Cultural intermediaries in place branding: Who are they and how do they construct legitimacy for their work and for themselves?

Abstract
This article applies a social constructionist approach to the analysis of the promotional actors in place branding. Previous studies have provided useful conceptual and empirical perspectives on place branding as an emerging practice in urban governance. However, little attention has been paid to the dispositions and occupational resources drawn upon by the promotional actors responsible for the design and implementation of place brand strategies. This article extends Bourdieu’s notion of cultural intermediaries to the field of place branding by analysing the promotional actors engaged in it. Through in-depth interviews with 16 professionals in Toronto, Canada, this paper employs a case study approach to identify the habitus, forms of social and cultural capital and field adaptation utilised by various promotional actors to not only construct legitimacy for their work for the city they represent, but also for themselves.
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Introduction
Much theoretical and analytical attention in tourism and urban studies has been paid to those cities that came to prominence as centres of global power, innovation and financial control in the latter years of the last century, seen as ‘drivers of globalisation dynamics and metropolitan norms’ (Peck, 2015, p. 163) and upon which competitive benchmarks for global positioning were built (Sassen, 2001). This lent itself to a type of urban entrepreneurialism that reflected the need for cities to position themselves in relation to dominant market forces, resulting in urban policy theories increasingly being driven by tourism, promotional considerations and market-oriented governance.

In a time of increasing competition driven by market forces, the conceptualization of places as brands is now firmly established (Dinnie, 2011; Kavaratzis and Hatch, 2013; Pike, 2009; Ward, 2000; Warnaby, 2009), although subject to contestation on the grounds of potential commodification of places (Medway and Warnaby, 2014) and for over-simplifying the complex, multidimensional nature of territorial space (Ren and Blichfeldt, 2011). Place promotion has attracted scholarly attention from a variety of perspectives including public relations (Gold and Ward, 1994), economic geography (Pike, 2013), public administration (Eshuis, Braun and Klein, 2013), political geography (Hymans, 2010), cultural sociology (Cormack, 2008), tourism (Lorenzini, Calzati and Giudici, 2011) and marketing (Gilmore, 2002).

Critical approaches to the idea of urban subjugation, the “pervasive naturalization of market logics” (Peck and Tickell, 2002) or the problems inherent in creating a 'market
city’ (McCann et al., 2013) reflect a post-globalist view, and emphasise that cities following this path might gear their management more towards markets than people. Place branding scholars also reflect that place branding, as a discipline, is used to legitimize neoliberal urban governance models and the elitist market-oriented strategies that support them (Kavaratzis and Kalandides, 2015).

Thus explorations within geography have moved away from the predominantly global powerhouse and market-oriented theories to consider the multiplex, ordinary city – a shift from big picture urbanism to study the microcosms of cities (Peck, 2015). Cities are conceived as places of everyday practices, or ‘unique assemblages’ of human/non-human, economic and cultural factors that played out in everyday practice, endlessly renewing themselves according to the actions and dispositions of its actors (McCann et al., 2013). This anti-essentialist and deconstructivist turn in urban studies represents a new, grassroots way of reading a city, through the close exploration of the daily rhythms of the people and their practices (Amin and Thrift, 2002; Peck, 2015). Such an approach emphasises the city ‘as a place of mobility, flow and everyday practices, and which reads cities from their recurrent phenomenological patterns’ (Amin and Thrift, 2002, p. 7). This perspective opens up multiple avenues for new research in terms of understanding how cities are continually made and re-made in the image of those who promote them, especially from a destination management perspective.

Reflecting Morgan and Pritchard’s (1998) assertion that tourism processes have broader cultural meanings which extend far beyond the actual consumption of tourism products and places, and that tourism identities are packaged according to particular dominant value systems and meanings, reinforcing dominant ideologies (p. 3), this paper uses a social constructionist approach and draws specifically on the theoretical lens of Bourdieu’s (1984) notion of cultural intermediaries to analyse the characteristics and work of the promotional actors in place branding.

We build upon and extend previous work that highlights the interactive participatory nature of place brands (Kavaratzis and Kalandides, 2015) by examining the professional knowledge, cultural/social capital, and other occupational resources drawn upon by the promotional actors responsible for the design and implementation of place brand strategies. Because ‘the product must plausibly resemble the representation, and thus cities often remake themselves in conformity with their advertised image’ (Judd and Fainstein 2009, p. 4), and ‘representation of place, the images created for marketing, the vivid videos and persuasive prose of advertising texts, can be as selective and as creative as the marketer can make them’ (Holcomb 1993, p. 54) a cultural intermediary framework is an appropriate starting point from which to explore the means by which such actors construct legitimacy for their work and for themselves. This study contributes to a broader sociological understanding of the occupational functions and impacts within tourism promotion, and opens new avenues for research in considering how the tastes and aesthetic dispositions of marketers might translate into a city’s policy decisions and government practices.

This paper will first identify the unit of analysis – the actors who work in a variety of
professional contexts, but whose dominant function is the promotion of place. It will highlight that ‘place’ is a three-dimensional construction, one that is a lived and breathed reality in the minds of those hired to promote it representing a unique set of occupational challenges. Thus, place is paramount in their lives and requires their personal investment of ‘taste’ in order to succeed at their jobs. The paper then goes on to identify the theoretical foundations that underpin this occupational reality, with a focus on Bourdieu’s notion of cultural intermediation. The third section identifies Toronto as an appropriate context for the case study, while the fourth section outlines the methods used in obtaining the data to explore it. The fifth section reports the findings and offers a discussion on how Bourdieu’s theories might be applied to practice.

Cultural intermediaries

Through the cultural intermediary lens, Bourdieu (1984) addressed the sociology of consumption by identifying those social actors who work at the intersection of culture and the economy, adding value through the symbolic qualification of goods and services in a market-oriented society. Bourdieu sought to establish a theory of practice that explored the human interactions and conventions that helped maintain hierarchical social orders; he focused on the behaviours of people within public arenas, exploring how they might hold influence over others and maintain privileged positions of power in society (Bourdieu, 1994; Browitt and Nelson, 2004). Such individuals achieve this through the display of ‘autonomy, authority and an arsenal of devices’, acting as ‘professionals of qualification’ who operate on the supply side of markets (Smith Maguire and Matthews, 2014, pp. 2-4). Cultural intermediaries are ‘taste-makers’ who leverage their own personal experiences into occupational resources to legitimate certain forms of culture over others (Bourdieu, 1984). The central tenet of cultural intermediation is that it places an emphasis on those workers who reside in the nexus between reality and what is perceived as reality by the target audience, continually engaged in forming a point of connection, or ‘articulation’ between production and consumption (Curtin and Gaither, 2007) in the ‘circuit of culture’ (du Gay et al., 1997). Bourdieu’s notions of habitus, capital and fields focus on the means by which cultural intermediaries are able to do this, and where. Thus his attention is turned towards the taste-making and influential functions of the social actors who work in promotional occupations such as marketing, advertising, design and public relations (Bourdieu, 1991).

