

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/161103/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Reynolds, Laura, Doering, Heike , Koenig-Lewis, Nicole and Peattie, Kenneth 2023. Engagement and estrangement: A "tale of two cities" for Bristol's green branding. *European Journal of Marketing* 10.1108/EJM-08-2021-0602 file

Publishers page: <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-08-2021-0602>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.





Engagement and estrangement: A 'tale of two cities' for Bristol's green branding

Journal:	<i>European Journal of Marketing</i>
Manuscript ID	EJM-08-2021-0602.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Branding, Stakeholders, Sustainable Development, Participation, Brand Management, Qualitative research

Engagement and estrangement: A ‘tale of two cities’ for Bristol’s green branding

Laura Reynolds ^{a*}, Heike Doering ^b, Nicole Koenig-Lewis ^c and Ken Peattie ^d

^{a*} Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University, Colum Drive, Cardiff, United Kingdom, CF10 3EU. ReynoldsL4@cardiff.ac.uk Telephone: +442920 875704

^b Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University, Colum Drive, Cardiff, United Kingdom, CF10 3EU. DoeringH@cardiff.ac.uk

^c Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University, Colum Drive, Cardiff, United Kingdom, CF10 3EU. Koenig-LewisN@cardiff.ac.uk

^d Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University, Colum Drive, Cardiff, United Kingdom, CF10 3EU. Peattie@cardiff.ac.uk

Declaration Statements:

This research is based on a PhD funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC).

The authors do not have any financial or non-financial interests or affiliations to disclose connected to the research. All research was approved and adhered to principles set out by Cardiff University’s ethical approval committee. Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study. Data is not open access to protect anonymity of participants.

Engagement and estrangement: A ‘tale of two cities’ for Bristol’s green branding

Abstract

Purpose – Drawing on the service-dominant logic and taking a multi-stakeholder brand value co-creation perspective, this paper investigates whether positioning a place brand around sustainability helps or hinders stakeholders’ ability to co-create value for themselves and the brand.

Design/ methodology/ approach – The paper is based on a case study of Bristol’s city branding following its award of European Green Capital, drawing on 29 in-depth interviews with key informants from multiple stakeholder groups. These interviews are supported by secondary material and field observations.

Findings – The findings evidence a ‘tale of two cities.’ When sustainability is used as a positioning device, tensions are identified across three elements of brand co-creation: (1) brand meanings; (2) extraordinary versus mundane brand performances; (3) empowerment and disempowerment in branding governance. These tensions create stakeholder experiences of both engagement and estrangement.

Research Limitations/Implications – This article is based on one case study and evaluates face-to-face stakeholder interactions. Future research could access further stakeholders, across multiple cities and also examine their digital engagement.

Practical implications – Positioning a brand as sustainable (i.e., ‘green’) requires strong commitment to other ethical principles in practice. Brand practitioners and marketers may benefit from advancing stakeholders’ everyday brand performances to reduce disillusionment.

Originality/value – Rallying around virtuous associations, i.e., sustainability, does not in itself facilitate the generation of value for stakeholders and the brand, but instead can illuminate power imbalances and tensions in stakeholder interactions that result in a co-destruction of value.

Keywords – Brand co-creation; Brand co-destruction; Sustainability; Stakeholder engagement; Stakeholder Empowerment; Performativity; Branding community

Paper type – Research paper

Engagement and estrangement: A ‘tale of two cities’ for Bristol’s green branding

1. Introduction

A key evolution in the field of branding involves the ‘opening up’ of branding processes by adopting a multi-stakeholder perspective. This reflects the developments of the service-dominant (S-D) logic which traditionally rested on the value created by marketer-to-consumer or consumer-to-consumer marketing exchanges (Vargo & Lusch, 2004), particularly through brand communities (Merz et al., 2009), before a rising recognition that value propositions can be explored through a multi-stakeholder perspective (Frow & Payne, 2011; Vargo & Lusch, 2017). This evolving brand logic takes a more process-oriented and holistic view of “brands as dynamic and social processes and brand value as a brand’s perceived value-in-use determined by all stakeholders” (Merz et al., 2009, p. 338). Brand value co-creation therefore captures “the process of creating perceived use value for a brand through network relationships and social interactions among all the actors in the ecosystem” (Merz et al., 2018, p. 80). This, in turn, generates important questions about the processes by which branding is governed and value co-created (Conejo & Wooliscroft, 2015; Hatch & Schultz, 2010).

The literature concerning brand communities and co-creation is large and multi-faceted, and Sarasvuo *et al.*’s (2022) review of it demonstrates that co-creation occurs across a range of brand contexts beyond its origins in products and services. However, Peattie and Samuel (2021) highlight four limiting tendencies within that literature: (1) a focus on a limited range of brand types, particularly high-involvement consumer durables or leisure activities; (2) a predominance of research into online communities of interest, rather than offline or actual geographic communities; (3) a tendency for brands to be considered individually when they can interact in practice; and (4) a continuing preoccupation with the direct interactions amongst brands or brand managers and consumers, rather than Hatch and Schultz’s (2010, p. 601) “full stakeholder perspective”. Beyond this, the focus on consumers in brand community and co-creation research is problematic because, as Haverila *et al.* (2021, p. 3) note: “Broadly speaking, brand communities can be characterized as a group of people who are fans of a particular brand.” Our understanding of brand co-creation will therefore be improved by research that goes beyond relatively devoted brand advocates, to consider all those stakeholders with an interest in, and ability to influence, a brand, its values and its value.

1
2 An appreciation of stakeholder breadth and diversity creates a need to unpack the
3 “particularities of collective–conflictual value co-creation process” (Cannas et al., 2018, p.
4 141) and the extent to which variations in stakeholders’ interactions can result in both co-
5 creation and co-destruction of value (Plé & Chumpitaz Cáceres, 2010; Ripoll Gonzalez & Gale,
6 2023). As Sarasuwo *et al.* (2022) highlight, important emerging research themes in the field
7 concern the variety of roles that stakeholders can play in co-creation, the risks of unharmonious
8 or negative outcomes, and questions around who gets ‘invited’ to be part of the co-creation
9 process. We therefore posit that a multi-stakeholder approach to brand co-creation requires
10 paying greater attention to empowering stakeholders, i.e. the feeling that stakeholders can make
11 a ‘real’ difference in shaping the continuously evolving brand engaging as active partners in
12 co-creation. According to Cova and Pace (2006, p. 1090) “consumer empowerment has been
13 defined (Wathieu et al., 2002) as letting consumers take control of variables that are
14 conventionally pre-determined by marketers.” Within multifaceted and multi-stakeholder
15 brand communities these variables and conventions become increasingly blurred.
16
17

18
19 A second development concerns calls for branding, and those involved in brand management,
20 to develop more virtuous, responsible and sustainable brands (Iglesias & Ind, 2020; Powell &
21 Balmer, 2011; Septianto et al., 2020), including positioning brands as encouraging or
22 promoting environmental sustainability (Borah et al., 2021). Such ‘green’ brands ingrain
23 environmental endeavours across their products, services, practices, people and
24 communications (Borah et al., 2021; Rivera-Camino, 2007). Although each of these
25 developments has gained momentum within the branding literature when considered
26 separately, there is a scarcity of research examining how sustainability influences
27 empowerment across brand co-creation processes. This is curious, because adopting or
28 promoting sustainability-orientated values encourages an extension of the range of
29 stakeholders taking an active interest in a brand (Iglesias & Ind, 2020). In this paper, we
30 investigate this relationship through a case study of a ‘green’ place brand, asking if positioning
31 a place brand around sustainability (i.e., green branding) helps or hinders stakeholders’ ability
32 to co-create value for themselves and the brand?
33
34

35
36 Drawing on the S-D logic and taking a multi-stakeholder brand value co-creation perspective,
37 this paper contributes to the branding literature by critically examining the relationship between
38 sustainability and stakeholder empowerment within a dynamic brand co-creation process. In
39 doing so, we respond to calls to develop the field of brand co-creation from a multi-stakeholder
40 perspective (Iglesias & Ind, 2020), explaining how sustainability and stakeholder participation
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 impact the brand co-creation processes and the resultant outcomes for multi-stakeholder value
3 co-creation and value co-destruction. This contributes to emergent debates in branding theory
4 and practice, while also illuminating the tensions relevant in place branding and stakeholder
5 engagement literatures.
6
7

8
9
10 We structure the remainder of the article as follows. First, we examine how branding (in the
11 place context) has evolved into a dynamic co-creation process, and unpack the ways place
12 branding literatures have responded to calls to act more virtuously. We subsequently set out
13 the empirical investigation of Bristol's place brand, where we detail its positioning as 'green'
14 and environmentally sustainable following its award of European Green Capital (EGC) in
15 2015. Themes explaining how multiple stakeholder groups co-create and enact Bristol's green
16 city branding are identified and then discussed alongside extant theory. Finally, theoretical and
17 practical implications, as well as avenues for future investigation are outlined.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **2. Literature Review**

