

London has Fallen: A Case Study on Global City Branding, Terrorism and Crisis Communication

by

Fallon Porter

Department of Advertising, Public Relations, and Media Design

College of Media, Communication, and Information, University of Colorado, Boulder

Defense Date: April 9, 2018

Thesis Committee:

Hun Shik Kim | Thesis Advisor | Associate Professor, Department of Journalism

Jolene Fisher | Assistant Professor, Department of Advertising, Public Relations, and Media

Design

Acknowledgements	3
Abstract	4
Chapter One: Literature Review and Rationale	5
Introduction	5
Place Branding	6
Evaluating Place Brands	9
Global Crises: Terror and the City	12
Terrorism in London	12
Terrorism, the Urban Landscape, and Icons	16
Crisis Communication	19
Research Questions	22
Chapter Two: Methods	24
Procedures	24
Data Analysis	27
Chapter Three: Analysis	29
Background Information	29
Westminster Attack Response	31
London Bridge and Borough Market Attack	37
Response to Multiple Attacks	43
Effects of Terrorism	49
Place Brand Indices	52
Chapter Four: Discussion and Conclusion	57
Results	57
Conclusion	72
Limitations	74
Future Research	75
References	76

Acknowledgements

First, I'd like to thank Dr. Cindy White for her guidance and support throughout this experience, she went above and beyond in her interest in this project as well as in my personal goals and aspirations. To my thesis advisor Hun Shik Kim and my outside committee member Jolene Fisher - thank you both for your guidance, support and assistance throughout this process. Your mentorship has positively impacted my academic development. The kind words and advice you both have imparted will remain with me in my future academic and professional endeavors. I am forever grateful for the time and energy my committee put into this experience - Hun Shik Kim and Jolene Fisher were instrumental to the success of this project, I couldn't have done it without them! To my parents, Dr. and Mrs. Porter - thank you for your unwavering support and for providing me with this educational opportunity and constantly motivating me to follow my dreams. Without my parents, I wouldn't have had the opportunity to study at the University of Colorado or had the privilege of studying abroad in London, an experience that ultimately inspired this project. I'd also like to thank my sisters, boyfriend, and friends for their support and reassurance throughout this process. Lastly, I would not have been able to complete this project without the support and encouragement of all of my fellow honors students. These women are all incredible individuals and I will cherish the friendships I have built with them all in this past year - We did it!

Abstract

The year of 2017 brought challenges to London in the form of the four terror attacks that occurred throughout the year, negatively affecting London's image and industries while creating a precarious environment for crisis management. The purpose of this project was to closely examine the effects of terrorism on London's place brand and how London's key actors and organizations responded to the unusual year of terror attacks. The #LondonisOpen for summer campaign represented both the impact of the terror attacks on tourism and the need to address terrorism in a strategic way. Additionally, key actors such as Prime Minister Theresa May and Mayor Sadiq Khan's discourse responding to various attacks communicated key conceptual counterterrorism mechanisms and evolved as the attacks continued. Changes in counterterrorism policy and guidelines also reflect the importance of safety and preparedness as key themes in the rhetoric surrounding and response to terrorism in a major global city. Data sets from the city of London and outside consulting groups were examined to understand the effect of terrorism on London and London's place brand. This study's implications for place branding as an academic discipline are explored further in the applications of previous research to this unique case and provide insight into the relationship between terrorism and the global city.

Keywords: place branding, city branding, crisis communication, terrorism, London

Chapter One: Literature Review and Rationale

Introduction

On March 23, 2017 a service sign at the Tower Hill tube station read “Quote of the day: The flower that blooms in adversity is the rarest and most beautiful of them all #Londonisopen #Westminster #WeAreNotAfraid”. This was the day after a van drove into pedestrians along the Westminster Bridge and Bridge street, crashing into the gate of the Palace of Westminster, home to Big Ben and the United Kingdom’s Parliament. This was just the beginning of a year of terror attacks in London, as the London Bridge and Borough Market attack, Finsbury Park Mosque attack, and Parsons Green attack followed. In London, the year of 2017 contained crisis, controversy, and subsequent international attention for London. Attention was especially garnered in the response to terror attacks and the ongoing negotiations with Britain’s departure from the European Union, dubbed Brexit. The response to the 2017 terror attacks reflected political and economic challenges surrounding the unusual circumstances of repeated terror attacks, Brexit, and the relationship between London’s globalized nature and the worldwide phenomenon of emerging resistance towards globalization.

