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Abstract

Three branches of research in terms of “Place” are studied on the basis of a marketing-oriented approach underlining the relevance of the relational network and strategic planning. Place Brand and Place Management are included in the Place Marketing global strategy, identifying a management process that allows local authorities to find a unique strategy to plan the process of value creation in place through the development of network of services and economic activities, with the goal of value creation for the stakeholders of the location.
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1. Introduction and methodology

The international literature shows terminological and conceptual differences in terms of place marketing, place management, place brand, and evolutionary trends in studies of applied place marketing. Although the approaches of many studies of place marketing topics have their common roots in the basic principles of marketing, management, and network analysis, several pieces of research underline the difficulties and inappropriateness of these approaches to the understanding of place marketing through traditional paradigms typical of enterprise studies; in this sense, it is certainly inconsistent to assimilate place marketing to enterprise marketing, considering the evolutionary dynamics of the complexity of place. In recent years, international research has produced surveys of various study areas that constantly combine the comparative approaches of new theoretical formulations with best practices on the international level: the diversity of places analyzed and communities observed has given us a significant number of benchmarks, including linear and shared solutions, some of which are vastly different interpretations in terms of organizational models and managerial implications. Place brand themes, for example, are still a subject of study and definition on the international level, even though the academic community has “produced” a way to define a rigorous conceptual framework for properly approaching the definition of the phenomenon. Much complexity certainly remains and study spaces are still open that point out difficulties in implementation, especially in the monitoring of results and the identification of solutions.

In recent years, the effort of the research community has allowed some locations to build and develop a globally recognized image, thanks to planning and participatory planning with policymaker and stakeholders, and through the choice of the correct direction of information and correspondence between what is being planned and what users in the broad sense observe.

The Italian situation in place marketing has a long tradition that has involved several academic fields in its studies and research, with forms of representation and experience, cases and situations often distant from the theoretical principles modeled in the literature. On all levels of Italian local administration, Place Marketing is de facto interpreted as a pure and simple tool of communication for conveying to overseas the place’s potential and to attract potential investors within the country, and capable of ensuring employment and economic development. Sometimes it happens that Place Marketing is confused with Destination Marketing, an area often belittled and reduced to tourist communication or traditional advertising by those who implement the strategies.

In order to overcome the logic of valuing exclusively communication and to begin to identify the contribution of thoughts that allow place marketing and management evolutionary trends to be traced, this paper promotes an integrated approach to the reference literature on Place Marketing, Place Brand, and Place Management. It also proposes a focus on the role of relationships between local stakeholders (valued and summarized in the Place Brand) and shared place planning (a prerogative of Place Management) with a perception of generating economic value and increasing quality of life (the primary objective of Place Marketing plans).

Research objectives and original ideas were identified through an analysis of the literature on the subject of place marketing and management. Specifically, at least 3 characteristic currents can be seen form the analysis. These share the development of a relationship between local stakeholders, and the local policymaker. Internationally recognized designations include Place Marketing, Brand Place, and Place Management. These currents are analyzed generally using a management approach and the underlying necessary connections to the relationships in the stakeholders network. As is clear, these take the form of a series of relationships and interactions capable of determining the development of an area. So far, three approaches have been studied individually, and in this work (without the
presumption of completeness), it is attempted to propose an integrated approach by first enunciating in detail the main contributions of research and the international point of view on the subjects of place marketing, place brand, and place management, following considerations for the improvement of the place-value generation process by proposing a management model that would allow the generation of value in a territorial area through the strengthening of the relationship between stakeholders and through shared planning and increasing the perception of value for stakeholders.

2. Place Marketing, Place Brand, and Place Management: methodology and literature

A. Place marketing

The approach to place marketing is considered to be very complex because of the variety and variability of the object under study, identifiable in the place (a complex and changeable entity), in government, in the governance of the place, and in territorial stakeholder (those that are interested in the place and in its evolutionary trends, whether they be a resident of a geographic area, tourists, domestic firms, or external investors).

Several authors have participated in the development of the literature since the early 1990s when the role of pure promotion of urban facilities was first studied (Ave, 1993; Borchert, 1994).