Bourdieu conceptualized habitus as “a structured and structuring structure” (1994, p. 170). It is ‘structured’ by one’s past and present circumstances, such as family upbringing and education. It is ‘structuring’ in that one’s habitus helps to shape one’s present and future practices, and it is a ‘structure’ in that it is systematically ordered rather than random. This structure comprises a system of embodied social structures such as race, class and gender that are internalized to form one’s values, disposition and lifestyle that generate perceptions, demeanor, knowledge and practices within specific fields – the various institutional and social structures where people perform their roles and create their identities (Bourdieu, 1990 c.f Maton, 2008: 51). These fields are where power is developed and manifested.
The place that actors hold within a field are dependent on the relative weight of their combined capital assets, which derive from a broad range of both personal attributes as well as current social values. Power and identity are not fixed; a field can be created in the intellectual, religious, cultural or social arenas, and an individual’s sense of themselves and where they are situated in a given social hierarchy can change depending on the field they occupy at a given moment. Fields are formed from networks of social relations; they are competitive environments in which social actors leverage their own habitus to compete for placement – for economic, cultural, social and symbolic power.

The currency that allows this to occur is capital. Economic capital, or the attainment of monetary currency, was not Bourdieu’s primary concern. He extends the importance of capital beyond the material and contends that one’s social or cultural influence could be just as valuable in determining the amount of power that one has in society. Bourdieu uses these concepts to detail how the social order is progressively inscribed in people’s minds through ‘cultural products’ including systems of education, language, judgements, values, methods of classification and activities of everyday life (1984, p. 471).

The resources that actors rely on, such as educational or professional credentials, knowledge, networks, affiliations, memberships, social style, titles and qualifications, in aggregate make up their ‘symbolic capital’. Bourdieu characterizes the ‘taste’ that is legimitated through these forms as ‘aesthetic disposition’ (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 28). Actors exert their influence over others through their symbolic capital, legitimating the way they see the world over others, and performing an influential taste-making function within consumer-driven society.

The past decade has witnessed a trend in exploring promotional occupations through a socio-cultural lens, building on Bourdieu whose work focused on societal power and influence (1984). The working lives of cultural intermediaries often overlap with their lives outside of work, with many believing that the lifestyles they lead personally help them impart an authority and authenticity necessary for the messages they promote and the organisations they represent to be perceived as credible (Smith Maguire and Matthews 2010). For example, the public relations practitioners in Hodges’ (2006) study in Mexico City drew on their own personal experiences and believed that their social capital and lifestyles played a significant role in maintaining their credibility as bridges between organisations and their publics. Practitioners expressed a need to embody the values they were responsible for communicating, and that drawing on their personal experience and demonstrating authenticity was ‘central to their effectiveness as professional communicators’ (Hodges 2011: 39). Thus, the boundary between work and leisure is often blurred for cultural intermediaries, as they are often called upon to insert their own personal taste, or cultural capital, gleaned from their habitus to bestow legitimacy on both the products they endorse, as well as cement their own general authority as ‘arbiters of taste and style’ (Smith Maguire 2014: 219). A cultural intermediary’s private life becomes a crucial occupational resource, and their credibility as a mobiliser and motivator of consumers to emotionally connect with the brand they represent thus becomes central to the legitimisation of their professional identity.
Thus there has been increased interest in applying the concept of cultural intermediation to the promotional occupations in recent years, particularly in the fields of branding (Moor 2008, 2014), advertising (McFall 2004; Cronin 2004; Kelly et al. 2008, Hackley and Kover 2007) and public relations (Hodges 2006; Piecska 2006; L’Etang 2007; Edwards 2012; Edwards and Hodges 2011; Hodges and Edwards 2014).

The relevance of this to place branding is that Bourdieu’s theory of cultural intermediation is largely concerned with how certain occupations appear to possess more social and cultural capital than others in certain fields. He suggests that representation and symbolic production is central to the work of cultural intermediaries as it helps them forge a sense of identity with the product, place, artist, or commodity they represent and contextualise it for their target audiences. The symbolic power they hold stems directly from the economic, social and cultural capital they possess – and this capital is highly valued within the profession. If we understand that place marketers, by way of their position at the centre of cultural representation, create specific identities that represent certain ways of seeing reality, and have a certain degree of power over how reality is perceived by target audiences, we can infer that these identities might both reflect and reinforce perceptions that are grounded in particular hegemonic power structures (Morgan and Pritchard 1998). This makes a case for understanding who such individuals are, how they develop their social and cultural capital and where it is leveraged to impact promotional outcomes (Smith Maguire and Matthews, 2010).

Promotional actors in place branding

Kavaratzis and Hatch (2013) point to Zenker and Braun’s (2010) comprehensive definition of place branding as ‘a network of associations in the consumers’ mind based on the visual, verbal, and behavioural expression of a place, which is embodied through the aims, communication, values, and the general culture of the place’s stakeholders and the overall place design’ (p. 5). They emphasize that place branding does not stem from a single unified managerial process, but is implemented through a set of intertwined collective sub-processes (ibid). This builds on Hanna and Rowley’s (2011) assertion that there is a need to understand the ‘agents, relationships and interactions’ (p. 473) involved in those sub-processes to better understand how place brands come about.

The literature on place branding clearly points to the importance of partnerships and relationships in forming a ‘collaborative stakeholder approach’ and ‘strong compatible partnerships’ (Hankinson, 2007) that emphasise the co-creation of meaning in the development of a place brand, and the need for key individuals with strong leadership abilities to bind communities together (Landry, 2008) and to form networks to facilitate the creation of shared meaning that will inevitably enhance brand strength (Kapferer, 2001).

If we understand that places do not emerge fully formed but as endlessly redefined and socially constructed products that are reinterpreted via discourse by the people hired to promote them, then the nature of a place is constantly being rewritten through creative human endeavor (Warnaby and Medway 2013, p. 357). This theoretical position is grounded in a participatory approach to place branding which stresses co-creation,
community and collaboration in promotional activities among myriad stakeholders who care about the future of the brand.

The network of actors involved in city branding may occupy all levels of government (regional, municipal, arm’s length/agency), as well as permeating civil society (voluntary, non-profit) and the business sector. This constitutes a large infrastructure of workers including, but not limited to: marketing and public relations personnel at the local destination marketing organization (DMO); brand consultants hired by the local government to carry out campaign-specific work focused on targeted audiences both locally and internationally; bureaucrats and politicians within municipal and regional government who work within an economic development, inward investment, tourism, or a resident engagement capacity; the various ‘taste-makers’ around the city who write about local happenings (bloggers and cultural influencers who write about food, theatre, nightlife, arts/culture, festivals/events, sport); and the city’s daily and weekly media who report on the activities of all of the above. At various levels, all of this work could be classed as promotional and takes place within a ‘culture of circulation’ – a cultural process created by the interactivity taking place between circulating forms and the interpretive communities built around them (Lee and LiPuma, 2003; Aronzyk, 2013).