London has maintained one of the top place brands in the world according to contemporary place branding indices. The global city is iconic in its own right, and it is home to cultural movements and artifacts, sporting centers, and famous icons. Furthermore, London has political significance and economic importance. Yet, as major uncontrollable events, like terror attacks, target iconic places and spaces, does the mind of the public shift away from the positive aspects of a place brand and begin to think about terror instead? Uncontrolled terror events and global crises have the potential to negatively impact a city brand, especially in the international

community. This thesis will examine how the repetitive threat and successfully executed terrorist attacks have changed the perception of London's brand as well as the crisis communication response from key actors following the two most fatal terrorism attacks London had experienced in over a decade.

Place Branding

Nation, city and place branding are relatively new academic concepts in comparison to the traditional definitions of branding for products, persons, and corporations. Academic discussion of nation and city branding began between the late 1990's and early 2000's. Place branding academia gained momentum as a result of academic literature published by Simon Anholt, the "father" of nation and city branding (Boisen, 2011). According to Govers (2011), place branding should create a brand strategy and competitive identity that reflects a nation's, city's, or region's history, accomplishments and aspirations, regardless of the markets served. In contrast, scholars like Moilanen (2009) argue that place branding should exist considering the consumer, comparable to traditional product branding. This is what Govers (2011) considers place marketing. Govers (2011) differentiates place branding from place marketing, emphasizing place marketing should follow a strong, well-constructed, place brand. Scholars agree that a place brand should differentiate and emphasize a region's, nation's, or city's uniqueness as compared to competitors. A place brand is more challenging to control compared to product or company-type brands because of the size and diverse populations of these large spaces (Moilanen, 2009). No single individual or group of cohesive individuals solely make executive decisions for a place brand in the same manner as decision makers in a corporation or business, which results in different approaches to branding.

The process of place branding is attributed to the multitude of actors and influencers influencing and operating within the space, including government actors, key business executives operating in the region, celebrities from the area, and citizens of the space interacting with outsiders themselves. Green (2005) states that place branding is a collaborative effort of the actors, corporations, and leaders of the geographic area they are located in. It is important for these government and business leaders to understand the brand and understand how their space is conceptualized by potential visitors, investors, customers, and future citizens from around the world (Anholt, 2006). Key actors relevant to this case will be discussed further in the analysis chapter of this study.

Place branding serves an array of purposes. Place branding results in prosperity that benefits various interest groups and stakeholders when successfully executed. The general consensus among scholars is that the contemporary boom in place branding is due to the rise of globalization resulting in the increased competition between cities, spaces, and places (Molilanen, 2009; Anholt, 2006; Govers 2011; Papp-Váry, 2001). Nation brands have three important and intertwined components, dubbed “sub-brands” by Fan (2008), that drive branding campaigns: the economic brand, the political brand, and the cultural brand. A successful nation brand attracts business and investments, promotes the goals of the tourism industry, promotes public diplomacy, supports interests of exporting industries, strengthens national identity and increases self respect of citizens (Moilanen, 2009). The rationale behind branding typically focuses on increasing investment and economic profit. Govers (2011), Anholt (2006), and Papp-Váry (2001) corroborate Molilanen’s economic benefits of a place brand, adding that successful place brands can promote a place’s products and exports and even bring in new inhabitants. According to

Nallathiga (2011), globalization created a shift in the importance of and competition between nations to increased importance and subsequent competition between cities. Today, cities influence investment inflow into a country and cities have a competitive advantage in that they possess educated, skilled, and cost effective labor in comparison to other parts of a nation (Nallathga, 2011). Fan (2008) argues cities have become the key to national success due to their global importance. Therefore, cities with good governance are attracting investments, and part of this governance relies on ensuring a strong city brand.

