection, all the interviewees had extensive experience in the tourism field and were participants of the EXPO-2017.

The open-ended semi-structured protocol for the interviews included the questions listed in Appendix C. Interview questions were aligned with the research

question and detailed to get valid information on the subject of this research. The collected data went through two cycles of coding (In-Vivo and Focus coding). All the codes were triangulated with multiple data resources to compile a table of economic and social effects. The results will be presented in Chapter 4 and grouped using parent codes, themes, codes, and research questions to ensure alignment between theories, data collection, and final results.

Chapter 4: Results

This study addressed the understudied areas of socioeconomic effects of tourism by applying a qualitative methodology to understand the industry's impact on the local community in Nur-Sultan after it hosted a significant tourism booster event international exhibition EXPO-2017. This study included open-ended interviews to answer the research question: How do business leaders, leaders of tourism, and government officials perceive the socioeconomic effects of tourism in Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan, following EXPO-2017? Interviews were conducted in the Russian language via Zoom. Fifteen participants agreed to join this study. Participant selection was based on the criteria that included their experience in the tourism field (at least 6 years) and involvement in tourism-related activities around the EXPO-2017. All participants answered the interview questions (see Appendix D). Interviews were audio-recorded using the Zoom audio-recording system, transcribed, translated from Russian into English, and analyzed. The collected data were hand-coded using Microsoft Excel. Themes were categorized and identified (see Appendix E).

In this chapter, I discuss the research setting, recruiting procedure, participants, their competence in the tourism field, and steps to protect their confidentiality. I outline the data collection procedures and explain the data analysis procedure that revealed codes and themes related to the effects of the Nur-Sultan local population's socioeconomic constructs in 2017. The results are discussed and presented in Table 2, with three examples of discrepancies that were identified during data analysis. I also provide evidence of trustworthiness following Guba's (1981) four criteria of trustworthiness.

Settings

I used a qualitative design and open-ended interviews to collect and analyze data on tourism stakeholders' perceptions of the socioeconomic effects of tourism generated by EXPO-2017. The recruitment process did not imply any personal contacts until stakeholder organizations' leadership decision on participants and participation in interviews. Because I was on maternity leave, I had no leverage to encourage any participation using my professional position. I had no relationships with participants and did not know who would participate in interviews until the stakeholders' organizations decided it. This process minimized any perception of coerced research participation. First, I compiled a list of tourism stakeholder organizations and drafted a list of alternative stakeholder organizations if there was no interest from organizations in the first list. Second, I sent letters to the leadership of stakeholder organizations with detailed information on the study, the rationale for choosing the organization, and a request for assistance in recruiting 10 representatives of each organization to participate in interviews. The goal was to obtain permission from organizations' leadership to contact employees for interview purposes, inform them of the inclusion criteria, and provide them with my contact information.

In some cases, the leadership of stakeholder organizations advised outreach to some experts who had worked with them during the EXPO-2017 but had recently moved to other organizations. Third, when participants were identified, I sent an information letter (see Appendix B) to the participants with more details on the nature of the study, the reasons they had been selected, potential risks and benefits, protection of personal

information of the participants, and the informed consent. The letter informed participants that no financial incentives were offered. The participants responded to the invitation letters and signed the consent form by sending a responding email with the phrase “I consent.” During the interviews, participants did not experience any conditions, experiences, or trauma that might have influenced their responses and the results of this study.

Demographics

Fifteen participants agreed to volunteer for this study after the research purpose, selection criteria, and consent form had been explained. Five participants represented each of the three groups of tourism stakeholders: business (hotels and tourism services), NGOs (tourism associations), and government (central and Nur-Sultan tourism authorities). All participants had more than six years of experience in tourism, were involved in EXPO-2017, and witnessed the effects that tourism produced on Nur-Sultan’s local community in 2017. Tourism’s business arranged EXPO-related events for visitors and provided hotels, food, beverages, and logistics. Tourism-related NGOs helped tourism businesses communicate their EXPO-related needs to the central government, local authorities, and people of Nur-Sultan. The government and local authorities involved in tourism’s policymaking focused on ensuring macroeconomic effects by EXPO-2017.

Data Collection

Before data collection, I compiled the list of stakeholder organizations. I also drafted a list of alternative stakeholder organizations if there was no interest from

organizations in the first list. Both lists included tourism-related business organizations, NGOs, and government institutions responsible for tourism development. I sent official letters to the leadership of stakeholder organizations with detailed information on the study, the rationale for choosing the organization, and a request for assistance in recruiting representatives of each organization to participate in interviews (see Appendix A). These letters helped me obtain leadership's permission to contact the employees, identify participants, and recruit them by follow-up emails and phone calls to conduct individual interviews. I called potential participants of the study to brief them on the research, explain its purpose, and verify their eligibility and professional background against the participation criteria. Fifteen participants volunteered to participate in this research. Alphabetic codes were assigned (e.g., Participant A, Participant B).

The participants equally represented three stakeholder groups (five from business, five from NGOs, and five from tourism authorities) with knowledge and experience in tourism-produced social and economic effects. Representatives from vulnerable population were not interviewed. After the verification process, I sent consent forms by email, to which the participant responded "I consent." These responding emails were considered official agreements to participate in this study and were added to the research files. When participants' consent was secured, I sent interview questions and arranged 15 Zoom conferences (because of COVID-19) on the dates and times selected by participants.

The open-ended interviews were conducted in Nur-Sultan, the city host of EXPO-2017 and testing ground for Kazakhstan's tourism development. The first interview was

arranged for December 12, 2020. It took almost 2 months to complete all 15 interviews, with the final arranged on February 8, 2021. Each interview lasted between 60 and 80 minutes and was conducted via Zoom because of COVID-19. The Zoom platform allowed the automatic recording of the interviews that have been filed. Interviews' instrumentation included an interview protocol, interview audio recordings, transcripts of audio-taped interviews, and my written notes and memos in a reflective journal.

The open-ended semi-structured protocol and interview questions were tested with the Tourism Department of the National Chamber of Entrepreneurs of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Atameken) to ensure content relevance. The interview questions and protocol were used to discover common tendencies in interviewees' thoughts and opinions. This approach helped me identify the most salient social and economic effects of tourism development that impacted Nur-Sultan's daily life after hosting EXPO-2017, including new tendencies in Kazakhstan's tourism development and list of recommendations.

The interviews were audio-taped and transcribed after participants granted permission in the consent form. Transcripts were sent to participants for review. In addition, after each interview, I wrote protocols and memos to compile a reflective journal. In these papers, I highlighted my thoughts and bracketed some of the personal biases addressed at the later analysis stages. The protocol included four parts: introduction, warm-up questions, questions on tourism-related effects, and participants' concluding statement. Memos included information on participants' experience, the study's research questions, code choice and definitions, emergent patterns (trends), and

participant recommendations. Some of the memos reflected on potential networks among the codes and future direction for the study and were used in the first and second cycles of the coding process.

The data collected during the interviews on tourism effects were compared against existing resources on tourism-related effects in recent reports issued by the UNWTO and the OECD for triangulation purposes. I used the UNWTO database on tourism-related effects, the WEF database, the OECD, as well as the official information on tourism by Nur-Sultan local governance.

Data Analysis

Data analysis revealed codes and themes related to the effects of the Nur-Sultan local population's socioeconomic constructs in 2017. I conducted two steps of coding. The collected data were analyzed to define codes in a first circle using In Vivo codes technique. The first coding cycle results were processed in the second cycle of coding utilizing the focused codes technique. All defined codes were grouped between parent codes aligned with the theoretical framework and split between two sets: CSR and the organizational economics theory. I organized data by observing frequencies and themes that occurred within the data. For this purpose, I formatted pages of interview records in double-space. I separated the text of interviews into short paragraph units with a line break between them whenever the topic on effects appeared to change. Using the In Vivo technique, I applied codes to participants' language and arrange them in the columns between parent codes. In Vivo coding helped me draw codes from participants' language and extract terms that addressed the socioeconomic effects of tourism. Some In Vivo

codes became umbrella codes used in data analysis. For example, the code “business awakening” extracted from one of the interviews later became a theme for all business activities around EXPO-2017 that included tourism organizations, guides, logistics, catering, shopping, hotels, hostels, and types of services. My first cycle of coding ensured a quality transition from raw data to actual codes. This approach also indicated that further coding should be done by hand to define relationships between the codes as the analysis progressed.

The second cycle of coding required a revision of first cycle codes, an accurate recall of collected data, and efforts to regroup the codes to establish umbrella themes and a set of related codes within parent codes. This process was used to transform the first cycle codes into patterns, establish trends, and frame conclusions. Focused coding helped me link effects logically, fit codes into themes, synthesize related effects, and extract themes from the interview information. Focused coding helped me develop salient codes and organize them by assigning them to themes. Established themes were used to answer the research question within a dual theoretical framework. The alignment between the two theories and established themes and codes is presented in Table 2.

There are three cases of discrepancies in the collected data. The first case relates to the duality of the process of incorporating EXPO-driven green technologies in Nur-Sultan. The case was reflected in the tourism sustainable development parent code and addressed by creating two themes: the negative titled tourism infrastructure immaturity and the positive titled spatial greenification. The second case unveiled a low level of business social responsiveness in Nur-Sultan. It was discussed within the business social

responsiveness parent code that established two themes: the negative titled social irresponsiveness and the second titled new socioeconomic players. The third case discovered duality in the government's policies toward the business. Such duality was discussed within the public-privet partnerships parent code with two related themes: the positive titled the new business opportunities and the negative titled the selectivity in business partnerships. During the research, by aggregating all the records to get to the essence of tourism effects phenomenon and understand relationships between its economic and social parts, I also collected information on tendencies and recommendations that participants shared during the interviews. This information will be reflected in Chapter 5.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

Following Guba's (1981) four criteria of trustworthiness, *credibility* was established by conducting 15 interviews with stakeholders from Nur-Sultan's business community, government officials, NGOs in the tourism field. Participants of those interviews were selected by the decision of stakeholder organizations' leadership. Extended, in depth interviews with open ended questions ensured the highest possible saturation of data collection that was triangulated with official and international documents on tourism's socioeconomic effects. The tactic to ensure participants' honesty included open-ended and iterative questions, the right to refuse from participating in the interviews at any time through the encouragement of being frank and independent. Peer-review, debriefing sessions with the Chair, and drafting interview reports checked by

participants were conducted together with the analysis of previous research findings on the subject.

Transferability was ensured by outlining a detailed explanation of participants' variety, data collection methods, and decisions to analyze grouping results and build inferences. I used a full and detailed description of tourism's effects from participants to avoid any research bias in codifying the data.

Dependability was ensured by explaining design and its implementation for each interview with stakeholders in the tourism field. It slightly varied between participants, but the list of questions and prompts for each interview remained the same.

Conformability was ensured by the research design guaranteed the results to be defined by data rather than my preferences. Detailed transcripts, extensive quotes from participants, the reflective journal with brackets of my thoughts, memos, protocols, and recognition of the researcher's bias altogether contributed to this fact. I used triangulation elements to compare and check collected data with information on tourism-related effects collected from national and international documents.

Results

The research results are grouped among parent codes, themes, codes, and research questions to ensure alignment between theories, data collection, and final results. The first group of themes and codes related to the corporate social responsibility theory (CSR) and split among three-parent codes - *government social responsiveness*, *tourism sustainable development*, and *business social responsiveness* with their following grouping between positive and negative themes. The second group of positive and

negative themes and codes related to the organizational economics theory (OET) was arranged between three-parent codes - *government's policies*, *public-privet partnerships*, and *tourism's economic effectiveness*. The parent codes played the role of anchors, using which related themes and codes were grouped appropriately in a consistent and aligned way. All the themes were defined during the second cycle of codification process.

Table 2

Organization of Parent Codes and Themes Between the CSR and the OET

Parent Code	Theme	Code	Parent Code	Theme	Code
Government Social Responsiveness,	5	14	Government's Policies,	4	10
Tourism Sustainable Development,	5	13	Public-Privet Partnerships,	2	2
Business Social Responsiveness	4	9	Tourism's Economic Effectiveness	5	9

Corporate Social Responsibility's Codes and Themes

Parent Code 1: Government Social Responsiveness

This research has defined five themes, and 14 codes outlined positive and negative effects produced by the government's socially oriented policies during and right after the EXPO-2017. Such policies triggered some positive and negative developments - business and cultural awakening, national identity awakening, educational revival, and

unhappened social regeneration. These developments were organized into themes using the Focus codification technique and synthesized based on the codes extracted from interviews using the In-Vivo codification technique (by applying participants' language).

Theme 1: Business Awakening. The theme consists of three codes - proliferation of tourism-related business ($f = 9$), increase in tourism-related private investments ($f = 6$), and revival of souvenir production ($f = 3$). The proliferation of tourism-related business code was discussed by Participant A as the result of Nur-Sultan's "population gained confidence that boosted the development of small and medium-sized businesses" (right before, during, and right after the EXPO-2017). Participant E agreed that tourism with its "multiplier effect" generated business activities among a "huge number of other branches, including construction, mobile communication, entertainment, trade, catering, accommodations," and "a range of other services from laundry to beauty salons."

An increase in tourism-related private investments code was first mentioned by Participant A, "when the business itself began to give grants for tourism's development." "I think we can say that the EXPO-2017 influenced the increased confidence among businesses (to invest)" added Participant N. Participant G stressed the importance to keep the momentum "to create good conditions for local entrepreneurs to invest money. Participant J disagreed with the thesis saying that "the amount of total investment in the EXPO-2017 case was not the investment but expenditures from the national budget."

