REFERENCES:

1. Global Business Travel Association. Business Travel Index Outlook: Annual Global Report and Forecast, 2025–2029. – GBTA, 2025.
2. Jones C., Li S. The economic significance of meetings and conferences: A satellite account approach // Annals of Tourism Research. – 2015. – Vol. 52. – P. 117–133. – DOI: 10.1016/j.annals.2015.03.004.
3. Hanly P.A. Measuring the economic contribution of the international association conference market: An Irish case study // Tourism Management. – 2012. – Vol. 33. – No. 6. – P. 1574–1582. – DOI: 10.1016/j.tourman.2011.12.010.
4. Dwyer L., Forsyth P., Spurr R. Evaluating tourism's economic effects: New and old approaches // Tourism Management. – 2004. – Vol. 25. – No. 3. – P. 307–317.
5. Kim S.S., Chon K., Chung K.Y. Convention industry in South Korea: An economic impact analysis // Tourism Management. – 2003. – Vol. 24. – No. 5. – P. 533–541. – DOI: 10.1016/S0261-5177(03)00006-2.
6. Getz D., Page S.J. Event Studies: Theory, Research and Policy for Planned Events. 4th ed. – London: Routledge, 2019. – DOI: 10.4324/9780429023002.
7. Taipakova B. Analysis of the interaction of MICE tourism development factors (the case of Astana city in Kazakhstan) // GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites. – 2023. – Vol. 51. – No. 4, Suppl. – P. 1600–1609. – DOI: 10.30892/gtg.514spl01-1156.
8. Kenzhebekov N. et al. Foresight of tourism in Kazakhstan: Experience economy // Information. – 2021. – Vol. 12. – No. 3. – Art. 138. – DOI: 10.3390/info12030138.
9. National Statistics Bureau of the Agency for Strategic Planning and Reforms of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Official statistics portal [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: stat.gov.kz. – Date of access: 09.04.2026.

AUTHOR INFORMATION:

Темирбеков А.Г. — докторант образовательной программы 8D04117 «Инновационный менеджмент», кафедра «Менеджмент», Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилёва (г. Астана, Республика Казахстан), e-mail: temirbekov.expo2017@gmail.com

Толысбаев Б.С. — доктор экономических наук, профессор кафедры «Менеджмент», Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилёва (г. Астана, Республика Казахстан), e-mail: bauke.311@gmail.com

Майдырова А.Б. — доктор экономических наук, профессор кафедры экономики и предпринимательства, Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилёва (г. Астана, Республика Казахстан), e-mail: maydirova2010@gmail.com

Темирбеков А.Г. — 8D04117 «Инновациялық менеджмент» білім беру бағдарламасының докторанты, «Менеджмент» кафедрасы, Л.Н. Гумилёв атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті (Астана қ., Қазақстан Республикасы), e-mail: temirbekov.expo2017@gmail.com

Толысбаев Б.С. — экономика ғылымдарының докторы, «Менеджмент» кафедрасының профессоры, Л.Н. Гумилёв атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті (Астана қ., Қазақстан Республикасы), e-mail: bauke.311@gmail.com

Майдырова А.Б. — экономика ғылымдарының докторы, экономика және кәсіпкерлік кафедрасының профессоры, Л.Н. Гумилёв атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті (Астана қ., Қазақстан Республикасы), e-mail: maydirova2010@gmail.com

Temirbekov A.G. — Doctoral Student of the Educational Program 8D04117 "Innovation Management", Department of Management, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan), e-mail: temirbekov.expo2017@gmail.com

Tolysbayev B.S. — Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor at the Department of Management, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan), e-mail: bauke.311@gmail.com

Maidyrova A.B. — Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor at the Department of Economics and Entrepreneurship, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan), e-mail: maydirova2010@gmail.com

МРНТИ 6.56.21
УДК 338.2:330.34

DOI 10.58319/26170493_2026_3_138

ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AS A FACTOR OF NATIONAL SECURITY

Rey I. Yu.[1], Yessilov A.B.[1], Jumabekova A.T.[2],

[1]K. Kulazhanov Kazakh University of Technology and Business, Astana, Kazakhstan; [2] Esil University, Astana, Kazakhstan.