29 ***2.1 Putting brand co-creation in its place***

30
31
32 Place branding represents a valuable context in which to investigate the evolution and
33 complexities of brand co-creation processes because it is arguably the marketing field in which
34 participatory branding and co-creation via a wide range of stakeholders is furthest evolved
35 (Samuel et al., 2018; Vallaster et al., 2018). Place brands are defined as "a network of
36 associations in the place consumers' mind based on the visual, verbal, and behavioural
37 expression of a place, which is embodied through the aims, communication, values, and the
38 general culture of the place's stakeholders and the overall place design" (Zenker et al., 2017, p.
39 17). Therefore, place brands are sites of multi-stakeholder interactions whereby meanings are
40 forged, shared and enacted. Meanings are ascribed and exchanged across a range of consumers
41 and stakeholders, allowing value to be created for consumers, a host of connected and disparate
42 stakeholders, and society more broadly (Conejo & Wooliscroft, 2015). Places are
43 "multitudinous in their rich and varied arrays of meaning, infinitely divisible into smaller parts
44 from different vantage points" (Andéhn et al., 2019, p. 323). Investigating brand meanings
45 captures stakeholders' varying perceptions of the brand, and the corresponding functional and
46 psychological value placed upon it (Wilson et al., 2014). The brand is therefore created and
47 shared through the narratives and discursive activities deriving from these fluid and eclectic
48 meanings (Green et al., 2016). Gaps inevitably emerge between marketers' strategic brand
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 positioning and the meanings assigned by stakeholders (Wilson et al., 2014). Merrilees *et al.*
3 (2012) also highlight the benefits of exploring multiple stakeholder groups and the variations
4 in the brand meanings they hold, and their resultant expectations of the branding process by
5 comparing residents and businesses. The authors show how residents focused more on the
6 social and human qualities of the place (i.e., community bonds and culture), while business
7 stakeholders looked more at the economic and functional associations (i.e., business prospects
8 and transport infrastructure). While the study identifies how local governments can manage
9 trade-offs between these competing groups, the focus retains an emphasis on manager-to-
10 stakeholder interactions rather than stakeholder-to-stakeholder interactions (i.e., exchanges
11 across residents and businesses).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Another reason why place brands provide an important lens to investigate brand co-creation
22 relates to the complexity of creating effective place brands, which requires far more than trying
23 to distil their essence into logos and slogans. Several alternative suggestions have been put
24 forward, including a consideration of the multifarious brand components, set out as the “vision,
25 mission, personality, values, relationships, visual presentation, strategy and physique” (Casidy
26 et al., 2019, p. 1446). Together these form the essence of the brand, its underlying narrative
27 and how it is presented via communication tools. While the eight components provide a useful
28 heuristic lens, they are often entangled and interconnected. The literature remains dominated
29 by an emphasis on the various ingredients that combine to create a place brand, which can lead
30 to a static view and a comparative lack of focus on the dynamics and interactions between these
31 ingredients (Andéhn et al., 2019).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Place branding involves diverse types of stakeholders who share an innate connection with a
42 ‘place’, who collectively build, enact and share meanings (Samuel et al., 2018), drawing
43 parallels to a governance process (Braun et al., 2018; Klijn et al., 2012). Within it, stakeholders
44 are evolving from being passive audiences into partners and co-producers (Klijn et al., 2012),
45 encouraging ongoing “dialogue, debate, and contestation” (Kavaratzis & Hatch, 2013, p. 82),
46 and creating value for the parties involved (Okazaki et al., 2021). Hanna and Rowley (2015)
47 pinpoint the multifaceted “brand architectures” in which a range of local tourism, cultural,
48 commercial, sporting and governmental organisations (many with their own brand) are woven
49 together in a ‘brand web’. Within such webs, public branding organisations (such as a
50 destination management organisation (DMO)) represent the place brand manager, with varying
51 degrees of influence over the many participating organisations and the development of their
52 brands and agendas. Focusing primarily on the role of the brand manager and their interactions
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 with other stakeholders can overlook the value of exchanges between groups that have
3 previously been considered auxiliary to the process (Samuel et al., 2018). A breadth of
4 stakeholders are considered in the place branding literature extending beyond the original
5 emphasis on tourism organisations and visitors to include entrepreneurs, local business leaders,
6 and local residents (Aitken & Campelo, 2011; Jain et al., 2021; Samuel et al., 2018). The bulk
7 of studies, however, investigate either the relevance of a single stakeholder group to the place
8 brand, or the interaction between the stakeholder groups and the DMO. Advancements in the
9 place branding literature therefore help to move our understanding of brand co-creation beyond
10 an existing preoccupation with online communities of brand enthusiasts, and considering
11 brands in isolation, to considering the eco-system of stakeholders involved in creating value
12 for themselves and the brand.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 ***2.2 Participation in place branding: engagement and performances***

23
24 Stakeholder engagement is a well-recognised tool for brand co-creation (Loureiro et al., 2020;
25 Nysveen & Pedersen, 2014), supporting the identification, production and enactment of shared
26 brand meanings (Hatch & Schultz, 2010) amongst the organisations constituting the pillars of
27 a brand's architecture (Hanna & Rowley, 2015). Ideally, stakeholder engagement is less
28 structured and managerial (Hankinson, 2009) and more of an evolving, social and dynamic
29 process (Hanna & Rowley, 2011). This can help to develop a shared sense of purpose,
30 belonging and pride in the place that stakeholders represent and seek to promote (Govers,
31 2013). The emphasis is therefore on managing *across* multiple stakeholder groups, who are
32 spread over the voluntary, public, private and civil society sectors (Klijn et al., 2012).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41
42 Much of the place branding literature paints an idealised picture of open and inclusive
43 processes, whereas in practice they often remain disappointingly top-down and centrally
44 controlled (Kavaratzis & Kalandides, 2015), and narrowly focused on the construction of a
45 commercialised identity supported by marketing communication campaigns (Green et al.,
46 2016). Moreover, while engagement may be pursued when seeking to overtly develop or
47 update the place brand, ensuring that engagement succeeds long-term is often more
48 cumbersome (Casidy et al., 2019). Barriers to stakeholder engagement can relate to conflicts
49 amongst them, as well as a lack of resources or leadership (Casidy et al., 2019). More critical
50 views of stakeholder engagement have therefore emerged (Ripoll Gonzalez & Gale, 2020),
51 with a distinction drawn between stakeholder engagement in the entire branding process, and
52 a façade of involvement through inflexible and structured meetings and fora (Henninger et al.,
53 2016). Partnerships, for example, may involve a host of stakeholders, but with only the 'core'
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 partners having the ability to influence the outcomes (Casidy et al., 2019; Hankinson, 2009).
3
4 In practice, place branding processes are often actively exclusionary (Rabbiosi, 2016), perhaps
5 because the diffused ownership of place branding increases the risk of tensions arising between
6 competing stakeholder interests and concerns (Hanna & Rowley, 2015). Differences in
7 stakeholder interactions may also create an arena within which the value exchange may not be
8 equally experienced by all the parties involved in the process (Plé & Chumpitaz Cáceres, 2010).
9
10
11

12
13
14 Aligning diverse stakeholder interests within place branding is acknowledged as both
15 important to do, and difficult to achieve (Kavaratzis & Kalandides, 2015). Attempts to open up
16 the branding processes are reflected in a push towards bottom-up and inclusive stakeholder
17 participation (Jain et al., 2021), driven by an emphasis on partnerships to engage with and enact
18 “issues of social responsibility, ethical practice and sustainable ways of living” (Morgan, 2012,
19 p. 9). As Rabbiosi (2016, p. 155) summarises, place branding is the “entanglement of material,
20 discursive and embodied performances”, with stakeholder engagement operating as a potential
21 conduit between these often disconnected acts. Andéhn *et al.* (2019), however, question the
22 extent that academic and practitioner calls for collaboration and empowerment are able to move
23 away from the prevailing influence of market logics that infiltrate the meanings attached to
24 places and the processes through which they are enacted. There remains a need for the branding
25 literature, specifically within a place branding setting, to more explicitly surface the underlying
26 discourses, performances and implications. Even when attempts at collaboration are
27 encouraged, multiple stakeholders partake in discursive and socio-material acts that ultimately
28 reflect the power laden identity of the place, absorbed and reflected in the identity of its
29 stakeholders (Platt, 2011; von Wallpach et al., 2017). Despite the rising recognition that these
30 complexities remain embedded within branding, relatively little is known about the processes
31 used to successfully engage multiple stakeholders, how stakeholder interests can be better
32 balanced through effective engagement, and most importantly for this paper, how a positioning
33 around sustainability may impact the process of engaging and representing a brand’s
34 stakeholder community.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 52 **2.3 Sustainability as a positioning device** 53

54 Using place branding as the case setting also helps to unpack the complexities of ingraining
55 sustainability into the brand positioning. Place brands frequently position themselves as
56 environmentally conscious (Taecharungroj et al., 2019), generating competitive advantage by
57 presenting the brand as sustainable and virtuous (Andersson, 2016; Zerrillo & Thomas, 2007).
58
59
60

1
2 A place brand positioned around sustainability facilitates the promotion of a place as
3 somewhere to live, work, visit and invest within. As Ma *et al.* (2019, p. 2) set out:
4

5 “place branding... is considered an essential tool to respond to sustainability challenges,
6 to maintain a good reputation and to maintain their attractiveness to investors,
7 companies, and a talented workforce.”
8
9

10
11
12 Maheshwari *et al.* (2011) recognise that place branding and sustainability can be mutually
13 beneficial, but only when the stakeholders and initiatives operate in harmony. Their study of
14 Liverpool’s Capital of Culture award, identifies multiple benefits for the city, including rising
15 tourist numbers, investment in cultural and architectural heritage, further investment
16 opportunities, and evidence of heightened responsiveness to governance. Ersoy and Lerner
17 (2020) also describe the potential governance gains ascribed to focusing on sustainability when
18 evaluating urban entrepreneurialism during the European Green Capital award. They were
19 among the first to suggest tentatively that focusing on environmental initiatives, as opposed to
20 traditional economic narratives, can allow greater access to city-wide partnerships. Similarly,
21 Ripoll Gonzalez and Gale (2023) recently showed that even when sustainable city narratives
22 are premised as central, these are often overshadowed by a continued focus on economic
23 growth. However, more research is needed to unpack these complex relationships and evaluate
24 the impact of these normative advancements for a place and its assortment of stakeholders.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Positioning the brand around virtuous principles can provide additional symbolic benefits for
37 the place and its stakeholders (Wang, 2019). Using the example of Fair-trade towns, Peattie
38 and Samuel (2021) identify the pivotal role of local activists in creating an ethical brand identity
39 that creates reputational gains for the place, as well as symbolic benefits for its consumers.
40 Other positive reinforcements suggest that involving stakeholders in co-creating shared local
41 initiatives creates more space for sustainability while adding a further benefit of heightened
42 authenticity (Aitken & Campelo, 2011). However, making claims about the place is not
43 enough, there needs to be an enactment of real change for sustainable development to become
44 a distinctive marker of the place brand (Gustavsson & Elander, 2012). This further suggests
45 that place branding is performed through overlapping discursive and socio-material acts that
46 shape the identity of the place and its stakeholders (Platt, 2011; von Wallpach et al., 2017).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Yet, there is scepticism that attaching associations such as ‘green city’ or ‘eco-city’ to places
58 merely provides ‘greenwashing’ (Lu et al., 2018), rather than material environmental gains.
59 Similarly, there is a paucity of evidence on the extent to which such developments are driven
60

1
2 by top-down approaches whereby brand managers (e.g., local governments and DMOs) devise
3 the branding to achieve reputational gains for their environmental, social and economic
4 ambitions. In particular, there is a scarcity of research on the relationship between brands that
5 are positioned around sustainability (i.e., a 'green' branding) and a brand co-creation process
6 that is inclusive of multiple stakeholder voices.
7
8
9

