

A REVIEW OF EPISTEMOLOGICAL ISSUES AND PHILOSOPHICAL POSITIONS FOR THE
DEVELOPMENT OF THEORY IN PLACE MARKETING AND PLACE BRANDING

Nikos Ntounis, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK, n.ntounis@mmu.ac.uk

Javier Lloveras, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK, j.Lloveras@mmu.ac.uk

Cathy Parker, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK, c.parker@mmu.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

The aim of this paper is to present a critical review of epistemologies within the place marketing and place branding fields and propose alternative philosophical positions that can contribute to theory development. The paper argues that the majority of place marketing and place branding literature (either explicitly or implicitly) embraces in either interpretivist or positivist philosophical stances, which have helped the field to progress in the past 20 years, but have evident drawbacks when applied as sole epistemologies. Alternative philosophical perspectives of doing research in the field of place marketing are presented, which stem from a mixed-paradigm, pragmatic approach to research, and blend pragmatism, realism and social constructionism in the context of places. Such views can delimit the concept of “place” from practical issues such as deprivation, crisis, and regeneration, as well as explore “marketing” as a social process, which can benefit communities within places. Overall, the paper suggests that philosophical and epistemological debates can clarify the field of place marketing and advance theory-making.

KEYWORDS: Place Marketing; Theory Development; Epistemology; Philosophy; Pragmatism

Introduction

The choice of the right philosophical position within a general epistemological framework is a very difficult and crucial decision that researchers must take in order to advance theory and knowledge and make significant contributions in their fields (Williamson, 2000). Interestingly enough, epistemological issues in place marketing theory have not been stressed enough in the literature, mainly due to the complexity of the field and the attempt of researchers to firstly describe “what is going on?” in those fields (Niedomysl & Jonasson, 2012). It can be argued that due to the descriptive nature of these fields, place marketing theories have so far partially served as aids for place managers in their attempts to make places better (Kavaratzis & Ashworth, 2008). However, philosophical and epistemological debates can add depth and clarification on how researchers conceptualise and theorise place marketing, which can help the field to move towards maturity and a normative stage of theory creation (Gertner, 2011).

Whereas there is little or no evidence of philosophical debates in the field of place marketing, it can be claimed that most researchers (either explicitly or implicitly) embrace in either interpretivist or positivist philosophical stances. The purpose of this paper is to offer an alternative philosophical perspective of doing research in the fields of place marketing and place branding, which stems from a mixed-paradigm, pragmatic approach to research, and blends pragmatism and social constructionism in the context of places.

Before we explain this philosophical position, we will present a review of epistemologies that are evident in the field, in terms of place, marketing and place marketing/place branding. Berglund and Olsson (2010) were the first to use a similar approach in their attempt to offer new typologies of place marketing literature, and

identified that research in the field starts from either the “place” side or the "marketing" side of the concept. This distinction aims to contribute to the better understanding of the roles of each concept in the field.

Interpretivism: The Dominant Epistemology

Interpretivist positions are founded on the theoretical belief that reality is socially constructed and fluid (Angen, 2000). Interpretivism advocates a clear distinction between the natural and social world, as well as the necessity of understanding phenomena through the meanings people assign to them. In interpretivism, events are understood through the mental processes of interpretation that is influenced by interaction with social contexts. An assumption that social actors generate meaningful constructs of the social world in which they operate is at the core of interpretivism (Cantrell, 1993; Saunders et al., 2009). A "blend" of hermeneutics and phenomenology, interpretivism was primarily influenced by the work of Weber who defined sociology as "a science which attempts the interpretive understanding of social action in order thereby to arrive at a causal explanation of its course and effects" (Weber, 1964; p.68).

Interpretivist "Place"

For human and cultural geographers, people are not only attached to the natural, physical or built environment of a place, but they are also influenced and interpret a place based on cultural, temporal, genetic, and social factors (Hauge, 2007). Therefore, the relationship between people and the environment is determined as dynamic and interactive, and includes the social, cultural and psychological meanings of a place (Franck, 1984). Interpretivist geographers are mainly influenced by phenomenology, which focuses on the subjective experience and perception of a person's life world (Husserl, 1970). The core

concepts of interpretivist place worth considering here are linked with a dynamic, interactive, cyclical and never-ending process of place identity formation, which is influenced by the different experiences of people who are associated with the place (Kavaratzis and Hatch, 2013). These are:

Genius loci, which refers to a location's distinctive atmosphere, a "spirit of place" (Norberg-Schulz, 1980)

Sense of place, which is the local structure of feeling that subjectively and emotionally attaches people to places (Relph, 1976; Agnew, 1987)