ABSTRACT. The article examines how economic diversification can contribute to national security, with particular reference to Kazakhstan. The purpose is to identify the channels through which a concentrated production and export structure creates economic vulnerabilities and to develop a conceptual framework for their assessment. The study draws on the literature on resource dependence, structural transformation and economic complexity. Systemic, structural-functional, comparative and institutional approaches are used to bring these perspectives together. The analysis distinguishes sectoral, export, technological and regional diversification, together with the institutional conditions that support them. These dimensions link the composition of economic activity to fiscal stability, employment, technological capabilities and exposure to external shocks. For Kazakhstan, the discussion focuses on converting resource revenues into productive capabilities through manufacturing, processing, human capital, innovation and non-resource exports. The proposed framework organizes potential indicators for subsequent empirical assessment; it does not provide a calculated index or a quantitative estimate of the effect on national security. The policy implications concern the quality and competitiveness of new activities, cooperation between research and business, and alternative sources of regional employment. Diversification can strengthen economic resilience when supported by effective institutions and the development of productive knowledge.

KEYWORDS: economic diversification, national security, economic resilience, resource dependence, economic complexity, structural transformation, Kazakhstan.

Экономиканы әртараптандыру ұлттық қауіпсіздік факторы ретінде

Рей И.Ю.[1], Есілов А.Б.[1], Жұмабекова А.Т.[2]

[1]Қ. Құлажанов атындағы Қазақ технология және бизнес университеті, Астана, Қазақстан; [2] «Esil University» университеті, Астана, Қазақстан

АҢДАТПА. Мақалада Қазақстан мысалында экономиканы әртараптандырудың ұлттық қауіпсіздікті қамтамасыз етудегі рөлі қарастырылады. Зерттеудің мақсаты — өндіріс пен экспорттың шоғырлануы жағдайында экономикалық осалдықтардың қалыптасу арналарын анықтау және оларды бағалаудың тұжырымдамалық негізін ұсыну. Зерттеу материалы ретінде шикізаттық тәуелділік, құрылымдық трансформация және экономикалық күрделілік мәселелеріне арналған еңбектер пайдаланылды. Бұл тәсілдерді жинақтау үшін жүйелік, құрылымдық-функционалдық, салыстырмалы және институционалдық

талдау қолданылды. Салалық, экспорттық, технологиялық және өңірлік әртараптандыру, сондай-ақ оларды іске асырудың институционалдық шарттары бөлініп көрсетілді. Осы құрамдастардың мемлекеттік қаржы тұрақтылығымен, жұмыспен қамтумен, технологиялық мүмкіндіктермен және сыртқы күйзелістерге осалдықпен байланысы қарастырылды. Қазақстанға қатысты шикізаттан түсетін кірістерді өңдеу өнеркәсібі, адами капитал, инновациялар және шикізаттық емес экспорт арқылы өндірістік мүмкіндіктерге айналдыру мәселесі талқыланды. Ұсынылған схема кейінгі эмпирикалық бағалау үшін ықтимал көрсеткіштерді жүйелейді; жұмыста интегралдық индекс есептелмейді және ұлттық қауіпсіздікке ықпалдың сандық бағасы берілмейді. Практикалық ұсыныстар жаңа қызмет түрлерінің бәсекеге қабілеттілігіне, ғылым мен бизнестің өзара іс-қимылына және өңірлердегі жұмыспен қамту көздерін кеңейтуге қатысты. Тиімді институттар мен өндірістік білімді дамыту жағдайында әртараптандыру экономикалық орнықтылықты арттыра алады деген қорытынды жасалды.

