

UDC 330.15

TOURISM AS A «POST-STAPLES» DIVERSIFICATION FOR RUSSIAN REMOTE RESOURCE-DEPENDENT REGIONS: A NEW PATH FOR KUZBASS

Liliya G. Kiriyanova¹,

kiriyanova@tpu.ru

Anna A. Surtseva²,

ansokol@mail.ru

Konstantin V. Yumatov²,

yumatov@list.ru

Anton A. Pyatovskiy²,

kempochta@mail.ru

¹ National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University,
30, Lenin avenue, Tomsk, 634050, Russia

² Kemerovo State University,
6, Krasnaya street, Kemerovo, 650000, Russia

The article written in the analytical framework of evolutionary economic geography, which stipulates that current distribution of economic activity depends on past history and following path dependence. Many remote regions in the world based their economies on the extraction of natural resources – mining, oil and gas industries, agriculture and forestry etc. Those commodities are commonly referred to as «staples», i. e. natural resources that require minimal on-site processing to prepare them for export. This paper answers the research question – whether resource regions can transit from extractive industries to attractive due to economic lock-ins and an embedded lack of local capacity. There is a lack of investigation in research literature on how accumulated resources of «old» staples path are used to create new industries that are completely different from any existing ones. This paper presents successful cases of Kemerovo region – Kuzbass, Russia, on how the new tourism industry uses and transforms generic resources of resource-based economy. It is shows that public-private interactions can lock-out even staple-economy and establish tourism destination in tourism unfriendly environment of industrial and mining region.

Key words:

Path dependence, resource-dependent regions, tourism, new path creation, Kemerovo region.

Evolutionary economic geography as the main methodology

Recently, evolutionary economic geography becomes a central approach to analyze modernization of regional economy [1–4]. EEG stipulates that current distribution of economic activity depends on past history and stresses out complex interdependencies, competition, growth and structural change through actions formed by experience and interactions of economic agents over time [5]. Historically prevalent regional socio-economic paths determine current development of the territory and form path dependence.

Economic, social and technological processes, communication domains and actor interaction forms become sustaining and self-reproduced over time. Possible negative consequence of such strong historically prevalent interactions can lead to a lock-in, when a system resists any new forms and blocks changes even when a regional economic situation requires new paths [3, 5].

However, it is essential to reveal whether historical processes not only reproduce the dominant path but also influence the development of alternatives [6–8]. This becomes crucial for declining economies of remote resource-based regions.

Resource-dependent regions and their staples

Previously, many remote regions in the world based their economies on the extraction of natural resources – mining, oil and gas industries, agriculture and forestry etc. Those commodities are commonly referred to as «staples», i. e. natural resources that require minimal on-site processing to prepare them for export [9, p. 201]. Staples economies of remote regions are characterized by several patterns, which have high impact on their social and political systems, civic society labor market and possible alternative path development: based on natural resources, producing minimal added-value to extracted products, dependent on significant government mediation and highly sensitive to external market fluctuations [10, 11].

Staples researchers have questioned whether resource towns can transit from extractive industries to attractive due to economic lock-ins and an embedded lack of local capacity [12–15]. However, new mobility patterns can «unlock» previous pathways by bringing new people, ideas, skills, technologies and resources to remote areas.

Tourism as a new path or new staple

Tourism development is often mentioned as the best suitable option for «post-staples» diversification of remote resource-dependent regions and for balancing negative effects of economic restructuring [9, 16–20]. Therefore, tourism can be viewed as a relatively easy way for peripheral regions to «unlock» previous pathways.

Abundant in natural resources, remote regions often utilize the availability of nature to promote tourism-based activities. That is why some staples researchers suggest that tourism in peripheral regions often follows the patterns that are similar to previous staples development: based on natural resources, relied on public policy agencies and government (or quasi government) mediation (for development, investment, marketing and distribution) and highly susceptible to external market fluctuations [21]. D. Schmallegger and D. Carson pursue that tourism used as an easy way to diversify remote region economies can appear a new staple, which supposes that tourism is controlled from core sectors and is highly sensitive to volatile tourism demand.

However, new tourism paths inherit not only patterns but also its «initial capital» from «old» economies. Some studies within evolutionary economic geography show that new firms have a higher chance to successful development if they use some routines from their «parent» companies (spin-offs) rather than if they lack previous experience (start-ups) [22]. Old path inputs to new paths with financial investments, managerial skills, networks, connections to decision-making persons etc. [23].

Nevertheless, there is a lack of investigation in research literature on how accumulated resources of old paths are used to create new industries that are completely different from any existing ones. Particularly, there is a lack of successful cases on how the new tourism industry uses and transforms generic resources of resource-based economy in peripheral regions to create alternative paths.

Tourism in Russia

Russia has remained under-considered and under-estimated in the tourism literature for the past 15 years despite its size, the relevance of its economy and its chances for development [24]. The most comprehensive discussion on how tourism can change Russian remote regions economy can be found in [25], who analyzed the challenges associated with ecotourism, and in [20], who proposed case studies.

Most Russian remote regions are resource-dependent to some extent. Besides, tourism development was considered as a way to react to the sudden economic decline in 1990s and as a tool to diversify economy and become independent from gas, oil and timber in most peripheral regions [25–27]. That is why the national government has officially acknowledged tourism as a strategic sector of the Russian economy.

Tourism is a promising branch in the development of the national economy of the Russian Federa-

tion, which manifests itself in the development indicators over recent decades. The international tourist flow from Russia to other countries (outbound tourism) significantly increased. The same is true about the volume of inbound tourism by overseas residents. The 2014 Olympic Games and the 2018 FIFA World Cup hosted by Russia attracted national and regional attention to tourism policy and infrastructure. After Crimea became a part of the Russian Federation in 2014 and following the Donbass military conflict, Western sanctions made outbound tourism more complicated. The sanctions and the decrease in energy prices weakened the Russian ruble, which had a further negative impact on outbound tourism, but potentially improved the situation for domestic and inbound tourism. According to the Federal State Statistics Service, an average decline of an outbound tourist flow from Russia amounted to 31–31,5 % [28, 29] and an increase in the domestic tourism was equal to 20–25 %. From July to August 2016, the number of plane tickets sold for domestic flights significantly exceeded the number of tickets sold for international flights. Domestic flights accounted for 58 % of sales and international flights amounted only to 42 %. In the same period of 2015, the gap was less – 53 % and 47 %, respectively. The experience of American (8 % of tourism share in GDP, 80 % of GDP in tourism from tourism – domestic tourism) and Chinese (9,4 % of tourism share in GDP, 76 % of GDP in tourism from tourism – domestic tourism) economies proves that domestic tourism can and should be a driver for post-industrial development of a country.