The ‘place myths’ that are constructed about a place – the combined imagery, narratives, clichés and messages that circulate within society – need not necessarily reflect its actual reality; perception becomes reality through the constant repetition and circulation of these messages in the media environment (Lash and Urry, 1994; Lübbren and Crouch, 2003). The visual and discursive representations of a city are encountered everywhere, including through official channels such as advertising, way-finding signage, maps, photography, travel brochures, web sites, B-roll and YouTube videos created by marketing and public relations staff, and in ‘talking points’ in political speeches and policy documents. These are further reinforced by unofficial media discourse in traditional mainstream and alternative press, lifestyle and personal blogs, and through the personal iconography captured by residents and visitors who take photos, upload them and share them via social media, prompted, in some cases, by the messages they primarily encountered through official promotional channels. Thus the stories told about a place can ultimately impact its culture, as such stories are often shared and repeated through an ongoing circle of production, representation and consumption (Kavaratzis and Ashworth, 2005; du Gay et al., 1997). This discourse is then adopted into policy documents and press releases, and begins to infiltrate the decisions that might be made about infrastructure and economic development strategy. If we accept that the messages that originate through official city branding processes have broader cultural meanings which extend beyond the actual consumption of tourism products and places, then place branding practitioners, through the images and narratives they deploy, are responsible for creating a certain way of seeing reality – and possess a great deal of influence over how that city comes to be perceived (Morgan and Pritchard, 1998).

Yet, while much analysis of the occupational function of place marketers exists, to date there has been little exploration of the personal and professional dispositions of practitioners – who they are (Aronczyk, 2013) and how their lives might impact their
work. Moreover, as with most promotional occupations, they are most influential when invisible. The work of interpreting the city, collecting, curating and amplifying its meaning via communicative action is meant to be felt, not seen, and yet it is a crucial element in the broader practice of city branding. The lack of academic enquiry into the social, cultural and symbolic impact of these occupational functions is a conspicuous omission in the tourism and place branding literatures, which the current study seeks to redress.

A broader sociological approach to city branding through the lens of promotional culture points to the cultural influence exerted by promotional actors, who are in a position to directly impact the dominant discourses that exist about the commodity they represent, through a process of meaning-making (Wernick, 1991; Davis, 2013). Because meaning is culture-specific, places rely on cultural intermediaries who understand the local nuances of a place and can articulate that meaning through communication channels that resonate with multiple audiences.

Given the centrality of cultural intermediaries in the formulation and implementation of place brand strategy, there have been calls to better understand the challenges practitioners face and the mechanisms by which they overcome these challenges (Moilanen, 2015). Taking a participatory approach to place branding means that examining the ways in which practitioners approach their work, the meanings they create and the discourses they influence, matters (Hudak, 2015). Identifying the promotional actors in place branding within a socio-cultural framework helps to contextualise the importance of their work amongst broader sociological and institutional structures. It also identifies the important role that they play and makes a stronger case for their input early in the policy planning and development phases of city branding. The aim of this study is thus to position the promotional actors in place branding as cultural intermediaries, and to argue that this position uniquely affords them the ability to shape the culture of that place. We introduce a new way of thinking about the occupational functions of the promotional actors in place branding, and open up new avenues for future research.

**Theoretical framework: Cultural Intermediaries**

Through the cultural intermediary lens, Bourdieu (1984) addressed the sociology of consumption by identifying those social actors who work at the intersection of culture and the economy, adding value through the symbolic qualification of goods and services in a market-oriented society. Bourdieu sought to establish a *theory of practice* that explored the human interactions and conventions that helped maintain hierarchical social orders; he focused on the behaviours of people within public arenas, exploring how they might hold influence over others and maintain privileged positions of power in society (Bourdieu, 1994; Browitt and Nelson, 2004). Such individuals achieve this through the display of ‘autonomy, authority and an arsenal of devices’, acting as ‘professionals of qualification’ who operate on the supply side of markets (Smith Maguire and Matthews, 2014, pp. 2-4). Cultural intermediaries are ‘taste-makers’ who leverage their own personal experiences into occupational resources to legitimate certain forms of culture over others (Bourdieu, 1984). The central tenet of cultural intermediation is that it places
an emphasis on those workers who reside in the nexus between reality and what is perceived as reality by the target audience, continually engaged in forming a point of connection, or ‘articulation’ between production and consumption (Curtin and Gaither, 2007) in the ‘circuit of culture’ (du Gay et al., 1997). Bourdieu’s notions of *habitus*, *capital* and *fields* focus on the means by which cultural intermediaries are able to do this, and where. Thus his attention is turned towards the taste-making and influential functions of the social actors who work in promotional occupations such as marketing, advertising, design and public relations (Bourdieu, 1991).

Bourdieu conceptualized *habitus* as “a structured and structuring structure” (1994, p. 170). It is ‘structured’ by one’s past and present circumstances, such as family upbringing and education. It is ‘structuring’ in that one’s habitus helps to shape one’s present and future practices, and it is a ‘structure’ in that it is systematically ordered rather than random. This structure comprises a system of embodied social structures such as race, class and gender that are internalized to form one’s values, disposition and lifestyle that generate perceptions, demeanour, knowledge and practices within specific *fields* – the various institutional and social structures where people perform their roles and create their identities (Bourdieu, 1990 c.f Maton, 2008, p. 51). These fields are where power is developed and manifested.

The place that actors hold within a field are dependent on the relative weight of their combined capital assets, which derive from a broad range of both personal attributes as well as current social values. Power and identity are not fixed; a field can be created in the intellectual, religious, cultural or social arenas, and an individual’s sense of themselves and where they are situated in a given social hierarchy can change depending on the field they occupy at a given moment. Fields are formed from networks of social relations; they are competitive environments in which social actors leverage their own habitus to compete for placement – for economic, cultural, social and symbolic power.

The currency that allows this to occur is *capital*. Economic capital, or the attainment of monetary currency, was not Bourdieu’s primary concern. He extends the importance of capital beyond the material and contends that one’s social or cultural influence could be just as valuable in determining the amount of power that one has in society. Bourdieu uses these concepts to detail how the social order is progressively inscribed in people’s minds through ‘cultural products’ including systems of education, language, judgements, values, methods of classification and activities of everyday life (1984, p. 471).

The resources that actors rely on, such as educational or professional credentials, knowledge, networks, affiliations, memberships, social style, titles and qualifications, in aggregate make up their ‘symbolic capital’. Bourdieu characterizes the ‘taste’ that is legitimated through these forms as ‘aesthetic disposition’ (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 28). Actors exert their influence over others through their symbolic capital, legitimating the way they see the world over others, and performing an influential taste-making function within consumer-driven society.