10
11
12 The breadth of stakeholders with vested interests in green marketing and branding, can also
13 make attempts to identify and represent the diverse and salient voices cumbersome
14 (Rivera-Camino, 2007; Wang, 2019), with further difficulties when considering the
15 empowerment of multi-stakeholders in the brand co-creation process. Sarasvuo *et al.* (2022, p.
16 543), for example, note in this respect that "not all co-creation is collaborative and mutually
17 beneficial". Without full support by all diverse stakeholders, using sustainability as a positive
18 positioning device could therefore risk place brand co-destruction. This was experienced in
19 Munich's city brand development during the refugee crisis when some citizen's collective
20 actions challenged the co-created meaning of Munich being open, welcoming and 'colourful'
21 (Vallaster *et al.*, 2018).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 In summary, there remains a dearth of understanding about how these purportedly normative
32 changes within branding and its governance alter the way in which value is co-created for the
33 'green' brands and those groups who help to build, share and 'live' them. As such, this research
34 set out to investigate whether positioning a place brand around sustainability (i.e., green
35 branding) helps or hinders stakeholders' ability to co-create value for themselves and the brand.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **3. Case study: Bristol's green branding**

44
45 Located within the West of England and with a population of approximately 465,000 people,
46 Bristol is among the UK's ten 'Core Cities' (Bristol, 2021). In addition to being voted 'best
47 place to live' in the UK in 2017 (Sunday Times, 2017), Bristol's visitor economy (pre-
48 pandemic) was estimated to provide £1.4bn and 29,000 jobs to the local economy (Destination
49 Bristol, 2021a). Central to Bristol's international reputation is its association with the green
50 movement, cemented through its award of European Green Capital (EGC) in 2015, and also
51 promoted through its use of smart technology to encourage sustainable living, and its status as
52 a Fairtrade City and a cycling city (Destination Bristol, 2021b). Rallying around 'virtuous'
53 narratives also provides an avenue through which the city's stakeholders seek redemption for
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 an iniquitous past, namely the city's close association with the nineteenth-century slave trade
3
4 (Malpass et al., 2007; Peattie & Samuel, 2021).
5

6
7 This paper investigates the Bristol brand following its 2015 EGC award. Originating in 2006,
8
9 the EGC award celebrates "green cities – fit for life" (European Commission, 2021). To receive
10
11 the accolade, cities must evidence high environmental standards, outline ambitious goals for a
12
13 legacy of sustainable development and showcase an ethos of environmentally and socially
14
15 conscious living, offering inspiration for other cities (European Commission, 2021). The
16
17 award, however, comes at a cost, with the total expense for the Bristol Green Capital campaign
18
19 amounting to £12.6m (UK government 55%, private sector 34%, local authority 8% and Arts
20
21 Council 3%) (Bristol Green Capital, 2016).
22

23
24 Bristol's EGC application set out its environmental credentials and the practices to protect its
25
26 natural and built environment, including green space management, protection of biodiversity,
27
28 local transport initiatives, air quality management, waste consumption and treatment and
29
30 energy performance (Bristol, 2014). Central to these initiatives were partnerships that devolve
31
32 power, share resources and empower community-led change. Bristol also pledged to contribute
33
34 to global environmental commitments including ambitious CO2 reduction efforts, e.g. a
35
36 reduction of 40% by 2020 and 80% by 2050 (from a 2005 baseline) through reducing transport,
37
38 commercial and residential emissions (Bristol, 2014). The purposive case study provides a
39
40 noteworthy example of how a brand's positioning is often cemented using a combination of
41
42 governance and communication tools, providing a helpful lens through which to explore the
43
44 complexities of combining sustainability with stakeholder empowerment in the brand co-
45
46 creation process.
47

4. Methodology

48
49 Case studies remain a widespread method for extracting detailed accounts of branding
50
51 processes (Casidy et al., 2019; Kavaratzis & Kalandides, 2015) and the importance of wider
52
53 community members when co-creating value (Samuel et al., 2018). Our case study was
54
55 implemented using a social constructionist epistemological and ontological perspective,
56
57 evaluating the brand co-creation process through the lens of those involved, and considering
58
59 the context of the site's social, economic and environmental status. This afforded a critical
60
61 examination of stakeholder involvement and their dynamic interactions (Eriksson &

1
2 Kovalainen, 2008). Using an in-depth case study we also developed a holistic understanding
3 of this phenomenon to generate theoretical, empirical and practical outcomes (Yin, 2009).
4
5
6

7 Our primary data collection tool was in-depth interviews with 29 key informants from multiple
8 stakeholder groups, undertaken in the 12-months up to March 2017 (aftermath of the EGC
9 award). To prompt discussion, an interview protocol was designed around three areas selected
10 following an analysis of the literature and advanced in line with emergent data: (1) an
11 exploration of stakeholders' perceptions and experiences of the environmentally conscious
12 brand positioning; (2) discussions surrounding stakeholders' involvement in engagement and
13 promotional activities (e.g. consultations, collaborations, partnerships, events and campaigns)
14 where participants were able to enact the meanings and associations assigned to the place; and
15 (3) an exploration of perceived opportunities and barriers when seeking to partake in these
16 activities. Interview duration ranged from 60 to 120 minutes. Informants consented to their
17 interviews being audio-recorded and transcribed, resulting in over 250,000 words of
18 transcription data.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 The interviewee sample was determined through a two-pronged approach. First, we adopted a
29 multi-stakeholder approach recruiting participants from stakeholder groups featured in place
30 branding studies (Hanna & Rowley, 2015), namely the business community, local authority,
31 local community, visitor economy and higher education. Second, we focused on senior-level
32 stakeholders with a role in the representation of the city. We identified these participants using
33 Mitchell et al.'s (1997) stakeholder salience model. Participants were selected that had access
34 to one, or more, forms of engagement (power); participated in engagement and collaborative
35 activities that affect their primary stakeholder group (urgency); and were perceived as having
36 a substantial role within their stakeholder category (legitimacy). Once the sample frame was
37 decided, online material was assessed to identify salient stakeholders from across the groups.
38 To help with the challenging task of accessing local community stakeholders, a well-placed
39 "gatekeeper" assisted with the snowballing process.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Interviews were conducted at locations in and around Bristol, including participants' place of
52 employment, visitor attractions, local coffee shops and community hubs. Undertaking
53 interviews at these sites allowed for immersion into the city and ongoing observations of its
54 neighbourhoods, visitor attractions and amenities. Further field visits (n=5) were conducted,
55 including walking tours and visits to attractions. Photographs and fieldnotes were taken
56 allowing for reflexivity in the analysis and helping to inform subsequent interviews (Nadin &
57
58
59
60

1
2 Cassell, 2006). Secondary materials were also collated, based on materials provided by
3 participants (e.g., promotional leaflets, or business information packs) and an online search of
4 relevant policy documents and independent reviews following the EGC award (n=14) (Table
5 2). Data and methodological triangulation were employed by including multiple groups of
6 stakeholders in the final sample and utilising supplementary observations and secondary
7 sources (see Appendix 1). These measures help to encourage internal and construct validity
8 (Gibbert et al., 2008).

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16 Further measures to support validity and reliability in the data collection instruments included
17 encouraging participants to articulate their perceptions through projective techniques (Belk,
18 2013), including photo elucidation and sentence completion and word association exercises.
19 Of particular benefit was the incorporation of questions surrounding the personification of the
20 brand, enabling participants to reflect on both the strengths and weaknesses of the city's
21 identity. In addition to providing interview prompts and enriching discussions, the data derived
22 was compared to discussions around the interview themes to check for consistency.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 Three stages of analysis were undertaken (Gioia et al., 2013), as illustrated in Appendix 2. The
31 first round of coding identified emergent incidents from the raw data, with codes based on
32 stakeholders' experiences of sustainability and stakeholder empowerment. Participants'
33 experiences of sustainability were evidenced across (a) the brand meanings and narratives they
34 assigned, (b) the way through which these meanings were shared and enacted across a
35 multidimensional place brand web, and (c) stakeholders' conveyance of their role within the
36 brand co-creation process. Second round coding involved identifying variations in the
37 meanings (associations and values) and social processes (engagement performances), which
38 included differences across stakeholder groups. Tensions across the brand co-creation process
39 were identified. Finally, a third set of coding developed core categories aligned with the extant
40 literature, pointing to a juxtaposition of value co-creation and co-destruction for the brand and
41 its stakeholders.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 To support the trustworthiness of the results, the initial round of coding was undertaken by the
53 first author, which was checked and refined by the research team. Subsequent second and third
54 order coding was undertaken through iterative exchanges among the research team, whereby
55 codes were compared and evaluated collaboratively alongside theory. Member checking
56 occurred during in-person meetings, where notes were compiled and shared, producing a series
57 of coding instructions. In addition, the second and third order codes were stored, refined and
58
59
60

1
2 checked using qualitative data analysis software (NVivo). Coding collaboratively ensures
3 greater rigour in the analysis (Weston et al., 2001) and supports the dependability of the results
4 (Cascio et al., 2019). The methodology was also informed by aspects of grounded theory that
5 advances the investigation of under-researched and complex phenomena (Samuel & Peattie,
6 2016). For example, the key categories were developed based on immersion into the literature
7 and iterative analysis of the data (Charmaz, 2014). Detailed memos were utilised throughout
8 data collection and analysis, unpacking themes and their connection to theory (Charmaz, 2014;
9 Samuel et al., 2018). However, this research set out to examine the relationship between
10 sustainability and stakeholder empowerment based on understandings from the brand co-
11 creation literature and therefore would not be considered as employing grounded theory.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **5. Findings: a “tale of two cities”**

24 The findings evidence a series of tensions when positioning a brand around environmentally
25 conscious connotations, with stakeholders presenting an assemblage of brand meanings,
26 enacted through extraordinary and mundane engagement performances, and resulting in
27 uncertain stakeholder roles within a contested brand web (Appendix 2).
28
29
30
31
32

33 **5.1 Sustainability as an assemblage of environmental, economic and social meanings**

34 The brand’s positioning as environmentally conscious created a juxtaposition of unity and
35 division evident across the brand meanings that were shared and debated by the participants.
36
37
38
39

40 *5.1.1 Expressions of pride and differentiation*

41 For those supportive of Bristol’s label as a ‘green’ brand, the environmental accolades provided
42 shared sources of pride and differentiation, which expanded beyond the EGC award to include
43 the intangible and tangible character of the city and its organisations:
44
45
46
47

48 Bristol has a strong green activism ... It’s sort of in peoples’ DNA to be interested and
49 passionate about the environment ... There’s a whole raft of organisations who are very
50 interested in sustainability and the natural environment, and the wider sense about
51 sustainability ... We have some of the leading people who are making money out of
52 the environment. It is important to align the economy with the environment. (P-2,
53 business community)
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 For this leading business representative, sustainability in the “*wider sense*” encompassed a
3 need to connect environmental narratives with economic ones. A director of investment within
4 the local council similarly reaffirmed the value of combining sustainability with economic
5 prosperity:
6
7

8
9
10 What has shifted in the time I have been here is that Bristol very much sees itself as
11 similar to London and a serious city. They can both have a high quality of life and be
12 concerned about sustainability, but you can also be economically successful. You don’t
13 come here to retire, you come here to start your creative, innovative start-up business,
14 which I don’t think we would have seen our place as the place to do that years ago. (P-
15 16, local authority)
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 *5.1.2 Driving narratives around inclusion and exclusion*