According to official statistics, the tourism share in GDP grew from 1,5–1,6 to 3,4 % over the last several years (2016–2018).

Russia's domestic tourism is growing fast; hence, many Russian regions are currently trying to increase their share in this market in order to gain the diversification and sustainability of the regional economy. Even those regions of Russia where tourism is not one of the main branches of the regional economy and takes one of the last places in the share of the region's GRP, on the contrary, are not an exception. For example, most regions in the Siberian Federal District (except the Novosibirsk region, the Altai Territory and the Altai Republic) are industrialized regions, where the GRP value is mostly formed by the extraction of minerals: the oil, gas or coal industries. At the same time, these regions have a fairly large resource base for the development of tourism; their historical, cultural and natural resources can be used to develop various types of tourism in the region.

Tourism development involves a complex network of communication between public and private stakeholders in any country; however, the nature of such communication depends on the areas of economic development of the territory, the available tourism resources, as well as the interests of the key actors in the strategic use of local opportunities [30].

The following part of the article presents the case of the Kemerovo region – a Russian remote resource-

based region, which found the way to successfully use the financial and administrative resources of its «old» economy to develop the tourism sector. By the example of this region, the problem of transition from the industrial to post-industrial image and economy can be vividly demonstrated. The purpose of this case is to identify the main areas, forms and types of interaction between public and private stakeholders in the emerging tourism industry of the Kemerovo region.

Kemerovo as the main mining region of the country

The Kemerovo Region was established in 1943 as a new industrial base of the USSR that fought against the Nazi Germany. Tremendous natural resources (iron, copper, manganese and polymetallic ores, phosphorites and aluminum raw materials, dolomite and quartzite) had made the region one of the most urbanized and industrialized regions of Western Siberia. Kemerovo region takes the first rank among Russian regions for diversity and development of natural resources. Kemerovo is the main mining region of the country where 60 % of all Russian coal are mined. The coked coal reserves account for more than 73 % of the total value of coal reserves in Russia, and for the entire group of particularly valuable rocks they make 100 %. Until today, its share in the economy of industrial and raw materials sector is high and the socio-economic situation is complicated. 70 % of Kuzbass population reside in cities and urban-type settlements that depend on a single industry: coal, mining, metallurgy, etc. As a result, the region acquired an industrial external and internal image and the toponym Kuzbass (**Kuznetsk Coal Basin**, proposed by P.A. Tchihatcheff in the XIX century [31] became the second official name of Kemerovo, although the borders of the Kuznetsk coal basin do not coincide with the borders of this region.

Kemerovo region: tourism statistics

The tourism industry has been virtually absent in the Kemerovo region since its establishment. It was not until 1970 when the first piste was opened in the south of the region, in Tashtagol. Then, another ski resort (the Sheregesh ski resort) was opened in the Tashtagol region in 1981. Its opening coincided with the Spartakiad of Peoples of the USSR, a major sporting event. In late 1970s and early 1980s, a study of the tourism potential of Kuzbass was carried out, which helped identify 12 tourist and recreational areas [32]. Such division is still in place.

The tourism industry in the Kuznetsk Basin began to develop in 1990s. As the need for the economy modernization arose and the demand for coal and metal dropped, the strategy for tourism development in the 21st century was launched. Today, there are several popular ski resorts in Kemerovo (Tashtagol, Mezhdurechensk, Novokuznetsk, Tanai, etc.); there appear historical and cultural centers, museums and reserves Tomskaya Pisanitsa and Krasnaya Gorka (Kemerovo), Kuznetsk fortress (Novokuznetsk), a complex of modern-time monuments of Mariinsk.

The analysis of tourism statistics in Kemerovo during the period of 2000–2017 [33–37] shows a significant growth in the inbound tourist flow in the region. Compared to 2000, this indicator had grown 10 times by 2015: 150 thousand people traveled to the Kemerovo region in 2000; the flow of inbound tourists increased up to 850 thousand people in 2013; this number amounted to 1,5 million people in 2015 (the real figures were much higher because some tourists traveled rough). The growth of the inbound tourist flow occurs due to the internal tourist flow as the number of international tourists visiting the region is constantly decreasing. Thus, 52860 foreign nationals visited the region in 2011, 34200 in 2013 and 26600 in 2015. In 2011, the internal tourist flow comprised 92,5 % from the inbound tourist flow; it was 95,9 % in 2013 and 98,2 % in 2015. At the same time, the inbound tourist flow was much higher compared to the outbound tourist flow, which was only 81,27 thousand people (5,4 % in relation to the inbound tourist flow) in 2017, although the growth of outbound flow amounted to 81,3 thousand compared to 111,8 thousand in 2003. In general, the dynamics of both indicators is positive for the described period. A decline was observed only in 2009, which is due to the global economic crisis. At the same time, it is well known that about 50 % of Kemerovo residents traditionally spend their holidays in the region (58,4 % in 2000, 43,4 % in 2006 and 52,9 % in 2012). The volume of fee paid services in the tourist and recreational areas grew as the incoming tourist flow increased (hotels and other accommodation facilities, health resort services, etc.). In 2000, Kemerovo earned 31,2 million rubles from tourism, while this number was 248 times higher – 7740 million rubles (nominal prices) in 2017. According to comparative indices, the growth is even more significant, i. e. from 0,04 % in GRP in 2000 to 0,78 % in 2017.