"Marketing" from an Interpretivist Viewpoint

Interpretivist perspectives to marketing research are increasingly seen as a way of gaining a better insight into the decision-making process and of developing theory more effectively (Goulding, 2005). Studies on the topics of relationship marketing, branding, and consumer behaviour followed an interpretivist approach as a way to identify the development of meanings and experiences of customers and to tackle the transient nature of marketing phenomena (Chung, & Alagaratnam, 2001). The versatility of phenomena in marketing and the complexity in their interconnectedness show the openness of marketing as a discipline. Therefore, authors such as Hunt (1994) and Gummesson (2002) suggested that interpretive approaches to research would allow researchers to confront the complexity, ambiguity and dynamism of the real world, with recognition of relationships, networks, and interactions as core variables.

Interpretivist Place Marketing and Place Branding Research

Major advancements in the place marketing and place branding fields have stemmed from the interpretivist stance that researchers have adopted. From a marketing

management perspective, insights of how place managers can develop a long-term sustainable strategy in order to handle changes in the macro and microenvironment of place were identified (Rainisto, 2003). Similar findings related to place branding stressed the importance of dynamic relationships between stakeholders in order to extend the place experience (Hankinson, 2004). Other studies conceptualise place branding as a socio-cultural process, which is deeply rooted to the distinctive characteristics and identities of places. In this case, the discourse and meaning that local people attach to the place's culture and the social aspects that define the place (quality of life, sense of place, place identity) are of central importance to the development of appropriate place marketing or place branding strategies (e.g. Jensen, 2007; Hospers, 2010).

As research strategies, single or multiple case studies provide a specific research context, and interviews, participant observation, and discourse, document, and thematic analysis are among the common methods that researchers employ. Place marketing and place branding research is naturalistic in its majority, and is directly influenced by the views and values of researchers (subjective ontology), who are active participants in the process, regularly as members of specific project(s) (e.g. Rainisto, 2003; Kavaratzis, 2008; Kalandides, 2011a).

Unarguably, interpretive research has helped both fields to progress in the past 20 years. Through constant reformation of theory building, based on descriptions, insights, and explanations, and by borrowing concepts from a variety of disciplines (geography, marketing, planning, branding, etc.) in order to understand place marketing and branding practices in a specific context, researchers have reached to a satisfactory level of understanding both fields (Gertner, 2011). The notions of multiple realities and relative

truths are now well contextualised in the concepts of "place" and "marketing", even though some researchers still neglect these issues and tend to simplify the concepts of place marketing and place branding in this epistemology (Kavaratzis & Hatch, 2013). In addition, the plethora of conceptual papers and models, which are also guided by an interpretive stance and an inductive approach to theory building, helped the discipline to gain useful understandings of the parameters that influence place marketing practice (Niedomysl & Jonasson, 2012).

Criticism against the Dominant Epistemology

However, interpretivist place marketing and place branding fails to show the potential and effectiveness of place marketing and branding practices. From an epistemological viewpoint, interpretivism advocates that there is not one absolute truth, but different truths and realities, which tackles any attempts of interpretivists to justify their inductive inferences that are meant to show theories to be true or probably true (Chalmers, 1999). For example, observable facts regarding the multiple facets of place marketing (marketing strategy, marketing planning, vision, communication strategy, etc.) or the relationships between stakeholders in a specific context can only produce, at best, novel predictions about the place under investigation. Interpretivist research suffers from a "storytelling" discourse and representation of phenomena, which means that most of its concepts and theories are vague in their substance. These abstract claims are rarely supported from validated data, which explains the reluctance of researchers to test their models empirically in order to support their theories (Skinner, 2008; Niedomysl & Jonasson, 2012).

Another drawback stems from the interpretivist concept of "place"; as mentioned above, elements of place such as place identity are dynamic, interactive and cyclical. The never-ending processes of identity formation, sense of place, and genius loci stem from the belief that all places are different, that the place is not a static construct, that boundaries are not necessary for the conceptualization of places, and that places do not have single fixed identities as they are full of internal conflicts (Massey, 1994; Kalandides, 2011b). The statement "All places are different" is commonly interpreted in its absolute sense in place marketing and place branding research.

If one is following Popper's (1963) theory of falsification, he/she can argue that this claim is not falsifiable; all places can be different by default. Even if, for example, we build two identical houses (the "place" in that case is the house) side by side, the foundations of each house will be placed in a different physical ground, and the people that will live inside the "place" will likely form different genius loci, senses of place, and place identities. In that absolute sense, the "all places are different" statement can lead (and has led) to an endless discussion about unfalsifiable statements regarding place identities, senses of place, place realities, genius loci, and so on. That endless stream of immunised hypotheses can lead to pseudo-scientific claims about the physical world. From this view, the "place" concept of "place marketing" threatens the entire field of being accused of producing "quackery", rather than generating acceptable knowledge (Niedomysl & Jonasson, 2012).