Cities have a critical role in the global economy, national political goals, and cultural movements. According to Fan (2008), political or diplomatic dimensions can drive nation and place branding efforts. Major global cities are capable of enhancing a nation's soft power and political brand. Therefore, brand management campaigns involving a nation or a nation's capital, like London, can be seen as an asset to the respective nation's government. Soft power is "the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments. It arises from the attractiveness of the country's culture, political ideals, and policies. When our policies are seen as legitimate in the eyes of others, our soft power is enhanced" (Alaimo, 2017, p. 134). Fan (2008) asserts the link between soft power and public diplomacy, demonstrating that diplomacy, a political dimension of place branding, is a way to boost a nation's soft power, as "nation branding and soft power both are concerned with a nation's influence on the world stage" (Fan, 2008). Furthermore, public diplomacy is a political subset of nation branding that can contribute to a nation's soft power by creating a more favorable image among the international audience, enhancing the nation's soft power and helping the nation achieve its goals in the international arena (Fan, 2008). Due to the increased competition between cities and the subsequent increased

value of place branding for economic and diplomatic ambitions within cities, nation and city brands can now be evaluated and better understood from an academic and professional viewpoint.

Evaluating Place Brands

Major city brands are now measurable due to the increased popularity of city branding. A number of qualitative and quantitative measures of nation, city, and place brands have emerged in scholarly periodical research and professional studies from marketing and consulting firms. Two measurement frameworks of city brand strength include the Anholt-GMI City Brands Index and the Resonance World's Best Cities Ranking. Both measurements of city brand strength employ different approaches to first assess qualitative brand asset categories, then place quantitative numeric scores on the range of categories to derive a numeric score and rank international cities (Papp-Váry, 2011).

The Anholt-GMI City Brands Index (CBI) considers six key components of a city; the presence, the place, the potential, the pulse, the people, and the prerequisites, organizing them into the city brand hexagon (Anholt, 2006). According to Anholt (2006), 'the presence' focuses on a city's international status resulting from international familiarity and contributions to the world in areas such as culture, science, or governance. 'The potential' considers economic and educational opportunities of a city (Anholt, 2006). Excitability and interesting activities are critical considerations by Anholt (2006), which fall under 'the pulse' for both short-term visitors and long-term residents. 'The people' aims to capture how friendly residents are and an individual's ability to fit into a community. A key consideration of 'the people' includes the perceived level of safety of a city (Anholt, 2006). Finally, 'the prerequisites' encompass basic

qualities of cities, such as affordability, the idea of ease of life, and public amenities like schools, hospitals and transportation.

The Resonance World's Best Cities ranking is conducted annually and evaluates 23 factors placed equally in cities with populations of one million. These 23 factors are distributed under six key categories: (a) place, including air quality, weather, crime rate, neighborhoods & landmarks, and parks and recreation; (b) product, including university rankings, airport connectivity, convention centers, attractions, and museums; (c) programming, which includes shopping, culture, culinary, and nightlife; (d) people, which includes the immigration rate and education; (e) prosperity, which is based off of unemployment rates, GDP per capita, and the number of Fortune 500 companies; and (f) promotion, which assesses Google search results, Google trends, Facebook check-ins, and TripAdvisor reviews (Resonance, 2017; Resonance, 2018).

Both the Anholt-GMI City Brands Index and the Resonance World's Best Cities Report assign numeric scores to major global cities and rank global cities regularly. The Anholt Nation Brand Index is published annually, while the City Brands Index was published every two years. According to Anholt (2017), the City Brand Index is no longer produced under his management. Other professional firms, such as the More Memorial Foundation Institute for Urban Strategies, noticed the value in place brand evaluation and have produced studies of their own, which will be considered in the following chapters of this project.