The number of travel agencies registered in Kemerovo region is steadily growing. For example, there were 40 travel agencies in 2000 while their total number was 254 in 2017. The most significant growth was observed in 2010 when the number of travel agencies increased by 46,4 % within one year. Unfortunately, most agencies specialized in the outbound tourism and the domestic tourism is of lower priority.

Not only the number of travel agencies grows, but also their performance indicators improve, i. e. the number and the cost of package tours sold to the population. The number of package tours grew 4,1 times, from 10,4 to 42,6 thousand packages during 2005–2017. The cost of package tours sold to the population (in nominal prices) increased 8,9 times (from 307,3 to 2741 million rubles) from 2005 to 2017. If compared to the year 2000, the cost increased 75,7 times. The comparative index growth of travel packages sold to the population increased from 0,07 % in GRP in 2000 to 0,1 % in GRP in 2005 and 0,47 % in GRP in 2016. Similarly to the overall

tourist flow, this positive dynamics is interrupted in 2009.

Unfortunately, the growth of outbound and domestic tourism did not give the expected result, i. e. a qualitative and permanent income increase of the region and the state. The amount of tax revenue was very uneven: taxes amounted to 907,3 million rubles in 2011, 1299,3 million rubles in 2012 and 1063 million rubles in 2013.

The indicators concerning the accommodation of tourists during the described period grew insignificantly. Despite the fact that the number of hotels and collective accommodation facilities increased by 80 units and the growth amounted to 49,1 % (from 163 to 243 units) in 2000–2017, the dynamics within the period was unstable. The number of overnight stays in collective accommodation facilities increased by 27,4 % from 2635,8 thousand in 2000 to 3357 thousand in 2015. The number of persons placed in collective accommodation facilities gradually grew from 303,6 in 2000 to 360,8 in 2011 and 554,1 thousand people in 2017, which amounted to a 82,5 % increase during 2000–2017. However, the number of tourists who entered Kemerovo is three times higher than the number of tourists who stayed in official accommodation facilities. This fact may indicate that more than half of tourists stayed in rented apartments, houses or with their friends and relatives.

The richest natural complex of the Kemerovo region allows developing many different types of tourism: mountain skiing, cross-country skiing, water, pedestrian, cave, horse, snowmobile, historical, cultural and ecological, etc. About 70 % in the total volume of the entire tourist flow is attributed to Alpine skiing. This type of tourism is developed in the territory of 12 municipalities. In this respect, the main resort of Kuzbass is Sheregesh. When looking at numbers, the growth of tourists' attraction becomes obvious, i. e. about 30000 people attended the Scheregesh ski resort every year in early 2000s; the flow of tourists amounted to more than 1 million people during the winter season in 2014–2018. Thus, Sheregesh became the most popular ski resort in Russia already in 2015. The growing popularity of winter tourism in the Kemerovo region is due to the available infrastructure and the duration of the ski season, which begins in the early days of November and ends in early May. At the same time, there is a problem of seasonal functioning of the most part of the tourism industry of the region. Historical and cultural, as well as natural values of Kuzbass are not very popular outside the region.

Proclaiming tourism as a priority direction of economic development, the federal authorities have legislatively enshrined it in the Federal Target Program of *Domestic and Inbound Tourism Development in the Russian Federation (2011–2018)*. The goal of the Program is to increase the competitiveness of the Russian tourist market, which meets the needs of Russian and international citizens regarding the quality of tourism services. When the Pro-

gram was audited in 2014, a number of issues were identified that hampered the effectiveness of its implementation. Among the internal issues, unfruitful cooperation with investors in the regions, slow pace of infrastructure construction, postponed commissioning of facilities, as well as the refusal of some regions to participate in the Program were named.

Some macroeconomic risks associated with the deterioration of external economic environment are the main external issues. Many regions stated in their yearly reports that they had to return the funds allocated and transferred for the year 2014 to the federal budget due to the fact that the money were transferred in the very last days of December and the region could not manage spending them until the end of the year. In total, 143 million rubles out of 139,5 billion rubles (0,1 %) remained unspent [38]. Regional authorities of most Russian regions approved and began to implement their regional development programs to be included into the Federal Program under the deficit of regional budgets.

Main actors and their initiatives

Tourism development in Kemerovo is initiated by the state; other interested parties who have resources are rarely involved into the process of strategic programs and specific projects. At this, a full-scale development of tourism in the region is possible only with active participation of all stakeholders. Therefore, development and implementation of regional programs should be considered in the context of the stakeholder approach. According to E. Freeman, the founder of the stakeholder approach, stakeholders are any individuals, groups or organizations that have a significant impact on the decisions made by a certain organization and/or are affected by these decisions [39, p. 366].

Since the tourism industry is of great interest not only for the state (federal, regional) and municipal authorities, but also for all stakeholders, a regional tourism industry can be viewed as an organized system in which the use of stakeholder management positions can make it possible to establish a balance of interests of all participants and more fruitfully implement its development. In this regard, a subject of the tourist industry of the region is any subject (state and municipal authorities, legal or private entity), both resident and non-resident, whose interests and resources can directly or indirectly influence the development of tourism in the region.

In a broad sense, stakeholder participation is seen as a variety of methods and practices in which stakeholders take decisions about further development, for example, meetings and consultations are forms of such stakeholder interaction. However, stakeholders' participation can be regarded as a partnership or cooperation where they play an active role in decision-making, affecting both short-term and long-term interests [40, p. 103].

One of the main reasons for the growing interest in partnerships in the development of tourism is the

belief that tourist destinations and organizations are able to gain a competitive advantage by combining knowledge, experience, capital and other resources of several stakeholders [41, p. 2]. However, there may be a conflict of stakeholders in tourism development in the region related to different interests and perceptions about the issues of tourism development. Therefore, it is necessary to take into account the interests of each stakeholder group for a successful stakeholder management [42, p. 99].

