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INTRODUCTION

The strategic use of branding techniques to emphasise the role of value creation in the consumption of places started to strengthen in the beginning of the 1990s as the time of the globalisation of markets was blossoming (Van den Berg and Braun 1999; Kavaratzis 2005; Zenker and Braun 2010). Places attempted to utilise marketing tools to create a distinctive approach to achieve their social and economical development goals. The expansion of branding scholarship and practices applied to places, situated place branding in the realm of marketing and brand theory (Hall 1999; Gnoth 2002; Kotler and Gertner 2002; Morgan et al. 2002; Papadopoulos and Heslop 2002; Anholt 2005).

Place is a multi-dimensional phenomenon of experiences that engages geographic location, landscape, space and time (Relph 1976). The human embodiment in a place is a translation of the social, economical, cultural and political practices that organise society, communities and markets. The use of branding principles, and their implications, affect a variety of aspects related to places, such as definitions of places, boundaries and stakeholders. It also has significant managerial implications in terms of branding practices, brand architecture and brand communication. These managerial and communicational implications assume particular contours for its implementation in places, cities, regions or countries.

This chapter firstly reviews the historical evolution of place branding in marketing scholarship; secondly, it reviews types of geographic brands distinguishing destination branding, nation branding, city branding and regional branding and their respective characteristics. Finally, it discusses place branding as a strategy for economic development.
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HISTORY AND EVOLUTION

Firat and Venkatesh (1993) assert that marketing is ‘the conscious and planned practice of signification and representation’ (p. 246). Shaped by its internal representations and nurtured by external perceptions, place branding is a strategy of communication that involves culture, economy, history and people. Papadopoulos and Heslop (2002) explain that country brands already exist in consumers’ minds. Thus, every place seems to have stereotypes that represent a particular belief or characteristic of a place’s culture (Brioschi 2006). The existing elements around a place’s name create a universe of representations, reputation and imagery. The branding practices for places take into account the collective perceptions created by the people who live in a place, the image of the products and services provided by these people, and the consumers – the visitors and outsiders who buy and experience the place.

The development of branding practices in relation to geographic locations has its roots in the concept of country-of-origin. The purpose of the ‘made in’ statements to identify the origin of the product is extended to tell consumers something about the image of the place where the product comes from (Papadopoulos 1993; Papadopoulos and Heslop 2002; Jaffe and Nebenzahl 2001). Based on the ideas of Papadopoulos (1993), Lee (2009) presents a summary of key concepts about country-of-origin images. Both authors acknowledge that research about country-of-origin concepts has appeared as an economic and political phenomenon in marketing scholarship during the middle of the 1960s (Schooler 1965; Relerson 1966). However, during the 1970s national governments started to regulate made in labels to protect national industries.

Papadopoulos (1993) organised the use of country-of-origin concepts into two periods of time according to the economic context. The first period, from 1970 to the early 1980s, is characterised by rules of country-of-origin legislation, and by the need of enforcement to protect domestic producers promoted by national governments. Groups representing producers and governments started to work together promoting local industry and developing promotional campaigns such as ‘Crafted with pride in the USA’ or ‘Think Canadian’ (Papadopoulos 1993). Companies began to emphasise place of origin characteristics as an identifier and product differentiator. The second period runs from the 1980s onwards. Governments started to act more proactively and systematically in promoting their image in international contexts through joint foreign-promotion campaigns. The trading blocs developed between countries gave more attention to the image of the countries and to the origin of products. Finally, the globalisation of markets and business has
intensified the debate about the merits and relevance of national origin identifiers (Lee 2009).

As a consequence of the globalisation of markets, manufacturers started to experience more flexibility in trading across countries, affecting the origin of products' design, production and assemblage (Jaffe and Nebenzahl 2001). Production lines began to be fragmented between places and countries according to their competitiveness in terms of price, availability of resources, and proximity to markets and consumers. In 1993, Kotler, Haider and Rein introduced the idea of strategic marketing planning for places. They suggested that places should respond to market challenges by establishing a strategic vision and market-oriented strategic planning process, and by building qualified programmes to communicate and promote their competitive advantage (Kotler et al. 1993). The proposition to enhance and promote the competitive advantages of places brings to this discussion other aspects that impact the image of places, such as geographic location, political orientation and economic and socio-cultural characteristics (Pasquier 2008).