The revival of souvenir production code was discussed by Participant L who agreed that the EXPO-2017 "stimulated the qualitative growth of artisans" and sustained their "qualitative leap in production" as an emergent industry. Participant I reminded that

it happened because of government's efforts "providing space for artisans to produce and to sold" their products during the EXPO-2017,

Theme 2: Cultural Awakening. The theme includes two codes – proliferation of Kazakhstan's culture ($f = 12$) and cultural enrichment ($f = 9$). The expansion of Kazakhstan's culture went through two dimensions among Kazakhstan citizens and inbound visitors, but both discovered the country from new, before unknown angles. As Participant E stated, the EXPO-2017 "had an educational (cultural) impact not only on foreign tourists but also on Kazakhstan citizens who got acquainted with its own culture." Participant J agreed that the EXPO-2017 played a role of "a big incentive for Kazakhs to remember their culture, and it became widespread." Participant K mentioned its international dimension by saying that "during the city tours, Chinese and many other visitors were attracted by visiting Kazakhstan's museums and cultural places."

The cultural enrichment code was discussed in greater detail by Participant A, who reminded "Cirque du Soleil" performance, "Terakot Army and many other international exhibits" performed in Kazakhstan during the EXPO-2017 that "may influence" Kazakhstan's cultural development of generations to come." This thesis was also supported by Participant C, who agreed that the EXPO-2017 "had a positive impact on people's perspective." Participant M also explained that "the culture was enriched, because new cultural facilities operated, and people (including foreigners) wanted to come ... and to see them."

Theme 3: National Identity Awakening. The theme includes four codes - increased confidence in future ($f = 8$), cultural self-recognition ($f = 5$), increased national

pride ($f = 6$), and national reunification ($f = 5$). The increased confidence in future code was described by Participant A as the EXPO-2017, and related policies produced an increased “confidence in future among Nur-Sultan’s population... when some categories of people were able to improve their living situation by finding additional income, and so on.” Participant B, Participant H, and Participant I correlated it with the fact that the EXPO-2017 created “more opportunities.”

The cultural self-recognition code was defined by Participant F as a process of the “population’s psychological transition toward an atmosphere of freedom in” various forms of public manifestation.” Participant D noted that it was inspired by “people’s hope” in the country’s future and dictated by the cultural enrichment effect, as it was proposed by Participant H.

The increased national pride code, as Participant E discussed, was nurtured by “people who lived in Nur-Sultan”. “It was pride and patriotic or spiritual rise,” concluded Participant E. Participant G agreed that it was based on “respect for their country, for what they see and what they experienced.” Participant F noted that this sense of pride felt people “around Kazakhstan.”

Participant E described the national reunification code as people’s satisfaction with economic improvement. “People have found a place to work,” and “the national pride - national unity, had increased.” Participant G explained the national reunification due to the process triggered by the EXPO-2017 and named it a “formation of modern thinking and integration with the international community.”

Theme 4: Educational Revival. The theme consists of two codes – the extended outlook ($f = 1$), increased interest in learning ($f = 12$). The extended outlook code was explained by Participant A as the EXPO-2017 generated cultural events, including Circus Du Soleil or the Terracotta Army exhibition arrived in the city from France and China and inspired the interest of adults and children. “They became interested, they began to learn something about it, look at the Internet,” he said.

The increased interest in learning code was explained by Participant A as an “unequivocal” reaction of people who saw in tourism “more opportunities.” “Even now, if earlier hotel owners could not answer tourists in English or other languages, today I see that more people already answer freely - that is, English has become more common, for sure,” he added. Participant C considered the effect as a “multiplier” effect from tourism when “let’s say just an elementary increase in foreign tourists and the system immediately begins to train people to learn languages, learn the history of the country and so on.”

Theme 5: Unhappened Social Regeneration. The theme is a negative one with three codes – the low hospitality culture ($f = 12$), the intolerance with elements of phobia ($f = 3$), the corruption ($f = 1$). The low hospitality culture code was discussed by Participant B, who stated that “the culture of the inhabitants as travelers themselves should increase and accordingly the culture of the population toward the visitors, toward the tourists. So, it’s a culture of hospitality, again.” Participant J agreed, “those, who worked with foreigners focused on them, had a hard time morally because the culture of domestic and inbound tourism rough - no one can serve (tourists).”

Participant L discussed the intolerance with elements of the phobia code as a phobia against Chinese tourists. “It exists in general, throughout the world, not only in our country. This phobia comes from the fact that there are a lot of Chinese out there getting into the economy.” Participant K agreed “during the EXPO-2017 there were elements of intolerance of Nur-Sultan’s population toward foreign tourists. I think the local population had some aversion toward Chinese visitors.”

The corruption code was discussed by Participant G saying that “corruption is our native. We always have it, but for me, the EXPO-2017 was more of a positive thing.” Participant A agreed, “I cannot say that the EXPO brought corruption to us, but the cases were observed during the period of preparation to the EXPO-2017.”

Parent Code 2: Tourism Sustainable Development

There are five themes, and 13 codes revealed positive and negative effects produced by the EXPO-2017 in Nur-Sultan. The exhibition laid a foundation for Nur-Sultan’s spatial greenification and tourism sustainable culture emergence that was still unsustainable in significant parts of the city suffered from tourism infrastructure immaturity. These developments were organized into themes using the Focus codification technique and synthesized into codes extracted from interviews using the In-Vivo codification technique.

Theme 1: Sustainable Culture Emergence. The theme consists of five codes – the profitable and sustainable tourism ($f = 3$), the business-driven-MICE ($f = 3$), the educational tourism ($f = 2$), the sustainable traffic management ($f = 2$), the green culture emergence ($f = 6$). Participant G discussed the profitable and sustainable tourism code as

a development that changes the government's perception of the industry. "What I see (after the EXPO-2017) was a shift in official mentality toward greater responsibility for economic, social and environmental issues of tourism development," said Participant G. Changes in the government's perception of tourism were also noted by Participant A, "I think the government saw the results of the EXPO-2017, which later played an important role in the positive decision to open a company to promote tourism - Kazakh Tourism."

The business-driven-MICE code was discussed as the EXPO's significant achievement when Nu-Sultan's moved away from the practice of entirely funding any events big hosted by the city (even Participant's travel and accommodation expenditures). Participant D described it as "the fact that we started to hold events at the expense of the organizers themselves and at the same time it allowed us to improve occupancy rates." Participant M agreed "the EXPO-2017 was the first time I have seen a large influx of tourists not only business (paid by Kazakhstan's budget), but also tourists who came to visit the EXPO, to make tours to discover Kazakhstan."

The educational tourism code discussed by Participant I, "the EXPO was a unique opportunity for development of children's tourism by attracting children in large groups and organizing trips to Nur-Sultan. Children's educational tourism was an opportunity to raise services' sustainability in many sectors." Participant C agreed with the thesis "the EXPO was visited primarily by schoolchildren attracted by the city and the new (sustainable) technologies itself. This fact had a positive impact on their outlook."

Participant I described the sustainable traffic management code "the EXPO had a particular impact that was made on the organization of traffic in the city. It was, in fact, a

tremendously positive effect on the (sustainable) development of the city itself.”

Participant A disagreed “We still have a big problem for foreigners to get from the airport to hotels. There is no good taxi, and the service is spontaneous. We need to gradually move to a market model of transport management in tourism.”

The green culture emergence code was defined by Participant J “(the EXPO-2017 inspired) people to try to move toward sustainable tourism. Sustainable tourism is about less plastic, less pollution, less everything... it’s started to show up.” Participant G agreed that the EXPO-2017 was “the moment when people start rushing to extremes and understood that it was essential...to move toward sustainable tourism and to preserve what we have.”

Theme 2: Spatial Greenification. The theme consists of two codes – the emergence of public green infrastructure ($f = 7$) and new green projects ($f = 7$). The green infrastructure code in Nur-Sultan was first discussed by Participant A “(one of the EXPO-2017 positive impact) was the renewed public transport fleet. Buses were renewed directly for the EXPO, and we can still see the effect... There are now electric buses and buses that are powered by gas.” Participant L added that “the fact that people had places to go for walks, greenery planting, green parks, there was no rest there before. I’m very proud that such an area appeared in the city.” Participant E discussed the emergence of the new green projects code by criticizing the government’s efforts to “stimulate the development of alternative industries... However, the idea was to implement several projects, some projects that even went through during the EXPO and provide the electrical personnel for the work accordingly.” Participant N agreed, “After the EXPO,

there were no good ...green projects started to be implemented. We did not yet have such qualified personnel... There are some small projects like.... building meter power plants. I do not see any bigger projects yet.”

Theme 3: Tourism Unsustainability Culture. The theme consists of two codes – the absence of sustainable traveling culture ($f = 2$) and the degradation of the traditional walk of life ($f = 2$). The absence of sustainable traveling culture code was discussed in more details by Participant A in various cases, all of which ended up in “the waste that eventually clogged natural springs,” “lead to polluted lakes,” or “damaging the limestone soil layer, which causes soil erosion, and dust rising affected residents.” Participant B underlined the problem, which was in “the culture of people... or rather its absence. I think there is a need to arrange social programs, like social advertising, maybe, training to start from school.” Participant G mentioned the degradation of the traditional walk of life code as “local population (that is involved in tourism development) began to give up animal husbandry... because cattle breeding is a long process and much more complex than tourism.” Participant J repeated the same thesis by saying that “development of tourism observes commercialization of community development... those, who were creative state farms nowadays refused from engaging in livestock breeding, because it’s easier for them to start with a small guest house for tourism purposes.”

Theme 4: Tourism Infrastructure Immaturity. The theme includes two codes – the chaotic infrastructure ($f = 2$) and the inadequate public infrastructure ($f = 2$). The chaotic infrastructure code covered the issue of white elephants (buildings built for the EXPO) that were not absorbed by the economy and stand idle later on. Participant A

stated that “one of such elephants is the Astana Light Rail Transport (LRT). They (the government) were afraid that the entire EXPO territory would also become such an elephant and did not know what to do with this territory further on.” Participant D agreed by adding, “We have four large facilities that bring colossal losses and nothing else. They are the Saryarka Skating Track, Barys Arena, Astana Arena. They are together with the EXPO facilities are a huge burden on the budget.”

The inadequate public infrastructure code was discussed by Participant A, “the navigation system for tourists was not in time for the EXPO.” Participant E added to the list “insufficient parking spaces for tourist buses around the city, public restrooms for tourists to go, housing and communal services.”

Theme 5: Imperfect Legislative and Economic Frames. The theme includes two codes – the lagging green economy ($f = 6$) and the spurious green legislation ($f = 7$). Participant E discussed the lagging green economy code by arguing that “the theme of EXPO was environmental to launch electric cars, other mobile devices, and build power plants. But due to various circumstances, it did not happen. We simply did not stimulate the development of alternative car industry.” Participant J agreed that “compared to what we had in 2017 and what we have now...the situation in terms of the same wind generators (and other green technologies) has not changed much.”

Participant G mentioned the spurious green legislation code, underlining the absence of legislation to regulate issues of recreational load “there are issues related to recreational pressure, which are far in excess. At least in our national cultural park, where people do not understand the methodology and the recreational load calculation (they

should be followed) not to eradicate nature.” Participant H agreed that “the recreational load is very high in Kazakhstan... this is the reason why the animals go far away, the birds fly away. This fact damages tourism in Kazakhstan.”

Parent Code 3: Business Social Responsiveness

There are four themes and nine codes that unveiled the new but yet insipid role that the business started to play in Nur-Sultan’s social life and its failure to address social responsiveness issues. The business emerged as a new socioeconomic player, tourism education promoter, and even an informal Kazakhstan’s cultural ambassador with elements of responsiveness immaturity. These tendencies of business development were organized into themes and synthesized into codes extracted from interviews.

Theme 1: New Socioeconomic Player. The theme consists of three codes – the business increased socioeconomic confidence ($f = 12$), the job generator ($f = 14$), the grants promoter ($f = 3$). The business increased socioeconomic confidence code was first mentioned by Participant A, who attributed this process to the increased confidence among Nur-Sultan’s population “The population gained confidence, which boosted the development of small and medium-sized businesses.” Participant B stressed that “the culture of entrepreneurship in Kazakhstan is gradually increasing. Business is growing, and business events affect the population because they provoke the growth of well-being.”

Participant G discussed the job generator code stated that before and during the EXPO-2017 tourism sector “created a large number of jobs and became an area that brings revenue to the state budget and promotes the development of small and medium-

sized businesses.” Participant C agreed that the “creation of more jobs (by business) in Nur-Sultan was significant, not even economically, but also socially because creating jobs creates social stability in the society.” Such development was observed in businesses like “transport services,” “guides,” “hotels,” “souvenirs production,” “entertainment industry,” and “shopping centers.”

The grants promoter code was mentioned by Participant A, who unveiled a new stage of tourism’s business development – the ability to provide grants. During the EXPO, there were some “very positive examples when the business itself began to give grants for the development of tourism.” Participant L criticized some organizations “that live to get grants...no matter if they have accomplished the goals and objectives”. “I divide the grantees into two types - those who are dependents or parasites who live off grants and those who are dedicated to getting grants and making some progress,” added Participant L.

Theme 2: Tourism Education Promoter. The theme consists of two codes - tourism-related training ($f = 4$) and foreign language courses ($f = 4$). The tourism-related training code was discussed by Participant A, who mentioned that almost 10 big hotels in Nur-Sultan “provided their staff with training.” Participant B agreed, “there were large-scale exhibitions, training, and courses on improving service. So we can say that the city was preparing on a large scale.”

The foreign language course code was mentioned by Participant A “I think the (EXPO) effect was unequivocal. Even now, if earlier hotel owners could not answer tourists in English or other languages, today I see that more people already answer freely

- English has become more common, for sure.” Participant B reminded business launching training for improving “English language skills.