Because terror events that occur in recognizable places may link terror events with a city in the minds of individuals, these events can negatively impact perceptions of safety in that city. In 2006, the Anholt-GMI City Brands Index (CBI) provided insight into memorable events in

major global cities, ranking the top ten events based on spontaneous association with a city. According to that list of top ten events most strongly associated with cities, London's 7 July 2005 terrorist attack was ranked fourth with a 34.30 percent average spontaneous association (Anholt, 2006). This is one of five terrorist-related attacks on the top ten list, with 11 September 2001 attacks ranking second and tenth in New York City and Washington D.C., respectively (Anholt, 2006). Despite the memorable impact of terrorism on London's brand, Anholt (2006) noted that London's safety perception was still high despite the attack's strong place in the minds of individuals. In a 2005 report, Anholt (2005) found that "people do not fundamentally change their minds about a place because of something that happens to that place, the brand only changes if they are personally affected by the place in some way" (p. 24). However, the frequency of terrorist events and their role in public perception may have changed since the early 2000s when Anholt made this claim.

This thesis will examine how the repetitive threat of terrorism and successfully executed terrorist attacks have changed the perception of London, with heavy consideration of the more recent studies on place brands. Anholt (2006) found that place brand perception will change if the changes to or variations in a place occur consistently, long-term. According to Anholt, "Most of the time the images of cities and nations are remarkably stable from year to year, and whilst episodes like terrorist attacks or natural disasters might temporarily affect people's *behaviour*, and consequently visitor numbers, they don't appear to affect the underlying image in any way at all" (S. Anholt, personal communication, December 6, 2017). This thesis will explore the validity of this claim, especially in consideration to changes in London's brand communication and short term international behavior pertaining to the perception of a city after a terrorist attack. Terror

events have become a prominent issue in present-day international affairs. These events mold responses to crisis by key city actors, the urban landscape and audiences within these cities. In order to understand the reactions to terrorism, the relationship between terrorism and cities need to be examined.

Global Crises: Terror and the City

Global crises challenge place brand maintenance, strength and resilience. Terror attacks are unpredictable and uncontrollable by nature. Terror poses a threat to the perception of a place and creates the fear that terror attacks are imminent. The September 11 World Trade Center attacks in New York City brought attention to terrorism as a major threat to cities around the globe. Terror attacks utilize cities to impact public opinion. Terror attacks are not disasters for PR, but are disasters created for PR reasons (Richards, 2004). According to Richards (2004), terrorist attacks need an audience for theatrics to shape and impact political climates, making major global cities the perfect stage for terrorists to carry out attacks. Because nation, place, and city branding are all relatively new concepts, there is little academic literature and research on the subject in general. Moreover, there are few publications that address the relationship between crises and city brands, especially crises that are not economic in nature. Therefore, this thesis will try to fill this gap in the literature and examine terrorism as a dimension of outside influence on city brands.

Terrorism in London

London is the capital city of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and is located in England (“World Factbook”, 2017). The United Kingdom is a parliamentary constitutional monarchy, with an executive branch containing the chief of state, Queen Elizabeth

II and heir apparent Prince Charles, son of the queen, as well as a Prime Minister as the head of state (“World Factbook”, 2017). Theresa May served as the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom in the time period this research was conducted. The legislative branch of the UK is a bicameral Parliament consisting of the House of Lords and the House of Commons (“World Factbook”, 2017). The United Kingdom has been a member state of the European Union since 1973, although on June 23, 2016, the UK voted to leave the EU with a referendum dubbed Brexit, or British exit. At the time of research, the UK had yet to formally withdraw from the EU and was negotiating the divorce from the European Union, which is relevant to the context of this case study.

London is no stranger to terror activity, as the Provisional Irish Republic Army (IRA) conducted numerous attacks in London from 1970 through the late 90’s (Coaffee et al., 2009), predating the 9/11 terror attacks in the United States. Although terror activities during this time influenced London’s contemporary security initiatives and crisis management, this project focuses on terrorist activity after the 2005 Underground bombings and their influence on London’s brand and crisis management initiatives. According to Friesen (2007), prior to 2004, “terrorism in Europe was limited to internal, historical conflict between the state and dissenting factions,” which includes London’s IRA terror attacks. Foreign Islamic extremist attacks in Europe echoed September 11, triggered by British and Spanish support of the American led “War on Terror” (Friesen, 2007). The United Kingdom and Spain, two American allies, supported the United States’ ‘War on Terror’ in the years following the September 11 attacks (Phillips, 2004).