The notion of market-oriented planning processes opens the possibilities of positioning the place in order to attract foreign direct investments (FDIs), to develop specific types of industry (tourism, services, etc.), to increase export (Kotler and Gertner 2002), to enhance public diplomacy (Anholt 2003; Mihailovich 2006), and to boost a new nationalism – such as the case of ‘Proud to be South African’ (Mihailovich 2006). These developments are based on strategic goals defined by the place or country towards repositioning or reframing an existing image and reputation portrayed by the place.

The country-of-origin concept or product-country image has moved to a new and broader level of branding places (Lee 2009). According to Papadopoulos (2004), the roots of place marketing and branding are grounded in product-country image research, or the traditional made in research, and in tourism destination image. Neither research in product-country image, including country-of-origin image, nor tourism destination image are new in marketing scholarship.

Product-country image has been researched for decades (e.g. Nagashima 1970; Bilkey and Nes 1982; Erickson et al. 1984; Johansson et al. 1985; Han and Terpstra 1988; Papadopoulos 1993; Peterson and Jolibert 1995; Nebenzahl et al. 1997; Verlegh and Steenkamp 1999). Indeed, tourism destination image has been researched for a considerable time (e.g. Echtner and Ritchie 1991, 1993; MacKay and Fesenmaier 1997; Baloglu and McCleary 1999; Gallarza et al. 2002; Gnoth 2002; Pike 2002). Both research fields, product-country image and tourism destination image, share an interest in using place images to enhance
places’ reputations to create more competiveness for products associated with them.

The importance of acknowledging research in country-of-origin, product-country image and tourism destination image is to recognise how previous research has informed and influenced current perspectives of place branding research. This previous research has influenced the design of models to access effects of country image. As stated at the beginning of this section, concepts of country-of-origin have provided the basis for branding countries and places. The knowledge of branding places has evolved and the current perspectives on branding places embrace nation branding, city branding, regional branding, destination branding and place branding.

NATION BRANDING, CITY BRANDING AND REGIONAL BRANDING

Apart from differences in terms of scale, the general idea of branding nations, cities and regions seems to be similar. They are all limited by physical boundaries, with similar forms of government and public administration, and all share a common notion of nation-state. This perception of state is clear if we think in terms of a city, which belongs to a region, and that region is part of a nation. In all countries around the world, the relationships between these three elements are regulated in terms of political, administrative, financial and legal systems. Additionally, the relationships between these places bond together the ethos of a nation, a region and a city. Ultimately, these relationships bind geographic locations to communities and citizens.

The concepts of nation brand and country brand are used interchangeably in branding literature (Lee 2009). The terminology country branding and country image has been applied by Jaffe and Nebenzahl (2001), Kotler and Gertner (2002), Gilmore (2002) and Papadopoulos and Heslop (2002). The terminology nation branding, according to Kavaratzis (2005), became a ‘trend within the marketing discipline and especially within the circles of marketing consultants’ (p. 333) (e.g. Anholt 2002; Ham 2001), and amongst academics (Endzina and Luneva 2004; Quelch and Jocz 2005; Fan 2006; Dzenovska 2005; Dinnie 2008; Lee 2009). Both terminologies embrace similar concepts by using a central idea and concern to create a strategic positioning of the country’s image, including historical, political, economic and cultural aspects (Quelch and Jocz 2005; Fan 2006). Dinnie (2008) defines nation brand as, ‘the unique, multi-dimensional blend of elements that provide the nation with culturally grounded differ-
entiation and relevance for all its target audiences’ (p. 14). De Chernatony (2008) sees a nation brand as ‘a cluster of values that enable a nation to make a promise about a unique and welcome experience’ (p. 16), highlighting the susceptibility of these values to governmental, social, political and economical interactions. Lee (2009) emphasises that the key concept of nation branding has been based on a tripod of country-of-origin, place development and public diplomacy. The definitions of country brand and nation brand are summarised in Table 1.1.