Other authors have defined a theoretical framework that can be referred to a more strategic approach (Ashworth and Voogd, 1990; Kotler, Haider and Rein, 1993; Kotler et al., 1999), giving importance to the study of the promotional-communication role for places. The need “to promote” places comes from the need to economically develop shared by countries involved in the process of renewal, caused by globalization and the industrial crisis. The development of foreign investment and the absence of real strategies for the progress of places also makes necessary methods based on communication.

The approach to place marketing has identified principles and multidisciplinary framework, including also studies attributable to the nonprofit sector. Some authors have underlined the possibility of apply marketing management paradigms to nonprofit enterprises, too, supporting the approach of marketing applications to places . Moore (1995) has contributed to the evolution of place marketing thought, which he attributes to the role of studying the instruments of exchange dynamics with the primary stakeholders that are internal to the place—seen as a public asset. He indicates that it is possible to produce public value without profit goals, with the consequent purposes of value creation. One of these elements establishes that place marketing contributes to improving the quality of life of residents and primary stakeholders. Lambin (2004) in particular connects place marketing with social marketing studies in the broad sense. Generally, place marketing is influenced by social marketing, public marketing (mainly nonprofit), business-to-business marketing, business-to-consumer marketing, relationship marketing, and others.

The goal of relationship marketing is to manage relations in the market so as to achieve sustainable competitive advantage; the connection between place marketing and relationship marketing lies in the concept of “relation,” in particular, in the long-term relation (Hakansson and Wootz, 1979; Berry, 1983; Ferrero, 1992). This is so because relational and territorial dimensions tend to both create and manage long-term relationships between the different actors involved. In this sense, it is appropriate to introduce the concepts of trust and mutual dependence, which are considered very important in “model of maintenance of relationship” (Bendapudi and Berry, 1997) because they generate cooperation, dependence, unity, and involvement. These concepts are integrated into the study of place dynamics characterized by the relationship network between stakeholders, by policymakers, and by place-marketing strategies. The real involvement of local actors in the overall marketing strategy allows them to transfer from upstream to downstream planned actions and so to realize activities concretely.
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In order to simplify and to approach the paradigm of place marketing, it is important to consider the distinction proposed by Corsico who identifies the city—and in general the place—in terms of three different but complementary aspects coherent with the concept of restart of place: in particular, Corsico talks about the enterprise city, the market city, and the commodity city. In the first case (the enterprise city), the place is the location of operational marketing actions, and this interpretation is supported by a large part of the Italian literature: “the existence of hypercompetitive and global dynamics and of exchange relationships between the place and the stakeholder justifies the use of the analogy of place as a firm and the implementation of marketing strategies for managing the place” (Ancarani and Valdani, 2000). In this sense, the authors underlined three types of analogies between firm and place:

1. The satisfaction of multiple stakeholders’ interests: as in enterprise, those who govern the place must know the different actors and must find a point of contact in order to reduce differences;
2. The presence of current and potential customers/market: it is important to segment the market in order to define the reference target (for example, external and internal customers, those who are interested in material and nonmaterial aspects, and so on) and then to establish competitive positioning;
3. Exchange processes: in order to offer attractive assets and services, it is necessary to aim at the goals of customer satisfaction and value creation for stakeholders.

In order to borrow the enterprise approach to place, the authors want to identify the type of enterprise that is most appropriate for the analogies hypothesized: the process of value creation for places is based on resources, expertise, and intangible capabilities (Conner and Prahalad, 1996; Wernerfelt, 1995; Grant, 1991; Penrose, 1959). The model to be taken as reference might thus be the postfordist model.

In this perspective, the concept of networking (Ford, Gadde, Håkansson, and Snehota, 2002) is very important and forms the basis of relationship marketing. In this sense, place marketing support relationships and exchange in the place, and is integrated into local specificity in broader the economic and sociocultural circuit (external networking). At the same time, it begins functional interactions between current and new markets and the primary stakeholders (internal networking).