The past decade has witnessed a trend in exploring promotional occupations through a socio-cultural lens, building on Bourdieu whose work focused on societal power and...
influence (1984). The working lives of cultural intermediaries often overlap with their lives outside of work, with many believing that the lifestyles they lead personally help them impart an authority and authenticity necessary for the messages they promote and the organisations they represent to be perceived as credible (Smith Maguire and Matthews, 2010). For example, the public relations practitioners in Hodges’ (2006) study in Mexico City drew on their own personal experiences and believed that their social capital and lifestyles played a significant role in maintaining their credibility as bridges between organisations and their publics. Practitioners expressed a need to embody the values they were responsible for communicating, and that drawing on their personal experience and demonstrating authenticity was ‘central to their effectiveness as professional communicators’ (Hodges, 2011, p. 39). Thus, the boundary between work and leisure is often blurred for cultural intermediaries, as they are often called upon to insert their own personal taste, or cultural capital, gleaned from their habitus to bestow legitimacy on both the products they endorse, as well as cement their own general authority as ‘arbiters of taste and style’ (Smith Maguire 2014, p. 219). A cultural intermediary’s private life becomes a crucial occupational resource, and their credibility as a mobiliser and motivator of consumers to emotionally connect with the brand they represent thus becomes central to the legitimisation of their professional identity.

Thus there has been increased interest in applying the concept of cultural intermediation to the promotional occupations in recent years, particularly in the fields of branding (Moor 2008, 2014), advertising (McFall 2004; Cronin 2004; Kelly et al. 2008, Hackley and Kover, 2007) and public relations (Hodges 2006; Piecska 2006; L’Etang 2007; Edwards 2012; Edwards and Hodges 2011; Hodges and Edwards 2014).

The relevance of this to place branding is that Bourdieu’s theory of cultural intermediation is largely concerned with how certain occupations appear to possess more social and cultural capital than others in certain fields. He suggests that representation and symbolic production is central to the work of cultural intermediaries as it helps them forge a sense of identity with the product, place, artist, or commodity they represent and contextualise it for their target audiences. The symbolic power they hold stems directly from the economic, social and cultural capital they possess – and this capital is highly valued within the profession. If we understand that place marketers, by way of their position at the centre of cultural representation, create specific identities that represent certain ways of seeing reality, and have a certain degree of power over how reality is perceived by target audiences, we can infer that these identities might both reflect and reinforce perceptions that are grounded in particular hegemonic power structures (Morgan and Pritchard, 1998). This makes a case for understanding who such individuals are, how they develop their social and cultural capital and where it is leveraged to impact promotional outcomes (Smith Maguire and Matthews, 2010).

While Bourdieu’s theories of cultural intermediation and capital are not the only ways of understanding the influence and impact of practitioners, his emphasis on taste-making and symbolic cultural power are of particular relevance when considering place. Other theories such as actor network theory, stakeholder theory, and legitimacy theory might also be considered useful in this regard. Latour’s (2005) actor network theory has informed a burgeoning body of tourism research that offers an opportunity to extend our
understanding of the human and non-human actors in tourism and the social, economic and political relations between them (Arnaboldi & Spiller, 2011; Beard et. al., 2016; Murdoch, 1998; Paget et. al., 2010; Pollack et. al., 2013; Ren et. al., 2010). Stakeholder theory also provides a potentially useful lens through which to view cultural intermediaries and place branding. Building on Hankinson’s (2004) contention that a stakeholder approach is central to place branding, stakeholder theory offers a managerial and organizational framework to help us understand the specific perspectives and needs of a diverse population with a vested interest in the city’s success. While stakeholder theory is widely applied in a business context, it remains under-explored in tourism, although events and festivals offer a ripe playground for enquiry (Todd et. al., 2017). Finally, given the micro-actions of legitimacy construction that promotional actors might need to undergo in the promotion of both the place they represent as well as their own credentials in representing it, tenets of legitimacy theory might also be applied. In its broad academic application, however, this theory largely concerns itself with the macro forces of corporations, organisations and movements within a broader society, and has yet to be explored in the context of the individual and the personal activities that form one’s occupational resources within a professional context. Thus, although far from the only potential theoretical approach, Bourdieu’s notions of habitus, fields, capital and cultural intermediation offer a worthy lens through which the influence and impact of promotional actors in place branding might be explored.
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Research context: Toronto

The city of Toronto was selected as an appropriate locus for the study as the city has an active network of promotional actors operating within a complex web of promotional bodies, internal and external stakeholders, and media. Toronto is the heart of Canada’s commercial, financial, industrial, and cultural life. The Toronto Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) is comprised of the City of Toronto as well as 23 surrounding municipalities, each with their own powers of planning and spending in the areas of economic development, infrastructure, services, arts, culture and recreation. Toronto is part of a metropolitan area known as the Greater Toronto Area (GTA), made up of the central City of Toronto, and the four regional municipalities that surround it: Durham, Halton, Peel and York. The former cities of Toronto, Scarborough, Etobicoke, North York and the borough of East York, were amalgamated to form the new City of Toronto on 1 January 1998. Since then, the City’s governance structure has been formed of a Council made up of a Mayor and 44 city councillors each representing one of the city’s wards.

The city sees itself as a rising power on the world’s cultural stage. After undertaking major structural renovations for most of its major cultural institutions and entertainment attractions from 2003 onwards, Toronto has pursued an ambitious branding and promotion strategy centred on its identity as a ‘Creative City’. This includes integrating key phases of development into its urban cultural policy as a means of improving its economic position; from the regeneration of ‘flagship’ cultural institutions, to arts districts, waterfront development and festivals (Richards and Palmer, 2012; Oakley and
O’Connor, 2015). This has led to the rise in the need for promotional actors both within City Hall as well as in attractions, arms length cultural properties, and tourism organizations.

The construction of Toronto’s place brand and the decisions that are made about how to promote it through various marketing, advertising and public relations channels fall to a diverse group of public sector organizations which are vested in both the tourism success as well as the overall economic development of the city. These public sector organizations work closely with relevant partners in the private sector in order to achieve the city’s promotional goals.

Organizations within which Toronto’s promotional actors operate

The development of a city brand requires the collaboration and cooperation of a wide range of organizations and individuals within both the public and private sectors, and acting within official channels as well as on an ad hoc, volunteer or entrepreneurial basis. Below is a broad description of the most significant organizations within which Toronto’s promotional actors operate. Though not comprehensive, the range of organizations detailed below provides insight into the organizational and personnel resources required for a city to undertake branding or promotional endeavours.

The City of Toronto operates under a decentralised communication structure, with each internal Division managing its own promotional and communicative activities. The Strategic Communications Department is responsible for the overall direction and implementation of communication outreach (both reactive and proactive) and issues news releases on behalf of communication professionals in divisions such as Transportation, Parks and Recreation, and Economic Development and Culture. Within the latter department, there exists a team of marketing and public relations professionals who are responsible for promoting the city’s cultural endeavours, including the City Cultural Events, any one-off tourism initiatives, and activities that fall under the Visitor Services portfolio. This team is an award-winning group of professionals who manage multi-million dollar marketing and publicity campaigns in both traditional and social media. They work with the promotional actors at Tourism Toronto to ensure that the arms-length agency is aware of what is happening within City Hall. They have in recent years been more closely linked with the City’s Economic Development arm, assisting in developing brand strategies, outreach, communicative tools and consultancy services to help guide those tasked with securing inward investment and business incubation and development within the city.