The following groups are identified as the main stakeholders of the tourism industry:

- internal group, i. e. regional and municipal authorities, citizens, organizations of different types and forms of ownership (travel agencies, educational and cultural organizations, etc.), public organizations of the regional industry, media;
- external group, i. e. federal authorities, public organizations (federal, international), non-economic entities that are non-residents, tourists, etc. [43, p. 103].

Kemerovo external actors:

1. Regional and municipal authorities in the Kemerovo region.

The tourism industry of the Kemerovo region functions under the supervision of the Deputy Governor for Education, Culture and Sports. The Department of Youth Policy and Sport of the Kemerovo region is in charge of this industry. The Department of Tourism is officially a part of the structure of the Department of Youth Policy and Sport. This Department acts as the coordinator of the tourism policy of the Kemerovo region and plays a key role in the development of the Strategy for Development of Tourism Industry in Kuzbass. However, the tourism industry is strongly associated with cultural institutions (museums, theaters, etc.). They, in their turn, are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Culture and National Policy of the Kemerovo region. Cluster projects funded through federal budget are supervised by the Deputy Governor for Economics and Regional Development.

At a municipal level, these functions are performed by the departments/divisions of the city and regional administrations. As far as the capital of Kuzbass concerns, this role is played by the Department of Culture, Sports and Youth Policy of Kemerovo. It coordinates the activities of urban centers in the field of culture and tourism.

The Public Tourist Board supervised by the Governor of the Kemerovo region acts as an interface between the regional authorities and business community. The Board is an advisory body ensuring interaction, coordination and conformity of the actions of executive authorities of the Kemerovo region, local government bodies, public tourism organizations, educational institutions and tourism industry entities. The Board includes internal stakeholder representatives, i. e. the main public organizations of the tourism industry, the largest cultural organiza-

tions and the media. Representatives of higher educational institutions ensuring training in the field of tourism are also invited to the Board.

2. Business community and Kemerovo regional public organizations in the field of tourism.

The business community of the tourism industry of Kuzbass is represented by two public associations: the Kuzbass Association of Tourism Industry Enterprises and the self-regulatory organization Kuzbass non-Profit Partnership of Tourism Industry. The Kuzbass Association of Tourism Industry Enterprises (KATI) was established in 2003. It includes 18 travel agencies mainly associated with the regional center. The main directions of its activity are as follows: the development and promotion of regional touristic product; the expansion of the charter program geography; redirection of the outbound tourist flow to Kuzbass market; performance of corporate customer functions at trade fairs; protection of legal, economic and other interests of the tourism industry. KATI actively cooperates with the Administration of the Kemerovo region, acts as a representative and lobbyist of the tourism industry of the region. In particular, the 2025 Strategy for Tourism Development of the Kemerovo Region was reviewed and approved by the Coordinating Council of the Kuzbass Association of Tourism Enterprises, the Public Tourist Board under the supervision of the Governor of the Kemerovo region, and then, by the Panel of Administration of the Kemerovo region.

At the same time, in addition to KATI, a number of influential organizations were established in the tourism industry of the region. In particular, a new organization named South Kuzbass Non-Profit Partnership of Tourism Industry (SKTI) was established on 21 July 2009. SKTI was the first in Russia to receive the status of a self-regulatory organization of travel agencies and travel agents in 2012 and became known as a self-regulatory organization Kuzbass non-Profit Partnership of Tourism Industry. Over 30 travel agencies are included into the non-profit partnership. Most of these travel agencies are mainly located in the territory of the south of the Kemerovo region: travel agents, tour operators specializing in domestic, inbound and outbound tourism, hotels of the sports and tourist complex Sheregesh. Since 2012, the Kuzbass non-Profit Partnership of Tourism Industry has created a compensation fund at the expense of the members of the partnership as an additional property responsibility towards consumers of the travel product. The standards and rules of tourist activity are based on the federal laws and are binding for all members of the partnership. In the north of the region and in Kemerovo, the organization is represented in a very piecewise manner; however, it conducts a very active PR-company and promotes its interests at the level of authorities, education and culture.

3. Museums of Kemerovo and Kemerovo region.

As a matter of fact, regional museums do not occupy top positions regarding their resources, influ-

ence and solid strategy for tourism development. Perhaps, only an open-air museum Tomskaya Pisnitsa is famous outside the region. In addition, the Kuznetsk fortress (Novokuznetsk) and Krasnaya Gorka (Kemerovo) are considered as historical and cultural centers of the city; besides, these museums attract tourists from the country, as well as international visitors. Unfortunately, most museums do not have financial and information capacity to independently promote themselves outside the region. The museums are financed by the federal and regional authorities; extrabudgetary revenues make up a small part of the budget of most museums.

4. Kuzbass universities providing training in the fields of tourism, service and hotel industry.

Five higher educational institutions of the region provide educational services in the field of tourism. Nevertheless, the tourism research and practices need further development. Education in the field of tourism involves some adjacent areas. For a long time Kuzbass State Technical University named after T.F. Gorbachev was the only university that provided training within the fields of tourism and services. Since the government of the Russian Federation had adopted a subject oriented educational strategy, tourism programs were closed at Kuzbass State Technical University and the initiative was gradually shifted to other universities. Thus, tourism as a field of study was opened on the basis of Kemerovo State Institute of Arts as part of the Museum Studies and other related fields.

Tourism as a study field at Kemerovo State University had a long way to go. Initially, three departments were in charge of the enrolment into bachelor's and master's degree programs, as well as CPE. Such approach turned out to be ineffective and today a new model is being developed in the Department of History and International Relations (since 2016, it is the Institute of History, Public Administration and International Relations) with the involvement of other divisions. Kemerovo Regional Resource Center for Tourism Industry was established on the basis of the Institute of History, Public Administration and International Relations of Kemerovo State University.

At this point, the real model of interaction between the main stakeholders of the region, among which there are regional and local authorities and business, is represented in the form of two relatively separate interaction zones, i. e. the white and the gray economies. The separation into three economic zones that describes the interaction of the government and business, i. e. white, gray and black economies, is used by many researchers (V. Tambovtsev, M.V. Kurbatova, S.N. Levin, etc.) [44, p. 33].