An important factor in shaping a nation’s or place’s public image is governmental decisions. Govers (2011) explains that place brands are built on the reputations and actions of

their leaders, their partnerships, and through popular media placement. The United Kingdom and the United States have a longstanding strong diplomatic relationship in the international community. A part of the UK's brand is soft power influence in international markets like America, which reinforces the US-UK diplomatic relationship. This close US-UK partnership may provide insight into some of the terror-related violence in London and the United Kingdom, especially looking to the years following the 9/11 terror attacks. The message that 9/11 terror attacks and subsequent London attacks sent were anti-capitalist, anti-globalization, and anti-western (Richards, 2004). The US-UK partnership may provide an exemplar for Gover's (2011) point about the effect of government decisions on a place brand. Thus, a negative consequence of some international partnerships with the United States is that terrorists target nations supporting the United States' war in the Middle East.

Anti-Western, anti-American terror activities prompted Spain's support of the "War on Terror" to change drastically on March 11, 2004. On that day, coordinated bombings of commuter trains in Madrid killed 201 people and wounded more than 1,600 (Phillips, 2004). The attacks took place just before a major election, where the opposition Socialist Party gained an upset victory over the conservative government that strongly supported the United States (Phillips, 2004). The new government immediately pledged to withdraw 1,300 Spanish troops from Iraq, weakening Western democracy building efforts in Iraq. The attacks were linked to foreign Islamic militants who claimed the bombings in Spain were meant to punish Spanish support for the U.S. led war in Iraq (Phillips, 2004).

Similarly, Londons' July 7, 2005 underground bombings, often referred to as 7/7, were attributed to the United Kingdom's support for the United States' 'War on Terror' (Friesen,

2007). The United Kingdom, perhaps one of America's strongest allies, did not follow Spain's decision to withdraw support from the U.S. (Friesen, 2007). Even though the London attacks created a provocative view of America's 'War on Terror', Britons held a strong identification with 9/11 and sympathized with America (Friesen, 2007). Friesen (2007) described increased camaraderie on both sides — the Americans sympathized with the U.K. after the 7/7 attacks, too. The 7/7 attacks in London differ from the attacks in both Madrid and those in the U.S. because the attacks were a type of "home grown" terrorism, meaning that the terrorists who carried out the atrocities were British born-citizens. Over a decade later, the U.K. still struggles with home grown terrorism, which was responsible at least two of the four 2017 London terror attacks as well as the Manchester arena attack in 2017.

In 2017 alone, there were five major terrorist attacks in the United Kingdom, four of which occurred in London. These four attacks consist of the Westminster attack on 22 March 2017, the London Bridge and Borough Market attack on 3 June 2017, the Finsbury Park Mosque attack on 19 June 2017, and the 15 September 2017 Parsons Green bombing. On March 22, Briton Khalid Masood drove a car into pedestrians on Westminster Bridge before exiting the vehicle and stabbing a police officer to death, killing five and injuring 50 (Hanna, 2017). During the London Bridge and Borough Market attack, three men drove a van into pedestrians before exiting to stab nearby restaurant patrons. Eight people died as a result and 40 others were injured (Hanna, 2017). Later that month, a Welsh man named Darren Osborne drove a van into pedestrians outside of the Finsbury Park Mosque, killing one man and injuring 11 (Hanna, 2017). In September, an improvised bomb detonated on the London underground during the morning commute at the Parson's Green station. Around 25 people were injured as a result of the

explosion (Hanna, 2017). Three of these four attacks have been directly linked to Islamic extremism. While the Finsbury Mosque attack was labelled an act of terror, the motives have not been linked to Islamic extremism. As of September 2017, local police had believed they foiled at least six other significant plots for terror attacks in London (Casciani, 2017). According to a BBC news reporter, “this is the most sustained period of terror activity in England since the IRA bombing campaign of the 1970s” (Casciani, 2017).