Theme 3: Kazakhstan’s Cultural Ambassador. The theme consists of one code - the popularization of Kazakhstan’s culture ($f = 7$). The code unveiled an increased business role in promoting Kazakhstan’s culture within the country and internationally as a business product that was packed before and during the EXPO-2017. Participant E reminded us that business was responsible for the “formation of the tour product.... and standards. We organized a culture cluster” for domestic and inbound tourists. Participant F mentioned that “foreigners were coming in great numbers to visit the exhibition and watched it.” “They also went to other tourism places where business was showing our culture,” Concluded Participant F.

Theme 4: Responsiveness Immaturity. The theme consists of three codes - big tourism business suppresses business of local communities ($f = 1$), business’s pivot from traditional production ($f = 2$), and lack of desire to adhere to the concept of recreational load ($f = 5$). The big tourism business suppresses business of local communities code was discussed by Participant A tourism’s negative impact “has only been observed on the environment and the economy, in cases when businesses were taken away from the local community by large travel agencies.”

Participant G discussed the business pivot from traditional production code criticized the tendency when “cattle breeding” businesses “give up animal husbandry” because it was “much more complex than tourism.” Participant J shared the concern “it is

easier for the local population to start with a small guest house than to sustain livestock breeding.”

The lack of desire to adhere to the concept of the recreational load was discussed by Participant G in various aspects, one of which was the business’s reluctance. The participant agreed that such a tendency produces “a negative impact of tourism on national parks” and “eradicates nature.” Participant B stressed the importance of “social activities, maybe, socially-oriented commercials advertising.” to increase business’s self-responsibility in this area.

Organizational Economics Theory’s Codes and Themes

Parent Code 1: Government’s Tourism Related Policies

There are four themes, and 10 codes revealed positive and negative results produced by the government’s tourism’s related policies and its deficiencies during and right after the EXPO-2017. Such policies triggered some positive and negative developments – ambiguous infrastructural policy and inconsistency in inbound tourism development. These developments were organized into themes using the Focus codification technique and synthesized based on the codes extracted from interviews using the In-Vivo codification technique.

Theme 1: Institutionalization. The theme consists of three codes - establishment of tourism institutions ($f = 5$), reduced obstacles ($f = 5$), emergence of domestic tourism ($f = 6$). The establishment of tourism institutions code was discussed by Participant A as a result of EXPO-2017 and the government’s comprehension of tourism’s importance “I think the government saw the results of EXPO, which later played an important role in

the positive decision to open a company to promote tourism - Kazakh Tourism,” and “the Committee on the Tourism Industry.” Participant C disagreed by saying that the “negative major impact” on inbound tourists inflow was made by the institutional “transferring of tourism from one ministry to another (in the form of Committee) during the year of EXPO-2017.”

The reduced obstacles code was stressed by Participant C, who agreed that “free visa regime for 64 countries”, “simplification of transit visa regimes,” as well as “72 hours free visa transit regime for Chinese citizens removed some barriers on the way of foreign tourists to Kazakhstan.” Participant G agreed by saying that the “government’s decisions on visa-free regimes, registration issues, electronic visas were revolutionary steps for tourism in Kazakhstan, and the EXPO played a major role here.”

The emergence of domestic tourism code was explained by Participant C. “2017 can be called the year of domestic tourism. That is probably when people started traveling more (around the country),” said the Participant C. Participant L agreed, “there was much domestic tourism. Remember the tickets were handed out in the regions by travel companies.” “They brought schoolchildren, teachers, veterans, and many other people who were surprised to see such a thing (the territory of EXPO) in our country,” added the Participant L.

Theme 2: Construction Boom. The theme consists of two codes – the brand new infrastructure ($f = 15$) and the proliferation of tourism’s soft infrastructure ($f = 13$). Every interview participant discussed the brand new infrastructure code. Participant E stated that “Nur-Sultan itself was the main infrastructure facility with the construction of

multiple buildings, which have quite a clear and applied purpose.” “If there is no EXPO in normal life, the city continues building residential complexes, hotel complexes, and restaurants. If you do not count the pandemic, they all work fine,” added the Participant E. Participant A, while agreed that the construction boom was a “positive thing in city’s development and significantly improved tourism’s opportunities,” stressed that in the end, the “city left behind some expensive buildings unconsumed by its economy”.

The proliferation of tourism’s soft infrastructure code was talking over by Participant D. The soft infrastructure in the city was built “at a minimal cost. The focus was given to social projects like bicycle and scooter lanes.... and signposts. Now, the city has 140 signposts within a 15-minute walk from tourist centers, so that people can walk on foot,” said the Participant. Participant A pointed insufficiency of such efforts by saying that “the navigation system for tourists was not in time for the EXPO - all these signposts are in English. Moreover, unfortunately, we still see that they either appeared late or are still missing in important places.”

Theme 3: Inconsistency in Inbound Tourism Development. The theme consists of three codes - inadequate promotion on strategic markets ($f = 4$), unprepared migration regime ($f = 7$), absence of tourists attracting strategies ($f = 5$). The inadequate promotion on strategic markets code was discussed by Participant C, who vocalized some other participants’ concerns regarding the campaign before the EXPO-2017. “I do not say that there were a lot of foreign tourists, but there were, and we could take in a lot more. One of the reasons is that image events were organized untimely.” “We simply missed markets of neighboring China, Russia, Central Asia, as well as Arab countries,” stressed

the Participant C. Participant A mentioned that in the five years of preparations for the EXPO, “since 2013, we had allocated huge promotion funding that had never before seen in Kazakhstan.”

The unprepared migration regime became one of the obstacles on the way of inbound tourism during the EXPO. “Before the EXPO, the preparation of visa invitations was transferred from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Ministry of the Interior Affairs (MIA) that badly affected the migration service – it was not ready,” reminded Participant C. “It was a new job for the MIA, and they disrupted the deadlines for issuing visas. Because of the mistakes made, the group trips were disrupted,” stressed Participant C. Participant K agreed “before the EXPO, we were told that the registration is not needed at departure, it turns out that it was necessary to register foreigners - registration was required.” “It created cases when inbound tourists were not allowed to leave the country. They were frightened by so tightly controlling registration procedure. Such developments had created discomfort,” added the Participant.

The absence of a tourism strategies code revealed that tourists attracting initiatives, like the Open Sky policy or the Kids Go Free, were not proposed by Kazakhstan during the EXPO. As Participant D said, “we held the EXPO to show the world our country, and we needed to adopt the Open Sky policy, with which, we hoped, Nur-Sultan would become a regional tourism and transportation hub. However, it did not happen.” Participant E agreed that Kazakhstan needs “certain incentives” to develop inbound tourism “we need to adopt a state program as a matter of urgency, and the business itself needs to step up its activities today.”

Theme 4: Inconsistency in Tourism Policies. The theme consists of two codes – lagging tourism management ($f = 10$) and unimproved positions on tourism markets ($f = 1$). The lagging tourism management happened for various reasons, one of which was mentioned by Participant C was the “prolonged reformation of tourism management” and “unprecedented staff turn-over.” Participant G mentioned the other two reasons “the authorities failed to provide business with long money and to strategize its relations with the tourism business.”

The unimproved positions on tourism markets code were explained by Participant J, who argued that “Kazakhstan failed to come closer to Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan or Georgia on the level of tourism development. That is the result of the EXPO-2017.”

Parent Code 2: Public-Private Partnerships

There are two themes and two codes that discovered positive and negative tendencies in the dialogue between government and tourism-related business. Some of them (like new business opportunities) were considered as positive, some of them (like the government’s selectivity) were criticized by interview participants. These tendencies were organized into themes and synthesized based on the codes proposed by interview participants.

Theme 1: New Business Opportunities. The theme consists of one code - establishment of a conducive environment ($f = 13$). The establishment of a conducive environment code was discussed by Participant B mentioned that before the EXPO-2017, “several bills were initiated to improve the business environment. One of them was signed in 2015.” Participant I also discussed improved business environment “many

business support measures were taken under various programs. We can say that favourable conditions for the creation of business have appeared, and the EXPO attracted the city's population to begin to increase.”

Theme 2: Selectivity in Business Partnerships. The theme consists of one code – the selective access to the EXPO ($f = 3$). The code unveiled some cases when business was rejected to work on the exhibition territory. “It used to be difficult even for city business to work on the EXPO territory ... as it was someone's else business they – this fact had created a business conditionally,” said Participant J. Participant E named this cases as “no widespread governments' connection with representatives of tourism companies.”

Parent Code 3: Tourism's Economic Effectiveness

There are five themes and nine codes that discovered positive and negative tendencies in tourism's economic effectiveness. During the EXPO-2017, the Nur-Sultan's tourism experienced business and services proliferation, made multiplier effects on other industries, developed economic safety mechanisms, and increased the country's name recognition. However, the industry's development spurred inflation and price increase. These tendencies were organized into themes and synthesized based on the codes proposed by interview participants.

Theme 1: Hospitality Industry Sophistication. The theme includes three codes – proliferation of tourism-related business ($f = 15$), international standards of quality ($f = 2$), commercialization of national authenticity ($f = 4$). The proliferation of tourism-related business code was discussed by Participant A “the EXPO had a long-term effect on small

and medium-sized businesses. Now, if you look at the growth of catering, for example, in the country, even before the pandemic period, it has become just visual and pronounced.” “Earlier, when we talked about tourism related services we think about Almaty only. Today there are many coffee houses and franchises in Nur-Sultan. The population gained confidence, which gave a boost to the development of small and medium-sized businesses.” Participant I explained the effect “we can say that favorable conditions for the creation of business have appeared. The exhibition attracted the city’s population to begin increase.”

The international standards of quality code was discussed by Participant E, who stressed that the EXPO “formed a standard of standards.” “These are standards of conduct, performance, quality, and safety,” stressed the Participant E. Participant L agreed by focusing on the work of artisans “the EPXO provoked or stimulated the qualitative growth of artisans. It gave a qualitative leap in production.”

The commercialization of national authenticity code was discussed by Participant J “the EXPO triggered the process of commercialization of national identity. I’d say that’s a good thing. Before berkut, and other cultural things were hobbies. Now it is becoming a business.” Participant L said, “you see, artisans represented our culture everywhere (during the EXPO) and prepared themselves to produce a lot of products o sell... and now they are becoming a whole new industry... as a part of the tourism development process.”

Theme 2: Tourism’s Multiplier Effect. The theme includes two codes - increased macroeconomic indicators ($f = 10$) and increased demand for tourism services

($f = 7$). The increased macroeconomic indicators code was discussed by Participant A, “the EXPO produced the macroeconomic effect due to the increased number of tourists that particular visited Kazakhstan that year.” “The occupancy rate of hotels increased, public catering - a lot of new restaurants, many new places of accommodation appeared in the country and other cities. The jump was severe precisely in terms of places of accommodation,” added the Participant A. Participant E agreed, “there is certainly a robust investment component. The number of economic activities increased. The tax base increased. The domestic, regional product correspondingly increased.”

The increased demand for tourism services code was mentioned by Participant J “After the EXPO-2017, an average visitor is ready to pay a minimum of \$120 a day.” Participant C agreed that “more tourists are coming to Nur-Sultan – they use transport services, buses, guides, hotel, catering, souvenirs, various types of entertainment, shopping centers. They even buy our organic chocolate production, fruit, and vegetables for their smell.”

Theme 3: Economy’s Safety Valve. The theme consists of one code - export of money and service into the country ($f = 5$). The code revealed tourism’s importance for the national economy as it keeps money within national borders and exports it with the increasing flows of inbound tourism. Participant K mentioned that during the EXPO, “foreigners tourists who left money in Kazakhstan created a vital economic component of export earnings.” Participant H added that “EXPO-inbound tourism ensured the inflow of money into the country’s economy (export of services). EXPO-domestic tourism was about keeping money domestically. That created additional consumption, jobs, and

money circulation within the economy”. “It should also be noted that the country was also economically attractive for investors because a good tourist flow of foreign tourists was also an additional image of the country in the eyes of the world community,” added the Participant.

Theme 4: Image. The theme consists of two codes – Nur-Sultan’s positive image ($f = 3$) and Kazakhstan’s international tourism-related image ($f = 3$). The Participant explained the Nur-Sultan’s positive image code to the EXPO’s “a serious image effect” on the city promoted within the four years of the country’s promotion policy. Participant C disagreed by arguing that the EXPO promotion campaign was late, “the marketing activities should start as early as of 2014. If they started in 2015 or 2016, it would be too late”. “In general, it turned out that we had a change in tourism management with the wrong people working on events planned. The timing of marketing and marketing tools... were all ineffective,” added the Participant.

Kazakhstan’s international tourism-related image code was described by Participant A “before, Kazakhstan had a very narrow associative range reduced to the First President, cyclist Vinokurov, and boxer Golovkin. That is why it was important to promote the country itself, then within it specifically Nur-Sultan and only then the EXPO-2017.” “So in the four years of preparation a very large advancement was made, and it still reverberates,” added the Participant. Participant G agreed that “recognition of Kazakhstan as the country that hosted the EXPO also worked very well for the international market and worked very well for tourism.”

Theme 5: Price Increase. The theme includes one code - uncontrolled prices for hotels and transportation ($f = 6$). Participant C said that “the EXPO has created exactly the effect of high season that boosted prices on transportation services, hotels, and other tourism-related services.” Participant B agreed that the EXPO created conditions for the price increase and stressed that “the development of competition helps getting rid of such thing as uncontrolled price increases.”