Tourism Toronto is the official not-for-profit agency and industry association responsible for promoting and selling the greater Toronto region as a destination for tourists, convention delegates and business travellers. It is now fully funded by the province of Ontario, and has added responsibilities of promoting the Greater Toronto Region, including cities Mississauga and Brampton to the west of Toronto. It represents over 1,200 public and private sector members and is governed by a 22-member Board of
Directors drawn from a broad range of representatives from Toronto’s tourism industry. As a partnership of public and private sectors, Tourism Toronto’s partners include the Greater Toronto Hotel Association, the City of Toronto, the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture, the Canadian Tourism Commission, the City of Mississauga, the City of Brampton, Air Canada and VIA Rail. It also works in collaboration with representatives from the Toronto Board of Trade, Metro Convention Centre, Ontario Restaurant, Hotel and Motel Association, and Attractions Ontario.

Materials and Methods

In order to obtain ‘rich’ data (Creswell, 2013) and to gain insights into the complex phenomenon under investigation, this study employs an in-depth, qualitative single-case approach (Yin, 2003). The case study approach facilitates theory-building (Eisenhardt, 1989) and is appropriate for exploring previously under-researched topics. The single case approach has been used in the context of place branding to investigate, for example, complex phenomena such as historical materiality and linearity/diffuseness (Warnaby, Medway and Bennison, 2010). It has also been used extensively in the case of cultural intermediaries to examine how their occupational functions impact certain geographic fields (Hodges, 2006). The lead researcher of this paper implemented three different methods of investigation, ensuring the validity of the research through the triangulation of gathered data (Decrop, 1999; Yin, 2003). We drew upon multiple sources of evidence involving a mix of interviews, autobiographical ethnography and document analysis. Documents analyzed for historical content and discourse are summarized in Table 1.

A series of 16 semi-structured interviews were conducted with marketing, communications, public relations, cultural policy and tourism promotion and management personnel at a variety of organizations that represent the diverse landscape of Toronto’s cultural and tourism offering. These included the Economic Development and Culture Division at City Hall, the Special Events Office, Waterfront Toronto, Tourism Toronto, the Toronto International Film Festival, the (now defunct) Municipal Tourism and Planning Division, a major museum, a prominent music/entertainment weekly newspaper, a place branding consultant with clients throughout Toronto and in the surrounding regions, and the CEO of an urban sustainability and place-making collective. The interviews addressed the respondents attitudes towards Toronto’s promotional efforts, its brand development and cultural policy strategies over the last 15 years, the extent and nature of their work with other stakeholders, and the specific occupational functions they employ that allow them to best perform their jobs.

Concepts of process, identity, interpretation and meaning were explored through open-ended conversational interviews. The lead researcher held the position as Public Relations Supervisor (responsible for festivals, events and tourism strategies) within the Economic Development and Culture Division at Toronto City Hall from 2007-2013. As
such, professional relationships had been formed with some of the participants prior to the research being conducted. As this researcher had an intimate familiarity with the city as well as with the intermediaries hired to promote it and their strategies, a degree of informality, collegiality and ‘knowingness’ occurred in the interactions, allowing for the extraction more meaningful data, as well as a greater degree of access to otherwise hard-to-reach informants. This closeness with interviewees, whilst providing deeper data, might be perceived as creating a bias on behalf of the lead researcher. However, several steps were taken to minimise bias. There was a several year gap between when the researcher acted in a promotional capacity for the city, and conducted research into its processes. Further, many of the interview participants and the researcher were not previously acquainted; contact was made via snowballing, independent research and unsolicited requests. Whilst there was a familiarity amongst some (not all) of the participants, formalities were enacted (i.e., recording the interviews, using a templated interview guide, and whenever possible, conducting interviews within formalised, professional environments and timeframes) to mitigate the expectations of the researcher or the words and actions of participants. Further, follow up questions during the interviews were used to ensure that the researcher’s interpretation of certain narratives matched the interpretation of the informants.

Interview questions followed a theoretical framework and initially focused on how the informant understood the nature of their job, their personal and professional backgrounds (to explore habitus and fields), how decisions are made about promotional and message strategies (construction of legitimacy), how they develop their knowledge about the place they represent (cultural capital), and how they share that knowledge with key stakeholders (social capital). These questions were formulated to initially put informants at ease, while they recounted the day-to-day obligations, challenges and successes of their evolving career and the dynamics of their current occupation. Given that the over-arching brand promise of Toronto as a ‘Creative City’ celebrates its a high degree of cultural diversity, socially progressive values and creativity, questions focused on the social and cultural component of the work, especially as these are subjective assets that benefit most from meaning-making and narrative. Respondents’ understanding of the brand of their city, how they leverage relationships to gather content, interpret and promote the brand promise for key audiences offered insight into their position as cultural intermediaries whose role is integral to the creation of a cultural identity in the city for which they work.

The interviews typically lasted between 60 and 90 minutes. They were transcribed, anonymized and coded in NVivo with regard to specific themes that emerged from the interview data. The codes aligned with the theoretical framework and included evidence of forms of cultural and social capital, as well as descriptions of professional knowledge and constructions of legitimacy being leveraged. Inter-coder reliability (Saldaña, 2009) was achieved through intensive ongoing discussion between the researchers regarding the coding of the data. The use of theory-driven codes enhanced the validity of the study (DeCuir-Gunby et al., 2011). Further steps to increase the validity of the study included prolonged observations in the field and the use of thick, rich descriptions (Creswell and Miller, 2000).
When data saturation became apparent, it was decided that an adequate number of interviews had been undertaken. A list of interview participants described by titles and the organizations they represent are summarized in Table 2.

**Insert Table 2 Interview participants here**

The next section examines the material function of the promotional actors who operate within the above organizations – their professional knowledge, the cultural/social capital they employ, and the ways in which they construct legitimacy for their roles, positioning them as cultural intermediaries.

### Results and Discussion

Smith Maguire and Matthews (2014) argue that an important arena for studying cultural intermediaries lies in the practicalities of the profession – analysing the ways in which such individuals leverage their knowledge, dispositions, and cultural and social capital to frame themselves as experts in the qualification of goods, services or places they might promote. Thus we examine how promotional actors as cultural intermediaries go about constructing legitimacy, both for themselves, as well as the product/place they represent; and how the material practices of their work enable them to wield influence at the articulations of production and consumption in the promotional value chain.

A detailed analysis of the interview data led to the identification of two main dimensions of occupational resources drawn upon by promotional actors as follows: first, their *cultural capital*, gained through having a ‘finger on the pulse’ of unfolding cultural developments and an educational and professional background conducive to taste-making; secondly, their *social capital*, the quality of being politically savvy and an honest broker amongst a complex web of interacting organizations and individuals, and leveraging their relationships to inform their craft. We were able to discern that these actors drew upon these forms of capital to achieve a certain level of legitimacy for their work, and for themselves as professionals suitably positioned to perform it. The dimensions of these occupational resources are discussed below.