Popper's falsificationism has been rigorously criticised by other philosophers, (e.g. Bartley III, 1968, Kuhn, 1970, Feyerabend, 1975) mainly for its strict definitions, which fail to take into account sciences that are mainly observational and descriptive (as place marketing and place branding are mainly from an interpretivist view) and its logical positivism

approach. Sciences can evolve through scientific methods and paradigm shifts, or even by rejecting any scientific method. The extreme example of "place" analysed above is, in our view, the biggest drawback for the development of place marketing theory from an interpretivist approach. A better conceptualization of "place" is needed; one that will still accept that two places cannot be 100% identical, but it is possible that a group of "places" will share a number of similarities that have the potential to create almost shared senses of place and genius loci. For example, there are seven Chinatowns in England, and their similarities could probably form common genius loci. Therefore, a clarification of place boundaries based on their commonalities (if they exceed the differences) can offer various definitions of "place", without damaging the fluidity of place identities and place marketing and branding processes (Kavaratzis and Hatch, 2013).

A final argument against interpretivist research has to do with the apparent confusion that this epistemology causes. An evident drawback of interpretivism, combined with the interdisciplinary natures of place marketing and place branding, is the anarchy that is caused due to myriad approaches to research, and the difficulty of recognising what is right and what is wrong as a concept/theory/viewpoint (Feyerabend, 1975). Feyerabend's "anything goes" approach has been well documented in place marketing literature (Skinner, 2008; Lucarelli and Berg, 2011; Gertner, 2011; Lucarelli and Brorström, 2013), and the individualism evident in the field has led to theories mostly based by the researchers' personal opinions and by the lending of theories from different disciplines. Chalmers's (1999) opinion that a middle ground between universal method and no method seems to be appropriate in place marketing and useful frameworks and methods that have been well developed and accepted over the years, particularly from the marketing field, need to be adapted in place marketing theory and practice.

Positivism: The Minor Epistemology in Place Marketing

In positivism, the key ideas are that the social world exists through objective methods and that social phenomena can be studied, measured and understood like physical objects by using scientific methods. A single external reality exists, independent from human feelings, ideas and perceptions, and the end product can be law-like generalisations similar to those produced by natural and physical scientists (Remenyi et al., 1998). The works of Comte (initially) and Emile Durkheim established positivism as a *de facto* paradigm for conducting research in sociology, a view that was challenged fiercely in the latter half of the 20th century.

Positivist "Place"

It is fairly easy to define "place" from a positivist lens, as positivist geographers refute the influence of personal beliefs in human geography and therefore define the "place" as a single entity independent from human perceptions. The main method, spatial statistical analysis, is used to describe spatial patterns and make statistical inferences about the causes of these patterns. Empiricists in geography mainly use geographic information systems (GIS) as a way to support their view of a "place" as a construct, which can be defined by mathematics and empirical spatial databases (Sheppard, 2001).

Positivist "Marketing"

The positivist view of marketing stemmed from the urge of researchers to advance marketing theory by creating law-like principles and subsequently, a grand marketing theory (Hunt, 1983). Positivists present marketing models in the manner of scientific laws; these models are regarded as having universal validity, and are intended to be used as a *de facto* choice by marketing managers and practitioners (Nevett, 1991). Marketers and consumers

are always detached in positivist marketing; consumers are treated as passive objects and are segmented in terms of *a priori* variables (age, income, traits, etc.). In consumer behaviour and marketing communications, consumers are seen as reactive beings and mechanistic models of stimulus-response or stimulus-organism-response are used to explain their attitudes and behaviours about products, brands and services (Marsden and Littler, 1996; Szmigin and Foxall, 2000).

Limitations of positivist research in Place Marketing

The positivist view of place marketing does not differ a lot from the traditional positivist marketing view. The seminal works of Kotler et al. (1993, 1999) presents various models and tools that stem from positivist marketing and treats places and people in these places as passive entities. The commercial product marketing standpoint of positivists in place marketing advocates that places are seen as physically extended but otherwise familiar products in which the equally familiar marketing techniques can be applied. Sellable characteristics and the geographical nomenclature of places will be selected, modified, or manipulated by marketers in order to achieve maximum benefit from that use (in a form of competitive advantage) (Kavaratzis & Ashworth, 2008). Researchers applying the positivist epistemology in place marketing also try to identify attitudes, perceptions, and feelings of place stakeholders, in order to make causal relationships between those stakeholders and the place (see e.g. Zenker, 2009).