Supposing an analogy between enterprise and place, there are some basic aspects in common (market, policymaker, property, customer, and provider) that allow the correct interpretation of place. In regards to market, each enterprise should operate in the sector in which it believes it can achieve competitive advantages, and it should capitalize on its expertise and resources in order to achieve better performance than its competitors (Porter, 1985). In this case, the place should identify a vocation, its inclinations, and should value the physical resources, capabilities, and specializations that over time it has developed in order to differentiate itself from others. Concerning ownership, a public company is indicated, as place belongs to those who now and in the future have an interest in that place.

The governance body of a place signifies the local governmental authorities (both in voluntary and associative form) recognized as interest groups that work in the place; the latter can be categorized as “customers” of the place, but in each case, they play an active role because they represent those who have “pseudoproperty” and through the democratic process of voting for policies select the governance body. The satisfaction of residents is one of the primary goals to be achieved, and the governance body obtains satisfaction directly through solutions that improve the quality of life, and indirectly from an atmosphere of serenity and order. In this way, diseconomies within the community are reduced, and consequently there is an increase in satisfaction that will be perceived by all actors of the place through the network effect. In the analogy with enterprise organizations, it is possible to consider the
presence of a human resources category that enables all type of resources to achieve any compensation (salary, incentive, benefits, career possibility, etc.). Human resources are to the enterprise what those who are located in a place (or who frequent it for other reasons—for work, study, recreation, volunteering, sport, etc.) in order to exchange utility are to the place.

In the opinion of the author, the analogies with enterprise system are difficult to sustain, because a large number of interpretative simplifications are employed: the reality of place is subjected to competitive forces that can be denominated in different ways, depending on the moment when they are analyzed and on the relationship that they have with local stakeholders.

In Corsico’s interpretation, place is considered as a reality where opportunities occur for exchange and, in the specific case of the city, several stakeholders communicate and exchange opinions to reach an agreement about future development. Everything is left to free organization and for events to naturally and uncontrollably evolve (or not, as the case may be). In this case, there is thus no unitary control and no strategy to monitor. In the concept of the commodity city, place is considered as a product, an object of exchange and marketing strategy; it is managed as an enterprise that uses all the available tools to achieve goals and competitive advantages.

In this work, place is identified as a subject, and it may be relevant to use the viable systems approach. The entity of place, lacking rigorous, marketing-oriented planning, would risk losing the opportunity to involve all potentialities, losing sight of the goal of value creation.

Ashworth and Voogd (1990), as well as Van den Berg and Braun (1999), suggest studying place on three levels: on the first level are the individual firms in the place; on the second level, we can find the companies in clusters; on the third level is the entity of the holistic place product. This third level is the metaphor of the place as a holistic entity, in which the value of the complete system is greater than the sum of the individual parts that compose the system. The parts of the system are the goods, services, companies, and local authorities of the place. In this scenario, place marketing is a tool in place planning.

In this case, place as a “subject” will have a governance body capable of systematizing, planning, and monitoring the elements of the place in order to develop a specific identity complying with tradition, consciousness of development, and the strengthening of competitive advantages, which are necessarily accountable to value creation and value diffusion. If we talk about the enterprise city, or about a more limited place where place marketing plans similar to general strategy do not exist, then place marketing will coincide with urban marketing.

Because of its complex features, place cannot be considered an object of a model or of a univocal marketing approach. Place is characterized by complexity, variety, and variability, and so it is very difficult to define its boundary on account of the changes that occur in the place element over time. Increasing the extent of a place increases the difficulties of the governance body in defining strategic guidelines for the development. If the governance body is able to recognize and understand variability, then the development opportunities will be greater.

On the subject of the place-marketing-oriented approach, Gilodi and Van den Berg insist that place cannot be assimilated tout court to enterprise, but should be managed like enterprise (Gilodi, 2004; Van den Berg, 1990)—that is, as an enterprise and with a marketing-oriented approach. In fact, Gualtri, Vicari, and Fiocca (1999) affirm that marketing values, given their flexibility, are applicable in new areas, including far from enterprise, within just the mentioned limits.