The research results unveiled meticulous but vital thematic collisions within the same codes that brought different connotations when attributed to various themes. There are three such examples. The first example relates to the sustainable tourism development parent code and two related themes: the negative titled tourism infrastructure immaturity and the positive titled spatial greenification. Both discussed infrastructure and unveiled subtle but vital duality that the EXPO produced with green infrastructure projects that are still underdeveloped but continue emerging. The second example related to the business social responsiveness parent code with two related themes: the negative titled social irresponsiveness and the second titled new socioeconomic players. Such duality determined a strong tendency in tourism’s business development that had been maturing because of economic opportunities created by EXPO but still experienced hardships in undertaking the whole package of social responsibilities in protecting self-interests and interests of Nur-Sultan’s population. The third example related to the public-privet partnerships parent code with two related themes: the positive titled the new business opportunities and the negative titled the selectivity in business partnerships. Such inconsistency unveiled the duality of business-related processes triggered by the EXPO

when the government, overwhelmed with EXPO-preparations and related macroeconomic indicators, failed to hear business recommendations channeled through the established for these purposes discussion platforms before and during the exhibition. It was very selective in choosing business partners to work on the EXPO territories. Such policies significantly reduced the number of beneficiaries and opened up new opportunities that allowed the directly uninvolved business to work with tangible economic results.

Summary

In this chapter, I covered the data collection process, data analysis, and the results of this research that established the extended list of tourism's socioeconomic effects as the answer to the research question. The research question guided this study and helped to understand how do business leaders, leaders of tourism, and government officials perceive the socioeconomic effects of tourism in Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan following EXPO-2017. Additionally, I covered participants' interview settings, evidence of this study's trustworthiness, and research discrepancies that confirmed vital reflection of tourism socioeconomic effects' complexity. An extended analysis of this research's results I plan to discuss in Chapter 5 with some conclusions and recommendations.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

In the absence of knowledge on tourism's socioeconomic effects and any related study conducted in Nur-Sultan, the current study was qualitatively designed to understand the industry's socioeconomic impact on the local community Nur-Sultan following EXPO-2017. The purpose was to explore the perceptions of stakeholder groups on the subject by conducting open-ended interviews. I produced a table of tourism's socioeconomic themes and codes, unveiled some hidden tendencies, and provided recommendations to consider while managing the tourism field.

This study confirmed that tourism's socioeconomic effects change according to destination and time and transform socioeconomic constructs of local communities, and that a multidisciplinary approach is needed to be researched, measured, and managed. Within this study's theoretical framework, tourism's positive and negative effects were grouped in six parent codes dictated by the CSR (see Sheehy & Farneti, 2021) and the organizational economics theory (OET) (Arrow, 1969): government social responsiveness (CSR), sustainable tourism development (CSR), business social responsiveness (CSR), government tourism-related policies (OET), public-private partnerships (OET), and tourism economic effectiveness (OET). The findings also indicated tendencies in tourism development triggered by the EXPO-2017 and recommendations for the government and business.

Interpretation of the Findings

The indicated three vital conclusions for the tourism field. First, tourism's socioeconomic effects are not static. During and after the EXPO-2017, socioeconomic

effects acted as agents of change with the then unknown consequences evolving by transforming Nur-Sultan's local communities' social constructs. Second, the UNWTO (2016) and the WEF (2017) definition of tourism's socioeconomic effects (as a transformative power affecting residents' lives) proved to be relevant for Nur-Sultan and its people. Tourism's socioeconomic effects vary among destinations and are unique for each one, as noted by Balazik (2016); Howell (2002); Monterrubio, Osorio, and Benitez (2018); Njoroge et al. (2017), and Sawant (2017). Third, the tourism field's structural incongruence proposed by Kozak and Kozak (2011) validates a multidisciplinary approach to study its effects on local communities. The current study affirmed the industry's socioeconomic nature that, as Brauer (2019) described, changed both social and economic constructs of Nur-Sultan as a tourism destination after the EXPO-2017.

The dual theoretical framework unsquared limits that would be imposed by pure social or economic science and established a dynamic framework that would allow this study of tourism's economic effects to be a trigger and tourism's social effect to be a social change consequence of this trigger. The CSR and OET guided the study toward a better understanding and definition of tourism's socioeconomic effects through the prism of sustainability. The framework facilitated a greater understanding of tourism's effects using the concept of sustainability as an umbrella for the concept of organizational performance.

The research's theoretical framework indicated six parent codes. The first three codes (government social responsiveness, tourism sustainable development, and business social responsiveness) related to the CSR. The other three (government's tourism-related

policies, public-private partnerships, and tourism's economic effectiveness) related to the OET. These served as anchors that helped me group and identify socioeconomic themes and codes and judge the level of their sustainability and Nur-Sultan's organizational performance.

The analysis of the government social responsiveness code revealed a bulk of positive effects generated by the tourism industry during and after the EXPO-2017. The government awakened latent business activities, cultural and national identities, social life, and the desire to be educated among Nur-Sultan people. The business awakening was characterized by its proliferation in a socially responsible way, by an increased inflow of private investments into the tourism field, and by souvenir production's transformation into a profitable business. The culture started playing the role of societal integrator that, by attracting foreigners, raised its positions among native Kazakhs, who started visiting museums, concert halls, and libraries. The cultural awakening led to the growth of national pride, cultural self-recognition, national reunification by incorporating a new generation, and, as a result, the increased confidence in Kazakhstan's future. The cultural awakening triggered social infrastructure development that enriched Nur-Sultan's social life, increased social engagement, and prompted the volunteer movement. The cultural awakening extended Nur-Sultan's population outlook with increased interest in learning languages, Kazakhstan's history, geography, and tourism as a profitable industry. However, the government's social responsiveness did not bring social regeneration, did not raise hospitality culture, and did not help overcome Kazakhs'

intolerance of particular national groups. Also, the cultural awakening did not mollify the taint of corruption.

The sustainable tourism development code revealed that the EXPO-2017 encouraged the emergence of sustainable culture and city infrastructure's spatial greenification. However, the EXPO-2017 failed to produce a sustainable effect on culture, infrastructure, economy, and legislation. These did not indicate any significant change.

The business social responsiveness code revealed that the EXPO-2017 incited the process of change in Nur-Sultan business's social status and the increase in its economic confidence. The business entered a team of so-called city socioeconomic players by producing new job opportunities and promoting grants. Medium-size companies started conducting tourism-related training and language courses and became Kazakhstan's cultural ambassadors by promoting national culture among foreigners internationally and Kazakhs within the national borders. However, some forms of business's irresponsiveness persisted. Big tourism companies continued to suppress local businesses, and local businesses continued to violate the concepts of recreational load.

The government's tourism-related policies code proved controversial in the year of EXPO-2017. The policies allowed developing tourism related soft and hard infrastructure, and boosted tourism in Nur-Sultan that had transcended into tourists' magnets. A new airport, new high-tech railway, hotels, districts, and public buildings were built. The most successful was the MEGA SilkWay shopping center that attracted more than 1,000 visitors per month. However, some of the buildings did not retain their

value after EXPO-2017. The economy did not consume them, and by being supported by the governmental budget, they are considered a waste of people's money. There were inconsistencies in many efforts, including those that were aimed to attract inbound tourism by improving logistics to and from Nur-Sultan, facilitating flights within the country and internationally, and renewing fleet and public transportation in Nur-Sultan.

The overfocus on international markets resulted in overstretched limited resources that overlooked strategically essential markets such as bordering Russia regions, China, and Saudi Arabia. The government also overlooked the domestic market that should be considered of utmost importance and should be profitable. Nur-Sultan increased its brand awareness internationally by attracting franchises such as Starbucks, McDonald's, and Kentucky Fried Chicken. Nevertheless, unprepared visa and migration regimes created obstacles for foreigners, and the absence of open sky and kids-go-free policies prevented many foreigners from visiting the city in 2017. Furthermore, a visa-free regime for 64 less critical countries, simplification of transit visa regimes, and 72 hours free visa transit for Chinese citizens produced modest results and failed expectations.

The public-private partnerships code revealed some strongholds and imperfections in the government-business dialogue during and after the EXPO-2017. The event produced new business opportunities and established a competitive business environment that triggered new job opportunities, a conducive business environment, and partnerships with foreign companies. With government support, businesses launched professional and language training for tourism-related personnel. However, access to this partnership was provided selectively. Not all Nur-Sultan businesses were granted access to work on the

EXPO-2017 areas. Not all companies' recommendations were heard to promote EXPO-2017 as a tourism product and set up logistics toward EXPO tourism-related products. Such selectivity resulted in insufficient tourism-related products for domestic tourism, a failure to transform the traditional Kazakh culture of hospitality into a marketing advantage, and the absence of systemic government support of tourism business.

The tourism's *economic effectiveness code* revealed some tangible improvements dictated by the needs of the EXPO-2017. Nur-Sultan's hospitality industry was improved with the increased number of hotels (including luxury), catering and taxi services, logistics, shopping centers, tour operators, and guides. For the first time in Kazakhstan's history, authentic national businesses like the berkuchi and craft industry could commercialize their activity and feel this sense of profit satisfaction. The food industry increased its activity with the increased number of restaurants, fast food courts, coffee shops, and food delivery services. All of these industries incorporated international tourism-related standards of quality. The exhibition created flows of alternative income for the business and platforms to establish partnerships with foreign companies. The event created momentum that was multiplied by increased tax revenues, GDP, number of jobs, demand for tourism-related services, and number of luxury hotels. The event also generated trade and promoted transport logistics, medicine services, agricultural development, mobile communications, handicrafts, construction, housing, and many other national economies' niches. Nur-Sultan's tourism became an economic safety valve that triggered money export into the national economy and export of services and kept the

currency within the country's borders. Tourism also created a new image of Nur-Sultan and Kazakhstan as an integral part of international tourism and business markets.

Despite these positive effects, some of the business activities were meager. Lack of accommodations and food centers; lack of staff training; rude behavior among taxi drivers, hotels, and other services; and shortage of buses and trains were apparent. In the absence of investment preferences in tourism, many hotels and other tourism-related businesses remained in the grey market. The EXPO-2017 triggered inflation and price increases for hotel accommodations, transportation, and tourism-related services. One of the most significant adverse effects of EXPO-2017 was the failure to build on its results and to establish a post-EXPO economic policy. The government failed to effectively and profitably manage EXPO infrastructure; promote hostel, craft-making, and berkutschi business; and transform them into profitable industries. The government also failed to adopt an effective MICE-tourism policy to transform Nur-Sultan and its hi-tech MICE-infrastructure into the Central Asian MICE-tourism hub.

The current study also revealed three tendencies triggered by the EXPO-2017. First, 2017 revealed the richness of Nur-Sultan's (and other regions') tourism proposal for its citizens and triggered development of domestic tourism with people traveling around the country, discovering their history, and spending money on the way. Such realities proved that the future of Kazakhstan's tourism depends on domestic, not inbound, tourism. Second, for the first time in Kazakhstan's tourism history, tourists' inflow equaled the inflow of money and increased opportunities for the city and its people. Such an equation transforms the industry into a profitable business and attracts

investments into the field. Third, tourism's classic negative effects such as an increase in pollution or crime were not observed in Kazakhstan due to its immaturity. It is its infrastructural vestige, absence of tourists' behavior regulatory system, and wild form of tourism that damage fragile eco-systems around Nur-Sultan. The same form of irresponsiveness is observed in other regions including Burabay, Alakol, Kobeituz, Bosjara.

Limitations of the Study

This research inherited some limitations due to its design, participants, and potential researcher's bias. First, the qualitative design challenged the results' transferability and validity across Kazakhstan and internationally. As a result, the produced table of tourism's socioeconomic effects and discovered tendencies will not be applicable for other Kazakhstan's regions, tourism destinations, and even for Nur-Sultan in the years to come. Some of the interviewed stakeholders expressed reluctance in answering interview questions and sharing their insights on the tourism effects. These instances were addressed by a comprehensive list of questions and persistent control of the interview process, adding additional emotional questions that underline interviewees' importance and experience. Such a technique had ensured saturation of the collected data. Third, my own bias was addressed by admitting the researcher's professional and personal predisposition toward the issue. The professional predisposition was addressed by conducting an audit trail (Shenton, 2004) in the form of the field journal, in which all the personal or emotional thoughts were squared and highlighted in red. This technique

was used to free analysis and data collection from inadvertent biases by escorting each with reflective commentary.

Recommendations

There is no way to ensure transferability and validity of any research on tourism's related effects, as they are unique for each tourism destination. However, there is a strong need for extending knowledge on tourism's effects and their quantitative measurement to improve management efforts in the tourism field. This need dictates the following recommendations. First, future researchers could extend the sample size of participants and include four stakeholder-groups – officials, NGOs, businesses, and experts in the tourism field (from the academic community). Second, future research could determine if there is a measurement system of tourism socioeconomic effects to manage trajectories of its development in local communities' best interests. Such research should be a mixed-methods study with a qualitative part to research tourism's economic effects and related social post-effects as a public phenomenon. The quantitative part should be focused on finding a statistical value of the effects to test correlation relationships between the independent variable, which is the economic effect of tourism, and the dependent variable, which is the social effect. The quantitative part should also test the future development of the effects using linear regression analysis.

Implications

The relationship between tourism's socioeconomic effects and the positive social change may not be apparent, but, as this research had reconfirmed previous studies' results on the subject, tourism's direct impacts on destination's local communities change

the way people socially and economically behave and feel. These research results (the tourism's socioeconomic effects table and discovered tendencies) might inform decision-makers in the tourism field and significantly improve their performances, avoid misleading, reshape tourism-related policies, and, as a result, raise the quality of people's life affected by tourism development. This study might contribute to the government's efforts by informing on tourism's socioeconomic effects and their transformative power to engage the post-EXPO momentum into the policies to build an environment of sustainable and responsible progress Nur-Sultan and neighboring regions. The research's results might promote socially oriented tourism-related policies only if they are considered and partially implemented by all stakeholder-groups. Socioeconomic refocus of tourism's Nur-Sultan policies would improve the quality of tourism development strategies, budgeting, and its real-life projection. It is also believed that the results would help central and local authorities to understand the post-EXPO momentum better and capitalize on it by better engaging the business and local communities. The proposed approach would improve the critical assessment of tourism's pros and cons and ensure its responsible and sustainable development by reducing its adverse effects.