In recent years, London has been a prime target of terrorist activity due to the city’s prominent role in global business activities and London’s importance in international economic activity, as a major geographic gateway to the European continent. Additionally, London serves a political role; the city is the center of the United Kingdom’s political institutions as well as the European Union’s major banking institutions. According to Coaffee et al. (2009), terrorist attacks affect global business centers both materially and symbolically. Materially, attacks such as 7/7, destroyed the infrastructure and technology used to carry out business and economic activity in major economic hubs. Symbolically, these attacks ignite fears and create security concerns for global business actors, who may question safety and stability in cities with a history of terrorism. Since the early 1990s, financial centers have become prime targets of terror attacks because of their “vast array of new designer office buildings, their increasingly cosmopolitan business communities and the significant media attention and publicity that could be obtained by the terrorists” (Coaffee et al., 2009, p. 96). Similarly, the attacks today rely on the media attention and publicity that are readily available in cities.

Terrorism, the Urban Landscape, and Icons

Physical features such as unique buildings and architecture are city brand assets. These structures create a skyline and contribute to the general atmosphere of the place. These iconic structures contribute more than identifiers that set the city apart, as cities have iconic structures to represent strengths and positive features that provide messages for prospective investors (Nallathiga, 2011). St. Paul's Cathedral and the Royal Exchange in London represent a period of imperial pride and English primacy, for example (Kaika, 2010). Changes in an urban landscape document changes over time, as landscapes reflect changes in attitudes, technology and businesses. New buildings, like the Gherkin, the Shard and the Walkie Talkie, showcase a generation of new architecture and welcome the updated presence of London following a period of financial and institutional despair (Kaika, 2010). These icons demonstrate a shift from an isolated, exclusively English part of London's history in the 1970s to an expansion of a globalized London, adjusted to a changed world (Kaika, 2010). Icons serve the role of an identifier. According to studies by Anholt (2006) and Saffron Consultants, insights into brand strength are reflected by how well known a city's icon is - the more known, the stronger the brand. People who have never been to London can easily identify red telephone booths, the London eye, and Big Ben. These icons are symbolic of London's power and popularity, hence the reason terrorists target these spaces - for maximum PR effect and attention from the media. Iconic terror targets become an important safety challenge for city leaders and planners, who then shape and adjust the city landscape to promote safety and prevent violent attacks on large populations.

Terrorism and crises shape the urban landscape and architecture due to contingency planning by key urban actors, both government institutions and private businesses, in order to

promote key safety interests. Kaika's (2010) research found that the city's skyline has changed as a reaction to the effects of international crisis and changes in the international arena. Architecture paranoia demonstrates a nuanced reaction to terrorism activity in global cities, which consists of the physical fortification of areas effected by said terrorist activity (Coaffee, Wood & Rogers, 2009, p. 90). Architecture paranoia turns public spaces, such as office blocks and pedestrian shopping centers, into "territorial enclaves through methods of restricted access" (Coaffee et al., 2009, p. 90). In cities like London and Nice, for example, this includes the erection of defensive barriers and reinforced bollards around high-risk sites following terror activity involving vehicular weapons. The City of London, known as the Square Mile or the City, consists of myriad architecture paranoia artifacts, dubbed the City's 'ring of steel' by Coaffee et al. (2009). The Square Mile's business significance resulted in a technologically advanced security approach, a stealthy covert system of security which would be acceptable to the business community enclosed in the Ring of Steel (Coaffee et al., 2009). These nuanced security processes in the Ring of Steel substantiate concern to maintain the reputation of London as a safe and secure business center.

Responses to crisis and safety concerns, both in their physical manifestations of safety barriers in the city and in the form of crisis communication from municipal and national governments, must work to alleviate the fears and emotions of their citizens and other key stakeholders (Coaffee et al., 2009). Communication responses to terrorism-related crises must aspire to regulate and continue business activities and sources of financial inflow, such as tourism. One major challenge of key decision makers in London today is ensuring businesses and tourism operate at capacity after terrorism activity or in anticipation of threats of terrorism. A

way to address this challenge includes maintaining an appropriate strategic response to terror events from a communication perspective.