ТҮЙІН СӨЗДЕР: экономиканы әртараптандыру, ұлттық қауіпсіздік, экономикалық орнықтылық, шикізаттық тәуелділік, экономикалық күрделілік, құрылымдық трансформация, Қазақстан.

Диверсификация экономики как фактор национальной безопасности

Рей И.Ю.[1], Есилов А.Б.[1], Жумабекова А.Т.[2]

[1]Казахский университет технологии и бизнеса имени К. Кулажанова, Астана, Казахстан; [2] Университет «Есиль», Астана, Казахстан

АННОТАЦИЯ. В статье рассматривается роль диверсификации экономики в обеспечении национальной безопасности на примере Казахстана. Цель исследования — определить каналы формирования экономических уязвимостей при концентрации производства и экспорта и предложить концептуальную основу их оценки. Материалом служат работы по проблемам сырьевой зависимости, структурной трансформации и экономической сложности. Для обобщения этих подходов использованы системный, структурно-функциональный, сравнительный и институциональный анализ. Выделены отраслевая, экспортная, технологическая и региональная диверсификация, а также институциональные условия их осуществления. Рассмотрена связь этих составляющих с устойчивостью государственных финансов, занятостью, технологическими возможностями и подверженностью внешним шокам. Применительно к Казахстану обсуждается преобразование сырьевых доходов в производственные возможности посредством развития обрабатывающей промышленности, переработки, человеческого капитала, инноваций и несырьевого экспорта. Предложенная схема систематизирует возможные показатели для последующей эмпирической оценки; расчёт интегрального индекса и количественная оценка влияния на национальную безопасность в работе не проводятся. Практические рекомендации касаются конкурентоспособности новых видов деятельности, взаимодействия науки и бизнеса и расширения источников занятости в регионах. Сделан вывод, что диверсификация может повысить экономическую устойчивость при наличии эффективных институтов и развитии производственных знаний.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: диверсификация экономики, национальная безопасность, экономическая устойчивость, сырьевая зависимость, экономическая сложность, структурная трансформация, Казахстан.

INTRODUCTION. The capacity to maintain production, public services and employment during external disruptions forms part of national security. For economies whose export earnings depend on a narrow range of commodities, a decline in global prices can affect public finances, investment and the exchange rate at the same time. Diversification is relevant to security because it changes the sources of income and the productive capabilities available to respond to such pressures.

Research on resource dependence provides a starting point for examining this relationship. Sachs and Warner associate natural-resource dependence with weaker long-term growth [1]. Van der Ploeg shows that the consequences of resource wealth depend on economic structure, institutions and the management of resource revenues [2]. These studies suggest that resource abundance alone cannot ensure sustained development. The question is how the income generated by extractive activities is used and whether it supports production beyond the resource sector.

This issue is relevant to Kazakhstan, where oil, gas and metals occupy an important place in economic development and export earnings. Resource revenues provide investment capital and finance public expenditure and infrastructure. Their contribution to long-term resilience depends on the development of other activities capable of sustaining income and employment when commodity markets weaken. Diversification therefore concerns the conversion of resource income into productive capabilities across the economy.

The economic complexity approach helps explain the quality of that transformation. Hausmann et al. relate the composition of production and exports to the productive knowledge available in an economy [3]. A broader range of sophisticated activities requires technical skills, organizational competence and cooperation among firms. These capabilities are also relevant to security, since they influence the ability to maintain production when access to imported goods or technologies is disrupted.

Diversification is closely connected with structural transformation. Kuznets examines development through changes in production, employment and productivity [4], while McMillan, Rodrik and Verduzco-Gallo analyse the contribution of structural change to productivity growth [5]. This perspective directs attention to the productivity of new activities. Expanding the number of sectors may have limited value if the new enterprises remain dependent on subsidies or fail to acquire competitive capabilities.