#### Cultural Capital

Respondents in this study, whether knowingly or not, rely heavily on symbolic forms of cultural capital to demonstrate their efficacy in their roles. Promotional actors (n=12) frequently displayed large, graphic depictions of media coverage celebrating the city, advertisements promoting festivals and attractions, glossy marketing collateral and dramatic city imagery on their office walls, highlighting the outcomes of their promotional work, an example of *objectified cultural capital*, or the display of artefacts and possessions that contain perceived value (Bourdieu, 1990; Browitt and Nelson, 2004). Many (n=11) were quick to point to their academic and professional backgrounds in politics, corporate marketing and cultural management, and spoke often about the need for continuous learning and the pursuit of higher credentials that might assist them in more fully performing their occupational roles – a clear indication of *institutionalized cultural capital*, the demonstration of qualifications conferred by recognized bodies, for
instance academic degrees or measures of professionalization which is dependent upon
rates of exchange within society, or the values held by dominant social coalitions
(Bourdieu, 1990; Browitt and Nelson, 2004). A common theme (n=8) was to talk about
their habitus – how their particular personal background enabled them to do their job
properly, whether that meant growing up in Toronto, or being Canadian, or having
intimate knowledge of certain neighbourhoods by maintaining a very active social life in
the city.

Finger on the pulse.

It is imperative that those who are hired to promote a city remain abreast of the latest
trends and happenings within their city, as well as in other competitor cities around the
world. The constant need for good content and innovative promotional strategies requires
that practitioners ‘keep their finger on the pulse’ of what is going on in their city
(Informant 1) and maintain an up-to-the-minute awareness on issues such as the latest
hotel and restaurant openings, major shows, architectural and infrastructural
developments, leisure, retail and entertainment options, as well as business opportunities
and economic development trends. It is also vital that they remain consistently informed
about developments in other cities, both politically as well as promotionally, and follow
rankings, analyses and research on the factors that might nudge competitor cities into
greater international prominence.

The onus generally falls to the practitioner to proactively seek out relevant content that
aligns with both political and city branding goals, as well as audience preferences,
seeking to link the two in promotional discourse. Staying abreast of what’s new, unique,
popular and sought after is an important part of the practitioner’s role in maintaining their
cultural capital. However, more than just knowing what’s new, or what’s happening, they
must also contextualise this information against what audiences want to know. It is not
enough to be aware of new restaurants, bars or attractions – practitioners must also
intrinsically understand what makes these locations attractive to potential tourists and
residents. This not only requires a broader knowledge of cultural trends that are occurring
beyond the boundaries of the city, but a willingness to look at and shape current trends
within the city as well. As one informant stated:

‘We do a lot of call-outs to our partners in the community. You always have
to stay current on what’s new, what’s happening. A lot of journalists will ask,
‘what’s new, what’s hot’... So that’s why we always need to figure out,
‘what’s the new bar, new club, new lounge, new restaurant’? We’re
constantly looking and reading what other people are covering as well, to
find out what they’re covering, whether it’s local or international, to see what
some of our journalists are covering in other destinations, and how long ago
it was, and how long it’s been since they’ve covered the destination if they
have at all’ (Informant 3).

Vitally, the dominant way that participants were able to acquire this ‘finger on the pulse’
was through leveraging their networks throughout the city. Thus, intermediaries were
able to orchestrate a conversion process of social capital into cultural capital, and utilise
both to achieve their legitimizing ends. This conversion process, and the means by which it occurs, is an area ripe for new research.

**Social Capital**

Social capital refers to the networks of social influence that actors might maintain within certain fields (Bourdieu, 1990). It is made up of the aggregate of actual or potential interpersonal resources an individual can access by virtue of their belonging to a certain group:

‘...we’ve got these huge groups of stakeholders. There’s the broader public which is important to us, but in terms of achieving these goals and getting our projects done, it’s more about governments, opinion leaders, thought leaders, influencers, and that kind of ecosystem around them. And that includes any possible platforms in there. That’s social media, that’s one to one, that’s the whole universe in there. Well beyond traditional media relations, which we also do a lot of as well.’ (Informant 12)

The main way that promotional actors can stay connected to the happenings in the city is through networking and the development of relationships with like-minded professionals in similar organizations. These social and professional links allow them to share successes and failures, and contextualise their specific work within a larger city branding context. Promotional actors also find that they ‘speak the same language’ and can leverage their relationships to lend a greater consistency in their overall strategies. One respondent commented:

‘...we’ve got a lovely network of people in both marketing and communications and creative within other arts institutions and the city at large, and there’s an informal network of people liaising with each other and chatting about best practices and frustrations that might occur. There’s a lot of shared learnings. (Informant 6)

Membership affiliation within certain groups and a commitment to leveraging partnerships with key stakeholder groups outside the city was also a priority:

‘I think my vision for the city is one that comes from seeing a lot of cities globally. I spend a lot of time with different institutions globally. I’m doing a lot of work with the Rockefeller Foundation globally working with other cities, the Davos Forum, the Creative Cities tour, that was also interested in what we’re doing. It involved a half a dozen of those groups looking at cities and where they’re going, what they’re doing, and how we can do something similar.’ (Informant 8)

*Political savvy, the honest broker:*

Professionals responsible for city branding initiatives tend to work in highly complex, political and bureaucratic structures. These are the fields where they must constantly negotiate their position and powers of influence and persuasion. They are beholden to myriad stakeholders, straddling the divide between public sector accountability and
private sector promotional discipline. As such, their work is situated within a challenging
web of public/private partnerships, balancing the need for exposure with the need to be
perceived as unbiased and committed to the public good. This dilemma – to remain
objective and true to public sector principles, while also not playing favourites and
going the job done in the most effective (but not necessarily cheapest) way – was
alluded to by one respondent:

“I get asked all the time about suppliers, everything. I deal with over 400
event companies and get asked make recommendations all the time. And I
can’t. Even though I know who are the best players in the city and who the
best providers are that would make everyone’s life easier if they were hired, I
still can’t do it.” (Informant 4)

Where the need for political savvy in these cases is most pronounced is in the
promotional actors’ ability to resolve the tension between short-term political goals and
long-term branding objectives. Within the political field, politicians tend to occupy front-
line positions in the promotion of their city, whether at home or abroad. However, their
focus tends to extend the length of a political cycle and may not align with long-term
strategic city branding objectives in place over a time period of several years or even
decades. However, promotional actors appeared to understand that without political
backing or influence, little can be achieved. This can lead to some taking a ‘behind the
curtain’ approach, allowing political actors to command the spotlight on promotional
endeavours, but firmly present in guiding the result:

“I often think of us as back-seat drivers. We’re definitely not sitting in the
front seat, we’re not steering. The Mayor is doing that, along with a bunch of
other people, like Councillors. But we are provoking from the back seat.
We’re creating the parade. We’re building that parade for them to participate
in.” (Informant 13)

Such findings suggest that the promotional actors mostly perceive themselves as ‘Honest
Brokers’ (Informants 3, 5, 6), especially within certain fields. Their role is to take into
consideration all of the moving parts and how they fit within the overall reputation of the
city, bringing stakeholders together in a common pursuit of a public goal. The ability to
do this effectively derives from the maintenance of objectivity in stakeholder
relationships, a focus on the bigger picture as it relates to branding strategies and careful
navigation the power relations inherent in certain fields.