In the author’s opinion, place marketing (Figure 1) contributes to the value creation of the place, first of all for primary stakeholders (local enterprises and residents) with the aim of improving quality of life through the development of knowledge and the generation of culture, increasing the possibility of manage place with marketing-oriented approach and beginning the process of cooperation with other territorial areas. Place marketing identifies a dynamic positioning and general strategies that define reference
areas for marketing strategies. In this sense, although place marketing is applied to large areas—for example nations—it is possible to consider place marketing regarding place as being composed of contiguous geographic spaces characterized by cultural, economic, and social homogeneity—identified by the stable presence of relationship, interactions, and exchanges of information flow between subjects—and communities, and enterprise.

**B. Place brand**

The concept of the place brand has in recent years received more attention from authors writing on place: some are interested in the comparison between product/service brands and destination brands (Cai, 2002; Kavaratzis and Ashworth, 2005; Parkerson and Saunders, 2005), others in the comparison between corporate branding and brand cities (Kavaratzis, 2004; Trueman, Klemm, and Giroud, 2004), others in place branding and positioning (Gilmore, 2002a and 2002b), and others still between generation and the regeneration of place image (Curtis, 2001; Hall, 2004). Ashworth (2010), Hankinson (2004,2005) and Kavaratzis (2008) underline the importance of the place brand concept and are interested in the state-of-the-art of reference literature, stressing the limits of some studies in the matter of place brand. From this, the study of place brand relationship networks is relevant.

Generally, scholars have proposed in some works to understand, through best practices, the best means of applying theoretical models in the complex reality of place, cities, and community. In this work the contributions that have defined the characteristics of place brand are analyzed. Ashworth, Hankinson, and Kavaratzis maintain that places can be conceptualized into recognizable brands, and that awareness of them is developed due to the intervention of a few clear target groups, each of which has different needs that define the distinctive features of place, and thus, the image of the place—that is difficult to identify if the number of target group is high. When there is a multiplicity of groups, preferences, and nonhomogeneous needs, it is difficult to realize the place brand that is appropriate with place positioning.

Some authors, for example Warnaby and Medway (2008), have studied the effects on place of negative events and cases that, over time, have contributed to an awareness of place according to a particular type of image. In particular, in their case study on “perverse place marketing,” they affirm that is possible to gain advantages through the diffusion of place negativity; so place image contributes to defining the place brand that is able to produce value over time.

Place brand is a result of clear positioning, image, and place features: the greater the dimensions of the place, the smaller will be the possibilities of define a place brand and diffusing it among stakeholders. It may be easier to identify the concept of a place brand with city realities, because its border delineates a more limited space than a nation. In this sense, the network should be characterized by a boundary that is well defined through relationships established between the subjects that belong to it—stakeholders and enterprises. To this end, place brand represents the community goals explained in the place marketing strategy. Hankinson (2004) stresses the importance of relationships and behaviors among stakeholders and the coherence between the worlds and attributes evoked by the brand and the specific place reality. By identifying the term “Core Brands” with three elements (personality, positioning, and reality), he indicates the existence of a place identity that contributes to define the place brand through a relationship network of local stakeholders. The concept of necessary connection between reality and place recalls a strategic perspective, also supported by Allen (2007), that detects a need for coherence between what is being conveyed by the place brand and what actually corresponds to it in the area—coherence is required between marketing planning, promotion, and tangible results.

The literature analysis indicates the nature of the place brand characterized by image, identity, marketing-oriented approach, and the valorization of stakeholder relationships. In the place of marketing strategy, place brand has the role of contributing to value creation by strengthening the stakeholder
relationships; through place branding, it is possible to identify a country, a region, and in general a territorial area as a construct that contains functional, emotional, relational and strategic elements that help to define an image in users’ minds. In this way, it is possible to generate the conditions necessary to identify a positioning, and possibly to measure it and control it over time, characterizing it in parallel with the place mission and vision.

C. Place management

Place management is an approach to studying management modes, effects, and innovative models of place development. The theme is close to that of studies on the urban environment, architecture, sociology, management, economic geography, and other areas of research, but the approaches chosen in this paper concern the works of authors who have focused on the concept of an integrated approach to place redevelopment, with particular reference to central and peripheral urban environments. We refer specifically to the work of Parker (2008), which concentrates on the need to identify management approaches and tools for the renewal of place and on improving quality of life, with a focus on intervention planning in urban areas and the sharing of the interventions with the greatest number of stakeholders. Stuart-Weeks (1998) and Walsh (2001) defined the theoretical and practical approach to place management, understood in its multiplicity of meanings and characterized by and as “the process of making better places.” Place management—although it is a discipline comprehensible only through interdisciplinary approaches—proposes focusing on the study of social relationships, on the impact and results of urban interventions, and on the population’s reactions to urban development plans.