The purpose of this article is to develop a conceptual framework explaining the contribution of economic diversification to national security, with particular reference to Kazakhstan. The analysis considers the vulnerabilities associated with commodity concentration, the dimensions of diversification relevant to resilience and their implications for economic policy. It brings growth-oriented and security-oriented arguments into a common framework while retaining the distinction between a theoretical relationship and an empirically measured effect.

MATERIALS AND METHODS OF RESEARCH. The object of the study is the relationship between the structure of the national economy and its capacity to withstand external economic disruptions. The materials comprise the academic literature cited in the article on resource dependence, structural transformation, economic com-

plexity, skills, innovation and institutions. Kazakhstan provides the context for interpreting these approaches and discussing their policy implications. The study is theoretical and analytical; it does not use an original statistical dataset or estimate causal effects.

A systemic approach is used to consider economic, technological, social and institutional conditions as interconnected aspects of national security. Structural-functional analysis identifies how the composition of production and exports can affect fiscal revenues, employment and the continuity of economic activity. Comparative analysis brings together the explanations offered in the literature on resource-rich economies, without constructing a separate country ranking. Institutional analysis examines the conditions under which diversification policies can support competitive production.

Conceptual modelling combines these approaches into a framework linking diversification, concentration risks and economic resilience. The analysis first traces how commodity shocks can spread through the economy, then considers the contribution of sectoral, export, technological and regional diversification. Institutional conditions are included as a dimension affecting the implementation of all four. The resulting framework identifies possible indicators for later assessment rather than presenting a validated measurement instrument.

RESULTS AND THEIR DISCUSSION. Economic concentration creates several connected channels of vulnerability. Where a small number of commodities account for a substantial share of export earnings, changes in their prices or external demand affect foreign-exchange receipts. Lower export revenues can place pressure on the exchange rate and public finances, reduce investment and create employment risks. Trade restrictions, transport interruptions and technological constraints can produce similar pressures by limiting the ability to sell goods or maintain production. The security implications arise when these economic effects impair public services or social stability.

The resource-curse literature describes mechanisms through which resource dependence can influence macroeconomic performance. Frankel discusses commodity-price volatility, exchange-rate appreciation and institutional difficulties [6]. Together with van der Ploeg's analysis [2], this work indicates why diversification needs to be considered alongside the management of resource revenues. A broader production structure can reduce exposure to an individual market, but its contribution depends on whether the new sources of income are sufficiently productive and sustainable.

Fiscal stability is one channel through which sectoral diversification may support security. In a commodity-dependent economy, rising prices increase public revenues and can encourage expenditure growth. A subsequent downturn reduces revenues and may lead to budget deficits or the postponement of investment projects. Manufacturing, business services, logistics, tourism, agriculture and food processing provide other sources of taxable activity. Their development can broaden the fiscal base and reduce the extent to which public finances depend on conditions in a single commodity market.

Export diversification addresses external vulnerability more directly. A wider range of export products and destinations can reduce dependence on individual buyers and markets, support foreign-exchange earnings and expand international partnerships. Participation in global value chains may create additional opportunities for domestic firms. The composition of exports remains important: an increase in the number of exported products does not by itself establish that the economy has acquired more sophisticated production capabilities.

Economic complexity provides a way to interpret this distinction. Hidalgo and Hausmann relate economic development to the accumulation of productive capabilities reflected in the diversity and composition of production [7]. Together with the approach presented in The Atlas of Economic Complexity [3], this suggests that diversification should be assessed through the knowledge and skills embodied in new activities. Manufacturing and knowledge-intensive services can contribute to resilience when they develop capabilities that are usable across different products and markets.

Technological dependence is a further source of vulnerability. Financial resources do not ensure continuity of production if critical equipment, software or technical knowledge are available only from external suppliers. The technological dimension of diversification includes telecommunications, digital infrastructure, cybersecurity, machinery, pharmaceuticals, energy and agricultural technologies. The development of domestic competence in these fields can improve the ability to maintain essential economic functions during supply disruptions.