This research also produced recommendations made by interviewees to the government and tourism business community. Interviewees advised the government to focus on Mice-tourism in Nur-Sultan and inbound tourism by arranging several small tourism-related events instead of one giant to unleash a more significant impact by saving more money. The MICE-tourism is safer (compare with other forms of tourism) in the era of COVID-19, poses minimum pressure on fragile ecosystems, and can spot

Kazakhstan's tourism among other Central Asian countries (like Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan) that are better positioned in term of cultural and nature tourism. If Kazakhstan is serious about tourism, the government should improve center-regions and between-the-ministries coordination on tourism and stop staff turnover, bringing random people to manage the field. The government should listen to tourism's business and adjust its tourism-related policies accordingly. The business needs incentives (loans, long money, various tax exemptions), clear regulatory policies and apparatus (including the recreational load), reduced red tapes, and administrative levers. The field needs qualified staff and standards for domestic and inbound tourism that might be addressed by state order to form tourist products in Nur-Sultan, Almaty, and East Kazakhstan Oblast and to establish tourism field's standards. The field also needs an increased competition, a long-term prospect for business to jump into the field, and incentives to reduce the average bill paid by inbound tourists while visiting Kazakhstan.

Tourism's success lies in professional marketing. Thus, the government needs the country's brand and new strategies to work on China, Russia, and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) markets. Chinese market needs cancelation of group visas toward free of visa group visits. Russian market needs reconsideration of the marketing strategy by strengthening the promotion campaign on bordering with Kazakhstan markets. It is also essential to work with the Russian government on improving border crossings by tourist buses. The UAE market promotion should consider its people's interest in Kazakhstan's nature and Kazakhstan's ability to facilitate a visa-free regime between the countries. The government should revisit the open skies policy and promote hospitality culture among

tourism-related businesses and the local population to ensure a mentality shift. It may use social advertising, participation in social events, and the introduction of appropriate activities for schoolchildren while visiting tourist destinations.

Conclusion

This research explored tourism stakeholder groups' perceptions on the socioeconomic effects of tourism in Nur-Sultan, following EXPO-2017. The research revealed that modest EXPO-related economic effect became a transformative power for the city's local community. The event created new opportunities in public and private life dimensions. The exhibition triggered business, cultural and national identity awakening, revived Nur-Sultan's social life and people's interest in education. The EXPO had created Kazakhstan as a tourism destination for its own people. The EXPO-related policies laid a foundation for tourism's future greenification, and increased business social responsibility. The event significantly improved tourism's economic effectiveness, unveiled the pros and cons of public-private partnerships in Nur-Sultan, and measured the effectiveness of government's tourism-related policies. For the first time since Kazakhstan's independence, the country witnessed the EXPO triggered development of domestic tourism with people traveling around the country, discovering the history, and spending money on the way. This research had proved the role of the EXPO-2017 as a socioeconomic transformer, changed multiple facets of Nur-Sultan's society. However, the durability and sustainability of these effects were questionable. The post-EXPO momentum had not been effectively engaged into the policy-making processes and left the transformation unattained with a rolling-back effect.

References

- Adrian, S. (2017). Effects of economic and social implications of tourism on economic flows. *Ovidious University Annals*, 17(2), 467–471.
- Alberti, F., & Giusti, J. (2012). Cultural heritage, tourism and regional competitiveness: The Motor valley cluster. *City, Culture, and Society*, 3, 261–273.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2012.11.003>
- Alekseeva, T. (2016). Design of organizational and economic management mechanism for foreign economic activity of the enterprises. *Technological Audit ta Rezervi virobnictva*, 2(5), 20–23. <https://doi.org/10.15587/2312-8372.2016.65861>
- Aliyeva, S., Chen, X., Yang, D., Samarkhanov, K., Mazbayev, O., Skenuly, A., Issanova, G., & Kozhokulov, S (2019). The socioeconomic impact of tourism in East Kazakhstan Region: Assessment approach. *Sustainability*, 11(17), 4805.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su11174850>
- Alyabieva, O. (2019). The economic-organizational mechanism for innovative development of seaports. *Buzines Inform*, 8(499), 81–86.
<https://doi.org/10/32093/2222-4459-2019-8-81-86>
- Andereck, K., & Jurowski, C. (2006). Tourism and quality of life. In G. Jennings & P. Nickerson (Eds.), *Quality tourism experience* (pp. 136–154). Elsevier.
- Apostolopoulos, A., Leivadi, S., & Yiannakis, A. (2001). *The sociology of tourism: theoretical and empirical investigations*. Routledge.

- Arefieva, O., & Simkova, T. (2018). The organizational-economic provision of quality management of services of air transportation enterprise. *Biznes Inform*, 12(491), 224–231. <https://doi.org/f24af5579fe54ae698d4962020c456ea>
- Arrow, K. (1969). *The organization of economic activity: issues pertinent to the choice of market versus non-market allocations*. Joint Economic Committee of Congress,
- Assaf, G., & Tsionas, M. (2019). A review of research into performance modeling in tourism research: Launching the Annals of Tourism Research curated collection on performance modeling in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 76, 266–277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.04.010>
- Ateljevic, I. (2014). Mapping a history and development of tourism studies field. *Tourism*, 62(1), 75-101.
- Bakan, J. (2005). *The corporation: The pathological pursuit of profit and power* (1st ed.). Simon and Shuster Inc.
- Balazik, G. (2016). The socioeconomic impacts of casino tourism in Slovenia's Obalno-Kraska region. *Studies in Business and Economics*, 11(3), 150–162. <https://doi.org/10.1515/sbe-2016-0042>
- Barca, M. (2011). Third academic tourism education conference: The scientific state of tourism as a discipline. *Anatolia*, 22(3), 428–430. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2011.640883>
- Barney, J. (1990). The debate between traditional management theory and organizational economics: Substantive differences or intergroup conflict? *Academy of Management Review*, 15(3), 382–393. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258014>

- Berman, E., & Hirschman, D. (2018). Sociology of quantification: Where are we now? *Contemporary Sociology*, 47(3), 257–266.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0094306118767649>
- Bernardo, E., & Jorge, F. (2019). Are local residents able to contribute to tourism governance? Impacts and perceptions in Cape Verde. *Pasos: Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, 17(3), 611–624.
<https://doi.org/10.25145/j.pasos.2019.17.043>
- Bloom, N., Sadum, R., & Van Reenen, J. (2010). Recent advances in the empirics of organizational economics. *Annual Review of Economics*, 2, 105–137.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.economics.050708.143328>
- Bloomberg, L., & Volpe, M. (2018). *Compelling your qualitative dissertation: A road map for beginning to end* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Bolotova, O. (2018). The methodological approach to determination of conditions of organizational-economic provision of efficiency of staff management of enterprise. *Buzines Inform*, 6(485), 375–380.
<https://doaj.org/article/705c588a2ef443e38abc4528e26e19eb>
- Boyd, J., Harper, W., & Westfall, R. (1970). Interviewer bias once more revisited. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 7(2), 249–253.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/002224377000700215>
- Brauer, R., Dymittrow, M., & Tribe, J. (2019). The impact of tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 77, 64–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.05.006>

- Broadbent, J. (2007). If you can't measure it, how can you manage it? Management and governance in higher educational institutions. *Public Money and Management*, 27(3), 193–198. doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9302.2007.00579.x
- Bruce, P., & Bruce, A. (2017). *Practical statistics for data scientists: 50 essential concepts* (1st ed.). O'Reilly Media.
- Brutus, S., Aguinis, H., & Wassmer, U. (2013). Self-reported limitations and future directions in scholarly reports analysis and recommendations. *Journal of Management*, 39, 48–75. doi:10.1177/0149206312455245
- Burcin, H., Bengi, E., & Duygu, S. (2019). Corporate social responsibility in tourism as a tool for sustainable development: an evaluation from a community perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31(6), 2358–2375. doi: 10.1108/IJCHM-05-2018-0448
- Butler, R. (1980). The concept of a tourism area cycle of evolution: Implications for management resources. *The Canadian Geographer*, 24(1), 5–16.
- Butler, R. (2004). Geographical research on tourism, recreation and leisure: origins, eras, and directions. *Tourism Geographies*, 6(2), 143–162. doi: 10.1080/1461668042000208453
- Butler, R., & Russell, R. (2010). *Giants of tourism*. CABI.
- Capocchi, A., Vallone, C., Pierotti, M., & Amaduzzi, A. (2019). Overtourism: A literature review to assess implications and future prospective. *Sustainability*, 11(3303), 1–18. doi: 10.3390/su11123303

- Caretta, M.A. (2016). Member checking: A feminist participatory analysis of the use of preliminary results pamphlets in cross-cultural, cross-language research. *Qualitative Research, 16*(3), 305–308. doi:10.1177/1468794115606495
- Caric, H. (2018). Perspectives of greening tourism development – the concept, the policies, the implementation. *Tourism, 66*(1), 78–88. <https://eds-b-ebSCOhost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=3&andsid=8038b602-21ac-4aaf-9da1-22db40228fba%40pdc-v-sessmgr01>
- Carroll, A. (2015). Corporate social responsibility: The centerpiece of competing and complementary frameworks. *Organizational Dynamics, 44*, 87–96. doi: 10.1016/j.orgdyn.2015.02.002
- Chandler, D. (2015). *Corporate social responsibility: a strategic perspective*. Business Expert Press.
- Chaudhary, R. (2019). Corporate social responsibility perceptions and employee engagement: role of psychological meaningfulness, safety and availability. *The International Journal of Effective Board Performance, 19*(4), 631–647. doi: 10.1108/CG-06-2018-0207
- Chi, C., Chang, C., & Liu, Y. (2019). Determinants of corporate social responsibility attitudes: perspective of travel and tourism managers at world heritage sites. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 31*(6), 2253–2269. doi: 10.1108/IJCHM-03-2018-0217

- Choi, J., Peters, M., & Mueller, R. (2010). Correlational analysis of ordinal data: from Pearson's r to Bayesian polychromic correlation. *Asian Pacific Education Review*, 11(4), 459–466. doi: 10.1007/s12564-010-9096-y
- Cole, S. & Morgan, N. (2010). Tourism and inequality: problems and prospects. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(3), 27–48. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2011.04.007
- Committee of Statistics of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (2020). Tourism of Kazakhstan: 2015-2019. <https://stat.gov.kz/official/industry/22/publication>
- Cooperrider, D.L., Whitney, D., & Stavros, J.M. (2008). *Appreciative Inquiry Handbook – For Leaders of Change*. In Fry (ed.). (2nd ed.). Crown Custom Publishing and Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Coupet, J., & McWilliams, A. (2017). Integrating organizational economics and resource dependence theory of quasi markets. *Administrative Sciences*, 7(3), 37-52. doi: 10.3390/admsci7030029
- Cowen, T. (2004). *Market failure or success*. Edward Elgar.
- Crowther, D., & Rayman-Bacchus, L. (2016). *Perspectives on corporate social responsibility*. Routledge.
- Guba, E.G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquires. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 29, 75–91.
- Davis, K. (1967). Understanding the social responsibility puzzle. *Business Horizons*, 10(4), 45-51.
- Denzin, N. (2012). Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of Mixed Method Research*, 6(2), 80–88. doi: 10.1177/1558689812437186

- Deranty, J. (2005). Hegel's social theory of value. *The Philosophical Forum*, 36 (3), 307–331. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9191.2005.00205.x
- Diaz-Bone, R., & Didier, E. (2016). The sociology of quantification – perspectives on an emerging field in the social sciences. *Historical Social Research*, 41(2), 7–26. doi: 10.12759/hsr.41.2016.2.7-26
- Dilsahd, R., & Latif, M. (2013). Focus group interview as a tool for qualitative research. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 33(1), 191–197. <https://eds-b-ebSCOhost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=9&sid=7a41c4b7-072d-4447-bc38-6c459c17a274%40pdc-v-sessmgr05>
- Ebrahim, A., & Rangan K., (2010). The limits of non-profit impact: a contingency framework for measuring linear performance. *Social Enterprise Initiative. Harvard Business School*. <http://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Publication%20Files/10-099.pdf>
- Elff, M. (2014). *Estimation techniques: Ordinary least squares and maximum likelihood*. In H. Best and C. Wolf (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of regression analysis and causal inference* (pp. 7–13). doi: 10.4135/9781446288126.n2
- Epstein, M., & Yuthas, K., (2014). *Measuring and Improving Social Impacts*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Estevao, C., Garcia, A., Filipe, S., & Fernandes, C., (2017). Convergence in tourism management research: a bibliometric analysis. *Tourism and Management Studies*, 13(4), 30–42. doi: 10.18089/tms.2017.13404

- Eyraud, C. (2016). Quantification device and political or social philosophy. Thoughts inspired by the French State Accounting Reform. *Historical Social Research*, 41(2), 178-195. doi: 10.12759/hsr.41.2016.2.178-195
- Fang, L., & Sun, Y. (2019). Study on impact of Chinese tourism economy on urbanization: basing on empirical analysis of prefecture-level cities' panel data. *2019 IEEE 4th International Conference on Cloud Computing and Big Data Analysis*, 203–206. doi: 10.1109/ICCCBDA.2019.8725692
- Farmaki, A. (2019). Corporate social responsibility in hotels: a stakeholder approach. *Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31(6), 2297–2329. doi: 10.1108/IJCHM-03-2018-0199
- Fielding, N.G. (2012). Triangulation and mixed methods designs data integration with new research technologies. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6(2), 124–136. doi:10.1177/1558689812437101
- Firestone, W. (1993). Alternative arguments of generalization from data as applied to qualitative research. *Education Researcher*, 22, 16–23.
- Flingstein, N. (1985). The spread of the multidivisional form among large firms. *American Sociological Review*, 50, 377–391.
- Florio, M., Forte, S., & Sirtori, E., (2016). Forecasting the socio-economic impact of the Large Harbon Collider: a cost-benefit analysis to 2025 and beyond. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 112, 38–53. doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2016.03.007

- Foss, N. (2019). The corporate headquarters in organization designs theory: an organizational economics perspective. *Journal of Organizational Design*, 8(1), 104–109. doi; 10.1186/s41469-019-0048-7
- Friedman, A., & Miles, S. (2006). *Stakeholders: Theory and Practice*.:Oxford University Press.
- Friedman, M. (1970). The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *New York Times Magazine*, 32(33), 122–126.
- Franklin, M. (2003). I define my own identity: Pacific articulations of “race” and “culture” on the Internet. *Ethnicities*, 3, 456-490. doi: 10.1177/1468796803003004002
- Garriga, E., & Mele, D. (2004). Corporate social responsibility theories: mapping the territory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53, 51–71. doi: 10.1023/B:BUSI.0000039399. 90587.34
- Geng-qing Chi, C., Zhang, C., & Liu, Y. (2019). Determinants of corporate social responsibility attitudes: perspective of travel and tourism managers at world heritage sites. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31(6), 2253–2269. <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/10.1108/IJCHM-03-2018-0217>
- Gibbons, R., & Roberts, J. (2013). *The Handbook of organizational economics*. University Press.

