

A. ARGYNOVA¹, A. GUBARENKO¹, M. ALTAI², A. ABILDA¹

¹School of Tourism, International University of Tourism and Hospitality

(Kazakhstan, Turkistan), e-mail: adina.argynova@iuth.edu.kz

²Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University (Kazakhstan, Turkistan)

EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF THE INFLUENCE OF KAZAKHSTAN'S ETHNOCULTURAL HERITAGE ON TOURISM BRAND FORMATION

Abstract. *This study empirically examines how Kazakhstan's ethnocultural heritage contributes to tourism brand formation. It assesses the relationships of perceived ethnocultural value, authenticity, heritage interpretation quality, and digital presentation with brand attractiveness and intention to visit. The analysis uses survey data from 80 respondents selected through purposive sampling and occupational-status quotas. The sample included students, employees, tourism professionals, entrepreneurs, academics and researchers, and respondents in other occupational categories. A structured questionnaire comprising 24 items measured on a five-point Likert scale was used. The analyses included descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alpha, Spearman's rank correlation, exploratory factor analysis, the Mann–Whitney U test, the Kruskal–Wallis H test, and hierarchical regression. Authenticity was the strongest predictor of brand attractiveness ($\beta = 0.33$; $p = 0.002$), followed by interpretation quality ($\beta = 0.29$; $p = 0.006$), perceived ethnocultural value ($\beta = 0.24$; $p = 0.018$), and digital presentation ($\beta = 0.19$; $p = 0.041$). The final model explained 64% of the variance in brand attractiveness. The findings indicate that ethnocultural heritage can function as a valuable resource for tourism branding when authentic content is supported by high-quality interpretation and coherent digital communication.*

The study also offers practical recommendations for tourism authorities, museums, tourist information centres, ethno-village projects, and regional destination-marketing organisations. It recommends developing interpretation standards, creating digital content for specific audiences, and combining visitor feedback with digital analytics in monitoring systems.

Keywords: *ethnocultural heritage, tourism brand, authenticity, destination image, heritage interpretation, digital presentation.*

Introduction

Tourism branding requires a strategy that aligns destination identity, cultural resources, stakeholder interests, and long-term development priorities. Kazakhstan's national tourism policy similarly emphasises competitive tourism products, regional differentiation, digitalisation, and

*Бізге дұрыс сілтеме жасаңыз: Argynova A., Gubarenko A., Altai M., Abilda A. Empirical Analysis of the Influence of Kazakhstan's Ethnocultural Heritage on Tourism Brand Formation // Bulletin of the International University of Tourism and Hospitality. – 2026. – No3(13). – Б. 127–140. <https://www.doi.org/10.62867/3007-0848.2026-3.09>

*Cite us correctly: Argynova A., Gubarenko A., Altai M., Abilda A. Empirical Analysis of the Influence of Kazakhstan's Ethnocultural Heritage on Tourism Brand Formation // Bulletin of the International University of Tourism and Hospitality. – 2026. – No3(13). – P. 127–140. <https://www.doi.org/10.62867/3007-0848.2026-3.09>

coordinated stakeholder participation [1]. Within this framework, traditions, customs, national games, crafts, oral heritage, cuisine, and festive practices can serve as distinctive resources for positioning Kazakhstan in domestic and international tourism markets. The purpose of this study is to determine how perceived ethnocultural value, authenticity, interpretation quality, and digital presentation influence tourism brand attractiveness and intention to visit.

Cultural heritage encompasses monuments, objects, knowledge, practices, representations, and skills transmitted across generations. The UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage stresses the role of communities in recognising, maintaining, and transmitting living heritage [2]. Consequently, heritage should be understood not only as a collection of material assets, but also as a system of meanings through which communities reproduce identity and cultural continuity.

Literature review

The conversion of heritage into tourism value depends on how cultural meanings are selected, interpreted, and communicated. Research on ethnocultural branding demonstrates that language, symbols, historical narratives, and communication practices jointly shape a territory's distinctive image [3]. Regional branding studies also show that ethnocultural resources become strategically useful when they are incorporated into coherent destination products and marketing programmes [4].

Design is another mechanism through which ethnocultural codes are translated into contemporary visual forms. The integration of traditional motifs into modern design can strengthen recognisability, but it requires contextual accuracy to avoid reducing heritage to decorative imagery [5]. Ethnocultural tourism therefore operates at the intersection of cultural preservation, intercultural communication, and visitor experience [6].

Evidence from Lombok indicates that ethnocultural attractions can diversify tourism products and strengthen community-based destination development when local resources are systematically identified and managed [7]. Research on Ukraine likewise positions intangible cultural heritage as a basis for distinctive ethnocultural brands and new tourism destinations [8]. These studies underline the relationship between heritage safeguarding, local participation, and market differentiation.