Despite similar definitions and purposes as presented above, the conception of nation branding seems to be embedded within the idea of state. This assumes the complexity of an official unit that integrates people throughout citizenship status, common language and shared history organised by a political system. Nation branding seems to be an instrument to coordinate and integrate these elements in order to create a consistent communication message that would, amongst other tasks, assist with economic development. This understanding has placed nation branding on the agenda for diplomatic affairs and public and international relationship building between nations. The perspective is reinforced when managerial issues relating to nation branding are considered government technology and strategy (Dzenovska 2005), and the responsibilities for which are attributed to central governments and political leaders (Anholt 2005; Olins 2004).

NATIONAL IDENTITY

The extant branding literature suggests the representation of an identity (corporate, product) as a key factor in building brand strategy. The representation of national identity is the starting point from which a set of values and meanings are developed. National identity is the fundamental construct in nation branding because it is the foundation and core of a national brand (Dinnie 2008), but it is also subject to branding strategies and brand (re)positioning. In this context, branding is understood as an instrument of remoulding and re-imaging national identity (Hall 2002; Olins 1999). It is considered a helpful tool to align facets of the same supra identity.

Any national identity is diverse, dynamic and unique, created by a variety of features such as geographic location, history and culture. The variety of features that strengthen the uniqueness of the nation, creates challenges to reconcile differences (Tolz 1998). National identity is a mosaic of many singular identities manifested by the different cultures of each part of the nation. As a dynamic entity, the nation provides a terrain
### Table 1.1  Similar definitions of country brand and nation brand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Definition of country brand</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Definition of nation brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kotler and Gertner 2002</td>
<td>‘Country image results from its geography, history, proclamations, art and music, famous citizens and other features.’ (p. 251)</td>
<td>Anholt 2007</td>
<td>The systematic process of aligning the actions, behaviours, investments, innovations and communications of a country around a clear strategy for achieving a strengthened competitive identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmore 2002</td>
<td>‘...the core of a country’s brand must capture the spirit of its people and how it can be developed into a brand positioning after consideration of the four essential factors – macro trends, target groups, competitors, and core competences.’ (p. 281)</td>
<td>Dinnie 2008</td>
<td>The unique, multi-dimensional blend of elements that provide the nation with culturally grounded differentiation and relevance for all of its target audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho 2004</td>
<td>Country brand value is a long-term outcome influenced by country image and nation brand strategy.</td>
<td>Dinnie 2008</td>
<td>A very complex brand identity that is the result of a specific national reality, its perceptions and evaluations by many different internal and external stakeholders (brand images), and a specific overall reputation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell and Freire 2004</td>
<td>Countries are functionally diverse and they should leverage the emotive or representational parts of their brand identities.</td>
<td>Lee 2009</td>
<td>Nation branding aims to set the strategic approach that applies to innovating the economic, social, political and cultural realities and to align that approach to a strategy for improving national reputation and image.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: author’s own source.*
where individual and collective selves interact and negotiate a supra identity where, potentially, everyone is connected (Verdery 1993; Dzenovska 2005).

REGIONAL BRANDING

The literature on place branding approaches regional branding as processes driven by specific motivations, predominately related to two main domains: tourism destination and the wine industry (Bruwer and House 2003; Johnson and Bruwer 2007). In terms of destination branding, Caldwell and Freire (2004) analysed regional branding particularly related to travel and tourism marketing. The authors characterise regional brand by combining two dimensions: representational and functional. A representational dimension of a region is about attributes linked to the individual’s self-expression, for example how musicians and painters represent the place. The functional dimension embraces utilitarian aspects of the region, for example climate, landscape, landmarks and specific experiences.