- Gillen, J., & Mostafanezhad, M. (2019). Geopolitical encounters of tourism: a conceptual approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 75, 70–78. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2018.12.015
- Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (2017). Concept on tourism development of the Republic of Kazakhstan until 2023 (Decree of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, dated June 30, 2017, # 406).
https://tengrinews.kz/zakon/pravitelstvo_respubliki_kazahstan_premier_ministr_rk/kultupa/id-P1700000406/
- Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (2019). State program on tourism development in the Republic of Kazakhstan until 2025 (Decree of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, dated May 31, 2019, # 360).
https://tengrinews.kz/zakon/pravitelstvo_respubliki_kazahstan_premier_ministr_rk/kultupa/id-P1900000360/
- Gray, P.H. (1982). The contributions of economics to tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 9(1), 105–125.
- Greenwood, M., Kendrick, T., Davies, H., & Gill, F., (2017). Hearing voices: Comparing two methods for analysis of focus group data. *Applied Nursing Research*, 35, 90–93. doi: 10.1016/j.apnr.2017.02.024
- Groshev, S. (2019). The organizational economic-mechanism of efficiency management of use of farm land resources. *Biznes Inform*, 1(492), 208–214.
http://www.business-inform.net/export_pdf/business-inform-2019-1_0-pages-208_214.pdf

- Guba, E.G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquires. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 29, 75–91.
- Gursoy, D., Ouyang, Z., Nunkoo, R., & Wei, W. (2019). Residents' impact perceptions of and attitudes toward tourism development: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 28(3), 306–33. doi: 10.1080/19368623.2018.1516589
- Gwenhure, Y., & Odhiambo, N. (2017). Tourism and economic growth: A review of international literature. *Tourism*, 65(1), 33–44. <https://research-ebSCOhost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edo&AN=122628382&site+eds-live&scope+site>
- Hall, C., & Page, S. (2006). Progress in tourism management: from the geography of tourism to geographies of tourism – a review. *Tourism Management*, 30(1), 2–16.
- Hall, M., & Lew, A. (2009). *Understanding and managing tourism impacts: An integrated approach*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Han, L., & Haiyan, S. (2018). New evidence of dynamic links between tourism and economic growth based on mixed-frequency granger causality tests. *Journal of Travel Research*, 57(7), 899–907. doi: 10.1177/0047287517723531
- He, Y., Ganjam, K., Lee, K., Wang, Y., Narasayya, V., Chaudhuri, S., Chu, X., & Zheng, Y. (2018). Transform data by example (TDE): Extensive data transformation in Excel. *SIGMOND'18 Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Management of Data*, 1785–1788.

- Hesterly, W., Liebeskind, J., & Zenger, T. (1990). Organizational economics: an impending revolution in Organizational theory? *Academy of Management Review*, 15(3), 402–420.
- Hollensbe, E., Wookey, C., Hickey, L., George, G., & Nichols, C. (2014). From the editors: Organizations with purpose. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(5), 1227–1234. doi:10.5465/amj.2014.40005
- Holter, M., Johansen, A., Ness, O., Brinkmann, S., Hoybye, M., & Brendryen, H. (2019). Qualitative interview study of working mechanisms in electronic health: Tools to enhance study quality. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 21(5). doi: 10.2196/10354
- Horng, J., Hsu, S., & Tsai, C. (2018). An assessment model of corporate social responsibility practice in the tourism industry. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(7), 1085–1104. doi: 10.1080/09669582.2017.1388384
- Howell, B. (2002). *Culture, environment and conservation in the Appalachian* University of Illinois Press.
- Hritz, N., & Cecil, A. (2019). Small business owner's perception of the value and impacts of sport tourism on a destination. *Journal of Convention and Event Tourism*, 20(3), 224–240. doi: 10.1080/15470148.2019.1635547
- Huang, F., Ye, Y., & Kao, C. (2015). Developing a novel Intuitionistic Fuzzy Importance performance analysis for evaluating corporate social responsibility in sport tourism event. *Expert Systems with Applications* 42 (19), 6530–6538. doi: 10.1016/j.eswa.2015.04.008

- International Congress and Convention Association, (2017a). *ICCA Statistic report: Country and City Ranking*. <https://www.mice-club.com/media/W1siZiIsLjViM2RkYzU5M2VjYWU1NTFjMjAwMDAwMyJdXQ/ICCA%20Statistics%20Report%20201.pdf>
- International Congress and Convention Association, (2017b). *A modern history of international association meetings – update:1963-2017*. <https://www.iccaworld.org/knowledge/benefit.cfm?benefitid=5230>
- Jafari, J. (2003). *Encyclopedia of tourism*. Routledge.
- Jones, T., Harrison, J., & Felps, W. (2018). How applying instrumental stakeholder theory can provide sustainable competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(3), 371–391. doi: 10.5465/amr.2016.0111
- Jung, S., Lee, S., & Dalbor, M. (2016). The negative synergetic effect of internationalization and corporate social responsibility on US restaurant firms' value performance. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(8), 1759–1777.
- Kamaga, G., & Bello, F. (2018). Exploring corporate social responsibility adoption in the tourism industry: the case of Malawi. *Tourism Review International*, 22(2), 117–130. doi: 10.3727/154427218X15319286372270
- Karagiozis, N. (2018). The complexities of the researcher's role in qualitative research: the power of reflexivity. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Education Studies*, 13(1), 19–31. <http://doi.org/10.18848/2327-011X/CGP/v12i01/19-31>

- Kim, Y., Kim, M. & Mattila, A. (2017). Corporate social responsibility and equity-holder risk in the hospitality industry. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 58 (1), 81–93. doi: 10.1177/1938965516649052
- Kitzmueller, M., & Shimshack, J. (2012). Economic perspectives on corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 50(1), 51–84. doi:10.1257/jel.50.1.51
- Kivalov, O. (2019). Development of organizational and economic environment for implementation of structural policy in the agricultural sector. *Modern Economics*, 9, 43–52. doi: 10.31521/modecon.V9(2018)-05
- Kornilaki, M., & Font, X. (2019). Normative influences; How Socio-cultural and industrial norms influence the adoption of sustainability practices. A grounded theory of Cretan, small tourism firms. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 230, 183–189. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.09.064
- Kozak, M., & Kozak, N. (2011). *Sustainability of tourism: cultural and environmental perspectives*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publisher.
- Kozak, N., & Kozak, M. (2015a). *Tourism development*. Cambridge Scholars Publisher.
- Kozak, N., & Kozak, M. (2015b). *Tourism economics: a practical perspective*. Cambridge Scholars Publisher.
- Kozhokulov, S., Chen, X., Yang, D., Issanova, G., Samarkhanov, K., & Aliyeva, S. (2019). Assessment of tourism impact on the socio-economic spheres of the Issyk-Kul region (Kyrgyzstan). *Sustainability*, 11(14). 38–86. doi: 10.3390/su11143886

- Kriegler, E., O'Neill, B., Hallegatte, S., Kram, T., Lempert, R., Moss, R., & Wilbanks, T., (2012). The need for and use of socio-economic scenarios for climate change analysis: a new approach based on shared socio-economic pathways. *Global Environment Change*, 22, 807–822. doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.05.005
- Krueger, R.A. (2000). *Focus groups; a practical guide for applied research* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Lanfranchi, M., Giannetto, C., & Pirnea, I. (2015). Rural tourism: corporate social responsibility and sustainable tourism. *Quality – Access to Success*, 16(146), 83–88.
- Lamer, M., van der Duim, R., & Spaargaren, G. (2017). The relevance of practice theories for tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 62, 54–63. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2016.12.002
- Leung, E., & Chalupa, A. (2019). Coping with imminent death: thematic content analysis on narratives by Japanese soldiers in World War II. *Omega: Journal of Death and Dying*, 78(3), 211–301/ <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020333815612786>
- Lew, A (2001). Defining a geography of tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 3(1), 105–144. doi: 10.1080/14616680010008739
- Li, X., Wang, Y., Zhang, Y., & Cao, Y. (2019). Examining the role of corporate social responsibility in resident attitude formation: a missing link? *Journal of Travel Research*, 58(7), 1105–1122. doi: 10.1177/0047287518798490
- Liakhovych, G., Pavlykivska, O., Marushchak, L., Kilyar, O., & Shpylyk, S. (2019). The organizational-economic aspects of land relations provisions by administrative-

- territorial reform in Ukraine. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 17(2), 479–492. doi: 10.21511/ppm.17(2).2019.37
- Liu, Z., Yin, J., & Huang, S. (2018). Managing tourism impacts in China's wetlands: a total relationship flow management perspective. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 23(3), 231–244. doi: 10.1080/10941665.2017.1421239
- Liu, H., & Song, H. (2018). New evidence of dynamic links between tourism and economic growth based on Mixed-Frequency Granger causality test. *Journal of Travel and Research*, 57(7), 899–907. doi: 10.1177/0047287517723531
- Lovelock, B., Filep, S., & Melubo, K. (2019). Motivations and barriers for corporate social responsibility engagement: evidence from the Tanzanian tourism industry. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 19(3), 284–295. doi: 10.1177/1467358417742685
- Lukasz, P., & Michal, C., (2015). Negative effect of mass tourism on high mountain fauna: the case of the Tatra chamois *Rupicapra tatra*. *Oryx*, 49(3), 500-505. doi: 10.1017/S0030605313001269
- Lunt, P. (1996). Rethinking focus groups in media and communications research. *Journal of Communication*, 46. 79–98.
- Lusticky, M., & Musil, M. (2016). Towards a theory of stakeholders' perception of tourism impacts. *Czech Journal of Tourism*, 5(2), 93–110. doi: 10.1515/cjot-2016-0006

- Lwoga, N. (2018). Heritage proximity, attitudes to tourism impacts and residents' support for heritage tourism in Kaole Site, Tanzania. *Bulletin of Geography. Socio-Economic Series*, 42(42), 163–181. doi: 10.2478/bog-2019-0037
- Lyon, S. & Well, C. (2012). Ethnographies of global tourism: cultural heritage, economic encounters, and the redefinition of impact. *Global tourism: Cultural heritage and economic encounters* (pp. 1–20). Alta Mira Press.
- MacNeill, T., & Wozniak, D. (2018). The economic, social, and environmental impacts of cruise tourism. *Tourism Management*, 66, 387–404. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2017.11.002
- Marin-Pantelescu, A., Tachiciu, L., Capusneanu, S., & Topor, D. (2019). Role of torus operations and travel agencies in promoting sustainable tourism. *Amfiteatru Economic*, 21(52), 654–669. doi: 10.24818/EA/2019/52/654
- Marjory, B. (2009). Event studies: theory research and policy for planned events. *Tourism management*, 30(4), 611–612. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2008.09.004
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2016). *Designing qualitative research* (6th ed.). Sage.
- Mason, P. (2008). *Tourism impacts, planning and management* (2nd ed.). Elsevier.
- Mathieson, A., & Wall, G., (1982). *Tourism: economic, physical and social impact*. Longman.
- Miller, M.L., & Auyong, J. (1991). Coastal zone tourism – a potential force affecting environment and society. *Marine Policy*, 15(2), 75–99.
- Mitchell, L., & Murphy, P. (1991). Geography and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(1), 57–70.