Studies of the North-Eastern Caucasus further demonstrate that ethnocultural heritage can complement nature-based tourism and reinforce the identity of mountain destinations [9]. Territorial identity, however, is not static: it is influenced by historical boundaries, collective memory, and contemporary social interpretation [10]. This observation is relevant to Kazakhstan, where regional identities coexist within a national tourism narrative.

Living culture strengthens regional identity because it is reproduced through everyday practices rather than preserved solely as a museum object [11]. For tourism branding, this means that artisans, performers, guides, local residents, and cultural institutions should participate in content development. Their involvement can increase credibility and reduce the risk of presenting staged or decontextualised versions of culture.

In Kazakhstan, cultural and historical sites are recognised as important resources for ethnocultural tourism, although their market potential depends on infrastructure, interpretation, and promotion [12]. Legal and institutional regulation is also significant because heritage use must balance tourism development with safeguarding responsibilities [13]. Comparative research from Kalmykia confirms that ethnocultural tourism may support regional development when cultural specificity is linked to appropriate tourism products [14].

Country-image research identifies a continuing need to replace external stereotypes about Kazakhstan with a consistent and credible national narrative [15]. In this respect, ethnocultural

heritage can contribute to positive differentiation, provided that branding is based on authentic meanings rather than isolated symbols. The reviewed literature therefore supports a model in which heritage content, interpretation, and communication operate as interconnected determinants of tourism brand attractiveness.

The research addresses a practical and scholarly gap: previous studies have described Kazakhstan's cultural tourism resources and country image, but empirical evidence regarding the relative influence of authenticity, interpretation, and digital presentation remains limited. This study responds to that gap by testing five hypotheses on survey data and by comparing the explanatory contribution of the principal factors.

The study contributes to destination-brand research by operationalising ethnocultural heritage as a multidimensional construct. Rather than treating heritage as a single promotional asset, the proposed approach distinguishes perceived value, authenticity, interpretation quality, and digital presentation and assesses their relationship with brand attractiveness. The literature reviewed in this article suggests that ethnocultural resources acquire tourism-brand value through the interaction of cultural content, interpretation, and communication. Cultural content provides a basis for destination identity when local traditions and practices are recognised as meaningful and represented in a credible way [3, 4, 7, 11]. Interpretation connects a cultural resource with its historical and social context. It helps visitors understand why a practice or place matters, while careful contextualisation reduces the risk of presenting heritage as a decorative symbol [5, 6, 12, 13]. Digital communication makes this content accessible before a visit and can contribute to a consistent destination image [15].

These dimensions are related, but they perform different functions. Digital visibility alone does not demonstrate that cultural content is authentic. Likewise, a culturally valuable resource may be difficult for visitors to understand when it is presented without clear interpretation. The present study therefore considers perceived ethnocultural value, authenticity, interpretation quality, and digital presentation as distinct explanatory dimensions. Brand attractiveness is the principal evaluative outcome, while intention to visit is treated as a separate measured construct. This framework guides the analysis of relationships among the variables; it does not assume that the cross-sectional data establish a causal sequence.

Methodology

A cross-sectional quantitative design was used. Empirical data were collected in January–February 2026 through a structured questionnaire. Purposive sampling recruited respondents able to assess cultural tourism, destination image, or tourism services. Occupational-status quotas were used to avoid overrepresentation of a single group: students ($n = 18$; 22.5%), employees ($n = 24$; 30.0%), tourism professionals ($n = 13$; 16.3%), entrepreneurs ($n = 10$; 12.5%), academics/researchers ($n = 9$; 11.2%), and other respondents ($n = 6$; 7.5%). The final sample comprised 80 participants. Respondents' regions of residence were not recorded; therefore, no geographical quota was applied, and the findings should not be considered regionally representative of Kazakhstan. This limitation is considered when interpreting and generalising the results.

The sampling strategy was intended to capture perspectives from respondents with different levels and forms of engagement with tourism while maintaining diversity across occupational categories. The use of occupational-status quotas reduced the likelihood that the results would be dominated by a single respondent group; however, purposive recruitment and the relatively small sample size limit the statistical generalisability of the findings. Accordingly, the sample should be regarded as an exploratory empirical sample rather than a representative cross-section of

Kazakhstan's population. The results therefore provide evidence of patterns and associations within the surveyed group and should be interpreted within the defined sampling boundaries.

The questionnaire comprised 24 items, each rated on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The items covered six constructs: perceived ethnocultural value, authenticity, heritage interpretation quality, digital presentation, brand attractiveness, and intention to visit. Before the main survey, the instrument was reviewed in a pilot discussion. Ambiguous or overlapping items were revised or removed to improve clarity and reduce duplication.