Quite often, a regional branding strategy combines two or more places in the same region or two or more attractions, for example the Gold Coast in Australia, or the French Riviera. The elements and attributes that influence the image of a country are different from those that affect a region and city. Regional branding, however, tends to be facilitated by a more homogeneous cultural background and identity. In fact, regional branding seems to have a stronger relationship with the land as a metaphor for identity (Cayla and Eckhardt 2008), because regions are much more homogeneous in terms of human and natural factors in contrast to countries.

In the wine industry, for example, this homogeneity seems to be of fundamental importance. Wine is one of the agricultural products that can develop a close and distinct relationship with its geographic place of origin (Bruwer and Johnson 2010), particularly through the concept of terroir. Regional branding not only allows the possibility of differentiating a product, but allows consumers to identify the region of origin. According to Johnson and Bruwer (2007), regional brands are used by consumers as ‘cues, information and images in their assessment and evaluation of comparative wine labels’ (p. 295).

Regional branding is not only based on core competences of a region, but also it is based on the collaboration of many stakeholders who operate in that region. Further, as it creates a positive image of the region to achieve marketing goals, regional branding has the potential to enhance
a region’s identity and ethos by functioning as a cultural intermediary (Bourdieu 1984) creating a form of collective and regional consciousness (Cayla and Eckhardt 2008).

CITY BRANDING

Cities became the most prominent geographic location to adopt marketing tools to promote themselves, and to generate what Harvey (1990) describes as a proliferation of urban representations (e.g. I love New York, I Am-sterdam, etc). Virgo and de Chernatony (2006) argue that ‘cities have become major economic entities on an international stage, [. . .] cities became increasingly responsible for their own destinies as governments are unwilling to subsidise them’ (p. 381). The efforts to promote and reposition the image of cities have translated into city branding practices (Hospers 2003; Trueman et al. 2004; Kavaratzis 2005, 2009; Anholt 2006; Ashworth and Kavaratzis 2009). Strategic branding plans have been developed to reframe the image of the cities and to boost a spirit of a renaissance, which includes rebuilding the urban environment, and reinvigorating the sense of pride and identity amongst residents (Gilmore 2002; Virgo and de Chernatony 2006). Such efforts are designed to present cities as places in which to live, invest and visit.

Research in city branding has often been focused on two fields: tourist destinations (Kotler et al. 1993; Caldwell and Freire 2004; Hankinson 2004) and urban regeneration (Trueman et al. 2004, 2008; Virgo and de Chernatony 2006). The use of branding as a managerial instrument to renovate the urban environment has changed purpose over the years. It started with post-industrial cities with a specific purpose to rebuild and reanimate cities that were facing decay, particularly cities, such as Bradford and Manchester in the United Kingdom (Trueman et al. 2004, 2008). Then, cities started to re-plan their economies to adopt a more service-oriented economy with a focus on cultural production as an urban survival strategy (Harvey 1989a; Garcia 2004). Mega-events of sports and entertainment became powerful drivers for revenues. The best example is Barcelona in Spain, which not only renovated its urban fabric for the Olympic Games in 1992, but also took that opportunity to enhance and promulgate the Catalan culture, promoting a vibrant image of the city and reawakening the sense of pride amongst the residents (Gilmore 2002).

Indeed, the Olympic Games have been functioning as an event-led branding exercise for many cities. According to Gold and Gold (2008), ‘the prestige of the Olympics and the sustained attention that they attract provides unparalleled opportunities to make a statement on the world
stage’ (p. 301). A positive alliance can be established between mega-events, cultural projects and city branding to accomplish a successful programme of urban regeneration. Many cities followed the Catalan recipe; however, not many have had the same success. Greece spent approximately €9 bn on the Olympic Games in Athens in 2004. A decade after the event, many of its once-gleaming Olympic venues now lie abandoned and it is questioned if and how the city has benefited from the multi-billion-dollar event. A similar story has been experienced by Beijing. Post-Olympic strategy plans seem to be crucial for a long-term legacy and these have been a challenge for both Sydney and London.