- Monterrubio, C., Osorio, M., & Benitez, J. (2018). Comparing enclave tourism's impacts: A dependency theory approach to three state-planned resorts in Mexico. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 8, 412–422. doi: 10.1016/j.jdmm.2017.08.004
- Monterrubio, C., Osorio, M., & Jazmin, B. (2018). Comparing enclave tourism's socioeconomic impacts: a dependency theory approach to three state-planned resorts in Mexico. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 8, 412–422. doi: 10.1016/j.jdmm.2017.08.004
- Moterrubio, J., Mendoza, M., Fernandez, M., & Gulette, G., (2011). Tourism and social change. A qualitative study of on community perceptions in Huatulco, Mexico. *Cuadernos de Turismo*, 28, 255–256.
- Moustakas, C. (1990). *Heuristic research: design methodology and applications*. SAGE.
- Moutinho, L. (2000). *Strategic management in tourism*. CABI
- Muller, K. (2014). Drei methodische Pfade für die Soziökonomie im 21. Jahrhundert. *Was Ist und Wozu Soziökonomie*, 5(4), 181–208.
- Murphy, P. (2015). *Tourism: a community approach*. Routledge.
- Narendra, R., & Riann, S., (2017). An empirical study of resident perceptions of tourism impact in Store bay, Tobago. *Journal of Eastern Caribbean Studies*, 42(2), 24–52.
- Nejati, M., Mohamed, B., & Omar, S. (2014). Local's perceptions towards the impacts of tourism and the importance of local engagement: a comparative study of two islands in Malaysia. *Tourism*, 62(2), 135–146.

- Nesterenko, R. (2019). Evaluating the economic-organizational provision of machine building enterprises as an objective basis for implementation of the logic-oriented systems. *Biznes Inform*, 1(492), 371–376.
<https://doaj.org/article/d3315ec12b934a33bc081146894ea203>
- Njoroge, J., Atieno, L., & Do Nascimento, D. (2017). Sport tourism and perceived socioeconomic impact in Kenya: the case of Machakos county. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 23(2), 195–217. doi: 10.20867/thm.23.2.9
- Nunkoo, R. (2016). Toward a more comprehensive use of social exchange theory of study residents' attitudes to tourism. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 39, 588–596. doi: 10.1016/S2212-5671(16)30303-3
- Nyauoane, G., & Poudel, S. (2012). Application of appreciative inquiry in tourism research in rural communities. *Tourism Management*, 33(4), 978–987. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2011.10.009
- OECD, (2018). *OECD Tourism Trends and Policies*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/tour-2018-en>
- Olsen, T. (2017). Political stakeholder theory: the state, legitimacy, and the ethics of microfinance in emerging economies. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 27(1), 71 –98. doi: 10.1017/beq.2016.59
- Onwuegbuzie, A. Dickinson, W. Leech, N., & Zoran, A., 2009. A qualitative framework for collecting and analyzing data in focus group research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(3), 2–21. doi: 10.1177/160940690900800301

- O'Reilly, C., Main, B., & Crystal, G. (1989). *CEO compensation as tournaments and social compensation: a tale of two theories*. Cambridge University Press.
- O'Sullivan, E., Rassel, G. R., Berner, M., & Taliaferro, J. D. (2017). *Research methods for public administrators (6th ed.)*. Routledge.
- Ovichnikov, V., & Oganyan, A. (2019). Conceptual model of organizational-economic mechanisms of institutional modernization of the higher school as a driver for innovative transformation of the economic system of Russia. *Вестник университета, 0(6)*, 115–123. doi: 10.26425/1816-4277-2019-6-115-123
- Park, J., & Park, M. (2016). Qualitative versus quantitative research methods: Discovery or justification? *Journal of Marketing Thoughts, 3(1)*, 1–7.
doi:10.15577/jmt.2016.03.01.1
- Park, S., Song, S., & Lee, S. (2019). Influence of CEOs' equity-based compensation on restaurant firm' CSR initiatives: The moderating role of institutional ownership. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 31(9)*, 3664–3682. doi: 10.1108/IJCHM-03-2018-0221
- Paskova, M., & Zaelenke, J. (2019). How crucial is the social responsibility for tourism sustainability? *Social Responsibility Journal, 15(4)*. 534–552. doi: 10.1108/SRJ-03-2018-0057
- Patton, M. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods (4th ed.)*. SAGE.
- Peil, J., & Staveren, I., (2009). *Handbook of Economics and Ethics*. Edward Elgar Publishing Inc.

- Plano Clark, V. L., & Ivankova, N. V. (2016). *Mixed methods research: A guide to the field*. SAGE.
- Pulido-Fernandez, J., Cardenas-Garcia, P., & Rivero-Sanchez, M. (2013). Does tourism growth influence economic development? *Journal of Travel Research*, 54(2), 206–221. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287513514297>
- Ramgulam, N., & Singh, R. (2017). An empirical study of resident perceptions of tourism impact in Store Bay, Tobago. *Journal of Eastern Caribbean Studies*, 42(2), 24–52.
- Rovai, A., Baker, J., & Ponton, M. (2013). *Social science research design and statistics: A practitioner's guide to research methods ad IBM SPSS*. Watertee Press LLC.
- Rudestan, K., & Newton, R. (2015). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Salais, R. (2016). Quantification and Objectivity. From statistical conventions to social conventions. *Historical Social Research*, 41(2), 118-134. doi: 10.12759/hsr.41.2016.2.118-134
- Bakan, J. (2005). *The corporation: The pathological pursuit of profit and power* (1st ed.). Simon and Shuster Inc.
- Saldana, J. (2015). *Manual for qualitative research* (3d ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Sawant, M. (2017). Socio-economic impacts of tourism development at Aurangabad district. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315492199>
- Schmidt, M. (2010). Quantification of transcripts from depth interviews, open-ended responses and focus groups: Challenges, accomplishments, new applications and

- perspectives for market research. *International Journal of Market Research*, 52(4), 483–508. doi: 10.2501/S1470785309201417
- Seitzhanova, A. (2008). The impact of Astana EXPO2017 on tourist destinations. *Athens Journal of Tourism*, 5(4). 305–316. doi: 10.30958/ajt.5-4-4
- Sheehy, B. (2005). The reluctant stakeholder: Theoretical problems in the stakeholder-stakeholder debates. *University of Miami Business Law Review*, 14(1), 193–241
- Sheehy, B., & Farneti, F. (2021). Corporate social responsibility, sustainable: What is the difference, and does it matter? *Sustainability*, 13, 59–65.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su13115965>
- Shenton, A. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 28, 100 –119. doi: 10.3233/EFI-2004-22201
- Simon, M. (2011). *Dissertation and scholarly research: Recipes for success*. Dissertation Success, LLC.
- Singh, M. (2008). *Tourism management and marketing*. Himalaya Books Pvt. Ltd.
- Stergiou, D., & Airey D. (2018). Understandings of tourism theory. *Tourism Review*, 73(2), 156–168. doi: 10.1108/TR-07-2017-0120
- Stiglitz, J. (2012). *The price of inequality: How today ‘s divided society endangers our future*. W.W. Norton and Co.
- Szegedi, K., Fulop, G., & Bereczk, A. (2016). Relationship between social entrepreneurship, corporate social responsibility and social innovation: In theory and practice. *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and industrial engineering*, 10(5), 1402–1407.

- Shafritz, J. M., Ott, J. S., & Jang, Y. S. (Eds.). (2016). *Classics of organization theory*. (8th ed). Wadworth, Cengage Learning.
- Shenton, A. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 28, 100–119. doi: 10.3233/EFI-2004-22201
- Sheehy, A. (2015). Tourism market booms. *Herbert River Express*, 7, 3–18.
<https://search-ebscohost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bwh&AN=9X9HRENEWSMMGLSTRY000114636853&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Soria-Leyva, E. (2015). Proposal of a fussy math-based procedure to obtain a quantitative indicator that valuates tourism impacts on local residents. A case study. *Anuario de la Facultad de Ciencias Economicas y Empresariales*, 5(0), 131–148.
<https://doaj.org/article/76d1002eae334303ae3c46c5e2eaf363>
- Su, L., Scott, s., Hsu, M., & Chen, X. (2017). How does perceived corporate social responsibility contributed to green consumption behavior of Chinese tourists; a hotel context. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(12), 3157–3176. doi: 10.1037/t23058-000
- Suleyman, A., Murat, T., Ece, Z., & Sevki, U. (2019). The perspective of local residents on the rural tourism: the case of Samsun Kizilirmak Delta. *International Journal of Geography and Geography Education*, 40, 295–310.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research*. SAGE.

- Tamariz, L., Palacio, A., Robert, M., & Varcus, E.N. (2013). Improving the informed consent process for research subjects with low literacy: A systematic review. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 28, 121–126. doi:10.1007/s11606-012-2133-2
- Tazim, J., & Robinson, M. (2010). *The Sage handbook of tourism studies*. SAGE.
- Tembi, T., & Sakhile, M. (2019). Urban resident perceptions of the impacts of tourism development in Zimbabwe. *Bulletin of Geography. Socioeconomic series*, 43(43), 25–44. doi: 10.2478/bog-2019-0002
- Thanh, V., Nguyen, T., & Nguyen, T. (2018). 2018 4th International conference on green technology and sustainable development green technology and sustainable development: Put forth a conceptual model about corporate social responsibility in tourism in Ho Chi Minh City. *2018 4th International Conference*, 473–477. doi: 10.1109/GTSD.2018.8595584
- Theodoulidis, B., Diaz, D., Crotto, F., & Rancati, E (2017). Exploring corporate social responsibility and financial performance through stakeholder theory in the tourism industry. *Tourism Management*, 62, 173–188. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2017.03.018
- Timothy D., & Boyd, S. (2014). *Tourism and trails: Cultural, ecological and management issues*. Channel View Publications.
- Tribe, J. (1997). The indiscipline of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24, 628–657.
- Tribe, J. (2008). Tourism: a critical business. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46 (3), 245–255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287507304051>

- Trochim, W., & Land, D. (1982). Designing designs for research. *The Researcher*, 1(1), 1–6. <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/desdes.php>
- United Nations General Assembly (1981). World tourism conference: Report of the economic and social change. New York, NY.
- UN World Tourism Organization, (2018a). *2017 Annual Report*. <https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/book/10.18111/9789284419807>
- United Nations World Tourism Organization (2019). Overtourism? Understanding and managing urban tourism growth beyond perceptions (Vol. 2). <https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284420629.1>
- United Nations World Tourism Organization, (2018b). *UNWTO: Tourism Highlights* (2018 ed.). <https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284419876>
- United Nations World Tourism Organization, (2013). *The economic impact of tourism: Overview and examples of macroeconomic analysis*. http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/IP_Economic_Impact_EN.pdf
- United Nations World Tourism Organization, (2012). *Global report on aviation: responding to the needs of new tourism markets and destinations*. <https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284414925>
- Uysal, M., Schwartz, Z., & Sirakaya-Turk (2019). *Management science in hospitality and tourism; theory, practice, and applications (advances in hospitality and tourism)* (1st ed.). Apple academy press, Inc.

- Vaid, J., & Kesharwani, S. (2018). Role of big data analytics on social media marketing of MICE tourism. *Global Journal of Enterprise Information System*, 10 (1), 55–61. doi: 10.18311/gjeis/2018/21421
- Valenti, A., Carden, L., & Boyd, R. (2014). Corporate social responsibility and business: Examining the criteria of effective corporate implementation utilizing case studies. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(3), 1–4. https://www.ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol_5_No_3_March_2014/1.pdf
- Veltmeyer, H. (2016). Extractive capital, the state and the resistance in Latin America. *Sociology and Anthropology*, 4(8), 774–784. doi: 10.13189/sa.2016.040812
- Walden University. (2019). *IRB application*. <https://academicguides.waldenu.edu/researchcenter/orec/application>
- Wendy, E., & Mitchell, S. (2008). A sociology of quantification. *European Journal of Sociology*, 49, 401–436. doi: 10.1017/S0003975609000150
- Wilkinson, S. (2004). Focus group research. *Qualitative research: Theory, method, and practice*. SAGE.
- Williams, M., Grajales, C., & Kurkiewicz, D. (2013). Assumptions of multiple regression: Correcting two misconceptions. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 18(11), 1–14. <http://pareonline.net>
- Weller, S., Vickers, B., Bernard, H., Blackburn, A., Borgatti, S., & Graviee, C. (2018). Open-ended interview questions and saturation. *Plos One*, 13(6), 72–83. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0198606>
- Wheelan, C. (2014). *Naked statistics: stripping the dread from the data*. W. W. Norton.

- Whitfield, J., & Dioko, L. (2012). Measuring and examining the relevance of discretionary corporate social responsibility in tourism: some preliminary evidence from the UK conference sector. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(3), 289–302.
- World Business Council for Sustainable Development, (2016). Measuring a socio-economic impact: a guide for business. <http://www.wbcsd.org/Clusters/Social-Impact/Social-Capital-Protocol>.
- World Economic Forum, (2017). The Travel and tourism competitiveness report 2017: paving the way or a more sustainable and inclusive future. http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_TTCR_2017_web_0401.pdf
- World Travel and Tourism Council, (2018). Travel and Tourism Economic Impact 2018: Kazakhstan. <https://www.wttc.org/economic-impact/country-analysis/country-reports/>
- World Travel and Tourism Council, (2020a). Travel and Tourism Economic Impact 2019: World. <https://www.slovenia.info/uploads/dokumenti/raziskave/raziskave/world2019.pdf>
- World Travel and Tourism Council, (2020b). Travel and Tourism Economic Impact 2019: Kazakhstan. <https://www.wttc.org/Research/Economic-Impact>
- Xiao, H., & Smith, S.L.J. (2005). Source knowledge for tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(1), 272–275. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2004.06.004

- Yang, Q., Su, M., Wu, Y., & Wang, X. (2019). Economic efficiency evaluation of costal tourism cities based on fractal theory. *Journal of Coastal Research*, 93, 836–842. doi: 10.2112/SI93-118.1
- Yin, R. (2017). *Case study research: Design and method* (6th ed.). SAGE.
- Zhuchinsky, A. (2019). Organizational and financial and economic instruments of management democratization and regulation of social and cultural enterprises development in Ukraine. *Экономический Вестник Университета*, 42, 129–135. doi: 10.31470/2306-546-2019-42-129-135

Appendix A: Letter Request to Stakeholders' Organizations

Dear Mr. _____,

My name is Dana Kurmasheva, a Ph.D. student with the Walden University who currently conduct a study titled "Socioeconomic Effect of Tourism: Nur-Sultan after EXPO-2017." The purpose of this study is to address understudied areas of socioeconomic effects of tourism by applying qualitative methodology to understand the industry's impact on local community in Nur-Sultan, after it hosted a significant tourism booster event, the international exhibition EXPO-2017. The results of this study might create an original contribution to the body of knowledge on sustainable development of tourism by defining its socioeconomic impacts to inform public administrators' decisions on tourism's sustainable development.