It is evident that a positivist approach to place marketing is limiting the field to a sub-field of a marketing management epic that uses strictly the power of numbers in order to generate knowledge. Whereas the notions of generalisability and validity are intriguing and can offer academic recognition to a field that lacks any (van Ham, 2008), the treatment of

the place as an extended product is problematic. The role of a place's name as a heuristic and an identifier has been well documented in consumer behaviour and tourism marketing studies (Country-of-Origin, Region-of-Origin, Destination Branding, etc.) and only has value if it serves that purpose. In addition, the objective ontology of positivism is seriously limiting the active role that a place's stakeholders must have in the place marketing process. These stakeholders must be seen as active agents of the process, who intertwine with place marketers in order to make decisions regarding place marketing practices (Marsden and Littler, 1996). Positivism can be of value for place marketing, as the epistemology that can be used for measuring results of marketing efforts in places (Kavaratzis and Ashworth, 2008).

An alternative philosophical position

The evident drawbacks of interpretivism and positivism when applied as sole epistemologies in place marketing research were presented above. It is the author's view that neither of them can advance the place marketing field and new epistemologies must be selected. In this part, the proposed philosophical position will be presented. A mixed-paradigm approach will be discussed, which combines a pragmatic view of the "place" and a social constructionist view of "marketing".

A Pragmatic View of "Place"

In pragmatism, knowledge is linked to action and is derived from experience, while the truth is determined by the practical activities. Put simply, knowing and doing are indivisibly part of the same process (Bechara and Van de Ven, 2007). A central tenet of pragmatism that fits the author's understanding of "place" derives from Dewey's idea of body- mind, which advocates that:

...body-mind simply designates what actually takes place when a living body is implicated in situations of discourse, communication and participation. 'Body' designates the continued, conserved, and cumulative operations of factors continuous with the rest of nature (inanimate or animate), while 'mind' designates the characters and consequences which are differential, indicative of features which emerge when 'body' is engaged in a wider, more complex, and interdependent environment (Dewey, 1958; pg. 285).

Dewey's body-mind theory in the context of the relationship between people and place refutes the Cartesian distances between atomized bodies, and therefore a place cannot be seen entirely as a reflection of a naturalized body, which is subjected to mind and advocates a passive, one-way relationship between places and people (Grosz, 1995). The relationship is neither entirely representational, as representational space is seen as qualitative, dynamic, and fluid (Lefebvre, 1991), a notion that is used by interpretivists for defining places, place identities and *genius loci*, and as argued above, is highly problematic as it suggests that no place boundaries need to be drawn.

The proposed relationship between people and places derives from the transactional view of settings (Dewey & Bentley, 1949; Stokols & Shumaker, 1981). A transactional view of the relationship between an individual and the a place can be seen as unique because it focuses on the interface between people and environments, and describes places and people as a unit working together, highlighting the reciprocal influence between them (Hauge, 2007). In Dewey's (1958) view, this transaction between people and place involves a certain stability that is not stagnation but is rhythmic and developing. "Rhythmic" and "Developing" means that the fluidity of places and place identities will not be eliminated if the place can be defined from a pragmatist's view.

In transactionalism, a place can be defined as a geographical space that has acquired meaning because of a person's interaction with the space (Speller, 2000). In that sense, the acquired meaning for all places under investigation for the proposed research is deprivation. This delimitation of places stems from a socio-political factor, and Dewey's view of pragmatism contends that the success of theories is based on their ability to realise the goals of societal improvement and development (Dewey, 1905). Dewey's approach requires imaginatively directing experiences through some common faith to the problems, which a responsible community, that respects its democratic and pluralistic essence, must face. In this sense, Deweyan pragmatism is instrumentalist (Friedman, 2006), and the notion of instrumentalism supports the problematic nature of places under investigation, the attempts of people to communally understand what is going wrong in their places, and how the practical consequences of the place marketing practices can realistically alternate the truths and meanings that are attached in the place.