While public investments to host the Olympics seemed to be well justified to attract the world’s attention for the city and to present its advantages in an inter-cities global competition, the legacy of such significant public investment became a major concern. The legacy and its management is now an element of place making. Planning legacy is equally important as planning the games experience itself. Rio 2016 innovated when the opening ceremony brought up global warming as a theme and fifteen thousand seeds were planted by athletes.

Sports-led and cultural events give emotional fuel to cities in a broad sense, not only for urban regeneration, but also for tourism, and especially as an opportunity to portray an authentic image of the place and its people. A smaller but successful example is the Hay Festival in Hay-on-Wye in Wales. The literary festival shaped the identity of the small town and projected it worldwide. Now, the Hay Festival is a product replicated in many cities. Ultimately, branding cities with a decaying economy, in large measure, depends on the involvement of the local community who owns the identity of the place. Urban regeneration triggered by events, or triggered by long-term programmes based on the service-economy and cultural production, should attempt to recognise the ethos of the city towards developing sustainable tools to portray a city brand image.

The purposes of branding cities either to regenerate the urban fabric or to enhance tourism should lead to a more holistic development of cities. The upgrading of the city environment as a place to live, work and visit is the purpose of city branding. There is an increasing understanding that city branding is active within city planning and management activities and under the responsibility of the local authority or city council (Hospers 2003; Anholt 2006; Ashworth and Kavaratzis 2009). The characteristics of each type of geographic brand are presented in Table 1.2.

The characteristics of geographic brands might vary based on place-scale and on the complexity of branding tasks that require different levels of partnerships and collaboration. Place-scale seems to amplify or diminish branding complexity. For example, nation branding and city branding
## Table 1.2 Geographic brands’ characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of geographic brand</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Nation branding          | - Concerned with creating a strategic positioning of the country’s image, including historical, political, economic and cultural aspects  
- Motivations: FDI, export, tourism, public diplomacy and international affairs  
- Considered to be a government tool and strategy, and attributed to central governments and political leaders | Anholt 2003, 2005  
Olins 2004  
Kotler and Gertner 2002  
Gilmore 2002  
Papadopoulos and Heslop 2002  
Cho 2004  
Jaffe and Nebenzahl 2001  
Fan 2006  
Quelch and Jocz 2005  
Dinnie 2008  
Dzenovska 2005 |
| Regional branding        | - Branding processes are driven by a specific motivation (e.g. tourism, wine industry)  
- Branding strategy combines two or more places in the same region or two or more attractions  
- Tends to be facilitated by a more homogeneous cultural background and identity  
- Based on core competences of a region  
- Requires a high level of collaboration between the stakeholders who operate in that region | Bruwer and House 2003  
Johnson and Bruwer 2007  
Rasmussen and Lockshin 1999  
Bruwer and Johnson 2010 |
| City branding            | - Purpose of tourist destinations and urban regeneration  
- Branding as a managerial instrument of city planning  
- Relies on corporate branding techniques  
- General belief that branding process should be driven by the local authority  
- Requires the creation of partnerships amongst all stakeholders within city, including local people | Kotler et al. 1993  
Gilmore 2002  
Caldwell and Freire 2004  
Virgo and de Chernatony 2006  
Ashworth 2001  
Hospers 2003  
Trueman et al. 2004  
Kavaratzis 2005  
Kavaratzis and Ashworth 2005  
Ashworth and Kavaratzis 2009 |
seem to have very similar characteristics in terms of the approach to branding as governmental and managerial strategic tools. These managerial and strategic techniques are, however, simplified for branding cities, because cities don’t deal with international affairs and diplomacy.

In terms of collaboration and partnerships, regional branding seems to adopt more direct, horizontal and less complex types of partnerships. For example, the basis for collaboration to promote a region as a wine producer will be built and will rely on partnerships between wineries. In this case, complexity is reduced, as wineries share the same purpose, which is more likely to create a positive alliance between wineries’ stakeholders. In fact, other types of partnerships (e.g. with the hospitality industry) will help to enhance the ecotourism experience as a regional destination, creating benefits to the regional image and reputation. These collaborations with the hospitality industry, however, will not matter for wine exports from that same region. It means that motivations for regional partnerships found their base in collaboration between peers, which can be considered as horizontal collaborations and partnerships.