Complete technological self-sufficiency would be neither realistic nor necessarily efficient. The relevant policy objective is to maintain capabilities in critical areas while participating in international technological networks. This requires attention to the technologies on which essential production and services depend. Technological diversification can then be understood as a means of increasing the range of capabilities available to the economy, rather than as a general commitment to replace all imported technologies.

Human capital supports this process. Engineering, research, digital skills, management and technical occupations are needed to introduce and maintain more complex production. Acemoglu and Autor examine the relationship between skills, technological change and employment [8]. In the context of diversification, their approach draws attention to the capacity of workers and firms to perform new tasks. Investment in physical assets will have limited effects if the skills required to use them are unavailable.

For Kazakhstan, the implications concern engineering and vocational education, digital competence, applied research and cooperation between universities and industry. These activities can support the transition to more complex production by connecting training with the needs of enterprises. Education policy thus contributes to economic resilience through the availability of technical and organizational knowledge. The argument concerns the capabilities required for diversification; the present study does not measure the effect of particular educational programmes.

Innovation is another mechanism through which firms can expand their activities. New products and technologies can raise productivity, reduce costs and support entry into international markets. The Organisation for Economic

Co-operation and Development (OECD) connects innovation with productivity and long-term growth [9]. For diversification policy, this means that support for research should be considered together with the conditions under which firms can apply its results. Cooperation among government, universities, research organizations, enterprises and investors is relevant to the development and use of new technologies.

Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) can widen the production base through their participation in manufacturing, logistics, information technology, food processing, tourism and business services. Their contribution includes employment, entrepreneurship and the development of local supply chains. Diversification strategies centred only on large industrial projects may overlook these sources of economic activity. Access to finance, markets and predictable regulation affects the ability of smaller firms to enter new activities and develop export capacity.

The regional dimension is particularly important where employment and local revenues depend on oil and gas, mining, metallurgy or agriculture. A decline in demand for the dominant product can have a concentrated territorial effect even when the national economy retains other sources of income. Regional diversification concerns the development of alternative activities and the connections between them. Local processing, logistics, digital services, tourism, agro-processing and innovation clusters can support the development of alternative regional activities.

Regional specialization and diversification need to be considered together. Specialization can support productive activities, while excessive reliance on a single source of income increases vulnerability. Regional policy should therefore assess the dependence of employment and revenues on dominant sectors and identify opportunities for other activities. The objective is to develop connected regional economies in which firms, skills and infrastructure support more than one source of income.

For Kazakhstan, resource wealth and geographical links with major markets provide a basis for structural transformation. Resource revenues can finance infrastructure and human capital, which in turn support technological competence, manufacturing and services. The development of these capabilities creates opportunities for non-resource exports and a broader economic base. This sequence describes a possible use of resource income; its realization depends on investment decisions and institutional conditions.

Table 1 – Dimensions of economic diversification and their contribution to national security

Dimension	Potential indicators	Contribution to security
Sectoral	Composition of manufacturing, services and agriculture	Lower dependence on individual sectors
Export	Export concentration and product diversity	Lower exposure to individual products and markets
Technological	Research and development, patents and technology-intensive production	Broader domestic technological capabilities
Regional	Concentration of production across regions	Lower territorial vulnerability
Institutional	Governance, investment climate and competition	Conditions for effective diversification policy

Table 1 brings together the dimensions of the proposed framework. Sectoral, export, technological and regional diversification describe different aspects of the production structure. The institutional dimension concerns the governance, investment climate and competitive conditions that influence their development. Treating it in this way clarifies that institutional quality supports diversification across the economy rather than representing an additional industry or export category.

The framework shows why a single sectoral measure is insufficient for security analysis. An economy may produce a broad range of goods while its export earnings remain concentrated in a few commodities. It may also diversify exports while continuing to depend on imported technologies needed for production. The dimensions in Table 1 allow these forms of dependence to be considered separately and then interpreted together.