Some international organizations, as well as experts in tourism field alarm destructive effects that tourism brings on local communities while ensuring their socioeconomic progress. The problem proceeds from the absence of measurement system to measure tourism impacts for management purposes and from the fact that tourism-related effects are not universal and vary among tourism destinations. Tourism-related mismanagement provokes various forms of resentment by local communities against foreigners and tourism itself. This fact directly affects Nur-Sultan's population experiencing mismanagement of tourism growth after hosting EXPO-2017 with the positive dynamic of infrastructural and investment development, employment growth, and cross-cultural exchange, but increased prices, crime, and pollution.

To address the problem, I would like to conduct open-ended interviews to understand tourism-related impacts and to create a unique for Nur-Sultan list of socioeconomic effects for public management purposes. Interviews will take place on ____ at ____ at the following address: _____, (or, because of the COVID-19 pandemic, via zoom) and last approximately 60 to 90 minutes.

Taking into consideration your dedication to tourism development and the role you play in framing tourism-friendly policies in Kazakhstan, I am seeking your support in defining five experts of your organization with experience in tourism development during the EXPO-2017. If you kindly decide to support my research efforts, I would like you to consider the following criteria while defining representatives of your organization for the interviews. First, they should represent your organization. Second, they should live in Nur-Sultan during and after the EXPO-2017 or be involved in tourism activities taking place around EXPO-2017. Third, they should have more than three years of experience in developing and promoting the tourism industry of Kazakhstan. Fourth, they should be aware of the Government's role in managing the tourism industry. The goal of these criteria is to gain an in-depth understanding of tourism effects from in-the-field experts and practitioners to compile the most reliable list of tourism-related effects.

I am looking forward to hearing from you, and I hope that you decide to support my efforts and kindly contribute to results that might frame a deeper understanding of tourism impacting local people's lives. Such understanding may impact the way public management and tourism-related policy decisions are made toward people-oriented sustainability.

Appendix B: Participant Invitation Letter With Consent Form

Dear Mr. (Ms.) _____,

You are formally being invited to participate in a research study titled “Socioeconomic Effect of Tourism: Nur-Sultan after EXPO-2017.” This letter contains information included to help you decide whether or not you want to participate. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask.

Why have you been selected? Your participation is required because you have knowledge and experience of working in the tourism field.

Why is this study being done? Some international organizations, as well as experts in the tourism field, alarm destructive effects that tourism brings on local communities while ensuring their socioeconomic progress. The problem proceeds from the absence of a measurement system to measure tourism impacts for management purposes and from the fact that tourism-related effects vary among tourism destinations. Tourism-related mismanagement provokes various forms of resentment by local communities against foreigners and tourism itself. This fact directly affects Nur-Sultan’s population experiencing mismanagement of tourism growth after hosting EXPO-2017 with the positive dynamic of infrastructural and investment development, employment growth, and cross-cultural exchange, but increased prices, crime, and pollution.

What is the plan for this research? Open-ended interviews will be used for this study. You will be asked about the social and economic effects that tourism brings to the local community of Nur-Sultan to frame a list of the mentioned effects. Interviews will

last approximately 60 to 90 minutes. The interview will take place on ____ at ____ at the following address: _____. Food (snacks) and drinks will be provided during the interview. Your comments will be audiotaped during the session. They will be properly secured and reviewed only by the researcher. The tapes will be destroyed after the completion of the study. No information will be associated with you specifically.

What are the possible risks? The risk associated with this research study is that you will be sharing your thoughts on the social and economic effects of tourism that may not find consensus with other participants of the research.

What are the possible benefits of participating? You will receive additional information on tourism development and get new perspectives on the social and economic effects of tourism from a different angle.

How might the results of this study help others? Results from this study will frame a deeper understanding of the social and economic effects of tourism that are vital for managing and shaping policy decisions in a sustainable and people-oriented way. The results of the research will be published in an international scientific database and improve the global knowledge of tourism.

How will your information be protected? The only people who will have access to any of the research records are the researcher: the Walden University Institutional Review Board, and any other agency required by the US law. The information from this research study could be formally published in scientific journals, but your identity will remain confidential.

You will also be asked to keep the identities and comments of the other participants confidential.

If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact me at any time - Dana Kurmasheva, cell: +77712520007, email: xddana@yandex.ru, dana.kurmasheva@waldenu.edu. If you decides to outreach to the Walden University's Research Participant Advocate to discuss your rights as participants, you may call 001-612-312-1210 or send and email to irb@mail.waldenu.edu.

Documentation of Informed Consent. You are freely deciding to be in this research study. Signing this form means that you have read and understood this consent form that you have had the consent form explained to you, that you have had your questions answered, and that you have decided to be in the research study.

If you have any questions during the study, please contact the investigator listed below. You will be given a copy of the consent for your records.

Signature of Participant: _____ Date: _____ Time: _____

My signature certifies that all elements of informed consent described on this consent form have been explained fully to the subject. In my judgment, the participant possesses the legal capacity to give informed consent to participate in this research and is voluntarily and knowingly giving informed consent to participate.

Signature of Investigator: _____ Date: _____

Appendix C: Letter Request to Tourism Department of the National Chamber of
Entrepreneurs of the Republic of Kazakhstan With Interview Questions

Dear Mr. (Ms.) _____,

My name is Dana Kurmasheva, a Ph.D. student with the Walden University who currently conduct a study titled “Socioeconomic Effect of Tourism: Nur-Sultan after EXPO-2017.” The purpose of this study is to address understudied areas of socioeconomic effects of tourism by applying qualitative methodology to understand the industry’s impact on local community in Nur-Sultan, after it hosted a significant tourism booster event, the international exhibition EXPO-2017. The results of this study might create an original contribution to the body of knowledge on sustainable development of tourism by defining its socioeconomic impacts to inform public administrators’ decisions on tourism’s sustainable development. Some international organizations, as well as experts in tourism field alarm destructive effects that tourism brings on local communities while ensuring their socioeconomic progress.

The problem proceeds from the lack of theoretical knowledge on tourism’s socioeconomic effects on local communities due to its vulnerability and dependability on experience, perceptions and emotions by local communities. Such blank spots have resulted in public administrators’ inability to establish national systems of tourism’s effects management that continuously changing economic and social constructs of local communities. This fact entails public resentment against tourism and its development. In the latest reports, some international organizations, including the UNWTO and the

OECD, considered the absence of national tourism management systems as one of the most significant challenges to the industry's development and advised national governments to establish one. The describe conditions directly affect Nur-Sultan's population experiencing mismanagement of tourism growth after hosting EXPO-2017 with the positive dynamic of infrastructural and investment development, employment growth, and cross-cultural exchange, but increased prices, crime, and pollution.

To address the problem, I would like to conduct open-ended interviews to understand and define tourism-related effects on Nur-Sultan's local population. I have drafted a list of seven interview questions (see below) to ensure the rigor of information collected during the interviews. The goal is to collect qualitative data engaging a small number of people in informal, open, and friendly discussions focused on tourism's social and economic effects.

Taking into consideration your experience and dedication to tourism development, as well as the role you play in framing tourism-friendly policies in Kazakhstan, I am seeking your support in verifying the list of questions for correcting and improving them. I am looking forward to hearing from you, and I hope that you decide to support my efforts and kindly contribute to results that might frame a deeper understanding of tourism impacting local people's lives. Such understanding may impact the way public management and tourism-related policy decisions are made toward people-oriented sustainability.

Appendix D: List of Interview Questions

Question #1: What is your experience working in the tourism industry?

This question has been detailed by the SMEs who reviewed this interview protocol with the following sub-questions.

How many years have you been working in the field? In what type of tourism activity have you been working (inbound or outbound)? What positions you have been working in?

Question #2: What is your understanding of tourism's effects and their impact on local communities?

Question #3: How did tourism impact local communities, specifically in Nur-Sultan during the year of EXPO-2017?

Question #4: What do you perceive as being the most critical social and economic factors of tourism development that impact the daily life of Nur-Sultan's population after hosting EXPO-2017?

Question #5: How the relationship between economic and social factors of tourism effecting local community in Nur-Sultan can be described?

Question #6: How would you group the effects as economic or social or socioeconomic?

Question #7: How would you split them between positive and negative?

Question #8: What does your experience tell you about the relationship between tourism-related effects?

The following questions were suggested by the SMEs who reviewed this interview protocol.

Question # 9: What would you recommend to reduce locals' negative perception of tourists' inflow into the city and international events like EXPO-2017?

Question # 10: What would you recommend to stimulate locals' positive reaction toward inbound tourists and international events like EXPO-2017?

Question # 11: What is your assessment of local authority's efforts in managing tourists' inflow into the city, which number tripled during the EXPO? Whether there were problems and inconveniences for local residents in terms of transport services, access to facilities, the growth of offenses, or, conversely, excessive control? Were the issues addressed quickly or not fast enough? What recommendations could you give for the city authorities?

Appendix E: Tourism's Socioeconomic Themes and Codes

Positive/ Negative	Themes	Codes with frequency of occurrence (f)	Interview questions
Corporate Social Responsibility theory's (Sheehy, 1960-ish)			
Parent code 1: Government Social Responsiveness:			2, 3, 10
<i>Positive</i>	Business Awakening	proliferation of tourism-related business ($f = 9$), increase in tourism-related private investments ($f = 6$), revival of souvenir production ($f = 3$)	
	Cultural Awakening	expansion of Kazakhstan's culture ($f = 12$), cultural enrichment ($f = 9$)	
	National Identity Awakening	increased confidence in future ($f = 8$), cultural self-recognition ($f = 5$), increased national pride (patriotism, $f = 6$), national reunification ($f = 5$)	
	Educational Revival	extended outlook ($f = 1$), increased interest in learning ($f = 12$)	
<i>Negative</i>	Unhappened Social Regeneration	low hospitality culture ($f = 12$), intolerance with elements of phobia ($f = 3$), corruption ($f = 1$)	
Parent code 2: Tourism Sustainable Development			2, 8, 10

<i>Positive</i>	Sustainable Culture	profitable and sustainable tourism ($f = 3$);
	Emergence	business-driven-MICE ($f = 3$), educational tourism ($f = 2$), sustainable traffic management ($f = 2$), green culture emergence ($f = 6$)
	Spatial Greenification	emergence of public green infrastructure ($f = 7$), emergence of new green projects ($f = 7$)
<i>Negative</i>	Tourism Unsustainability Culture	absence of sustainable traveling culture (f = 2), degradation of the traditional walk of life ($f = 2$).
	Tourism Infrastructure Immaturity	chaotic infrastructure ($f = 2$), inadequate public infrastructure ($f = 2$)
	Imperfect Legislative and Economic Frames	lagging green economy ($f = 6$), spurious green legislation ($f = 7$)
Parent code 3: Business Social Responsiveness		2, 3, 10
<i>Negative</i>	Social Irresponsiveness	big tourism business suppresses business of local communities (1), business pivot from traditional production (2); lack of desire to adhere to the concept of recreational load (5)
<i>Positive</i>	New Socioeconomic Player	business increased socioeconomic confidence (12), job generator (14), grants promoter (3)
	Tourism Education Promoter	tourism-related trainings (4); educational

		language courses (4)
	Kazakhstan's Cultural Ambassador	popularization of Kazakhstan's culture for foreigners (4), popularization of Kazakhstan's culture within the country (3)
<u>Organizational Economics theory's (Arrow, 1969)</u>		
Parent code 1: Government's Tourism Related Policies		4, 7, 9, 11
<i>Positive</i>	Institutionalization	establishment of the Committee on the tourism industry and the Kazakh Tourism National Company ($f = 5$), reduced obstacles on the way of tourism development ($f = 5$), emergence of domestic tourism ($f = 6$)
	Construction Boom	brand new infrastructure ($f = 15$), proliferation of tourism's soft infrastructure ($f = 13$)
<i>Negative</i>	Inconsistency in Inbound Tourism Development	inadequate promotion on strategic markets ($f = 4$), unprepared migration regime ($f = 7$), absence of tourists attracting strategies ($f = 5$)
	Inconsistency in Tourism Policies	lagging tourism management ($f = 10$), unimproved positions on tourism markets ($f = 1$)
Parent code 2: Public-privet partnerships		5, 7, 9

<i>Positive</i>	New Business Opportunities	establishment of a conducive environment ($f = 13$)
<i>Negative</i>	Selectivity in business partnerships	selective access to the EXPO ($f = 3$)
Parent code 3: Tourism's economic effectiveness		6, 9
<i>Positive</i>	Hospitality Industry Sophistication	proliferation of tourism-related business ($f = 15$), international standards of quality ($f = 2$), commercialization of national authenticity ($f = 4$)
	Tourism's Multiplier Effect	increased macroeconomic indicators ($f = 10$), increased demand for tourism services ($f = 7$)
	Economy's Safety Valve	export of money and service into the country ($f = 5$)
	Image	Nur-Sultan's positive image ($f = 3$) and Kazakhstan's international tourism-related image ($f = 3$)
<i>Negative</i>	Price Increase	uncontrolled prices for hotels and transportation ($f = 6$)