A Social Constructionist View of "Marketing"

Social constructionism is similar to constructivism, as both epistemologies are concerned with the question of how people construct what they take to be real. However, constructivists advocate that the process of world construction is psychological, whereas for social constructionists believe that what we take to be real is an outcome of social relations (Gergen, 1999). The social relations are between people and therefore intersubjective, and the constructionist approach sees the social world and its meaning as co-constructed or co-created (Ferguson, 2002; Hines & Quinn, 2005). Hackley (2001) suggests a social constructionist view of marketing which:

... respecifies inner mental processes as interactional practices, thus setting the consumption of marketing within a more complex psychological and cultural landscape and... frames research from the point of view of those who experience marketing [consumers] rather than from the a priori precepts of consultants [suppliers] and hence offers a bridge between managerial practice and marketing research and theory (Hackley, 2001; pg. 53)

A social constructionist's aim is to examine the relationship to reality by dealing with constructive processes in approaching it (Flick, 2006). Acceptable knowledge is a product of social relationships, and in the case of place marketing practices, this knowledge can be acquired by dialogical understanding between place stakeholders, without neglecting cultural and psychological influences that stemming from the place itself, and by understanding collective activities during the place marketing process (Strauss, 1997; Hines & Quinn, 2005). The end product of the social constructionist approach in place marketing could be a place marketing theory or framework, which entails the notions of value co-creation between place stakeholders and place managers, and coordination processes which enable exchange and resource integration (Löbner, 2011).

This intersubjective view of place marketing has only recently come into the spotlight, mainly due to the introduction of the Service-Dominant Logic (Vargo and Lusch, 2004, 2008; Warnaby, 2009) in the discipline. Its main advantage over the interpretivist view is that stresses the importance of collective action and constant dialogues between local residents and place managers for the development of place marketing (and place branding) theory (see e.g. Kavaratzis and Hatch, 2013). The blend of social constructionism with a pragmatic view of "place" seems a good fit for place marketing and branding research,

mainly because Dewey's pragmatism is in its essence communalistic and society-oriented (Bechara and Van de Ven, 2007). This means that the pragmatic "place" will still distil meaning during place marketing and branding processes, which can be claimed that will be the outcome of interactions between place stakeholders, place managers, local people, tourists, etc., and can lead to socially constructed, scientific knowledge.

Some Concerns Regarding the Proposed Research Philosophy

A central concern stems from Burr (1995), which claims that researchers need to understand that different constructions of knowledge may lead to different actions. Even with the acceptance, that a central problem will define the choice of places (e.g. rebranding, deprivation, regeneration, town centre development), the fluidity of places and the differences between social groups can threaten the attempt of producing theory with some degree of generalisability and validity. If those issues dominate a study, a possible shift to an empirical view of "place" (e.g. logical positivism) should be tested as an alternative. This view stems from radical geographers, who are not only concerned with scientific representations of facts, but also try to incorporate social factors (e.g. poverty, racism, crime) into their definitions of place (Johnston et al., 1994).

Another issue regarding the social constructionist view of "marketing" is that is closely linked to interpretivism in terms of knowledge acquirement through discourses and creation of meanings (Schwandt, 2003). The close link to relativism led several authors (e.g. Craib, 1997) to severely criticise social constructionism as a comforting collective belief rather than a theoretical position, which fails to make judgements about which account of reality is better than another. In addition, Bury (1986) claims that research using a social constructionist framework lacks any ability to change things because there is nothing against

which to judge the findings of research. Social constructionism that views society as existing both as objective and subjective reality might be the solution to the issues above. This is also a methodological issue, and perhaps classical grounded theory approaches to research might be able to support the view of objective and subjective realities (Andrews, 2012).

However, the major problem with social constructionism is the "blurry" views of equality and power. The marketing view presented above presupposes that all social constructs that will participate in the marketing process will have equal rights and equal power. However, that is not the case for any place. Therefore, postmodernist and feminist views of power are perhaps of great importance for defining the roles of each social construct in the marketing process. Foucault (1995) suggested the concept of disciplinary power, which occurs when the anticipation of control causes people to engage in self-surveillance, and argued that this type of power is present in all social interactions. Acker (1990) stressed that the dynamics of power in organisations are mostly masculine oriented, and those are not grounded in any rational or structural reasoning, which has led to the marginalisation of the role of women and other minority groups.

In this respect, postmodern and feminist theories are essential for our understanding of place marketing and branding, as they cover paradoxical and oppositional views of experience in places and spaces by groups that are resisting dominant representations of place (Oakes, 1997). Consideration of these theories can eliminate predispositions of favouring inequality, stereotyping, homophobia, racism, exploitation, misogyny, classism and rivalry, which stem from a male-dominated modern society (Goldman, 1969; Springer, 2014), and can put an end to the unfair stigmatising and marginalisation of groups and communities who have an equal right to the place and the decisions regarding it.