Actors interactions: white and gray zones

The white zone is a concept of formal relationship between government and business, i. e. regulation of taxes, administrative and economic regulation of business (registration, licensing, control and enforce-

ment of established norms, etc.), government tenders, implementation of regional programs for tourism development and assistance in raising investment attractiveness of tourism industry in Kuzbass. According to expert estimates, the Kemerovo region is placed in the group of borrower regions with a high level of reliability in the investment attractiveness ranking of the subjects of the Russian Federation. In terms of fixed investment, the Kemerovo region ranked the 14th in Russia by the end of 2014 [45].

In the 2025 Strategy for Tourism Development of the Kemerovo Region, infrastructure of the recreation sector is one of the main investment priorities for the development of the region. At the same time, the development of some industries, including tourism, depends on how successfully the region copes with the tasks related to infrastructure development. So, one of the most important priorities is the development of tourism and energy infrastructure. A striking example of such parallel development is the ski resort Sheregesh. To implement the program, investments were attracted from the regional and municipal budgets, as well as the budget of municipalities of certain cities of the region, funds of banks and industrial giants of Kuzbass such as OAO Kuznetsk Metallurgical Combine, OAO West Siberian Metallurgical Complex, etc. The first ski slope was laid and the first lift was installed in 1992, when the construction of the ski resort Sheregesh, now known as the mountain ski complex Mustag, began.

The money invested into the development of the Sheregesh complex is provided by several companies. Among the investors, there are not only the companies of Kuzbass, but also representatives from other regions of the Russian Federation (Tomsk, Moscow, Nizhny Novgorod, etc.). Over 13 billion rubles of private investments have been donated into the resort development since 2000. 320000 Russian and international tourists visited the resort in 2010 [46, p. 426]. The project is implemented in accordance with the 2025 Strategy of Social and Economic Development of the Kemerovo Region and the 2012 Program of Social and Economic Development of the Kemerovo region. This project is the next development stage of the Sheregesh Tourist Complex based on the resort in Gornaya Shoria (Tashtagol region) as a year-round resort for winter and summer recreation with a subsequent release at the international level.

Another example of cooperation in the white zone is the creation of a regional most favored economic zone Gornaya Shoriya, where involved companies are provided with all the benefits and preferences stipulated by the regional legislation. Law No. 87-OZ resulted from the interaction between some private companies (operators of tourism infrastructure) and regional authorities to attract strategic investors.

The gray zone is a concept of an informal interaction between business and government. In this case, both regional and local authorities use their administrative resource to force business to make additional

contributions into various social needs. In return, the companies are guaranteed that their privileges and benefits remain and the business situation does not worsen. Thus, a status bargaining with the authority over the conditions for a particular business operation takes place in the gray zone, which means that the negotiation is initiated when the parties defend their own interests [47, p. 70].

When solving the issue of the state budget balance, federal authorities extended the functions and powers of regional and local authorities; however, they reduced a significant part of their funding sources. Under these circumstances, additional funding from business became a survival condition; thus, such voluntary or compulsory investments became a tool to achieve business interests.

Quasi taxes and formal sponsorship are the main types of additional resources that arrive from business. Quasi taxes are legally baseless additional business payments either to a local budget or to a specially established funds. Formal sponsorship is a form of funding various projects by the authority (social projects, organization of public services and amenities, etc.) from business companies [44, p. 41]. Unlike quasi taxes, formal sponsorship is of a targeted nature and the contributions are made in kind.

According to the estimates, additional funding of regions by business amounts to 110 billion rubles annually (about 3 % of the consolidated budgets of the constituent territories of the federation) [48, p. 99]. The city administration of Kemerovo and the subordinated institutions concluded 1581 social and economic partnership agreements in the beginning of 2014. Large, small and medium-sized enterprises participate in social and economic partnerships regardless of the type of the legal entity.

Such partnership demonstrates close cooperation with regional and local authorities and a standard of entrepreneurship in Kuzbass among business owners and managers. The government deliberately focuses the business on the support of partnerships and social programs. The content of agreements shows that in spite of the investment component, including the development of tourism industry, the agreements ensure the use of business resources to implement social projects and maintain social and economic stability of the region.

There are also good examples by local and regional authorities in switching from the gray zone to the partnership relations with regional stakeholders. One such example in Kuzbass is the Recreational Tourism Cluster Kuzbass. The Cluster was established on 13 October 2015 when a strategic session took place and the agreement on the establishment of the Cluster was signed. The establishment of this Cluster undoubtedly resulted in the interaction, cooperation and partnership between stakeholders in the Kemerovo region. This gives us hope for the soonest possible solution of some issues in the field of tourism [48, p. 51].

This agreement was signed by 42 participants of the session, including 30 small and medium-sized businesses (SMEs) in the tourism sector, five municipi-

pal organizations, two universities, the administration of the Kemerovo region represented by the heads of two departments and the director of Kuzbass Science Park, which housed the Center for Cluster Development of the Kemerovo Region. The participants chose the coordinating organization and approved 26 members of the Cluster Council ensuring interdepartmental interaction to solve the issues of the tourism industry development:

- 16 heads of small and medium-sized businesses (tour operators, travel agents, hotels, restaurants, excursion and transport organizations, owners of tourist infrastructure, etc.);
- 3 public organizations of tourism industry: Kuzbass Association of Travel Industry, SRO NP Kuzbassturindustry and Kemerovo Regional Public Organization Young Tourist);
- Kuzbass Chamber of Commerce and Industry;
- 2 higher educational institutions (Kemerovo State University and Kemerovo branch of Plekhanov Russian University of Economics);
- municipal enterprise (MUE Podnebesnye Zybya);
- museum (Tomskaya Pisanitsa);
- Department of Youth Policy and Sport of the Kemerovo Region as an executive authority responsible for tourism;
- Center for Cluster Development.