The questionnaire covered six constructs: perceived ethnocultural value, authenticity, heritage interpretation quality, digital presentation, brand attractiveness, and intention to visit. The first four constructs were examined as potential explanatory dimensions of brand attractiveness. Intention to visit was measured separately because a respondent's evaluation of a destination brand and their stated intention to travel are related, but distinct, outcomes.

The analytical procedures addressed different aspects of the data. Cronbach's alpha was used to examine the internal consistency of the scales. Spearman's rank correlation assessed pairwise relationships between the measured variables, which were based on ordinal responses. Exploratory factor analysis was used to examine how the questionnaire indicators grouped in this sample. The Mann–Whitney U and Kruskal–Wallis H tests were applied to examine differences between respondent groups, while hierarchical regression estimated the relative associations between the proposed predictors and brand attractiveness. These procedures provide complementary evidence about the sample, but the cross-sectional design does not establish causal effects.

Intention to visit is reported descriptively in Table 2. The results presented in this article do not include a separate correlation or regression estimate for that construct. Accordingly, the reported analyses describe its average score but do not establish which factors are associated with respondents' intention to visit.

Data analysis proceeded in six stages. Descriptive statistics were calculated first, followed by Cronbach's alpha to assess internal consistency. Spearman's rank correlation was used because the variables came from ordinal Likert-scale responses. Exploratory factor analysis used principal-component extraction and Promax rotation; the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure and Bartlett's test of sphericity assessed sampling adequacy. The Mann–Whitney U test and Kruskal–Wallis H test were used to examine differences by gender, age group, and occupational status. Finally, hierarchical regression estimated the predictors' relative contributions to tourism brand attractiveness. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

Taken together, this analytical strategy was designed to provide a comprehensive assessment of the measurement properties, relationships among the study variables, group-level differences, and the relative contribution of the proposed predictors to tourism brand attractiveness. The combination of reliability analysis, non-parametric association tests, exploratory factor analysis, group comparison procedures, and hierarchical regression allowed the data to be examined from complementary statistical perspectives. Given the ordinal nature of the questionnaire responses, non-parametric procedures were used where appropriate, while regression analysis was employed to assess the incremental explanatory contribution of predictor blocks. All findings were interpreted as associations observed within the study sample rather than evidence of causal relationships, in accordance with the cross-sectional research design.

The following hypotheses were tested:

H1. Higher perceived authenticity of ethnocultural heritage is positively associated with tourism brand attractiveness.

H2. Heritage interpretation quality is positively associated with tourism brand attractiveness.

H3. Digital presentation is positively associated with tourism brand attractiveness.

H4. Perceptions of the ethnocultural tourism brand differ significantly across age groups.

H5. Respondents professionally connected with tourism evaluate the brand potential of ethnocultural heritage more positively than other respondents.

Findings

Table 1 – Demographic profile of respondents

Indicator	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	34	42.5
Female	46	57.5
Age group		
18–25	21	26.3
26–35	24	30.0
36–45	18	22.5
46–55	10	12.5
56 and older	7	8.7
Occupational status		
Student	18	22.5
Employee	24	30.0
Tourism professional	13	16.3
Entrepreneur	10	12.5
Academic/researcher	9	11.2
Other	6	7.5
<i>Note: Compiled by the authors from survey data.</i>		

Table 1 summarises the sample. Participants aged 18–35 accounted for 56.3% of respondents. The inclusion of older age groups enabled an exploratory comparison across generations. The occupational quotas included both consumer and professional perspectives. Because recruitment was non-probabilistic and respondents' regions of residence were not recorded, the sample supports comparisons within this dataset but does not provide population-level estimates for Kazakhstan.

The diversity of age and occupational groups provided a broader range of perspectives on ethnocultural heritage and tourism branding, supporting exploratory comparisons between respondent categories.

Table 2 – Descriptive statistics for the study variables

Construct	Mean (M)	Standard deviation (SD)
Perceived ethnocultural value	4.36	0.54
Authenticity	4.21	0.61
Quality of interpretation	4.09	0.66
Digital presentation	3.98	0.73
Brand attractiveness	4.33	0.57
Intention to visit	4.18	0.64
<i>Note: Compiled by the authors from survey data.</i>		

Respondents gave high mean scores to perceived ethnocultural value ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 0.54$) and brand attractiveness ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.57$). Authenticity also received a high mean score ($M = 4.21$, $SD = 0.61$), suggesting that cultural elements are evaluated more positively when they are perceived as credible and meaningful. Digital presentation received the lowest, although still positive, mean score ($M = 3.98$, $SD = 0.73$). This difference suggests a gap between the perceived value of heritage content and the quality of its digital communication.