Conclusion

The choice of the right philosophical position within a general epistemological framework is a very difficult and crucial decision that researchers must take in order to advance theory and knowledge and make significant contributions in their fields (Williamson, 2000). Interestingly, the epistemological issues of place marketing and place branding have not been stressed enough in the literature, mainly due to the complexity of the field and the attempt of researchers to firstly describe “what is going on?” in place marketing theory and practice (Niedomysl & Jonasson, 2012). The absence of philosophical debates also shows the “immaturity” of these fields as a science, as their main purpose is to serve as an aid for place managers in their attempts to make places better (Kavaratzis & Ashworth, 2008).

In this paper, a critique of the major and minor epistemologies that are evident in the field was presented. The interpretivist approach, though very useful in providing rich descriptions of the concepts of “place” and “marketing”, seems to lead the place marketing field into a never-ending, cyclical production of invalidated models and theories, based on researchers’ personal opinions and theories from other disciplines. Anarchy is evident in interpretivist place marketing, which has led to great confusion between academics in the field. On the other hand, positivism epistemology is highly problematic for both place and marketing, as it treats places and people embedded in the process as passive objects.

A pragmatist view of “place”, along with a social constructionism view of “marketing”, is the epistemology suggested for the study of the role of place marketing in the regeneration of deprived places. Pragmatism can set important boundaries for the complex concept of “place”, by highlighting specific similarities that stem from social

deprivation and the communities' experiences of the places under study. Social constructionism stresses the need to place local people and communities as active agents of the place marketing process, and also accepts that knowledge can be generated by collective action and constant, everyday dialogue. The apparent drawbacks of this view are mentioned, such as issues of equality and power, as well as epistemological issues can hinder contribution to knowledge, mainly due to the close ties of social constructionism with interpretivism and the problems of generalisation and validity.

Future work should consider examining other alternative epistemologies (postmodernism, critical realism, feminism, queer theory, etc.) for theory development, as well as building on philosophies of space and place in order to examine, and understand, the dynamic role of "place" in theory building (see e.g. Warnaby and Medway, 2013). Postmodernism for example, can definitely stress issues of culture and power in space and place that were recognised above, and the 'play within language' and signs/signifiers can advance theory of practice within the marketing field, as Löbler (2010) suggested. A careful exploration of the philosophical positions will help the researcher to eventually find his right philosophy of knowledge.

References

Acker, J. (1990) Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender and Society*. 4(2). p. 139-158.

Agnew, J.A. (1987) *Place and Politics: The Geographical Mediation of State and Society*. Boston, MA: Allen & Unwin.

Andrews, T. (2012) What is Social Constructionism?, *Grounded Theory Review: An International Journal*, 11 (1). [ONLINE]. Available at: <http://groundedtheoryreview.com/2012/06/01/what-is-social-constructionism/> [Assessed: 08/06/2013].

Angen, M.J. (2000) Evaluating Interpretive Inquiry: Reviewing the Validity Debate and Opening the Dialogue. *Qualitative Health Research*. 10 (3). p. 378-395.

Ashworth, G. J. & Voogd, H. (1990) *Selling the city: marketing approaches in public sector urban planning*. Belhaven: London.

Ashworth, G.J. & Voogd, H. (1994) Marketing and Place Promotion. In: Ward, S.V. & Gold, J.R. (Eds.). *Place Promotion: The Use of Publicity and Marketing to Sell Towns and Region*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons. p. 39-52.

Bartley III, W.W. (1968) Theories of Demarcation between Science and Metaphysics. *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. 49. p. 40-119.

Bechara, J.P. & Van de Ven, A.H. (2007) Philosophy of Science Underlying Engaged Scholarship. In: Van de Ven, A.H. (Ed.) *Engaged Scholarship: A Guide for Organizational and Social Research*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. p. 36-70.

Berg, L. van den & Braun, E. (1999) Urban Competitiveness, Marketing and the Need for Organising Capacity. *Urban Studies*. 36(5-6). p. 987-999.

Berglund, E. & Olsson, K. (2010) Rethinking Place Marketing – A Literature Review. in *50th ERSA Congress*. Jönköping. Sweden. 19th – 23rd August.

Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2003) *Business Research Methods*. Oxford University Press: New York.

Burr, V. (1995) *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. Routledge: London & New York.

Cantrell, D.C. (1993) Alternative Paradigms in Environmental Education Research: The Interpretive Perspective. In R. Mrazek, (Ed.), *Alternative Paradigms in Environmental Education Research*. Troy: OH, North American Association for Environmental Education. p. 81-104.

Chalmers, A.F. (1999) *What is This Thing Called Science?*. 3rd Ed. University of Queensland Press: Queensland.