Kemerovo State University was chosen to coordinate the Cluster. The choice was not random. Since 2011, Kemerovo State University has been actively developing the tourism direction to seek forms of interaction with professional community and public authorities aiming at fruitful joint work in the field of tourism in the Kemerovo region. In 2013, the Regional Resource Center for Tourism Industry was established on the basis of Kemerovo State University, which was recommended and the activities of which were supported by the Public Council for Tourism under the supervision of the Governor of the Kemerovo region. In the framework of the Center, personnel development and refresher courses were conducted for employees of the tourism industry free of charge. Besides, academic staff of Kemerovo State University continues regular research in the field of tourism development in the Kemerovo region.

In May 2015, Kemerovo State University jointly with the Department of Youth Policy and Sport of the Kemerovo Region and the Department of Culture and National Policy of the Kemerovo Region held a conference and a seminar on the Development of the Tourist Destination: Mechanisms, Problems and Possibilities. The event took place with the involvement of international participants. Within its framework, a round table discussion was held, where over 30 representatives of the tourism business took part. The participants expressed interest in personnel training in the field of tourism and joint projects aimed at the promotion of Kuzbass.

Finally, in April and May 2015, Kemerovo State University together with the Department of Youth Policy and Sport of the Kemerovo Region, the De-

partment of Investment and Strategic Development of the Kemerovo Region and the Center for Cluster Development elaborated the 2025 Development Strategy of Recreational Tourism Cluster of Kuzbass, which was approved by the Panel of Administration of the Kemerovo region and supported by the Ministry of Economic Development of Russia.

As a result, the number of organizations of the tourism industry significantly expanded within two months and reached 59 members, among them 50 organizations of small and medium-sized businesses by the beginning of 2016. This fact indicates the interest of representatives of small and medium-sized businesses in cooperation with other regional stakeholders in order to increase the competitiveness of tourist and recreational enterprises, promote domestic tourism, expand the range of tourist services in the region and increase the level of awareness among residents and visitors about tourism opportunities of Kuzbass. However, the main focus of the region is still placed on the traditional industries of coal mining, metallurgy, etc. That is why tourism and investments directly depend on the resource-based industries of the region, i. e. energy and metallurgy.

Conclusions

The case of the Kemerovo region shows that networks and close interactions between the main stakeholders can create new paths even in resource-driven regions. Some success factors are:

1. An «old» path became the main investor into the new one. Kuzbass coal and metallurgy industries supported the initiatives of local authorities and established the first tourism companies at the beginning stage. It was not just the case of social responsibility but deliberate investments and attempts to diversify their own business. Being the main actor in the regional economy, resource-based industries were ready to invest not only finances but also their national lobbying capital, management skills and appropriate infrastructure.
2. Complex and close cooperation of the main actors:
 - municipal authorities who initiated the establishment and promotion of sports, tourism and resort facilities;
 - the Administration of the Kemerovo region, which managed to receive federal support for the tourism cluster;
 - private business companies, which were directly involved in the development of tourism (small and medium-sized tourism companies, other investors);
 - the university, which became a competence center for the new industry and also an independent communication platform that can bring together the key actors.

The research has been produced as a part of TOULL – Tourism and Lifelong Learning project (grant number 530750–2015-DK-JPHES) sponsored by the EU Tempus programme.

REFERENCES

1. Boschma R.A., Frenken, K. Technological Relatedness and Regional Branching. *Beyond Territory. Dynamic Geographies of Knowledge Creation, Diffusion and Innovation*. Eds. H. Bathelt, M.P. Feldman, D.F. Kogler. London, Routledge, 2011. pp. 64–81.
2. Neffke F., Henning M., Boschma R. How do regions diversify over time? Industry relatedness and the development of new growth paths in regions. *Economic Geography*, 2011, vol. 87, Iss. 2, pp. 37–65.
3. Martin R., Sunley P. Path Dependence and Regional Economic Evolution. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 2006, no. 6, pp. 395–438.
4. Martin R. Roepke Lecture in Economic Geography – Rethinking Regional Path Dependence: Beyond Lock-in to Evolution. *Economic Geography*, 2010, no. 86, pp. 1–27.
5. Brouder P., Eriksson R.H. Tourism evolution: on the synergies of tourism studies and evolutionary economic geography. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 2013, vol. 43, pp. 370–389. DOI: 10.1016/j.annals.2013.07.001
6. Henning M., Stam E., Wenting R. Path Dependence Research in Regional Economic Development: Cacophony or Knowledge Accumulation? *Regional Studies*, 2013, vol. 47, no. 8, pp. 1348–1362. DOI: 10.1080/00343404.2012.750422
7. MacKinnon D., Dawley S., Pike A., Cumbers A. Rethinking Path Creation: a Geographical Political Economy Approach. *Economic Geography*, 2019, vol. 95, Iss. 2, pp. 113–135. DOI: 10.1080/00130095.2018.1498294
8. Boschma R., Coenen L., Frenken K., Truffer B. Towards a theory of regional diversification: combining insights from Evolutionary Economic Geography and Transition Studies. *Regional Studies*, 2017, vol. 51, Iss. 1, pp. 31–45. DOI: 10.1080/00343404.2016.1258460
9. Schmallegger D., Carson D. Is tourism just another staple? A new perspective on tourism in remote regions. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 2010, vol. 13, pp. 201–221. DOI: 10.1080/13683500903359152
10. Gunton T. Natural Resources and Regional Development: an Assessment of Dependency and Comparative Advantage Paradigms. *Economic Geography*, 2003, vol. 79, Iss. 1, pp. 67–94. DOI: 10.1111/j.1944-8287.2003.tb00202.x
11. Hayter R. «The war in the woods»: Post-fordist restructuring, globalization, and the contested remapping of British Columbia's forest economy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 2003, vol. 93, pp. 706–729. DOI: 10.1111/1467-8306.9303010
12. Carson D.A., Carson D.B. Why tourism may not be everybody's business: the challenge of tradition in resource peripheries. *The Range-land Journal*, 2011, vol. 33, pp. 373–383. DOI: 10.1071/RJ11026
13. Koster R.L. Local contexts for community economic development strategies: a comparison of rural Saskatchewan and Ontario communities. *Geographical perspectives on sustainable rural change*. Eds. D.G. Winchell, D. Ramsey, R.L. Koster, G.M. Robinson. Brandon, Rural Development Institute, 2010. pp. 461–483.
14. Lundmark L. Economic restructuring into tourism in the Swedish mountain range. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 2005, vol. 5, Iss. 1, pp. 23–45. DOI: 10.1080/15022250510014273
15. Ryser L., Halseth G. So you're thinking about a retirement industry? Economic and community development lessons from resource towns in northern British Columbia. *Community Development*, 2013, vol. 44, Iss. 1, pp. 83–96. DOI: 10.1080/15575330.2012.680476
16. Carson D.A., Carson D.B. Mobilities and Path Dependence: Challenges for Tourism and «Attractive» Industry Development in a Remote Company Town. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality*