Table 3 – Internal consistency of the scales

Scale	Cronbach's alpha (α)
Ethnocultural value	0.87
Authenticity	0.84
Quality of interpretation	0.82
Digital presentation	0.85
Brand attractiveness	0.88
Overall scale	0.91
<i>Note: Compiled by the authors from survey data.</i>	

All scales demonstrated satisfactory to high internal consistency. Cronbach's alpha ranged from 0.82 to 0.88 for the individual constructs, while the coefficient for the overall instrument was 0.91. These values support the reliability of the scales used in the subsequent analyses.

Table 4 – Spearman's rank correlation coefficients

Construct	1	2	3	4	5
1. Ethnocultural value	1				
2. Authenticity	0.61**	1			
3. Quality of interpretation	0.56**	0.64**	1		
4. Digital presentation	0.42**	0.47**	0.58**	1	
5. Brand attractiveness	0.68**	0.71**	0.66**	0.53**	1
<i>Note: Values are Spearman rank correlation coefficients. **$p < 0.01$.</i>					

All principal variables were positively and significantly correlated. Authenticity showed the strongest relationship with brand attractiveness ($\rho = 0.71$, $p < 0.01$), followed by perceived ethnocultural value ($\rho = 0.68$, $p < 0.01$) and interpretation quality ($\rho = 0.66$, $p < 0.01$). Digital presentation had a moderate relationship with brand attractiveness ($\rho = 0.53$, $p < 0.01$). These results provide preliminary support for H1–H3, although correlations alone do not establish causality.

The observed pattern suggests that tourism brand attractiveness is associated most strongly with respondents' perceptions of authenticity and ethnocultural value, while the quality of interpretation also represents an important related dimension. The comparatively weaker, although still statistically significant, association for digital presentation indicates that technological representation may complement rather than substitute for the cultural and experiential attributes of a destination. At the same time, the relatively strong interrelationships among the study variables justified further examination of their underlying structure through exploratory factor analysis.

The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure was 0.84, and Bartlett’s test of sphericity was statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), indicating that the correlation matrix was suitable for exploratory factor analysis.

Table 5 – Rotated factor loadings (Promax rotation)

Indicator	Factor 1: Cultural-authentic capital	Factor 2: Interpretive communication	Factor 3: Digital branding
Traditions and customs	0.81		
National symbolism	0.77		
Authentic cultural experience	0.83		
Uniqueness of heritage	0.79		
Quality of tour interpretation		0.82	
Storytelling and content delivery		0.80	
Accessibility of information		0.74	
Quality of exhibition presentation		0.76	
Social-media presentation			0.81
Quality of visual content			0.78
Attractiveness of online platforms			0.75
Digital navigation, QR codes, and multimedia			0.72
<i>Note: Extraction method: principal components; rotation method: Promax. Total variance explained = 71.4%.</i>			

The exploratory factor analysis identified three interpretable dimensions that together explained 71.4% of the total variance. The first factor, cultural-authentic capital, combined traditions, national symbolism, authentic cultural experience, and heritage uniqueness. The second factor, interpretive communication, comprised tour interpretation, storytelling, information accessibility, and exhibition presentation. The third factor, digital branding, incorporated social-media presentation, visual-content quality, online-platform attractiveness, and digital navigation. The structure indicates that heritage contributes to tourism branding through the interaction of cultural meaning, interpretation, and digital mediation.

The Mann–Whitney U test found no statistically significant gender differences ($p > 0.05$). The Kruskal–Wallis H test identified age-group differences in selected dimensions: respondents aged 18–35 rated digital presentation more highly ($p = 0.012$), while older participants placed greater importance on authenticity and the preservation of traditional content ($p = 0.031$). Tourism professionals evaluated the branding potential of ethnocultural heritage more positively than other occupational groups, supporting H5. H4 was supported only for selected perception dimensions, rather than for the overall cultural-brand construct.

Overall, these findings suggest that perceptions of ethnocultural heritage and its branding potential vary across specific respondent characteristics, particularly age and professional involvement in tourism.

Table 6 – Final hierarchical regression model predicting brand attractiveness

Predictor	β	p-value
Ethnocultural value	0.24	0.018
Authenticity	0.33	0.002
Quality of interpretation	0.29	0.006
Digital presentation	0.19	0.041
<i>Note: Final model $R^2 = 0.64$.</i>		

In the final regression model, authenticity was the strongest predictor of tourism brand attractiveness ($\beta = 0.33$, $p = 0.002$). Interpretation quality ($\beta = 0.29$, $p = 0.006$), perceived ethnocultural value ($\beta = 0.24$, $p = 0.018$), and digital presentation ($\beta = 0.19$, $p = 0.041$) also made statistically significant contributions. The model explained 64% of the variance in brand attractiveness ($R^2 = 0.64$). Thus, H1–H3 were supported. Given the cross-sectional, non-probability design, these coefficients should be interpreted as predictive associations rather than definitive causal effects.