Social capital is not a permanent fixture; intermediaries’ standing within the groups they
occupy must always be re-evaluated and re-affirmed in the context of any given field,
meaning that they are constantly in a position of seeking legitimacy and favour within the
dominant group within that field (Smith Maguire and Matthews, 2014). One way of
achieving this is through constructing forms of legitimacy that might act as currency that
transcends multiple fields in multiple social arenas.

Construction of legitimacy
The study of cultural intermediaries has tended to focus on their standing within capitalist and market-oriented environments, both as actors within markets who construct value through the interpretation and mediation of value placed on the goods/services/places they represent, and also as ‘needs merchants’ who ‘always sell themselves as models and as guarantors of the value of their products, and who sell so well because they believe in what they sell’ (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 365; Smith Maguire and Matthews, 2014). Through their ‘symbolic imposition’ of meaning, cultural intermediaries employ various tools to legitimate their advice and maintain their influence (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 362). Thus they are not only responsible for framing cultural forms and aligning them with consumer taste, but also legitimating those cultural forms, injecting them with a credibility that speaks to their own personal taste and value within specific fields. This then requires them to secure and maintain a certain degree of professional authority; the meanings and messages they construct must carry credibility if they are to be successful at their jobs (Smith Maguire, 2008).

In a place branding context, promotional actors need to be diligent in their construction of legitimacy, in the face of conflicting priorities, accountability to diverse stakeholders, and the breadth of exposure the role entails. They do this by leveraging their social and cultural capital, with legitimacy manifested as symbolic power as the intended outcome. Theoretical articulation points to two arenas where cultural intermediaries must ‘construct repertoires of cultural legitimacy’ in their professional roles as ‘authorities of legitimation’ – not just as taste-makers, but ‘professional taste-makers’ (Smith Maguire and Matthews, 2014, p. 21; Bourdieu, 1990, p. 96). The first is in the social standing of the occupation, in using ‘symbolic rehabilitation strategies’ (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 358) to lend a degree of credibility to the work. The second is in ‘canonizing the not-yet legitimate’ (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 326) to transpose existing forms of established authority on to new cultural forms or understanding of value.

Our findings point to clear articulations where promotional actors engage in both forms of construction of legitimacy. As the work of place branding is still in its relatively nascent stages, place promoters do not necessarily enjoy a level of autonomy and authority that marketers in other more established sectors might. The concept of city branding is still largely new and misunderstood in political circles (Moilanen, 2015). Thus, promotional actors might need to downplay their activities in order to achieve buy-in, or even to be able to continue their work. This can sometimes manifest in the need to ‘fly under the radar’ with regard to the implementation of overt promotional activities:

“It’s really hard to market unless your leaders understand it. In a municipal context – your leaders, or your politicians, need to be on board or you’ll never ever get the money. Either that or you’ll need to hide your marketing budget in other places. For years we never called anything marketing. Because the minute you said you were marketing, the money got taken away. Because it was considered a frill. (Informant 12)"

This challenging environment presents a need for promotional actors to constantly attempt to improve their professional standing within the larger policy value chain of the
city. Literature in other fields has focused on marketing’s ongoing social struggle for professional legitimacy and influence in relation to business life (Lien 1997); the struggle is exacerbated in a governmental or public sector context, where notions of production, consumption and promotion might be considered inappropriate (Svensson, 2007). As one respondent stated:

'It’s considered distasteful. It’s like investing in attractions, or anything that’s entertainment focused, or doesn’t have a pay off. Anything marketing is considered frivolous and it’s hard to show a direct economic impact from marketing. Especially in the short term, within an election cycle.' (Informant 6)

This means that promotional actors are constantly having to ‘sell’ themselves and the professional services they provide within the city context. They may endeavour to do this through clearly articulated messaging about the value they provide, being consistently present and ‘at the table’ when policy decisions are being made, and through the construction of their own reputation management campaigns:

'Constantly, every day you have to make the case. That’s a daily thing. I don’t think it’s a bad thing, because it’s made us more robust than other sectors and other areas. In other areas where they don’t have to make the case, they’re vulnerable.' (Informant 3)

Cultural intermediaries are also cognizant of the need to legitimize their actions through the imposition of other forms of established authority, such as illustrating a mastery of abstract knowledge, assigning new criteria to the assessment of quality, or injecting meaning into cultural forms where none may have previously existed (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 326; Smith Maguire and Matthews, 2014, p. 21). This is especially crucial as practitioners undertake large-scale campaigns:

‘...Our communications overlay begins with goals. I refuse to do anything unless we have a larger organizational objective to work towards. And you can boil that down to a communications goal or a perception goal. But without goals we refuse to waste our time doing stuff when we don’t know what it is we want to achieve.’ (Informant 14)

Especially within a constantly evolving market context increasingly driven by technological advancements, cultural intermediaries must exhibit their expert orientation through an arsenal of professional skills, usually acquired and displayed as cultural capital. A unique challenge that faces the promotional actors in place branding is that in addition to the softer diplomatic skills they require to navigate a constantly changing economic and stakeholder environment and potentially tricky political climate, they must also possess a broad spectrum of ‘hard’ skills in public relations, marketing, advertising and brand strategy, maintain up-to-date skills in media relations, metric-driven campaign measurement techniques, strategic communications planning, visual and videographic story-telling, and most recently, social and digital interactive platforms. The speed and
accessibility of ever-changing 24/7 media platforms has also necessitated an ‘always on’ attitude among practitioners who feel they can never fully step away from their work. This leads promotional actors to pursue increasingly complicated means of measuring their outputs and outcomes, in an attempt to quantify their impact on citizen engagement and the overall success of the city’s reputation at home and abroad.

“We all have social media metrics... if you unpack the social we’ve got huge sets of statistics for each. One for Twitter, one for Facebook, one for LinkedIn. Retweets, engagement, efficiency. Because we started spending money on promoted posts and things like that. We found that when we break it down, it’s actually an extremely efficient way of spending money.”

(Informant 9)

From the interview data it emerged that the promotional actors in place branding should not expect that stakeholders will inherently see the value in their work. Promotional actors employ a complex system of reputation management protocols, internal and external engagement, and the imposition of quantifiable metrics – as well as digging deep into their arsenal of social and cultural capital – in order to inject a layer of credibility into the work they do. This construction of legitimacy draws heavily from the actors’ own perception of their role, and requires a certain degree of confidence in their ultimate contribution to the complex undertaking of city branding.

Conclusion

As cultural intermediaries, promotional actors use their taste-making proclivities to collect, curate and amplify information that portrays a place or product in its most positive light. Drawing upon Bourdieu’s theory of habitus, fields and capital, this article seeks to shed light on the practice of promotional actors in city branding by understanding who they are, where they might be situated, as well as identifying the cultural and social capital they leverage to inform their practice and construct legitimacy for themselves and for their work.