- and Tourism, 2014, vol. 14, Iss. 4, pp. 460–479. DOI: 10.1080/15022250.2014.967997
17. Jenkins J.M., Hall C.M., Troughton M. The restructuring of rural economies: Rural tourism and recreation as a government response. *Tourism and recreation in rural areas*. Eds. R. Butler, C.M. Hall, J. Jenkins. Chichester, England, Wiley, 1998. pp. 43–68.
 18. Hall C.M., Boyd S. Nature-based tourism in peripheral areas: Introduction. *Nature-based tourism in peripheral areas: Development or disaster?* Eds. C.M. Hall, S. Boyd. Clevedon, England, Channel View, 2005. pp. 3–21.
 19. *Tourism in Peripheries: Perspectives from the Far North and South*. Eds. D.K. Müller, B. Jansson. Wallingford, CAB International, 2007. 288 p.
 20. Halkier H., Møller D., Goncharova N., Kiriyanova L., Kolupanova I., Yumatov K., Yakimova N. Destination development in Western Siberia: tourism governance and evolutionary economic geography. *Tourism Geographies*, 2019, vol. 21, Iss. 2, pp. 261–283. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2018.1490808> (accessed 27 January 2019).
 21. Schmallegger D., Carson D. The economic geography of remote tourism: the problem of connection seeking. *Tourism Analysis*, 2010, vol. 15, Iss. 1, pp. 127–139.
 22. Klepper S. Disagreements, Spinoffs, and the Evolution of Detroit as the Capital of the U.S. Automobile Industry. *Management Science*, INFORMS, 2007, April, vol. 53 (4), pp. 616–631.
 23. Bresnahan T., Gambardella A., Saxenian A. «Old economy» inputs for «new economy» outcomes: cluster formation in the New Silicon Valleys. *Clusters, Networks and Innovation*. Eds. S. Breschi, F. Malerba. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005. pp. 113–135.
 24. Andrade L., Dimanche F. Destination competitiveness and tourism development in Russia: Issues and challenges. *Tourism Management*, 2017, vol. 62, pp. 360–376.
 25. Braden K., Prudnikova N. The challenge of ecotourism development in the Altai region of Russia. *Tourism Geographies*, 2008, vol. 10, Iss. 1, pp. 1–21. DOI: 10.1080/14616680701825107
 26. Burns P. Tourism in Russia: Background and structure. *Tourism Management*, 1998, vol. 19, pp. 555–565. DOI: 10.1016/S0261-5177(98)00060-0
 27. Sheresheva M., Kopiski J. The main trends, challenges and success factors in the Russian hospitality and tourism market. *Worldwide Hospitality Tourism Themes*, 2016, vol. 8 (3), pp. 260–272. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/WHATT-02-2016-0004> (accessed 25 March 2019).
 28. *Federalnaya sluzhba gosudarstvennoy statistiki* [Federal State statistic service]. 2016. Available at: <https://www.gks.ru> (accessed 1 June 2019).
 29. *Federalnaya tselevaya programma «Razvitie vnutrennego i vyezdnoy turizma v Rossiyskoy Federatsii (2019–2025 gody)»* [Concept of the federal target program «Development of domestic and inbound tourism in the Russian Federation (2019–2025)»]. Available at: <https://www.russiaturism.ru/contents/deyatelnost/programmy-i-proekty/federalnaya-tselevaya-programma-razvitie-vnutrennego-i-vezdnogo-turizma-v-rossiyskoy-federatsii-2019-2025-gody/> (accessed 27 January 2019).
 30. Dredge D. Policy networks and the local organisation of tourism. *Tourism Management*, 2006, vol. 27, Iss. 2, pp. 269–280.
 31. Tchihatcheff P. *Voyage scientifique dans l'Altai oriental* [Scientific trip to Eastern Altay]. Paris, Gide et comp., 1845. 466 p.
 32. Baev O.V., Makarov A.P., Mit' A.A., Yumatov K.V. Tourism development in Kuzbass. *Russian Regions: Looking into the Future*, 2015, vol. 3, pp. 9. In Rus.
 33. *Department of Youth Policy and Sport of the Kemerovo region. Social sphere annual report* <https://news.myseldon.com/en/dossier/institution/11723123/main> (accessed 25 March 2019).
 34. *Statistical Yearbook Kuzbass*, 2009.
 35. *Culture, leisure, tourism. Statistical Yearbook Kuzbass*, 2012.
 36. *Kuzbass 2013: statistichesky sbornik* [Kuzbass. Statistical compilation, 2013]. Kemerovo, Kemerovostat Publ., 2013
 37. *Kuzbass: Statistical compilation. Tourist activity and recreation in Kuzbass: Statistical book. Tourist activity and recreation in Kuzbass: Statistical book; Development of tourism in the Kemerovo region*: Kemerovo status reports of 2015, 2016 and 2017.
 38. Chizhikova O. V Rosturizme podveli itogi realizatsii meropriyatiy programmy razvitiya turizma v 2014 [Russian national tourism agency announced results of Tourism development programme in 2014]. *Investitsii v turizm*, 2015.
 39. Freeman E.R., Wicks A.C., Parmar B. Stakeholder theory and «The Corporate Objective Revisited». *Organization Science*, 2004, vol. 15, Iss. 3, pp. 364–369.
 40. Maiden J.A. *Participation in sustainable tourism development: Stakeholders & partnership working*. UK, Cardiff University, 2008.
 41. Bramwell B., Lane B. *Tourism collaboration and partnerships politics, practice and sustainability*. Clevedon, Channel View Publications, 2000. 343 p.
 42. Byrd E.T., Gustke L.D. Identifying tourism stakeholder groups based on support for sustainable tourism development and participation in tourism activities. *Sustainable Tourism*. Ed. by F.D. Pineda. UK, WIT Press, 2004. pp. 97–108.
 43. Brokaj R. Local government's role in the sustainable tourism development of a destination. *European Scientific Journal*, 2004, vol. 10, no. 31, pp. 103–117.
 44. Kurbatova M.V., Levin S.N. Deformalizatsia pravil v sovremennoy Rossiyskoy ekonomike (na primere vzaimodeistviya vlasti i biznesa) [Deformalization of rules in contemporary Russian economy (within authority–business interaction)]. *Terraeconomica*, 2010, vol. 8 (1), pp. 27–50.
 45. Rosstat (2015). *Investitsii v osnovnoy kapital* [Investments in fixed assets]. In: Rosstat. Russian Regions. Social and Economic indices. Statistical compilation. Rosstat, Moscow. P. 1176–1177. Available at: http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/doc_2015/region/reg-pok15.pdf (accessed 25 March 2019).
 46. Nizhegorodtsev R.M., Levin S.N., Nikitenko C.M., Goosen E.V., Surtseva A.A., Sablin K.S., Goridbko N.P., Postoev R.V., Kovrigina S.V., Olisaeva L.G. *Gosudarstvenno-chastnoe partnerstvo v innovatsionnoy sfere: mirovoy opyt i perspektivy Rossii* [State-private partnership in innovation sphere: the world experience and the prospects of Russia]. Kemerovo, Sibirskaya izdatelskaya gruppa Publ., 2012. 426 p.
 47. Surtseva A.A. Social contract in modern Russia: methodology of analysis and regional aspects of formation. *Omsk Scientific Bulletin. Series «Society. History. Modernity»*, 2012, no. 1 (105), pp. 69–71.
 48. Halkier H. *Tourist destination dynamics in Russia: Tourism development and public-private partnership in four non-metropolitan destinations*. Aalborg, Aalborg University, 2016. 67 p.