Discussion

The findings suggest a three-layer mechanism linking ethnocultural heritage to tourism branding. At the content level, cultural codes provide differentiation. At the interpretive level, narratives and explanations turn cultural resources into meaningful visitor experiences. At the media level, digital channels shape pre-visit awareness and expectations. The regression and factor-analysis results indicate that these layers are complementary rather than interchangeable.

The prominent role of authenticity is consistent with research that treats living culture and local participation as foundations of regional identity [7, 8, 11]. In this study, authenticity had both the strongest correlation with brand attractiveness and the largest standardised regression coefficient. This suggests that the credibility of the cultural experience is central to brand evaluation among the surveyed respondents.

Interpretation quality was the second strongest predictor. This finding extends earlier work on cultural and historical tourism in Kazakhstan by showing that heritage resources alone are insufficient; their meanings must be made accessible through guiding, storytelling, exhibitions, and visitor-oriented information [12, 13]. Interpretation is the mechanism through which a resource becomes an experience and, subsequently, a brand association.

Digital presentation received a lower mean score than the other constructs but remained a significant predictor. Respondents valued ethnocultural content while judging its digital delivery more cautiously. The result suggests that digital communication forms part of the tourism experience before arrival.

Age differences were dimension-specific. Younger respondents gave greater weight to digital presentation, whereas older participants prioritised authenticity and preservation. These patterns do not imply mutually exclusive audience preferences. Instead, they support differentiated communication in which verified heritage content is adapted to audience-specific formats without changing its substantive meaning.

The findings also have implications for Kazakhstan's country image. A coherent ethnocultural narrative may help replace fragmented external stereotypes with a recognisable destination identity [15]. Achieving this requires coordination among tourism authorities, museums, communities, businesses, guides, and content producers, together with safeguards against superficial commercialisation.

The results suggest several priorities for destination managers. Authenticity had the largest standardized coefficient in the reported regression model, while interpretation quality also showed a positive and statistically significant association with brand attractiveness. Digital presentation had the lowest mean score among the principal study variables, yet it remained a significant predictor. Taken together, these results indicate that cultural content, its explanation, and its digital presentation should be considered as connected parts of destination communication.

A practical first step is to identify the cultural practices, places, and stories that local communities consider meaningful. Tourism organisations can then work with community representatives, guides, museums, and heritage practitioners to check the accuracy and context of the material selected for promotion. This process is consistent with research that links living culture, local participation, and responsible heritage use [7, 11, 13]. It can also help tourism organisations develop a destination narrative that reflects local meanings rather than relying on isolated visual symbols.

The next step is to make that material understandable to visitors. Museums, visitor centres, guided routes, and digital platforms can use concise explanations, maps, oral histories, and multilingual materials to connect cultural objects and practices with their local context. The purpose is to make interpretation accessible while retaining the meaning of the heritage being presented [5, 6, 12].

Digital content can extend this work before a visitor arrives. Destination organisations may review whether official pages provide clear, consistent information about cultural sites, routes, events, and visitor services. They can then test suitable formats for different audiences and gather feedback on clarity, perceived authenticity, and usefulness. These actions are proposed as practical directions for future testing; the present survey does not demonstrate that any particular campaign or digital format will increase visits.

Because the sample was exploratory and not nationally representative, these priorities are best assessed through local pilot projects. A destination or visitor route could collect feedback before and after introducing revised interpretation or digital materials, then compare changes in visitor perceptions with available visitation indicators. Such evaluation would help determine whether the proposed measures are useful in a particular setting before they are applied more broadly.

Several limitations must be acknowledged. The sample was small and non-probabilistic, quotas were based on occupational status rather than population proportions, and the dataset did not record respondents' regions of residence. The cross-sectional design also restricts causal interpretation, and self-reported measures may be affected by common-method bias. Accordingly, the results should be treated as exploratory evidence rather than nationally representative estimates.

Overall, H1, H2, H3, and H5 were supported, while H4 received partial support. The convergence of the correlation, factor, group-comparison, and regression results supports the internal coherence of the proposed three-layer model, although confirmation with a larger probability-based sample remains necessary.

The study's scientific contribution lies in empirically distinguishing cultural-authentic capital, interpretive communication, and digital branding within a single framework and estimating their relative associations with tourism brand attractiveness in Kazakhstan.

Conclusion and recommendations

Scientific result. The study found that tourism brand attractiveness is associated with both the perceived value of ethnocultural heritage and the ways in which it is authenticated, interpreted, and communicated digitally. Authenticity was the strongest predictor. The three-factor solution—cultural-authentic capital, interpretive communication, and digital branding—described the structure of the measured indicators. The final regression model explained 64% of the variance in brand attractiveness.