Chung, E., & Alagaratnam, S. (2001) 'Teach ten thousand stars how not to dance': a survey of alternative ontologies in marketing research. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*. 4 (4). p. 224-234.

Creswell, J. (2003) *Research Design – Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 2nd ed. Sage: London.

Dewey, J. (1905) The Realism of Pragmatism. *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Methods*. 12(2). p. 324-327.

Dewey, J. (1958) *Experience and Nature*. Dover: New York. (originally published in 1929).

Dewey, J., & Bentley, A.F. (1949) *Knowing and the Known*. Beacon: Boston.

Ferguson, P. (2002) After Marketing and Social Construction. *Ephemera: Critical Dialogues on Organization*. 2(3). p. 258–262.

Feyerabend, P. (1975) *Against Method*. New Left Books: London.

Flick, U. (2006) *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. 3rd Ed. Sage: London.

Foucault, M. (1995) *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage.

Franck, K. (1984) Exorcising the ghost of physical determinism. *Environment and Behavior*. 16(4). p. 411-435.

Friedman, R.L. (2006) Deweyan Pragmatism. *William James Studies*. 1. [ONLINE]. Available at: <http://williamjamesstudies.org/1.1/friedman.html> [Assessed 05/06/2013].

Gergen, K.J. (1999) *An Invitation to Social Construction*. Sage: London.

Gertner, D. (2011) A (tentative) Meta-Analysis of the 'Place Marketing' and 'Place Branding' Literature. *Journal of Brand Management*. 19 (2). p. 112-131.

Goldman, E. (1969) *Anarchism and Other Essays*. New York: Dover.

Goulding, C. (2005) Grounded Theory, Ethnography and Phenomenology: A Comparative Analysis of Three Qualitative Strategies for Marketing Research. *European Journal of Marketing*. 39(3-4). p. 294-308.

Grosz, E. (1995) *Bodies-Cities: In Time, Space, and Perversion*. Allen and Unwin: London.

Gummesson, E. (2002) Relationship Marketing and a New Economy: It's Time for De-programming. *Journal of Services Marketing*. 16(7). p. 585-589.

Hackley, C. (2001) *Marketing and Social Construction: Exploring the Rhetorics of Managed Consumption*. Routledge: London.

Hauge, A.L. (2007) Identity and Place: A Critical Comparison of Three Identity Theories. *Architectural Science Review*. 50(1). p. 44-51.

Hines, T. & Quinn, L. (2005) Socially Constructed Realities and the Hidden Face of Market Segmentation. *Journal of Marketing Management*. 21(5-6). p. 529-543.

Hospers, G. (2010) Making Sense of Place: From Cold to Warm City Marketing. *Journal of Place Management and Development*. 3(3). p.182 – 193.

Hunt, S.D. (1983) General Theories and the Fundamental Explananda Of Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*. 47(4). p. 9-17.

Hunt, S.D. (1994) On Rethinking Marketing: Our Discipline, Our Practice, Our Methods. *European Journal of Marketing*. 28(3). p. 13-25.

Husserl, E. (1970) *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Northwestern University Press: Evanston, IL.

Jensen, O.B. (2007) Culture Stories: Understanding Cultural urban Branding. *Planning Theory*. 6(3). p. 211-236.

Johnston, R.J., Gregory, D. & Smith, D.M. (1994) *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, 3rd Ed. Blackwell: USA.

Kalandides, A. (2011a) The Problem with Spatial Identity: Revisiting the 'Sense of Place'. *Journal of Place Management and Development*. 4(1). p. 28–39.

Kalandides, A. (2011b) City Marketing for Bogotá: A Case Study In Integrated Place Branding. *Journal of Place Management and Development*. 4(3). p.282 – 291.

Kavaratzis, M. & Ashworth, G. (2008) Place Marketing: How Did we get There and Where are we Going?. *Journal of Place Management and Development*. 1(2). p. 150-165.

Kavaratzis, M. & Hatch, M.J. (2013) The Dynamics of Place Brands: An Identity-based Approach to Place Branding Theory. *Marketing Theory*. 13(1). p. 69-86.

Kavaratzis, M. (2008) *From City Marketing to City Branding: An Interdisciplinary Analysis with Reference to Amsterdam, Budapest and Athens*. Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Unpublished PhD thesis.

Kotler, P. & Levy, S.J. (1969) Broadening the Concept of Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*. 33(1). p. 10-15.

Kotler, P. & Zaltman, G. (1971) Social Marketing: An Approach to Planned Social Change. *Journal of Marketing*. 35(3). p. 3-12.