Received: 10 June 2019.

Information about the authors

Liliya G. Kiriyanova, Cand. Sc., associate professor, National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University.

Anna A. Surtseva, Cand. Sc., associate professor, Kemerovo State University.

Konstantin V. Yumatov, Cand. Sc., associate professor, Kemerovo State University.

Anton A. Pyatovskiy, postgraduate student, Kemerovo State University.

УДК 330.15

НОВАЯ РОЛЬ ПРИРОДНЫХ РЕСУРСОВ: ТУРИЗМ КАК МЕХАНИЗМ «ВЫХОДА ИЗ КОЛЕИ» РОССИЙСКИХ СЫРЬЕВЫХ РЕГИОНОВ (НА ПРИМЕРЕ КУЗБАССА)

Кириянова Лилия Геннадьевна¹,
kiriyanova@tpu.ru

Сурцева Анна Александровна²,
ansokol@mail.ru

Юматов Константин Владимирович²,
yumatov@list.ru

Пятовский Антон Александрович²,
kempochta@mail.ru

¹ Национальный исследовательский Томский политехнический университет,
Россия, 635050, г. Томск, пр. Ленина, 30.

² Кемеровский государственный университет,
Россия, 650000, г. Кемерово, ул. Красная, 6.

Статья подготовлена в рамках современной междисциплинарной теории «колеи» предыдущего развития (path dependence), которая исходит из того, что текущее развитие экономики любой территории определяется ее историей, сформированными социально-экономическими институтами и структурами. Регионы развиваются в рамках «колеи» и могут попадать в «институциональные ловушки», которые удерживают экономику в рамках одной колеи. Одной из наиболее распространенных экономик, попадающих в ловушки эффекта «колеи», являются регионы, зависимые от природных ресурсов. Экономика многих «нестолличных» удаленных регионов основывается на добыче природных ресурсов – угледобыча, нефтегазовая отрасль, сельское хозяйство, лесозаготовка. Эти продукты являются сырьем, т. е. природными ресурсами, получающими минимальную обработку (добавленную стоимость) перед экспортом, а экономики данных регионов – сырьевыми. В данной статье дается ответ на вопрос – могут ли природные ресурсы стать основой экономики нового типа, может ли сырьевой регион преодолеть институциональные ловушки и перейти от экономики добычи к креативной экономике. В мировой литературе недостаточно исследований, посвященных тому, как накопленные экономические и социальные ресурсы «старой» ресурсной колеи могут быть использованы для создания новой, креативной. Представлен успешный опыт Кемеровской области о том, как новая отрасль экономики – туризм, по-новому использует не только природные ресурсы региона, но и накопленные компетенции и ресурсы добывающей отрасли. Статья показывает, что активное взаимодействие органов власти, бизнеса и университетов может вывести из «колеи» даже ресурсозависимые регионы и сформировать туристскую дестинацию.

Ключевые слова:

Эффект «колеи», ресурсозависимые регионы, туризм, формирование новой колеи развития, Кемеровская область.

Статья написана в рамках проекта «Сеть ресурсных центров по туризму», финансируемого Европейской Комиссией, программа Erasmus. Номер проекта 530750–2015-DK-JPHES.

Информация об авторах

Кириянова Л.Г., кандидат философских наук, доцент Школы инженерного предпринимательства Национального исследовательского Томского политехнического университета.

Сурцева А.А., кандидат экономических наук, доцент Кемеровского государственного университета.

Юматов К.В., кандидат исторических наук, доцент Кемеровского государственного университета.

Пятовский А.А., аспирант Кемеровского государственного университета.