City branding, on the other hand, demands different levels of partnerships between different types of industries and stakeholders. It requires a network of collaboration more likely to embrace vertical and horizontal partnerships. In reality, the types of partnership amongst stakeholders may vary according to the type of geographic brand. Similarly, nation, region and city branding embrace ideas of collaboration, cultural background, place identity, and the need for purposes or motivations to drive branding activities. Indeed, all types of geographic brands are places and destinations embedded in their cultural and place identity, which will be discussed further on in this book. Cities, regions and nations become destinations when the brand purpose is to attract visitors or immigrants to the place.

Table 1.2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of geographic brand</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Accommodating a variety of different interests amongst stakeholders is a complex task</td>
<td>Anholt 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Opportunities for event-led branding or rebranding for many cities</td>
<td>Hankinson 2001, 2004, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trueman, Cornelius and Killingbeck-Widdup 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: author’s own source.
DESTINATION BRANDING

Destination is the place designated as the end of a journey. The motivations to pursue the journey may vary in terms of a destination to visit, to immigrate, to invest in or to study in (Hankinson 2005). Destination provides one way of looking at a place. Largely based on the necessity to achieve economic growth through differentiation, the scope of destination marketing includes efforts to attract income. Increasing tourism and expanding the hospitality industry are central to these endeavours (Kavaratzis and Ashworth 2005). Destination marketing refers more specifically to the application of marketing tools to lever the destination experience and to maximise benefits for the destination (Gnoth 2007). Managing and marketing destinations requires the orchestration of a number of marketing activities, the development and promotion of services and the provision of a variety of different tourism products to deliver the travel experience. Amongst these marketing activities, positioning the destination and portraying the destination image to attract visitors are of major importance.

The significance of destination imagery to boost the tourism industry has created a shift towards branding destinations (Kavaratzis 2005). For Hankinson (2004), destination branding is in the realm of place branding, but related to tourism marketing. As such, it focuses on vacation tourists and business tourists. Therefore, destination branding is the set of marketing tools that supports branding activities not only to identify and differentiate a destination, but also to communicate a place’s image to attract tourists to experience certain features and/or characteristics of that particular destination (Blain et al. 2005).

The concepts of destination branding and tourism destination image are probably the most developed within place branding theory, largely because they find roots in tourism industry studies. Gnoth (2002) explains that a successful destination brand depends on the synergy of the functional, experiential and symbolic levels of the tourism experience. Recognising these three different spectrums of the tourism experience to inform the destination brand image, Gnoth (2002) brings to the concept of destination branding ideas of cluster and collaboration between stakeholders (functional), tourists’ expectations and satisfaction (experiential), and visitors’ perceptions about a place’s culture and imagery (symbolic). This approach leads to an understanding of branding as an association of interwoven experiences.

The combination of attributes that provides the destination experience is seen by Morgan et al. (2003) as ‘a composite product consisting of a bundle of different components, encompassing accommodation,
hospitability, attractions, arts, entertainment, culture, heritage and the natural environment’ (p.287). The orchestration of different activities requires the collaboration and commitment of agencies and stakeholders from public and private sectors. In fact, destination branding relies on a continuous process of multi-stakeholder, collaborative decision-making, which demands a long-term and holistic management strategy (Ekinci et al. 2007).

The destination branding techniques include ideas to create a distinctive and attractive place image and to promote a satisfactory experience for visitors. The first idea of portraying a distinctive image is based on highlighting a place’s core competences and identity, which is very much related to portraying a place’s culture (Tasci and Kozak 2006). The second idea of delivering the place’s experience relies on the services provided by the local tourism and hospitality industry. Destination marketing involves a combination of services (from accommodation, tourist attractions to transportation) offered in a tourism product – which culminate in the travel experience (Perdue and Pitegoff 1990). Destination branding involves a liaison between the travel experience and the places’ culture and identity, with the purpose of designing a destination brand image.