In place management, the study of human and organizational capital is of great importance. Human capital is a synthesis of the individual resources (experience, knowledge, skills) of those who live in the place (administrators, businesses, residents, and others). Organizational capital is identified in the repetition of operational activities refined over time: they are two intangibles that—along with relational capital (knowledge, relationships, agreements, and so on)—contribute to generating hopefully positive relationships with local stakeholders over time. This virtuous circle, at different levels generates an increase in the quality of life, which in turn enhances intangible assets and promotes place value creation. Place management, therefore, is a tool available to government bodies that provides instruments for defining and implementing the overall marketing strategy and is configured as a management approach that is also capable of implementing operational marketing policies.

Place management contributes to the successful realization of policies established in the place marketing mix, because the principles of place management allow a shared and participative approach to all interventions on place. Place managers, at all levels, will follow a management schema based on respect for a strategic line, to reach sustainable development and with attention on planning that has been developed according to a shared logic—the coplanning of interventions and participative planning—that is able to generate results repeating over the long and medium term.

To identify the evolutionary trajectories of value creation in places, collective participation among public, private, and other stakeholders is crucial (Fontana, 2011). In particular, as argued by Spaziante and Pugliese (2003), it is necessary to balance leadership with partnership, to allow effective interaction between a plurality of public and private subjects (the “key players”), which will lessen opportunisms and attitudes aimed at personal interests in favor of value creation for the community: that is, everything receiving the benefits. In order to promote sustainable place development and place management planning, the role of knowledge needs to be enhanced so as to achieve better place development and performance. As has already been reported by Coda (1991) and Ferrando (1998), knowledge takes on a place-identification function next to public and private value generation. The concept of value creation through a public-private process alone shows its relevance in place.
management and expresses its greatest utility in the coordination process of place redevelopment and renewal—sometimes favored by EU directives and regulatory measures of development, which are very often underutilized in places because of the lack of an operational place management that would be capable of mediating between stakeholders and bringing in a management model based on sharing and on respect for future generations as.

3. Marketing and management trends in place and integration of the stakeholders in the strategy

The literature proposes integrated tools for place marketing and management, and it is possible to assert that there are common elements that define an integrated place marketing approach: the importance of the relationships between stakeholders, the shared, monitored planning process in a dynamic mode, and the importance of the perception of the generated value by the end user. These basic elements, if properly managed and exploited, can initiate a virtuous cycle that is automatically active for a time and participates concretely in achieving marketing strategies (Figure 1). Specifically, integrating a place-urban marketing plan into a place-brand project with an approach based on a place-management model, in a case not involving distorting factors, it is possible to start off on the right path to place-value generation. This value generation underlies a strengthening of place, not only in terms of competitiveness, but also due to the relevant place actor’s capacity to act as a “magnet” for other resources of a different nature that can be attracted by a supply place system which improves and multiplies its attractive effects over time. A developing place attracts investments, but can also attract knowledge and spread it. The ability to translate development intentions and thoughts into efficient practical cases that will generate permanent growth in the long and medium term is thus enhanced.