Practical recommendations. Tourism authorities and destination-marketing organisations should develop regional brand architectures that connect verified cultural meanings with a coherent national narrative. Museums, visitor centres, ethno-villages, festivals, and tourism businesses should introduce interpretation standards and provide training in storytelling, heritage communication, and visitor-experience design. Digital measures should include a unified visual system, short-form video, multilingual route narratives, accessible official platforms, QR-based navigation, and mobile content. Local communities and heritage practitioners should participate as co-creators and beneficiaries, rather than solely as performers.

Monitoring and management implications. Brand performance should be assessed using more than visitor numbers alone. Relevant indicators include experience quality, intention to revisit, recommendation behaviour, digital engagement, perceived authenticity, and local participation. Regular visitor surveys, content audits, and digital analytics can identify weak communication channels and support evidence-based adjustment of destination content.

Future research. Subsequent studies should record respondents' regions of residence, apply regional and demographic quotas based on official population or tourism statistics, and use a larger probability-based sample. Comparative analysis of destinations such as Turkistan, Mangystau, Zhetysu, and Altai would clarify territorial differences. Longitudinal designs and structural equation modelling could test causal pathways among authenticity, interpretation, digital presentation, brand attractiveness, and behavioural intentions.

ПАЙДАНЫЛҒАН ӘДЕБИЕТТЕР ТІЗІМІ

1. Қазақстан Республикасы Туризм және спорт министрлігі. Қазақстан Республикасының туристік саласын дамытудың 2023–2029 жылдарға арналған тұжырымдамасы [Электрондық ресурс]. – Астана, 2023. – URL: <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/P2300000262> (қаралған күні: 15.02.2026).
2. UNESCO. Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage [Electronic resource]. – Paris, 2003. – URL: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention> (accessed: 15.01.2026).
3. Guseynova I. A., Levshits A. D., Dubinina N. V. Cultural and historical heritage of the Republic of Tyva as an ethnocultural brand formation factor // RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics. – 2024. – Vol. 15, No. 4. – P. 1148–1168.
4. Sokolenko A. V., Mazurova A. V. Tourist branding project of Kharkiv region districts: Ethno-cultural aspect // Visnyk of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series: Geology. Geography. Ecology. – 2015. – No. 43. – P. 174–183.
5. Spirina M. V. et al. Ethno-cultural component in modern design // Global Media Journal. – 2016. – P. 1–7.
6. Elena D. Ethnocultural tourism in the context of intercultural communication // Scientific Almanac of the Black Sea Region Countries. – 2021. – No. 2(26). – P. 64–70.

7. Lestari Y. B., Yusra K. Identifying tourism potentials of ethno-cultural attractions in Lombok // *Sustainability*. – 2022. – Vol. 14, No. 23. – Art. 16075.
8. Antonenko V. Development of tourist destinations based on the use of the intangible cultural heritage of Ukraine as a tool for creating a unique ethnocultural brand // *Socio-Cultural Management Journal*. – 2024. – Vol. 7, No. 2. – P. 65–90.
9. Zaburaeva K. S. Ethnocultural heritage of the North-Eastern Caucasus as a factor of eco-tourism development // *Journal of Mountain Science*. – 2024. – Vol. 21, No. 8. – P. 2810–2824.
10. Kolosov V. Phantom borders: The role in territorial identity and the impact on society // *Belgeo*. – 2020. – No. 2. – P. 1–14.
11. Slusna Z. Living and lived culture as a part of regional identity // *Marketing Identity*. – 2016. – Vol. 4, No. 1/1. – P. 442–453.
12. Aldybayev B. et al. Popularization of objects of the cultural and historical heritage of the Republic of Kazakhstan as a factor for the development of ethnocultural tourism of the country // *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*. – 2021. – Vol. 39. – P. 1450–1460.
13. Ermukhamedovna E. A., Duisenbekovich U. A., Bolatovich E. A. Legal regulation of ethnotourism and cultural heritage in the Republic of Kazakhstan: State and prospects of development // *Global Interdisciplinary Science Review*. – 2025. – Vol. 1, No. 1. – P. 1–10.
14. Boldyreva S. B., Kekeeva Z. O., Kekeev O. I. Ethno-cultural aspects of tourism development in the Republic of Kalmykia // *Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism*. – 2018. – Vol. 9, No. 2(26). – P. 318–324.
15. Shakirova S. Country image of Kazakhstan: From stereotype and critique to positive national branding // *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research*. – 2015. – Vol. 2, No. 2. – P. 1–11.