The terms destination branding and place branding have been used interchangeably by many authors (Hankinson 2001, 2004, 2005; Gnoth 2002, 2007; Morgan et al. 2002). Indeed, the application of both terminologies occurs even when the discussion refers to a destination specifically, because it is not possible to separate the destination from the place. The destination is part of the place from the perspective of the person who is travelling to it. Destination branding is the branding activity that positions places to be visited and consumed. Fundamental for tourism destination branding strategy are the cultural characteristics of the place and the people who live in that place.

PLACE BRANDING AS STRATEGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

Branding places is a strategic approach for development that offers an array of planning tools and management strategies (Ashworth et al. 2015; Warnaby et al. 2015). Based on a place’s assets and resources, it relies enormously on the interactions and exchanges of values created and owned by all stakeholders (place’s stakeholders includes local community, investors and visitors) (Aitken and Campelo 2011). Collaboration is a key requirement for accruing value, and as discussed above, it may vary
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in complexity, but it is fundamental to set goals, to enhance assets and to bring stakeholders together.

Inspired by the Marxist idea of capital accumulation and by its development in social sciences by Bourdieu (1977), Gnoth (2007) recognised the different types of capital as places’ dimensions that influence and are determinant to create places’ experiences. The types of capital are cultural, social, natural and economic. These capitals represent a place’s assets: an accumulation of resources (natural, cultural, social) composed of the physical and historical features, and by interactions and interchanges that constantly rejuvenate them over time. By rearranging the place brand’s dimensions into types of capital, Gnoth (2007) brings the concepts of values: value-in-use and value-in-exchange. While the value-in-use is pursued by residents and visitors in living and experiencing the place, the value-in-exchange matters for business growth and economic development.

Lately, two features have been shaping the field:

1. The trend of urban conglomerations. According to the United Nations, in 2050 the urban population will be around 6 billion people. It means that we will have super cities and city branding tools will need to be refined and redeveloped.
2. The emergence of economic areas of activities, such as creative economy, circular economy, sacred economy and economy of culture, that are restructuring economic policies and initiatives.

The segmented kinds of economies matter for urban regeneration and, consequently, for city branding. Urban sustainability is a crucial issue for humankind and it has an important role in the global economic agenda. Cities started to shift from managerial leadership to more entrepreneurial governance due to the need to expand resources and income (Harvey 1989b). In the realm of what the author called the new ‘urban entrepreneurialism’, place branding is a tool for planning and government, which should lead to economic development. The challenge has been how to offer experiences for a such diverse audience (from residents to investors) able to accrue both value-in-use and value-in-exchange. Experiences are mentioned here in a broad sense, not only for tourism purposes. As an instrument of government planning, branding comes together with other initiatives of public management such as infrastructure, education, safety, positive business environment, public–private partnerships and local population involvement. And it is an important item for creative cities policies, especially in large cities (Evans 2012).

Kavaratzis (2005) argues the need for integrated place management. The first important task is to understand what place branding is not: it is...
not just a promotional campaign. Place branding is a strategy to identify market opportunities and to implement relevant economic tactics able to foster local assets.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has examined the origins of branding places and the evolution of brands in terms of geographic locations and purposes. Inside marketing scholarship, place branding finds roots in country-of-origin theory and tourism destination image. The application of marketing theory evolved towards geographic domains, adopting specific nomenclature and definitions. The geographic brands adopt particular strategies depending upon motivations and goals. In common, national, regional and city brands have the need of collaboration and the challenge of reconciling many stakeholders. Albeit marketing techniques may vary from one type of geographic branding to another, the underlying aim remains to attain some kind of social and economic development. Place branding comes together with other initiatives of public management such as infrastructure, education, safeness, positive business environment, public–private partnerships and local population involvement. It is a strategy of public planning and governance able to build up both value-in-use and value-in-exchange for a place’s stakeholders.
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