Kotler, P., Asplund, C., Rein, I., & Haider, D.H. (1999) *Marketing Places Europe*. Financial Times: Prentice Hall.

Kotler, P., Haider, D. H. & Rein, I. (1993) *Marketing Places: Attracting Investment, Industry, and Tourism to Cities, States, and Nations*. The Free Press: New York.

Kuhn, T.S. (1970) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL.

Lefebvre, H. (1991) *The Production of Space*. Blackwell: Oxford.

Löbler, H. (2010) Signs and Practices: Coordinating Service and Relationships. *Journal of Business Market Management*. 4(4). p. 1–14.

Löbler, H. (2011) Position And Potential Of Service-Dominant Logic - Evaluated In An 'Ism' Frame For Further Development, *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 51-73

Lucarelli, A. & Brorström, S. (2013) Problematising Place Branding Research: A Meta-Theoretical Analysis Of The Literature. *The Marketing Review*. 13(1). p. 65-81.

Lucarelli, A., & Berg, P.O. (2011) City branding: a state-of-the-art review of the research domain. *Journal of Place Management and Development*. 4(1). p. 9-27.

Marsden, D. & Littler, D. (1996) Evaluating Alternative Research Paradigms: A Market-Oriented Framework. *Journal of Marketing Management*. 12(7). p. 645-655.

Massey, D. (1994) *Space, Place and Gender*. Polity Press: Cambridge.

Nevett, T. (1991) Historical Investigation and the Practice of Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*. 55(3). p. 13-23.

Niedomysl, T. & Jonasson, M. (2012) Towards a Theory of Place Marketing. *Journal of Place Management and Development*. 5(3). p. 223-230.

Norberg-Schulz, C. (1980) *Genius Loci: Toward a Phenomenology of Architecture*. Rizzoli: New York.

Oakes, T. (1997) Place and the Paradox of Modernity. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*. 87(3), p.509–531.

Popper, C. (1963) *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*. Routledge: London.

Rainisto, S.K. (2003) *Success Factors of Place Marketing: A Study of Place Marketing Practices in Northern Europe and the United States*. Helsinki: Helsinki University of Technology. Institute of Strategy and International Business. Unpublished PhD thesis.

Relph, E. (1976) *Place and Placelessness*. Pion: London.

Remenyi, D., Williams, B., Money, A. & Swartz, E. (1998) *Doing Research in Business and Management: An Introduction to Process and Method*. Sage: London.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009) *Research Methods for Business Students*. 5th ed. Prentice Hall: Essex.

Schwandt, T. A. (2003) Three Epistemological Stances for Qualitative Inquiry: Interpretivism, Hermeneutics and Social Constructionism. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y (Eds.). *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. p. 292-331.

Sheppard, E. (2001) Quantitative Geography: Representations, Practices, and Possibilities. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. 19(5). p. 535-554.

Skinner, H. (2008) The Emergence and Development of Place Marketing's Confused Identity. *Journal of Marketing Management*. 24(9-10). p. 915-928.

Speller, G. (2000) *A Community in Transition: A Longitudinal Study of Place Attachment and Identity Process in the Context of an Enforced Relocation*. University of Surrey. Guildford, England. Unpublished PhD thesis.

Springer, S. (2014) Why a radical geography must be anarchist. *Dialogues in Human Geography*. 4(3) p. 249–270.

Stokols, D., & Shumaker, S. A. (1981) People in places: A transactional view of settings. In J. H. Harvey (Ed.). *Cognition, Social Behavior and the Environment*. Newark, New Jersey: Erlbaum. p. 441-488.

Strauss, A. (1997) *Mirrors and Masks: The Search for Identity*. Transaction Publishers: London.

Szmigin, I. & Foxall, G. (2000) Interpretive Consumer research: How Far Have we come?. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*. 3(4). p. 187-197.

Vargo, S.L. & Lusch, R.F. (2004) Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*. 68(1). p. 1–17.

Vargo, S.L. & Lusch, R.F. (2008) Service-dominant Logic: Continuing the Evolution. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 36(1). p. 1–10.

Warnaby, G. (2009) Towards a Service-Dominant Place Marketing Logic. *Marketing Theory*. 9(4). p. 403-423.

Warnaby, G. & Medway, D. (2013) What about the “place” in place marketing?. *Marketing Theory*. 13(3). p.345–363.

Weber, M. (1964) *The theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Oxford University Press: New York.

Williamson, T. (2000) *Knowledge and its Limits*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Zenker, S. (2009) Who's your Target? The Creative Class as a Target Group for Place Branding. *Journal of Place Management and Development*. 2(1). p.23 – 32.