23 Other participants also looked beyond the environmental connotations and related
24 sustainability to social equality:
25
26
27

28
29 There is a consciousness to the city. I would say there is a lot more ethics and thinking
30 about fair trade, or the green capital. It’s about thinking about the ethics behind
31 everyday life. (P-12, local community)
32
33
34
35

36 This wider remit of sustainability was evident during the personification exercises. Running
37 alongside descriptions of being fun, innovative and unorthodox, Bristol was also considered to
38 be thoughtful, caring and considerate:
39
40
41

42
43 [Bristol] would be someone who was concerned about the environment and the ethical
44 issues of the day. So, I think it would be somebody who (is) conscious about things (P-
45 16, local authority)
46
47
48

49 [Bristol] is a thoughtful place. It’s a green place. It’s a caring place. (P-2, business
50 community)
51
52
53

54 *5.1.3 Expressions of disillusionment and critique*

55 Expressions of optimism by some participants were matched with disillusionment by others.
56 Critiques included seemingly contradictory political decision-making by those who advocate
57 strengthening environmental sustainability, but in practice allow or facilitate environmental
58
59
60

1
2 degradation. Instead of the local government actions helping to build the social reality of
3 sustainability, contradictions undermined it.
4

5
6
7 Despite being Green Capital, the council had not adopted any policy that related directly
8 to not having 48 diesel generators banging away in the centre of the city ... That's just
9 one simple example. As a consequence, we're now beginning to have discussions to
10 feel our way towards a clean air and clean energy policy for the city, which are things
11 you would have expected to come up under a green capital. (P-9, local community)
12
13

14
15
16
17 There is a sense of being Green Capital in a city that is dependent on cars ... The mayor
18 previously tried to address some of that by introducing resident parking zones and cycle
19 lanes and it wasn't entirely popular. There was a lobby against it and people even came
20 and parked a tank on the green. There was that sense of, are we really green and
21 sustainable and cycling friendly, or are we a city that is not? (P-16, local authority)
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 Disillusionment expanded beyond a critique of the natural and built environment, with a
29 scrutiny of social equity and an ability of citizens to access material assets 'equally'.
30 Participants discussed Bristol as a "tale of two cities" (P-15, local authority), whereby the
31 prosperity, vibrancy and innovation are not equally enjoyed. P-11 (local community) identifies
32 the positioning of areas of extreme wealth next to areas of extreme deprivation. Similarly, P-
33 13 (business community) details, "Yes, diversity is brilliant, but there are challenges as a
34 relatively rich city, if you're poor in Bristol then you're excluded". These observations were
35 commonplace among interviewees, emphasising the perceived unfairness and social
36 inequalities, further highlighting that concerns over economic and social sustainability cannot
37 be separated from environmental sustainability.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 Positioning around sustainability acted as a unifier *and* point of division for stakeholders based
48 on their specific assemblage of environmental, economic and social brand meanings. For those
49 benefiting from sustainability, environmental assets and their economic outcomes were a
50 source of pride and commonality, but for those unable to access the gains (or for those seeking
51 to represent them) tensions emerge. These tensions were evidenced through the concerns over
52 Bristol being a place of prosperity and opportunity for some, and isolation and deprivation for
53 others.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

5.2 Enactment through extraordinary and mundane engagement performances

1
2 Positioning the brand around sustainability prompted large-scale extraordinary performances
3 that attracted local, national and international audiences. These were accompanied by smaller
4 and more incremental engagement performances whereby an assemblage of brand meanings
5 were shared, refined and enacted by city stakeholders.
6
7
8
9

10 *5.2.1 Celebrating sustainability through city-wide events*

11 Grandiose city-wide celebratory events and promotional activities associated with the EGC
12 campaign were organised throughout 2015. One such event was the week-long Big Green
13 Week festival, featuring live music, debates, family events, flash mobs, yoga, poetry and
14 speakers (S-7). Other activities included a giant water slide through the city-centre, showcasing
15 of a life-sized whale out of recycled materials and a 50-tonnes mechanical fire-breathing spider
16 made from recycled military hardware, alongside a series of family days and street celebrations
17 (S-2). A senior official (P-13) involved in executing these events justified their importance for
18 community enjoyment, enhancing the city's status and developing positive word-out-mouth:
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 ... the bigger thing was Big Green Week, which brought a lot of activities to our streets,
29 with street markets, and things, and national and international speakers. So those are
30 very visible events ... I want people to smile about Bristol. I think that's really, really
31 important. For me it's as important that we're a happy city, as we are an economically
32 successful city.
33
34
35
36
37

38 Heightened international awareness for the city's sustainable positioning could be exchanged
39 for pride and status:
40
41
42

43 It's [EGC] certainly putting a spotlight on the city, and I hope it made the city proud to
44 be recognised as being one of the more sustainable cities in Europe at the time, and that
45 people saw that as a community the people of Bristol are really committed to
46 sustainability and reducing their impact on the world. (P-1, business representative)
47
48
49
50
51

52 The value of these expensive and short-term celebratory events was not endorsed by all
53 inhabitants. Instead, the campaigns were critiqued by some as "something bestowed upon
54 Bristol" (P-25, visitor economy). Concerns over differing levels of access to these events
55 purporting to celebrate the city's environmental sustainability and unite its communities were
56 raised:
57
58
59
60

1
2 It's been hard going for things like Green Capital ... a huge amount of money went into
3 it, and it only lasted one year. I'm not sure what the legacy is to be honest. I think it's
4 quite good at putting on these huge festivals, but in terms of ongoing drip, drip, drip,
5 building up, then I think you've got to be careful it's not all flash and no substance.
6 Yeah, there's a huge amount of social isolation ... The older community tend to get a
7 bit left out and overlooked. Not everyone wants to go to big events. People want places,
8 affordable places, to meet up. (P-10, local community)
9
10
11
12
13
14

15
16 These criticisms were reflected in an EGC final report commissioned by the local authority (S-
17 6), which highlighted that minority communities and disadvantaged groups could have been
18 engaged further. An additional concern related to the dominance of events supporting the EGC
19 branding and overlooking the evolving nature of cities. As P-14 (local authority) expressed,
20 "I'm not saying we ought to neglect our past, and we should cherish and remember that, but
21 we are a living, breathing city, like all cities. We are not going to stay still. We shouldn't be
22 linked only with 2015".
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 30 *5.2.2 Incremental engagement and partnership building*

31 Running alongside these large-scale enactments, the findings evidence the overlooked potential
32 of smaller, rudimental or 'mundane' engagement performances occurring behind the scenes,
33 whereby local stakeholders share their meanings and experiences through their everyday
34 interactions with each other and the city's green movement. The EGC opened opportunities for
35 enactment of the brand through longer-term city-wide discussions and engagement. One
36 prominent example is the strengthening of the Green Capital Partnership, which "is in its widest
37 sense a bunch of 800 organisations who have signed up to pledge to be greener" (P-16, local
38 authority). Signing a pledge demonstrated a commitment for action and provided an arena
39 whereby interpretations could be shared and enacted. The Green Capital Partnership's mission
40 includes supporting environmental sustainability by "providing a leadership voice and enabling
41 collaborative and collective action across sectors towards [a] shared vision" (S-12).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 During the EGC award, this partnership, along with others across the city, utilised networking
53 events alongside collegial activities to showcase and reinvent material artifacts, share success
54 stories, plan small and larger scale events, build a community of interest and foster a sense of
55 pride (S-11; S-12). One participant of the monthly "Green Mingle" suggested that when
56 principles could be "bought into" then an "ecosystem" could emerge "built on a premise that
57 this is not us telling you what it is; this is for you to build into. We'll create as many channels
58
59
60

1
2 as we possibly can for you to feed into. We'll create organisation and structure, and then project
3 it outwards" (P-6, business community). These informal connections build commonality
4 toward an approach and promote participation:
5
6

7
8
9 If you look at that [Green Capital] partnership, it existed, but it had nothing like the
10 structure or the collective voice it does now. Even if that is the sole legacy [of EGC] in
11 giving all those organisations a mechanism to engage with the council, engage with all
12 the kind of big players in the city, then I see that as a positive. Quite often I think it's a
13 process of getting the big organisations working together and the kind of commonality
14 of the goal. (P-29, higher education)
15
16
17
18

19
20
21 Similarly, the business community established a Go Green network, with a commitment to,
22 and enactment of, sustainability providing a point of unity among their members:
23
24

25
26 That was a part of our strong pitch to be EGC, but it's also a signpost to the future. We
27 run a programme called Go Green, which we started a few years ago, but had quite a
28 big boost last year in getting businesses to talk to each other about how they're using
29 their facilities, how they're talking to their staff, and using their natural environment.
30 We've put sustainability at the centre of how we operate and position ourselves ...
31 Really aligning these values to the business. (P-2, business community)
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Pre-arranged networking events were important in building a community of shared interests,
39 developing collective activities and negotiating different associations.
40
41

42 43 *5.2.3 Negotiating and sharing a green legacy* 44

45 Small-scale and largely behind the scenes gatherings created an arena whereby larger city-wide
46 events can be planned and providing a platform through which a longer-term green legacy can
47 be endorsed. The connection to sustainability strengthened legitimacy amongst these groups,
48 and provided a point of commonality for promoting their collective activities.
49
50
51

52
53 Local community residents were also involved through the Neighbourhood Partnership
54 Scheme, uniting resident groups from across the city and providing a platform for their views,
55 including on how sustainability was incorporated, celebrated and showcased. By aligning with
56 the EGC this scheme provided resources to enable local community stakeholders to enact
57
58
59
60

1
2 cultural and environmental programmes. However, as a senior official described, awareness of
3 these opportunities remained limited:
4

5
6
7 Using EGC, the fact we gave £2million in grants that were distributed across the city,
8 and we gave a lot of those through the neighbourhood partnerships, for neighbourhood
9 programmes, both cultural and environmental programmes ... Maybe what we failed
10 to do with some of those was brand them very clearly as Green Capital, because that
11 would have given people greater pride in those projects. A lot of people didn't see
12 where the money had come from. (P-13, senior official)
13
14
15
16
17

18
19 Stakeholders identified collective 'storytelling', negotiation of associations and the resultant
20 development of a sense of community, pride and shared identity stemming from the
21 extraordinary and mundane engagement performances. However, tensions existed, with neither
22 the extraordinary or mundane performances providing equal participation or representation.
23 Therefore, despite the potential of value being generated through meaningful interactions
24 sparked by stakeholders' ongoing celebration of the sustainable brand, the findings denote an
25 overreliance on the exciting and extraordinary performances of the brand with well-positioned
26 stakeholders benefitting most overtly.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 34 **5.3 Empowerment and disempowerment in branding governance**

35
36 Since improved social equity is fundamental to sustainability, a green brand positioning might
37 seem to imply greater equity, empowerment, and grassroots stakeholder involvement.
38 However, the findings evidence continued hierarchies in involvement, creating dynamic and
39 evolving roles within the brand co-creation process.
40
41
42

43 44 *5.3.1 Leveraging sustainability for (active) participation*

45
46 Groups of sector-specific stakeholders established themselves as active partners in the branding
47 process by recognising the collective benefits of working collaboratively to share their vision
48 of the city and its sustainable legacy. Having a point of unity helped to strengthen stakeholders'
49 longer-term position:
50
51
52

53
54
55 There was a sense that we needed, together, to affect some really lasting change on how
56 these organisations are led and provided for. It was far better for us and the city. We
57 were far more powerful if we spoke as one voice, rather than battling. (P-22, visitor
58 economy)
59
60

1
2
3
4 The alignment between environmental and economic sustainability also supports the
5 development of sector-specific collaborations creating a “network and ecosystem of
6 organisations around sustainability and high tech” (P-16, local authority), and producing an
7 “economic opportunity” for those involved. Stakeholders with access to these close-knit
8 partnerships, were welcomed into the conversations and routes developed to promote their
9 mutual interests.