Figure 1: Value creation process

The value creation process (Figure 1) comes from a relationships network that is, in fact, present in the territories with different intensities, and which needs to be valued in relation to the most useful directions for the policymaker of the place. Depending on the place positioning, the stakeholders’ network will be encouraged in time to give a significant impetus to place strategic development. The process of building and strengthening the relationships between stakeholders is not expected to be easily activated; it instead represents the result of a plan with the active involvement of policymakers and of those who have an interest in the development of the place. The relationships are normally initiated in homogeneous areas for cost-effectiveness or business needs. Relationships may be more or less intense, depending on the interests that people have in keeping in contact: in the case of cost-effectiveness, it is interests that are important; when the relationships are between subject and context, commitment and rules are important. Relational weaknesses intervene when the actors of a network must activate their relationships with broader goals and for place development—perhaps in collaboration with policymakers. In this case, the interest is weakened for several reasons, and a complex, frail process begins and brings about the dissolution of the network that was planned for place development. In this process of stakeholder network building through place development plans, policymaker and metamanagement bodies assume an important role—that of steering the
network through a clear and measurable strategic plan, with respect for the rule of law and efficient management models that can be adapted to the reference context. The relational network, in line with the marketing strategy, is strengthened and begins to work collectively in order to achieve marketing goals through shared planning. The latter, in the place generally but especially in cities, is mostly supported by regulatory action capable of stimulating economic development. Although the regulatory action and rules, by themselves, are not the best solution for starting a place towards the creation of value, if management is fertile and receptive to innovative ideas, then financial and regulatory interventions can ensure a good base to work on. Referring to the Italian legislation, there are significant intervention programs in this regard, such as the Patti Territoriali (territorial pacts) and the Contratti di Quartiere. The first, for example, provides for the involvement of different types of stakeholders, including agreements between firms, local authorities, and associations. In order to foster collaboration, it was expected that the promoter must necessarily be a de facto association between local authorities, unions, firms, and place organizations. These programs, therefore, encourage integration between different sectors and between public and private institutions, valuing the relational network and the participatory planning. This tool has increased the number of people who would not have otherwise participated in development programs, on account of a lack of cohesion, since the same goals could not have been achieved individually. In addition, adherence to territorial pacts may involve a number of benefits, such as access to local, regional, national, and community financing and the opportunity to minimize administrative procedures.

The “Contratti di Quartiere” are an important tool for stakeholder engagement, and are promoted by the municipalities in areas characterized by widespread damage to buildings and the environment, by the lack of infrastructure and services in the context of reduced social cohesion, and by marked homelessness, in order to promote integration among residents and to eliminate the phenomena of social exclusion, while generating feelings of pride and belonging. Even in this case, the purpose of the regulatory instrument may stimulate the creation of internal relational networks—consequently facilitating urban marketing policies—because place actors have an active role, being at the same time promoters, investors, and users of the program. In a European scenario, there are many tools and programs that can be integrated well with policies of value creation and sustainable development, in order to support place brand, place management, and place marketing projects. This has already started with the Sustainable Cities project of 1993 and the European intervention programs entitled “Sustainable Urban Development in the European Union: A Framework for Action.” The fact that these are addressed to many countries means that they dictate general guidelines, leaving broad discretion to the local authorities, who are invited to consider the individual territorial realities. Since 1986, the Eurocities Organization has shown the intention of European policies to encourage cooperation between Member States, creating partnerships oriented towards the exchange of information and of good practices in urban management. The same cooperation principles are the basis of many other European programs: Interreg, since its first edition in 1989, focuses on three types of integration—cross-border, transnational, and interregional co-operation—and has led to TOCEMA Europe, one of the most important projects in Town Centre Management, through the creation of internal and external relational networks and the conception of a brand, providing for the integration of public and private stakeholders. What is described above underlines the laws and measures the importance of giving incentives, impulses, and economic and financial aid to the place. On the other hand, it also indicates the obvious limitations found in territories that do not possess the basic equipment or the fundamental principles of place management, place marketing, or place brand. These considerations are confirmed by experience and by the cases of places that have registered failure or shown a lack of
development, when considering financially significant interventions not supported by any type of organizational substrate or managerial expertise in place development, from a marketing perspective. Conversely, when the strategy is applied and shared on all levels in the territorial area, tangible and intangible assets emerge, and stakeholders interact profitably, increasing the perception of created value. The perception of value by the respective recipients can, in turn, lead to a further strengthening of relations between stakeholders, and then it multiplies the value of the place brand—especially among those who work actively and continuously in the territory and verify every day the strategic proposal, implementing it in phases. Among the stakeholders in a city are those who perform economic activities—such as retail, crafts, and services—but also residents who are configured as receivers of the value generated by urban renewal or by a strategy that promotes the economic development of place or improves quality of life.
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