REFERENCES

1. Kazakhstan Respublikasy Turizm zhane sport ministrigi. Kazakhstan Respublikasynyn turistik salasyn damytudyn 2023–2029 zhyldarga arnalgan tuzhyrymdamasy [Concept for the development of the tourism industry of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2023–2029] [Electronic resource]. – Astana, 2023. – URL: <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/P2300000262> (accessed: 15.02.2026).
2. UNESCO. Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage [Electronic resource]. – Paris, 2003. – URL: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention> (accessed: 15.01.2026).
3. Guseynova I. A., Levshits A. D., Dubinina N. V. Cultural and historical heritage of the Republic of Tyva as an ethnocultural brand formation factor // *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*. – 2024. – Vol. 15, No. 4. – P. 1148–1168.
4. Sokolenko A. V., Mazurova A. V. Tourist branding project of Kharkiv region districts: Ethno-cultural aspect // *Visnyk of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series: Geology. Geography. Ecology*. – 2015. – No. 43. – P. 174–183.
5. Spirina M. V. et al. Ethno-cultural component in modern design // *Global Media Journal*. – 2016. – P. 1–7.
6. Elena D. Ethnocultural tourism in the context of intercultural communication // *Scientific Almanac of the Black Sea Region Countries*. – 2021. – No. 2(26). – P. 64–70.
7. Lestari Y. B., Yusra K. Identifying tourism potentials of ethno-cultural attractions in Lombok // *Sustainability*. – 2022. – Vol. 14, No. 23. – Art. 16075.

8. Antonenko V. Development of tourist destinations based on the use of the intangible cultural heritage of Ukraine as a tool for creating a unique ethnocultural brand // *Socio-Cultural Management Journal*. – 2024. – Vol. 7, No. 2. – P. 65–90.
9. Zaburaeva K. S. Ethnocultural heritage of the North-Eastern Caucasus as a factor of eco-tourism development // *Journal of Mountain Science*. – 2024. – Vol. 21, No. 8. – P. 2810–2824.
10. Kolosov V. Phantom borders: The role in territorial identity and the impact on society // *Belgeo*. – 2020. – No. 2. – P. 1–14.
11. Slusna Z. Living and lived culture as a part of regional identity // *Marketing Identity*. – 2016. – Vol. 4, No. 1/1. – P. 442–453.
12. Aldybayev B. et al. Popularization of objects of the cultural and historical heritage of the Republic of Kazakhstan as a factor for the development of ethnocultural tourism of the country // *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*. – 2021. – Vol. 39. – P. 1450–1460.
13. Ermukhamedovna E. A., Duisenbekovich U. A., Bolatovich E. A. Legal regulation of ethnotourism and cultural heritage in the Republic of Kazakhstan: State and prospects of development // *Global Interdisciplinary Science Review*. – 2025. – Vol. 1, No. 1. – P. 1–10.
14. Boldyreva S. B., Kekeeva Z. O., Kekeev O. I. Ethno-cultural aspects of tourism development in the Republic of Kalmykia // *Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism*. – 2018. – Vol. 9, No. 2(26). – P. 318–324.
15. Shakirova S. Country image of Kazakhstan: From stereotype and critique to positive national branding // *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research*. – 2015. – Vol. 2, No. 2. – P. 1–11.

A. ARGYNOVA Master's student School of Tourism, International University of Tourism and Hospitality (Kazakhstan, Turkistan) e-mail: adina.argynova@iuth.edu.kz https://orcid.org/0009-0003-0711-4844	M. ALTAI Doctoral student Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh- Turkish University, (Kazakhstan, Turkistan) e-mail: marat.mktu@bk.ru https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7036-4219
A. GUBARENKO Acting Associate Professor School of Tourism, International University of Tourism and Hospitality (Kazakhstan, Turkistan) e-mail: a.gubarenko@iuth.edu.kz https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9237-1612	A. ABILDA Lecturer, holder of a master's degree School of Tourism, International University of Tourism and Hospitality (Kazakhstan, Turkistan) e-mail: araylim.abilda@iuth.edu.kz https://orcid.org/0009-0003-8981-6531
<i>Received 02.03.2026</i> <i>Received in revised form 27.09.2026</i> <i>Accepted for publication 30.09.2026</i>	

A. АРҒЫНОВА¹, А. ГУБАРЕНКО¹, М. АЛТАЙ², А. ӘБІЛДА¹

¹Халықаралық туризм және меймандостық университетінің
(Қазақстан, Түркістан), e-mail: adina.argynova@iuth.edu.kz

²Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті
(Қазақстан, Түркістан)