10
11
12
13
14
15 Engaged stakeholders (in particular the business community and leading visitor economy
16 members) outlined the opening up of access to the local authority and supported entry to the
17 periphery of the networks occurring with the “big players” in the city (P-29). One of the more
18 pronounced examples for enhanced stakeholder engagement is the above-mentioned Green
19 Capital Partnership with over 800 members (S-11; S-12). For the more influential stakeholders,
20 access to strategic long-term partnerships can present the opportunity to enact shared
21 commitments, relationships, events, information sharing and promotional campaigns across the
22 city.

31 5.3.2 *Utilising strategic (large and small) partnerships and collaborations*

32
33 Despite the potential for active participation in larger partnerships, such as the Green Capital
34 Partnership, not all stakeholders reported empowerment from its implementation. For example,
35 the local community were unable to undertake coordination-based roles, instead fulfilling
36 ancillary tasks, such as consultations, form-filling and attendance at periodic events. To some
37 extent these stakeholders tried to reduce the hurdles by creating their own vehicles for
38 collective enactment at the local level, developing informal, small-scale resident and
39 community interest groups. These smaller and more concentrated networks, whose participants
40 can formulate and shape the way that their associations and meanings are enacted, were more
41 successful in capturing local community engagement. While stakeholders built their own
42 circles and communities to share knowledge and community capacity, influence over the city-
43 wide partnerships and their corresponding engagement and events remains uneven.

44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54 Moreover, there was evidence of tensions within the local authority led organisations. For
55 example, the use of the Neighbourhood Partnership Scheme remained largely structured and
56 top-down with its remit under scrutiny, given ongoing reductions in public-sector resources. It
57 did, however, provide a channel for residents to articulate their vision of the city and gain
58 financial support. The findings, though, highlight dissent and critique relating to these
59
60

1
2 partnerships, given their perceived advancement of *lip service* as opposed to effective and
3 meaningful engagement. For example, when discussing the unevenness of inclusion for the
4 voluntary sector, a resident outlines the restrictions in engagement activities. The local
5 community member suggested that “cheerful stuff”, such as community events or hanging
6 baskets are encouraged by the local authority, so long as the resident group did not attempt to
7 undertake controversial activities that ran contrary to the local authority’s plans (P-7). Focusing
8 on sustainability was thus not enough to foster a strategic role for residents beyond their roles
9 as facilitators within local-level partnerships and networks.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 5.3.3 *Retaining direct and indirect brand managers*

18
19 Despite the EGC claims of shared ownership and community empowerment, analysis
20 following the award highlights a divergence in experiences for stakeholders (S-2; S-6; S-8; S-
21 11). Similarly, the interview data reveals the business community’s seemingly heightening
22 stake in overseeing the branding process and the local authority retaining its position of
23 influence. Top-down approaches to engagement co-exist alongside the development of
24 influential networks with a well-established structure of how groups are organised and
25 collaborative engagement activities undertaken. Elected officials and the local authority
26 retained a central role in arranging structured, and often city-wide, activities. However, rather
27 than managing these projects in-house, the local authority looked to long-term, cross-sector
28 partnerships involving the business community and the visitor economy. This included the
29 development of public-private partnerships, with the DMO remaining prominent. More
30 broadly, the local authority retained a role in partnerships led by members of the community,
31 such as the business communities’ investment collective and the retail Business Improvement
32 District.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 5.3.4 *Reinforcing commonality or dissent*

46
47 Our data points to persistent hurdles for stakeholder involvement and empowerment, even
48 when enactment of the brand is secured through multi-stakeholder partnerships. These
49 partnerships were predominately ‘successful’ when backed by the EGC campaign, with
50 membership largely comprising those with existing influence. Retaining an overall influence,
51 the local authority attempted to overcome some of these barriers for residents by encouraging
52 engagement and seeking to widen participation in the processes. Nonetheless, participation
53 remained cumbersome in practice despite some indication that sustainability can provide a
54 point of commonality. The problem remains that the experience of sustainability, the way that
55 these groups can ‘perform’ the brand, and the type of engagement undertaken remain
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 inconsistent and uneven. The result of these tensions is enduring hierarchies in stakeholder
3 involvement, which are expanding the gulf between those engaging in, and those becoming
4 estranged by, the brand co-creation process. Despite this study focusing on stakeholder-to-
5 stakeholder interactions across the place brand web, and the ingraining of sustainability into
6 the brand positioning, the evolving roles created a trajectory of power and influence across the
7 brand co-creation process. Therefore, while a 'green' brand positioning provides engagement
8 and benefits for some, it can also create estrangement (i.e., dissent and disillusionment) for
9 others.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **6. Discussion and implications**

20 ***6.1 Engagement and estrangement in 'green' branding***

21
22 The brand co-creation literature recognises stakeholders' interaction with the brand and each
23 other (Conejo & Wooliscroft, 2015; Davari et al., 2017; Merz et al., 2009) and yet, this implies
24 that the stakeholders are a unified and equal collective. Instead, our study suggests that
25 stakeholders are unequal "agents of brand performance" (von Wallpach et al., 2017, p. 443),
26 shaping, sharing, and enacting converging brand meanings through a myriad of interpersonal
27 interactions and engagement performances. Therefore, value is not co-created uniformly for
28 those partaking in Bristol's 'green' branding (Plé & Chumpitaz Cáceres, 2010).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Positioning the brand around sustainability exacerbates tensions across already contested brand
38 webs, illuminating stakeholders' differing and evolving roles that can create both opportunities
39 and barriers for involvement and empowerment. While studies increasingly recognise that
40 value can be created and diminished by stakeholders' relationship with the brand and its
41 stakeholders (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011; Makkonen & Olkkonen, 2017), we show how
42 positioning a brand around sustainability creates underexplored tensions for meanings,
43 interactions and engagement performances that create a disjuncture between those engaged in
44 the co-creation of value versus those disengaged leading to a co-destruction of value. In other
45 words, rallying around virtuous associations, i.e., sustainability and engagement, does not in
46 itself facilitate the generation of value for all stakeholders and the brand, but it can also activate
47 power imbalances and tensions that results in a co-destruction of value.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 *6.1.1 Sustainability as a catalyst for (dis)engagement*

1
2 It is well-documented that stakeholders' increased engagement (Okazaki et al., 2021; Pucci et
3 al., 2020) can support firm and stakeholder value co-creation. Yet, studies predominately relay
4 the benefits, such as opening channels for stakeholder communication and debate (Hanna &
5 Rowley, 2015), including to those groups (such as residents) previously considered ancillary
6 in the process (Merrilees et al., 2012; Samuel et al., 2018). Our study, however, provides
7 contrasting and co-existing accounts of stakeholders' experiences of social divides and social
8 inclusion as they seek to engage with the 'green' brand and each other. Positioning around
9 sustainability can help to entrench benefits for some, providing a unifying point through which
10 to collectively rally, access collaborations and partnerships, enact shared commitments, foster
11 relationships, exchange information and share expressions of pride and enthusiasm. However,
12 these opportunities exist alongside concerns over exclusion, rhetoric and replication of
13 positions of influence that create dissent and conflict for stakeholders estranged from the
14 process.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Instilling sustainability as a positioning device did not omit these tensions among stakeholders,
27 but rather illuminated and widened existing divisions. Brand meanings were built and shared
28 based on an assemblage of associations and experiences with the city's environmental, social
29 and economic prosperity. Socio-economic characteristics, however, influenced participants'
30 excitement and involvement in activities 'celebrating' the EGC award and participation in the
31 green movement and contributed to a "tale of two cities". As with sustainable consumption
32 more widely, the relative financial expense of supporting sustainable development through
33 individual consumption practice, and the resultant symbolic value placed upon this 'chic'
34 behaviour, has "infused environmental commitment with elitist class connotations" (Soron,
35 2010, p. 177). Moreover, sustainable consumers are able to demonstrate and define their own
36 sense of class through these consumption practices (Shaker & Rath, 2019). Similarly, we find
37 that certain stakeholders present themselves as environmentally conscious and proactive
38 citizens, supporting Bristol's 'green' positioning through their sustainable practices and
39 celebration of the city's environmental accolade. However, this creates discord for stakeholders
40 that have limited access to sustainable practices and the associated festivities. Instead, these
41 stakeholders call for attention to be paid to reducing economic inequality in the city rather than
42 supporting unaffordable lifestyles exacerbating the social divide. As such, instead of
43 sustainability providing a catalyst for change (Borah et al., 2021), our study points to
44 sustainability illuminating existing divisions among a brand's stakeholders.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

6.1.2 Performativity and participation

1 Stakeholders partake in a multitude of discursive acts that enable them to negotiate, collectively
2 share and enact their brand associations, narratives and meanings, while also fostering
3 relationships amongst the brand's stakeholders. Overlaps in engagement and performative
4 approaches to understanding branding are recognised (von Wallpach et al., 2017), seeing the
5 identity of a brand as not only shaped and deliberately communicated, but also enacted, for
6 example, through the interactions of consumers and producers 'performing' the roles of
7 consumer and brand manager (Rabbiosi, 2016). As the roles of consumer and producer
8 continue to blur, stakeholders (including residents) enact the brand through a myriad of
9 "stories, discussions, mundane and activities" which create "the character, the icons, the
10 stereotype and the myths of the city bringing new interpretations and negotiating their own
11 sense of being" (Platt, 2011, p. 41).