The proposed Economic Diversification and National Security Index (EDNSI) should be treated as a direction for future empirical work. The present article outlines its conceptual dimensions but does not specify a calculation procedure, assign weights or report index values. The framework can guide the selection of indicators, but a quantitative application would require a separate methodological justification and suitable data. It therefore cannot yet be used to rank regions or measure the strength of the relationship between diversification and national security.

The policy implications for Kazakhstan concern the development of productive capabilities. Manufacturing support can focus on machinery, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, food processing, advanced materials and electrical equipment. Their relevance lies in the opportunities they offer for processing, technical competence and non-resource production. These directions are policy proposals arising from the conceptual framework; they are not the outcome of a comparative assessment of sectoral returns.

Export support should help firms capable of entering regional and global markets, while innovation policy should strengthen links between research organizations and business. The development of technologies relevant to energy, food, healthcare, digital infrastructure and transport can be considered in relation to the continuity of essential economic functions. Regional programmes should address sectoral vulnerabilities and alternative sources of employment. These measures require predictable regulation, access to finance and effective public administration.

Institutional quality affects whether public support leads to competitive capabilities. Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson explain the importance of institutions for long-

run economic development [10]. In diversification policy, this directs attention to competition, investment conditions and the allocation of resources. Administrative selection of projects, continued protection of inefficient enterprises and excessive subsidies may preserve activities without improving their productivity. Under such conditions, a larger number of industries would not necessarily indicate greater resilience.

The relationship between diversification and security is consequently conditional. Diversification can spread economic risks, but excessive fragmentation may reduce economies of scale. State coordination can support infrastructure, education and innovation, while firms need incentives to improve productivity and compete. For Kazakhstan, the framework supports a long-term approach in which resource revenues finance the capabilities required for broader economic activity. The theoretical analysis identifies these channels but does not establish the size of their effects.

CONCLUSION. Economic diversification can contribute to national security by reducing the dependence of public finances, export earnings and employment on a narrow range of activities. The analysis links commodity concentration to fiscal, external, technological and regional vulnerabilities. It also shows why the quality of new economic activities matters: their contribution to resilience depends on productivity, skills and the ability of firms to compete.

For Kazakhstan, the main policy implication is to convert resource revenues into infrastructure, human capital and technological capabilities that support manufacturing, processing, services and non-resource exports. Regional diversification and the participation of SMEs can broaden the sources of employment and income. Effective institutions are necessary for these measures to produce sustained changes in the economic structure.

The contribution of the study is a conceptual framework combining sectoral, export, technological and regional diversification with their institutional conditions. It provides a basis for identifying vulnerabilities and organizing future empirical analysis. The proposed EDNSI remains a conceptual possibility rather than a calculated index. Further research could develop and test indicators using regional data for Kazakhstan and examine their relationship with employment, investment, fiscal stability and external vulnerability.

REFERENCES:

1. Sachs, J. D. The curse of natural resources / J. D. Sachs, A. M. Warner // European Economic Review. – 2001. – Vol. 45, no. 4–6. – P. 827–838. – DOI: 10.1016/S0014-2921(01)00125-8.
2. Van der Ploeg, F. Natural resources: Curse or blessing? // Journal of Economic Literature. – 2011. – Vol. 49, no. 2. – P. 366–420. – DOI: 10.1257/jel.49.2.366.
3. Hausmann, R. The atlas of economic complexity: Mapping paths to prosperity / R. Hausmann, C. A. Hidalgo, S. Bustos, M. Coscia, A. Simoes, M. A. Yildirim. – 2nd ed. – MIT Press, 2014.
4. Kuznets, S. Modern economic growth: Rate, structure, and spread. – Yale University Press, 1966.
5. McMillan, M. S. Globalization, structural change, and productivity growth, with an update on Africa / M. S. McMillan, D. Rodrik, I. Verduzco-Gallo // World Development. – 2014. – Vol. 63. – P. 11–32. – DOI: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.10.012.
6. Frankel, J. A. The natural resource curse: A survey of diagnoses and some prescriptions // Commodity price volatility and inclusive growth in low-income countries / ed. by A. Arezki, C. Pattillo, M. Quintyn, M. Zhu. – International Monetary Fund, 2012. – P. 7–34.
7. Hidalgo, C. A. The building blocks of economic complexity / C. A. Hidalgo, R. Hausmann // Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. – 2009. – Vol. 106, no. 26. – P. 10570–10575. – DOI: 10.1073/pnas.0900943106.
8. Acemoglu, D. Skills, tasks and technologies: Implications for employment and earnings / D. Acemoglu, D. Autor // Handbook of labor economics / ed. by O. Ashenfelter, D. Card. – Elsevier, 2011. – Vol. 4B. – P. 1043–1171. – DOI: 10.1016/S0169-7218(11)02410-5.
9. OECD. The innovation imperative: Contributing to productivity, growth and well-being. – OECD Publishing, 2015. – DOI: 10.1787/9789264239814-en.
10. Acemoglu, D. Institutions as a fundamental cause of long-run growth / D. Acemoglu, S. Johnson, J. A. Robinson // Handbook of economic growth / ed. by P. Aghion, S. Durlauf. – Elsevier, 2005. – Vol. 1A. – P. 385–472. – DOI: 10.1016/S1574-0684(05)01006-3.

АВТОРЛАР ТУРАЛЫ:

Рей Инна Юрьевна, Доктор PhD по экономике и управлению (туризм), ассистент-профессор, Казахский университет технологии и бизнеса имени К. Кулажанова Астана, Казахстан. E-mail: sayat01@mail.ru, Orcid: 000000417933587

Есилов Асылхан Бурамбекович, PhD, ассистент-профессор, Казахский университет технологии и бизнеса имени К. Кулажанова Астана, Казахстан. E-mail: esilov@gmail.com, Orcid: 0000-0002-4477-3780

Жумабекова Алмагуль Толегеновна, кандидат экономических наук, и.о. доцента кафедры финансов университета «Есиль», г. Астана, Казахстан. Электронная почта: a.jumabekova77@gmail.com, Scopus ID 57203664166

Рей Инна Юрьевна, Экономика және басқару (туризм) бойынша PhD докторы, ассистент-профессор, Қ. Құлажанов атындағы Қазақ технология және бизнес университеті, Астана, Қазақстан. E-mail: sayat01@mail.ru Orcid: 000000417933587

Есілов Асылхан Бурамбекұлы, PhD докторы, ассистент-профессор Қ. Құлажанов атындағы Қазақ технология және бизнес университеті. Астана, Қазақстан. E-mail: esilov@gmail.com, Orcid: 0000-0002-4477-3780

Жұмабекова Алмагүл Төлегенқызы, экономика ғылымдарының кандидаты, «Esil University» Қаржы кафедрасының доценті міндетін атқарушы, Астана қ., Қазақстан. Электрондық пошта: a.jumabekova77@gmail.com, Scopus ID 57203664166

Inna Rey, PhD in Economics and Management (Tourism), Assistant Professor, Kazakh University of Technology and Business named after K. Kulazhanov, Astana, Kazakhstan, E-mail: sayat01@mail.ru Orcid: 000000417933587

Yessilov Assylkhan Burambekovich PhD, Assistant Professor, Kazakh University of Technology and Business named after K. Kulazhanov, Astana, Kazakhstan, E-mail: esilov@gmail.com, Orcid: 0000-0002-4477-3780

Jumabekova Almagul Tolegenovna, candidate of economic sciences, Acting Associate Professor in the Department of Finance, Esil University, Astana, Kazakhstan, E-mail: a.jumabekova77@gmail.com, Scopus ID 57203664166