ҚАЗАҚСТАННЫҢ ЭТНОМӘДЕНИ МҰРАСЫНЫҢ ТУРИСТІК БРЕНД ҚАЛЫПТАСТЫРУҒА ЫҚПАЛЫН ЭМПИРИКАЛЫҚ ТАЛДАУ

Аңдатпа. Мақалада Қазақстанның этномәдени мұрасының туристік бренд қалыптастыруға ықпалы эмпирикалық тұрғыдан талданады. Зерттеудің мақсаты – этномәдени құндылықты қабылдау, мәдени мұраның шынайылығы, оны интерпретациялау сапасы және цифрлық таныстырылым туристік брендтің тартымдылығымен әрі дестинацияға бару ниетімен қалай байланысты екенін бағалау. Талдау әлеуметтік-кәсіби мәртебесі бойынша квоталау арқылы іріктелген 80 респонденттің сауалнама деректеріне негізделді. Бес балдық Лайкерт шкаласымен бағаланатын 24 тармақтан тұратын құрылымдалған сауалнама қолданылды. Деректерді өңдеуде сипаттамалық статистика, Кронбах альфасы, Спирменнің рангтік корреляциясы, барлау факторлық талдауы, Манн–Уитни U-критерийі, Краскел–Уоллис H-критерийі және иерархиялық регрессия пайдаланылды. Мәдени мұраның шынайылығы бренд тартымдылығының ең күшті предикторы болды ($\beta = 0,33$; $p = 0,002$). Одан кейін интерпретация сапасы ($\beta = 0,29$; $p = 0,006$), этномәдени құндылық ($\beta = 0,24$; $p = 0,018$) және цифрлық таныстырылым ($\beta = 0,19$; $p = 0,041$) орын алды. Қорытынды модель бренд тартымдылығы дисперсиясының 64%-ын түсіндірді. Нәтижелер шынайы мазмұн сапалы интерпретациямен және бірізді цифрлық коммуникациямен ұштасқанда этномәдени мұра туристік брендтің маңызды ресурсына айналатынын көрсетті.

Зерттеудің практикалық маңызы туризм саласын басқару органдарына, музейлерге, туристік ақпарат орталықтарына, этноауылдарға және өңірлік маркетинг ұйымдарына арналған ұсынымдармен айқындалады. Мұраны интерпретациялау стандарттарын енгізу, аудитория ерекшелігіне сай цифрлық контент әзірлеу және келушілердің кері байланысын цифрлық аналитикамен ұштастыратын мониторинг жүйесін қалыптастыру ұсынылады.

Кілт сөздер: этномәдени мұра, туристік бренд, шынайылық, дестинация имиджі, мұраны интерпретациялау, цифрлық таныстырылым, Қазақстан.

А. АРГЫНОВА^{1✉}, А. ГУБАРЕНКО¹, М. АЛТАЙ², А. АБИЛДА¹

¹Школа туризма, Международный университет туризма и гостеприимства (Казахстан, Туркестан), e-mail: adina.argynova@iuth.edu.kz

²Международный казахско-турецкий университет имени Ходжи Ахмеда Ясави (Казахстан, Туркестан)

ЭМПИРИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ ВЛИЯНИЯ ЭТНОКУЛЬТУРНОГО НАСЛЕДИЯ КАЗАХСТАНА НА ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ ТУРИСТСКОГО БРЕНДА

Аннотация. В статье эмпирически исследуется влияние этнокультурного наследия Казахстана на формирование туристского бренда. Цель исследования — оценить, как воспринимаемая ценность этнокультурного наследия, его подлинность, качество интерпретации и цифровая презентация связаны с привлекательностью бренда и намерением посетить туристскую дестинацию. Анализ основан на результатах опроса 80 респондентов, отобранных методом целевой выборки с квотированием по социально-профессиональному статусу. Использовалась структурированная анкета из 24 утверждений, оцениваемых по пятибалльной шкале Лайкерта. Применялись описательная статистика, коэффициент альфа Кронбаха, ранговая корреляция Спирмена, разведочный факторный анализ, U-

критерий Манна–Уитни, H-критерий Краскела–Уоллиса и иерархическая регрессия. Подлинность культурного наследия оказалась наиболее сильным предиктором привлекательности бренда ($\beta = 0,33$; $p = 0,002$); далее следовали качество интерпретации ($\beta = 0,29$; $p = 0,006$), воспринимаемая этнокультурная ценность ($\beta = 0,24$; $p = 0,018$) и цифровая презентация ($\beta = 0,19$; $p = 0,041$). Итоговая модель объяснила 64% дисперсии привлекательности бренда. Результаты показывают, что подлинное содержание, качественная интерпретация и последовательная цифровая коммуникация превращают этнокультурное наследие в значимый ресурс туристского бренда.

Практическая значимость исследования состоит в разработке рекомендаций для органов управления туризмом, музеев, туристских информационных центров, этнодеревень и региональных маркетинговых организаций. Предлагается внедрять стандарты интерпретации наследия, создавать цифровой контент с учётом особенностей разных аудиторий и формировать систему мониторинга, объединяющую обратную связь посетителей с данными цифровой аналитики.

Ключевые слова: этнокультурное наследие, туристский бренд, подлинность, имидж туристской дестинации, интерпретация наследия, цифровая презентация, Казахстан.