22 Bristol's EGC experience reveals a contrast between the discrete, large scale and extraordinary
23 performances of the city's green branding, and the less obvious but ongoing performativity
24 whereby the language and actions of the locals express the brand. Our findings confirm that
25 these incremental, everyday and discursive negotiations of the brand through sharing stories,
26 building a sense of community and unity among participants, signing pledges of allegiance and
27 even lobbying for change are important brand performances. We suggest that performativity
28 between internal stakeholders is often small-scale and behind the scenes through engagement
29 activities that include meetings, networking events, committees and fora but also involve a
30 breadth of informal channels such as knowledge exchange networks and relationship building.
31 These more 'mundane' and commonplace discursive exchanges provide a platform whereby
32 stakeholders negotiate, present and ultimately enact their brand meanings and images (Platt,
33 2011; Rabbiosi, 2016). However, within the EGC initiative, we identify a disjuncture in value
34 co-creation opportunities, with some stakeholders able to 'headline' large-scale performances,
35 while others remain on the side lines and carry out everyday performances.

48 *6.1.3 Re-evaluating the parameters of 'branding' communities and empowerment*

50 The literature on brand co-creation already extends its focus beyond brand enthusiasts to
51 consider a range of stakeholders who will vary in terms of the level and nature of their interest
52 in the brand, their degree of engagement with the brand, and their participation in the cocreation
53 process (Haverila et al., 2021; Sarasvuo et al., 2022). What our findings revealed within place
54 branding was a distinction between stakeholders able to secure direct involvement with formal
55 discussion and decisions about the brand and branding processes, and others who could only
56 hope to indirectly exert influence through communication, actions and performances. Sarasvuo
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

et al. (2022) note that the majority of the co-creation literature focuses on stakeholders influencing via communicating or acting upon brands in ways that only indirectly influence marketers' branding activities. The more direct involvement in branding that the most engaged and privileged stakeholders achieved suggests that, within the wider brand community, a 'branding community' existed of stakeholders with direct access to, and influence on, formal branding processes and decisions. This term was used by Yakimova *et al.* (2021) to describe social networks operating in franchise marketing contexts, but in our case more closely resemble a 'branding pool' that Mäläskä *et al.* (2011) describe operating in business-to-business markets as "a dynamic group of independent network actors that perform direct branding activities" (p. 1147). Considering the existence of such branding communities could provide additional clarity for future research in place branding and may become important in other brand contexts as branding processes become more open, participative, and orientated towards co-creation.

Key themes within Sarasvuo *et al.*'s (2022) review of brand co-creation included issues around the nature of co-creation 'interactions', who is involved in co-creation, who gets 'invited' into the co-creation process, and the different roles that stakeholders play. Our findings show the interconnection between these elements. In particular, the involvement and roles played by our stakeholders, with those 'invited in' to become fully engaged becoming active brand co-creators, while those left to become disengaged risked becoming not simply passive but involved in co-destruction. The nature of the interaction involved some stakeholders able to become part of the formal branding processes, whilst others relied on just influencing the brand through performances. Moreover, the alternative of only paying 'lip service' to the principles of engagement and collaboration is not only likely to fail (Zenker & Erfgen, 2014), but also intensifies disillusionment in the process itself, which can result in co-destruction of value (Plé & Chumpitaz Cáceres, 2010).

Through our case of a 'green' place brand, we highlight the nuance, contestation and contradictions involved in what ought to be considered as stakeholder empowerment. In doing so, we suggest that existing definitions of empowerment are outdated and continue to centre around notions of consumer empowerment and marketers' sharing of control over branding processes (Cova & Pace, 2006; Wathieu *et al.*, 2002).

6.2 Theoretical implications

1 We contribute to the brand co-creation literature by examining multiple exchanges and
2 interactions occurring *across* different stakeholder groups that exist within amorphous brand
3 communities (Hanna & Rowley, 2015; Samuel et al., 2018). In doing so, we demonstrate how
4 value is co-created when exchanges occur between different sets of stakeholders, including
5 when both groups are considered ancillary, such as residents and businesses. We show that
6 even within this more open and organic governance place branding context (Iglesias et al.,
7 2013), divisions between those included and those excluded are difficult to overcome (Ripoll
8 Gonzalez & Gale, 2020). Responding to calls to investigate multi-stakeholder perspectives of
9 green branding (Wang, 2019), we also offer insights into the impacts of positioning a place
10 brand around 'green' or environmentally conscious connotations. Our research demonstrates
11 that this virtuous positioning does not automatically encourage stakeholder involvement and
12 empowerment, but can lead to disengagement from, disillusionment with, and contempt for
13 branding processes.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 Moreover, we build on notions of multi-stakeholder brand co-creation, which remains a
27 pertinent area of study in branding theory (Iglesias & Ind, 2020; Merz et al., 2009). We
28 specifically unpack these developments within a place branding setting, selected to elucidate
29 the impetus on multi-stakeholder participation given local stakeholders' innate connection to
30 the brand (Casidy et al., 2019; Peattie & Samuel, 2021; Samuel et al., 2018). We evidence that
31 the acceptance of a widening of the catchment of stakeholders involved in the process does not
32 necessarily translate to the automatic or equal co-creation of value for all those involved, with
33 value being shown to be both co-created and co-destroyed (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011;
34 Makkonen & Olkkonen, 2017) depending on the stakeholder's varying participation and
35 empowerment. While value is co-created through often overlooked or taken-for-granted
36 everyday discursive and material brand performances (von Wallpach et al., 2017), this remains
37 an untapped and under-resourced asset within the brand co-creation process. Stakeholders
38 continue to co-create and co-destroy value based on their varying and conflictual meanings,
39 interactions and enactments they share within a multifaceted brand community.

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 Given the variations in meanings, interactions and value placed on brand performances, being
53 a member of the brand community does not always equate to involvement and empowerment
54 within its branding processes. Instead, we suggest there remains a distinction between everyday
55 sharing of meanings and brand performances in a brand community versus influence over the
56 branding processes that requires entry into the branding community (Yakimova et al., 2021).
57 The latter remains restricted to those with existing positions of influence, such as the local
58
59
60

1
2 authorities, DMOs and increasingly well-placed business stakeholders, whilst we see many
3 residents and smaller visitor attractions disengaged and disempowered by the process. The
4 brand co-creation process resultantly remains orchestrated to give voice to some stakeholders
5 whilst neutralising others.
6
7
8

9
10 Selectivity is not reduced, but instead illuminated by the ingraining of sustainability as a
11 positioning device. As with sustainable consumption more widely, the endorsement and
12 enactment of brands positioned around environmental claims can reinforce connotations of
13 social class and expand societal divisions within divided communities (Shaker & Rath, 2019;
14 Soron, 2010). Deliberate or inadvertent associations with environmentally sustainability
15 prompts heightened expectations of fairness, responsibility and inclusion, propelling narratives
16 about economic and social prosperity to the forefront of stakeholders' perceptions.
17 Sustainability does not encourage empowerment, but instead shines a light on its nuance,
18 complexity and contestation. Instead of continuing to evaluate consumer empowerment (Cova
19 & Pace, 2006), there is an urgent need to unpack and critique brand co-creation as a route to a
20 wider and more conflictual notion of stakeholder empowerment. As such, empowerment is a
21 concept far more contested and nuanced than its current remit in branding theory suggests and
22 should be updated to reflect the complexities of stakeholder empowerment within brand
23 communities.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 35 36 **6.3 Practical Implications**

37
38 Our study provides practical implications for stakeholders involved directly and indirectly in
39 the creation and communication of brands. For those involved in the widening remit of brand
40 management, we highlight the additional scrutiny attached to positioning around 'green' and
41 environmentally conscious connotations, which requires a strong commitment to sustainable,
42 fair and equitable principles in practice.
43
44
45
46

47
48 We also pinpoint the benefit of supporting the everyday and mundane activities that can help
49 stakeholders to enact and experience the brand. For example, additional resources could be
50 provided to enable stakeholders to share stories and knowledge, sign pledges that lobby for
51 environmental commitment, which build longer term relationships and a sense of community.
52 Encouraging enactment of the brand through everyday activities may also help to reduce
53 internal disillusionment and support routes to enhanced stakeholder empowerment.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 The research also sets out a holistic notion of stakeholder participation and empowerment,
3 reflecting the importance of discursive engagement practices, but also enacting the brand. At
4 the same time, it is important to accept that conflicts and contestation are a central part of
5 branding, especially for place branding, as stakeholders bring different associations, demands
6 and resources to the process. While barriers to participation need to be addressed to create a
7 more holistic, equitable and constructive branding co-creation process, perpetuating calls for a
8 completely unified view of how to represent and express a brand may be counterproductive
9 and privilege the loud voices and extraordinary performances over the less vocal and more
10 mundane activities. Moreover, processes relating to 'real' geographic communities and place
11 branding increasingly applies to other contexts as branding processes (by design or evolution)
12 is becoming more participative, and communities of stakeholders beyond 'fans' are taking a
13 greater interest in a brand and its values.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **7. Limitations and future research**

27 Our research pinpoints tensions surrounding the 'green' brand, its enactment and the varying
28 stakeholder roles resulting in an uneven brand co-creation process. Future research could
29 explore whether the brand co-creation process might differ where the brand positioning is
30 focused on alternative differentiators, such as heritage or retro brands. Our focus also centres
31 on salient stakeholders (Mitchell et al., 1997), i.e. those who already have access to, and
32 awareness of, the multifaceted brand community. Since this study points to a hierarchy of
33 involvement for stakeholders with a degree a salience, this is likely to be more pertinent for
34 those absent and removed from the process. Future research should access a wider sample of
35 stakeholders. Similarly, this article focuses on face-to-face rather than digital interactions,
36 which remains an important area of stakeholder participation and brand co-creation. Further
37 research could extend these findings and examine how digital and social media advancements
38 impact face-to-face engagement and networking.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Central to our study is an in-depth investigation into 'how' stakeholders are participating in the
51 co-creation process, and through this investigation we identify a disjuncture between co-
52 creation and co-destruction and a need to extend our understandings of stakeholder
53 empowerment. We call for more research on stakeholder empowerment that brings together
54 the need to support open invitations for multiple stakeholders to actively participate in a wider
55 range of branding processes and engagement performances that supports their ability to co-
56 create value for themselves and the brand. Moreover, our research helps to pave the way for
57
58
59
60

1
2 future studies to examine 'why' certain stakeholders are able to maintain or strengthen their
3
4 position within the brand(ing) community and assert influence over others.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