Situated within the broader canon of literature that embraces place particularity and pluralism in tourism studies, this paper explores practical and professional considerations within place branding by extending Bourdieu’s theory of cultural intermediaries to the domain of place promotion. For Featherstone (1991) and Lash and Urry (1994), cultural intermediaries act as early adopters in the consumption and communication of new lifestyles and trends. As a consequence of the professional activities of these groups, reality has been transformed “into images and fragmentation where aesthetic experience becomes the master narrative” (Jayne, 2006, p. 62). These occupational groupings are the communicators and meaning-makers who encourage cities to remain innovative, competitive and act entrepreneurially. What is perhaps most significant about this work is the scale, scope and degree of influence that is afforded these promotional actors. The communicative structures they employ are often broad and far-reaching. As municipal representatives they are relied upon to take complex and varied ideas and pieces of information about the city and quickly distil these into a promotional communication that lends itself to mass consumption, while still appearing objective, strategic and unbiased.
This is the output of ‘discourse workers’, or contemporary story-tellers, who combine material objects with words, symbols, and technological behaviours to create particular, specialized identities that might resonate with audiences (Edwards and Hodges, 2011; Gee, 2005). This aligns with Hodges’ (2011, p. 35) assertion that cultural intermediaries, “through their own symbolic work, have the potential to contribute to the transformation of the city through the narratives, imageries and rhetorical frameworks they present.”

The findings in this paper – namely that these intermediaries feel called upon to leverage their personal proclivities, their personal and professional relationships, and their specific yet broad professional knowledge to legitimise their influence and impact – offer particular implications for the study of both place branding and the promotional occupations more generally. Places undergoing promotional efforts and looking to hire key personnel might consider this information in their recruitment processes, adapting job descriptions and HR policies to align more closely with the tenets of cultural intermediation. Politicians and senior public sector management and policy makers might offer promotional actors an increased role in urban/regional/national planning decisions, recognizing their input to be both strategic and stakeholder-focused. The findings also suggest that promotional practitioners looking to work in tourism, culture, economic development or other public sector need to be politically savvy and an honest broker. This research also highlights the significant challenges faced by promotional intermediaries more broadly, as such intermediaries often operate in grey areas, balancing their personal lives with their professional obligations. This brings to the fore the importance of further research in this area, particularly in the realm of 24/7 communications and digital work, as well as emotional labour.

While the literature on place branding and destination marketing frequently mentions the need for strong, strategic leadership in urban promotion and planning (Hall, 1998; Kotler et al., 1993; Anholt, 2003; Morgan et al., 2011), in practice, cities still tend to overlook the contribution of promotional actors in helping to guide policy development. Promotional activity is still seen as an ‘add-on’, something to consider after policy decisions have been made. Place brand scholars reflect that promotional considerations are still treated with a level of distrust or derision, or treated as an after-thought, merely an aesthetic ‘nice to have’, mostly in a tourism capacity (Anholt, 2003; Govers and Go, 2009). Despite the tacit understanding by practitioners that the work is highly strategic, driven by consumer research, and measurable, similar attitudes persist among political decision-makers in Toronto, according to the (n=11) respondents in this study. As such, there is an expectation that the promotional actors in place branding should quantitatively and qualitatively demonstrate that the work makes a major difference – in awareness, attendance, acceptance and adoption of images and messages into wider discourse.

However, the work of promotional actors across a city – with roles in culture, attractions, heritage, tourism, entertainment, foreign investment and economic development – is largely invisible to the broader citizenry. The value that the largely unseen promotional actors offer the city is in their interpretive, taste-making and representative function; embracing the cultural vibrancy of the city and communicating it effectively to audiences both within and beyond the city. Positioning these actors as cultural intermediaries thus
offers an empirically grounded point of entry into the complex economic, social, political
and cultural process of place branding. Employing this approach allows us to ‘follow the
people’ in order to better understand how a city might be both conceptualized, packaged
and ultimately produced for consumption by myriad stakeholder groups (Matthews and
Smith Maguire, 2014). It also offers a sense of how cultural intermediaries might be
positioned within the larger social processes of tourism, migration and urban planning.
This provides opportunity for further qualitative and quantitative research into
substantiating this position, shedding light on how occupational structures might impact
place brand strategies in future, and why it matters. It also helps better understand the
layers of professional knowledge that promotional actors might require, the forms of
social and cultural capital they draw on to perform their roles, as well as the challenges
they face in legitimizing their work and earning the credibility necessary to practise their
professional taste-making function.

Certain limitations of the study should be noted. The focus on a single city, for example,
limits the generalisability of the study findings. Future studies should investigate cities in
other geographic settings in order to establish commonalities and differences in the roles
played by cultural intermediaries in place branding. A further, related limitation is the
relatively small sample size; future research is called for which utilises alternative
methodologies in order to capture a fuller understanding of the focal phenomenon.
Another limitation concerns the evaluation of cultural intermediaries’ legitimacy. Their
legitimacy could be investigated in future studies in various ways, for example by
tracking official events they attend, and their impact on issues such as policies, funding,
and media coverage. Finally, an alternative perspective on cultural intermediaries could
fruitfully be gained by conducting research amongst the stakeholders who interact with
the cultural intermediaries. Our study reflects the perspective of the cultural
intermediaries; future studies may contribute to the field by investigating the attitudes and
behaviours of the complex web of stakeholders who have an influence on the work of the
cultural intermediaries.
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Table 1 Documents analyzed for historical content and discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Published</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture Plan for the Creative City</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>City of Toronto, Culture Division</td>
<td>A policy framework that establishes Toronto’s Cultural Economy and outlines cultural priorities for the following decade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine a Toronto … Strategies for a Creative City</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Strategies for Creative Cities Project Team</td>
<td>Creative City strategy framework for Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Toronto the Best it Can Be: The Premier-Ranked Tourist Destination Project</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>City of Toronto, Toronto Tourism, Province of Ontario, BrainTrust Marketing and Communications</td>
<td>A destination audit, and thorough inventory of Toronto’s tourism assets in relation to a provincially-mandated framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Plan Progress Report II</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>City of Toronto, Culture Division</td>
<td>A mid-point analysis of achievements and outcomes relating to original Cultural Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario’s Entertainment &amp; Creative Cluster</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>The Ministry of Tourism and Culture</td>
<td>A vision for the growth and leadership of Ontario’s cultural and other creative industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Manager</td>
<td>Economic Development and Culture Division</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President, Marketing and Communications</td>
<td>Tourism Toronto</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Media Relations</td>
<td>Tourism Toronto</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Former) Executive Director</td>
<td>Toronto Culture Division</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Policy Advisor</td>
<td>Economic Development and Culture Division</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Relations Manager - Europe/Asia</td>
<td>Tourism Toronto</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity Supervisor</td>
<td>Toronto Special Events</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Former) Sponsorship Supervisor</td>
<td>City Cultural Events Office</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Toronto Culture Division</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>55-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Former) Director, Tourism</td>
<td>Municipal Tourism and Planning Division</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Manager, Consultant</td>
<td>Place-Branding Agency</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Journalist</td>
<td>Entertainment Weekly</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Arms-Height Sustainability Collective</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Publicity and Communications</td>
<td>Toronto International Film Festival</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Manager, Marketing &amp; Communications</td>
<td>Waterfront Toronto</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>CEO, (former) Marketing Director</td>
<td>Major Museum</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1: Bourdieu’s theory of cultural intermediation adapted to the context of place branding
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