European Journal of Marketing

References

- Aitken, R., & Campelo, A. (2011). The four Rs of place branding. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 27(9-10), 913-933.
- Andéhn, M., Hietanen, J., & Lucarelli, A. (2019). Performing place promotion—On implaced identity in marketized geographies. *Marketing Theory*, 20(3), 321-342.
- Andersson, I. (2016). ‘Green cities’ going greener? Local environmental policy-making and place branding in the ‘Greenest City in Europe’. *European Planning Studies*, 24(6), 1197-1215.
- Belk, R. (2013). Visual and projective methods in Asian research. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 16(1), 94-107.
- Borah, P. S., Dogbe, C. S. K., Pomegbe, W. W. K., Bamfo, B. A., & Hornuvo, L. K. (2021). Green market orientation, green innovation capability, green knowledge acquisition and green brand positioning as determinants of new product success. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print).
- Braun, E., Eshuis, J., Klijn, E. H., & Zenker, S. (2018). Improving place reputation: Do an open place brand process and an identity-image match pay off? *Cities*, 80, 22-28.
- Bristol. (2014). Environment: European Green Capital. European Commission. Retrieved 09.09.2017 from <https://ec.europa.eu/environment/europeangreencapital/winning-cities/2015-bristol/bristol-application/>
- Bristol. (2021). The population of Bristol. Retrieved 08.01.2021 from <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/statistics-census-information/the-population-of-bristol>
- Bristol Green Capital. (2016). Bristol European Green Capital 2015: Citywide Review. Retrieved 01.02.2018 from https://bristolgreencapital.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/bristol-2015_annual-review.pdf
- Cannas, R., Argiolas, G., & Cabiddu, F. (2018). Fostering corporate sustainability in tourism management through social values within collective value co-creation processes. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(1), 139-155.
- Cascio, M. A., Lee, E., Vaudrin, N., & Freedman, D. A. (2019). A Team-based Approach to Open Coding: Considerations for Creating Intercoder Consensus. *Field Methods*, 31(2), 116-130.
- Casidy, R., Helmi, J., & Bridson, K. (2019). Drivers and inhibitors of national stakeholder engagement with place brand identity. *European Journal of Marketing*, 53(7), 1445-1465.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. (2 ed.). London, England: SAGE.

- 1
2 Conejo, F., & Wooliscroft, B. (2015). Brands Defined as Semiotic Marketing Systems. *Journal*
3 *of Macromarketing*, 35(3), 287-301.
4
5 Cova, B., & Pace, S. (2006). Brand community of convenience products: new forms of
6 customer empowerment – the case “My Nutella the Community”. *European Journal of*
7 *Marketing*, 40(9/10), 1087-1105.
8
9 Davari, A., Iyer, P., & Guzmán, F. (2017). Determinants of brand resurrection movements.
10 *European Journal of Marketing*, 51(11/12), 1896-1917.
11
12 Destination Bristol. (2021a). Visit Bristol: about Bristol's tourism economy. Retrieved
13 02.03.21 from <https://visitbristol.co.uk/about/about-bridstols-tourism-economy>
14
15 Destination Bristol. (2021b). Visit Bristol: Green Bristol. Retrieved 02.03.21 from
16 <https://visitbristol.co.uk/inspire/green>
17
18 Echeverri, P., & Skålén, P. (2011). Co-creation and co-destruction: A practice-theory based
19 study of interactive value formation. *Marketing Theory*, 11(3), 351-373.
20
21 Eriksson, P., & Kovalainen, A. (2008). *Qualitative Methods in Business Research*. Thousand
22 Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
23
24 Ersoy, A., & Lerner, W. (2020). Rethinking urban entrepreneurialism: Bristol Green Capital –
25 in it for good? *European Planning Studies*, 28(4), 790-808.
26
27 European Commission. (2021). Environment: European Green Capital. European Commission
28 [online]. Retrieved 12.03.21 from
29 <https://ec.europa.eu/environment/europeangreencapital/about-the-award/faqs/>
30
31 Frow, P., & Payne, A. (2011). A stakeholder perspective of the value proposition concept.
32 *European Journal of Marketing*, 45(1/2), 223-240.
33
34 Gibbert, M., Ruigrok, W., & Wicki, B. (2008). What passes as a rigorous case study? *Strategic*
35 *Management Journal*, 29(13), 1465-1474.
36
37 Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive
38 research: Notes on the Gioia methodology. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(1), 15-
39 31.
40
41 Govers, R. (2013). Why place branding is not about logos and slogans. *Place Branding and*
42 *Public Diplomacy*, 9(2), 71-75.
43
44 Green, A., Grace, D., & Perkins, H. (2016). City branding research and practice: An integrative
45 review. *Journal of Brand Management*, 23(3), 252-272.
46
47 Gustavsson, E., & Elander, I. (2012). Cocky and climate smart? Climate change mitigation and
48 place-branding in three Swedish towns. *Local Environment*, 17(8), 769-782.
49
50 Hankinson, G. (2009). Managing destination brands: establishing a theoretical foundation.
51 *Journal of Marketing Management*, 25(1-2), 97-115.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2 Hanna, S., & Rowley, J. (2011). Towards a strategic place brand-management model. *Journal*
3 *of Marketing Management*, 27(5-6), 458-476.
4
5 Hanna, S., & Rowley, J. (2015). Towards a model of the Place Brand Web. *Tourism*
6 *Management*, 48, 100-112.
7
8 Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (2010). Toward a theory of brand co-creation with implications
9 for brand governance. *Journal of Brand Management*, 17(8), 590-604.
10
11 Haverila, M., Haverila, K., McLaughlin, C., & Arora, M. (2021). Engagement, participation,
12 and relationship quality in the context of co-creation in brand communities. *Journal of*
13 *Marketing Analytics*.
14
15 Henninger, C. E., Foster, C., Alevizou, P. J., & Frohlich, C. (2016). Stakeholder engagement
16 in the city branding process. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 12(4), 285-298.
17
18 Iglesias, O., & Ind, N. (2020). Towards a theory of conscientious corporate brand co-creation:
19 the next key challenge in brand management. *Journal of Brand Management*, 27(6), 710-
20 720.
21
22 Iglesias, O., Ind, N., & Alfaro, M. (2013). The organic view of the brand: A brand value co-
23 creation model. *Journal of Brand Management*, 20(8), 670-688.
24
25 Jain, V., Shroff, P., Merchant, A., & Bezbaruah, S. (2021). Introducing bi-directional
26 participatory place branding: a theoretical model with multi-stakeholder perspectives.
27 *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print).
28
29 Kavaratzis, M., & Hatch, M. J. (2013). The dynamics of place brands: An identity-based
30 approach to place branding theory. *Marketing Theory*, 13(1), 69-86.
31
32 Kavaratzis, M., & Kalandides, A. (2015). Rethinking the place brand: the interactive formation
33 of place brands and the role of participatory place branding. *Environment and Planning A:*
34 *Economy and Space*, 47(6), 1368-1382.
35
36 Klijn, E.-H., Eshuis, J., & Braun, E. (2012). The Influence of Stakeholder Involvement on The
37 Effectiveness of Place Branding. *Public Management Review*, 14(4), 499-519.
38
39 Loureiro, S. M. C., Romero, J., & Bilro, R. G. (2020). Stakeholder engagement in co-creation
40 processes for innovation: A systematic literature review and case study. *Journal of Business*
41 *Research*, 119, 388-409.
42
43 Lu, H., de Jong, M., & ten Heuvelhof, E. (2018). Explaining the variety in smart eco city
44 development in China-What policy network theory can teach us about overcoming barriers
45 in implementation? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 196, 135-149.
46
47 Ma, W., Schraven, D., de Bruijne, M., de Jong, M., & Lu, H. (2019). Tracing the Origins of
48 Place Branding Research: A Bibliometric Study of Concepts in Use (1980–2018).
49 *Sustainability*, 11(11), 2999.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2 Maheshwari, V., Vandewalle, I., & Bamber, D. (2011). Place branding's role in sustainable
3 development. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 4(2), 198-213.
4
5 Makkonen, H., & Olkkonen, R. (2017). Interactive value formation in interorganizational
6 relationships. *Marketing Theory*, 17(4), 517-535.
7
8 Mäläskä, M., Saraniemi, S., & Tähtinen, J. (2011). Network actors' participation in B2B SME
9 branding. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40(7), 1144-1152.
10
11 Malpass, A., Cloke, P., Barnett, C., & Clarke, N. (2007). Fairtrade Urbanism? The Politics of
12 Place Beyond Place in the Bristol Fairtrade City Campaign. *International Journal of Urban
13 and Regional Research*, 31(3), 633-645.
14
15 Merrilees, B., Abimbola, T., Miller, D., & Herington, C. (2012). Multiple stakeholders and
16 multiple city brand meanings. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46(7/8), 1032-1047.
17
18 Merz, M. A., He, Y., & Vargo, S. L. (2009). The evolving brand logic: a service-dominant
19 logic perspective. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 37(3), 328-344.
20
21 Merz, M. A., Zarantonello, L., & Grappi, S. (2018). How valuable are your customers in the
22 brand value co-creation process? The development of a Customer Co-Creation Value
23 (CCCV) scale. *Journal of Business Research*, 82, 79-89.
24
25 Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a Theory of Stakeholder
26 Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of who and What Really Counts.
27 *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4), 853-886.
28
29 Morgan, N. (2012). Time for 'mindful' destination management and marketing. *Journal of
30 Destination Marketing & Management*, 1(1), 8-9.
31
32 Nadin, S., & Cassell, C. (2006). The use of a research diary as a tool for reflexive practice:
33 Some reflections from management research. *Qualitative Research in Accounting &
34 Management*, 3(3), 208-217.
35
36 Nysveen, H., & Pedersen, P. E. (2014). Influences of Cocreation on Brand Experience.
37 *International Journal of Market Research*, 56(6), 807-832.
38
39 Okazaki, S., Plangger, K., Roulet, T., & Menéndez, H. D. (2021). Assessing stakeholder
40 network engagement. *European Journal of Marketing*, 55(5), 1359-1384.
41
42 Peattie, K., & Samuel, A. (2021). Placing an ethical brand: the Fairtrade Towns movement.
43 *Journal of Marketing Management*, 37(15-16), 1490-1513.
44
45 Platt, L. (2011). Liverpool 08 and the performativity of identity. *Journal of Policy Research in
46 Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 3(1), 31-43.
47
48 Plé, L., & Chumpitaz Cáceres, R. (2010). Not always co-creation: introducing interactional
49 co-destruction of value in service-dominant logic. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 24(6),
50 430-437.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2 Powell, S. M., & Balmer, J. M. T. (2011). The nexus between ethical corporate marketing,
3 ethical corporate identity and corporate social responsibility. *European Journal of*
4 *Marketing*, 45(9/10), 1365-1379.
5
6
7 Pucci, T., Casprini, E., Galati, A., & Zanni, L. (2020). The virtuous cycle of stakeholder
8 engagement in developing a sustainability culture: Salcheto winery. *Journal of Business*
9 *Research*, 119, 364-376.
10
11
12 Rabbiosi, C. (2016). Place branding performances in tourist local food shops. *Annals of*
13 *Tourism Research*, 60, 154-168.
14
15
16 Ripoll Gonzalez, L., & Gale, F. (2020). Combining participatory action research with
17 sociological intervention to investigate participatory place branding. *Qualitative Market*
18 *Research: An International Journal*, 23(1), 199-216.
19
20
21 Ripoll Gonzalez, L., & Gale, F. (2023). Sustainable city branding narratives: a critical appraisal
22 of processes and outcomes. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 16(1), 20-44.
23
24
25 Rivera-Camino, J. (2007). Re-evaluating green marketing strategy: a stakeholder perspective.
26 *European Journal of Marketing*, 41(11/12), 1328-1358.
27
28 Samuel, A., & Peattie, K. (2016). Grounded Theory as a Macromarketing Methodology.
29 *Journal of Macromarketing*, 36(1), 11-26.
30
31
32 Samuel, A., Peattie, K., & Doherty, B. (2018). Expanding the boundaries of brand
33 communities: the case of Fairtrade Towns. *European Journal of Marketing*, 52(3/4), 758-
34 782.
35
36
37 Sarasvuo, S., Rindell, A., & Kovalchuk, M. (2022). Toward a conceptual understanding of co-
38 creation in branding. *Journal of Business Research*, 139, 543-563.
39
40
41 Septianto, F., Tjiptono, F., & Arli, D. (2020). Authentically, proudly ethical: The effects of
42 authentic pride on consumer acceptance of unethical behavior. *European Journal of*
43 *Marketing*, 54(2), 351-379.
44
45
46 Shaker, R., & Rath, J. (2019). The coffee scene in Glasgow's West End: On the class practices
47 of the new urban middle classes. *City, Culture and Society*, 17, 1-7.
48
49
50 Soron, D. (2010). Sustainability, self-identity and the sociology of consumption. *Sustainable*
51 *development*, 18(3), 172-181.
52
53
54 Sunday Times. (2017). Bristol. *The Sunday Times*, March 19. Retrieved 08/01/2021 from
55 <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/bristol-best-places-to-live-2017-9fkfg7p8f>
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Vallaster, C., von Wallpach, S., & Zenker, S. (2018). The interplay between urban policies and grassroots city brand co-creation and co-destruction during the refugee crisis: Insights from the city brand Munich (Germany). *Cities*, *80*, 53-60.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, *68*(1), 1-17.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2017). Service-dominant logic 2025. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *34*(1), 46-67.
- von Wallpach, S., Hemetsberger, A., & Espersen, P. (2017). Performing identities: Processes of brand and stakeholder identity co-construction. *Journal of Business Research*, *70*, 443-452.
- Wang, H.-J. (2019). Green city branding: perceptions of multiple stakeholders. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *28*(3), 376-390.
- Wathieu, L., Brenner, L., Carmon, Z., Chattopadhyay, A., Wetenbroch, K., Drolet, A., . . . Wu, G. (2002). Consumer control and empowerment: a primer. *Marketing Letters*, *13*(3), 297-305.
- Weston, C., Gandell, T., Beauchamp, J., McAlpine, L., Wiseman, C., & Beauchamp, C. (2001). Analyzing interview data: The development and evolution of a coding system. *Qualitative Sociology*, *24*(3), 381-400.
- Wilson, J. E., Bengtsson, A., & Curran, C. (2014). Brand meaning gaps and dynamics: theory, research, and practice. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, *17*(2), 128-150.
- Yakimova, R., Owens, M., & Freeman, S. (2021). The 'visible hand' behind cooperation in franchising: A model of franchisor practices that influence cooperation within social networks. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *94*, 66-89.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zenker, S., Braun, E., & Petersen, S. (2017). Branding the destination versus the place: The effects of brand complexity and identification for residents and visitors. *Tourism Management*, *58*, 15-27.
- Zenker, S., & Erfgen, C. (2014). Let them do the work: a participatory place branding approach. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, *7*(3), 225-234.
- Zerrillo, P. C., & Thomas, G. M. (2007). Developing brands and emerging markets: An empirical application. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, *3*(1), 86-99.

Appendix 1: Sample description and secondary data sources

In-depth semi-structured interviews (n=29)		
Group	Reference	Participant Description
<i>Business community</i> (n=6)	P-1	Senior Manager in large innovation business group
	P-2	Chief Executive Officer for national business representative collective
	P-3	Operating Manager of large investment enterprise
	P-4	Senior Manager in a city-wide entrepreneurial and third-sector organisation
	P-5	Business representative and community engagement officer
	P-6	Marketing Communications Director for regional development group
<i>Local community</i> (n=6)	P-7	Secretary and coordinator for a local residents' group
	P-8	Committee Chair of a local residents' group
	P-9	Committee Chair of a local planning and city-lobbying collective
	P-10	Chair of a local residents' group
	P-11	Representative for a local community partnership
	P-12	Community engagement representative for community attraction
<i>Local government (local authority and elected officials)</i> (n=7)	P-13	Previously elected senior official representing all sectors
	P-14	Local councillor
	P-15	Senior manager of 'place' framework and implementation
	P-16	Director for investment and innovation department
	P-17	Senior officer in neighbourhood partnership programme
	P-18	Senior manager for state-owned cultural attractions for Bristol and wider region
	P-19	Principal officer for local government cultural strategy
<i>Visitor economy</i> (n=9)	P-20	Chief Executive Officer for Bristol's Destination Management Organisation
	P-21	Marketing and Communications Manager at city-centre visitor attraction
	P-22	Chief Executive Officer for a city-centre arts and cultural attraction
	P-23	Services and Visitor Manager at central landmark
	P-24	Curator for a large city-centre museum
	P-25	Owner and Chief Executive Officer for an independent city tours operator
	P-26	Marketing Manager for heritage attraction
	P-27	Volunteer Coordinator at city-centre visitor attraction
	P-28	Volunteer Coordinator at city-centre visitor attraction
<i>Higher Education</i> (n=1)	P-29	Communications Executive for a city-based University
Online Secondary Sources (n=13)		
Secondary Source	Reference	Source location
Bristol and the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) review	S-1	Fox, S. and Macleod, A. 2019. Bristol and the SDGs: a voluntary local review of progress 2019. Bristol University. Available at: https://www.bristol.ac.uk/media-library/sites/cabot-institute-2018/documents/BRISTOL%20AND%20THE%20SDGS.pdf [Accessed 01/03/2021]
Bristol European Green Capital 2015 Citywide review	S-2	Bristol Green Capital. 2015. <i>Bristol European Green Capital 2015 Citywide Review</i> . Bristol Green Capital [online]. Available at: https://bristolgreencapital.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/bristol-2015-annual-review.pdf [Accessed 03/02/2019]
Green pioneers for Bristol Green Capital blog	S-3	Greenhouse Agency. 2015. <i>Top 10 Green Pioneers for Bristol Green Capital</i> . Greenhouse Agency [online]. Available at: https://www.greenhouse.agency/green-pioneers-bristol-green-capital-triodos-soil-association/ [Accessed: 15/02/2021]
Delivering change and low carbon in European Green Capital review	S-4	Centre for Cities. 2016. <i>Delivering change: low carbon. Bristol European Green Capital</i> . Centre for Cities [online]. Available at: https://www.centreforcities.org/reader/delivering-change-cities-go-low-carbon-supporting-economic-growth/bristol-european-green-capital/ [Accessed: 01/03/2021]
B24/7 feature on Bristol's European Green Capital award	S-5	Bristol247. 2015. <i>Bristol Green Capital: success or flop?</i> Bristol247 [online]. Available at: https://www.bristol247.com/news-and-features/features/bristol-green-capital-success-or-flop/ [Accessed: 01/03/2021]
Report to Bristol City Council on European Green Capital	S-6	Bundred, S. 2016. <i>Report to Bristol City Council: Review of Bristol 2015 European Green Capital Year</i> . Bristol City Council [online]. Available at: https://www.bristol.gov.uk/documents/20182/1352057/European+Green+Capital+Review+report/f7ae017a-57b5-4bc0-acdf-a1ed61380a35 [Accessed: 01/03/2021]
VisitBristol 'green' website	S-7	VisitBristol. 2015. <i>Green Bristol</i> . VisitBristol [online]. Available at: https://visitbristol.co.uk/inspire/green [Accessed: 12/05/2018]
Thinktank review of Green Capital	S-8	Bristol's Citizens' Panel. 2015. <i>Citizens' Panel report: Bristol 2015 Green Capital</i> . Bristol City Council [online]. Available at: https://bristol.citizenspace.com/consultation-research-intelligence/greencapital/results/green-capital---citizens-panel-report-july-2015.pdf [Accessed: 01/03/2021]
Resilient cities newspaper report on Bristol Green Capital	S-9	Birch, H. 2015. <i>Is Bristol a worthy Green Capital of Europe – or is it all for show?</i> The Guardian: Resilient Cities. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2015/feb/18/is-bristol-a-worthy-green-capital-of-europe-or-is-it-all-for-show [Accessed: 01/02/2021]

1	Bristol MP blog on Green Capital	S-10	Williams, S. 2016. Where has the Bristol Green Capital Money Gone? Stephen Williams, MP blog.
2			
3	Bristol's Decade of Transformation event review	S-11	Bristol Green Partnership. 2020. Creating a Movement: Bristol's Decade of Transformation. Bristol Green Partnership [online]. Available at: https://bristolgreencapital.org/creating-movement-bristols-decade-transformation/ [Accessed: 21/04/2021]
4			
5			
6	Bristol Green Capital action plans	S-12	Bristol Green Capital. (2020). Mission & Vision. Bristol Green Capital Partnership. Retrieved 09.10.2020 from https://bristolgreencapital.org/who-we-are/mission-vision/
7			
8	Bristol One City to 2050 plan	S-13	Bristol City Council. 2020. One city plan: a plan for Bristol to 2050. Bristol City Council [online]. Available at: https://democracy.bristol.gov.uk/documents/s29198/One%20City%20Plan.pdf [Accessed: 13/01/2021]
9			
10			
11			
12	One city climate strategy	S-14	Bristol One City. 2020. One city climate strategy: a strategy for a carbon neutral, climate resilient Bristol by 2030. Bristol One City [online]. Available at: https://www.bristolonecity.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/placeholder-climate-strategy.pdf [Accessed: 01/03/2021]
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			
47			
48			
49			
50			
51			
52			
53			
54			
55			
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			

1
2
3 **Appendix 2 – Coding summary by stage and themes**
4
5