Crisis Communication

Crisis communication is frequent, honest, and specific communication which aims to reduce uncertainty and to maintain and restore an organization's reputation (Spence et al., 2014) following a public challenge to an organizations, or in this case place's reputation. There are various channels or tools used to facilitate the communication outlined by Spence et al. (2014), as "communications tactics within an organizations control that have the potential to affect stakeholders' perceptions of the organizations reputation" (p. 129). One of the many communication tactics or channels used in crisis communication is the press release, also referred to as a news release, the "press release has utility as a functional message strategy in restoring or maintaining organizational reputation in the event of crisis along with the support for the notion that it is important for an organization to be quick to address the public" (Spence et al., 2014, p. 129). Therefore, a swift response is essential when it comes got crisis communication.

The press release is a written form of communication designed for announcing something newsworthy in an official capacity and according to Cmeciu & Miron (2011), it should contain at least two features, factuality and objectivity. Press releases are a traditional form of one-way communication from an organization to audiences and stakeholders, although the advent of digital communication, the internet, and social media led to the evolution of the digital press release (Cmeciu & Miron, 2011). Press releases are not solely for the purpose of crisis communication activities and are often used in day-to-day communication, as "press releases

have been considered an autobiographical means through which organizations might shape their identity by incorporating persuasive and sometimes even promotional elements” (Cmeciu & Miron, 2011, p.64). The evolution of the digital formatting of the press release has changed the press releases’ target audience - traditionally, press releases target the mass media. Digital press releases have allowed organizations to more directly communicate with key stakeholders directly online, and actually resonate better with audiences according to a study on press releases and crisis communication by Spence et al. (2014): “press releases issued from the organization concerning the event had the strongest opinion and highest perception of organizational reputation in the experiment” (p. 129). Therefore, the use of digital press releases in more contemporary crisis communication cases facilitates better control of messaging and enhances the relationship between an organization and audiences.

Terrorism affects how audiences process, understand, and react to information. Strategic communications practitioners must understand their publics, especially during crisis communication. Richards (2004) describes two types of publics, participation publics and passive publics, as well as how these publics understand and respond to information from key institutions such as the government and media. Theoretically, modern liberal democracies like the United Kingdom should fall into the category of participatory publics, which are a collective of citizens engaged in informed and rational discussions in dialogue with message leaders (Richards, 2004). Passive publics existed before participatory publics, in the era of monarchies and dictatorships, and are vulnerable to manipulation and charisma in one-sided communication practices. The passive public absorbs information in response image and emotion rather than fact (Richards, 2004). During global crises like terrorism, modern mass media turns participatory

publics into much more emotional, passive publics, vulnerable to manipulation and charisma. This is no longer solely a participatory public but a spectator public whose collective mind is full of image and emotion (Richards, 2004). Richards (2004) asserts the modern western publics, with the role of the mass media, are a hybrid mix of the two especially during crises.

Terrorism changes how people communicate. Leaders and communicators must adapt responses and actions based on appealing to the changes in a more emotional, hybrid participatory-spectator type public. According to Richards (2004), terrorism compels values-based and power-based public relations responses to appeal to the participatory-spectator type public. Power-based public relations responses are usually actions by key actors, such as government leaders. Power-based public relations responses during terrorism include police and military responses, who assist victims and work to keep the public safe (Richards, 2004). Values-based responses are symbolic in nature and utilize western values in counterterrorism efforts (Richards, 2004). Citizens compellingly deploy these symbols after attacks, like placing candles and the Union Jack flag on the Westminster Bridge after the March 22 attack. Western government leaders must find the appropriate and compelling forms of spectacular power-based responses to terror in a values-based atmosphere (Richards, 2004). Without an appealing values-based response, municipal and national leaders will not implore the emotional side of the spectator public that was transformed from a participatory public by crises.

Crisis communication activities must be facilitated by first understanding the interconnections between terror events, audiences, and responses to terror. Key actors, leaders and communicators must prepare in anticipation of events or quickly plan and respond to crisis once it happens. It is important to consider whether strategic communication responses to

terrorism are proactive and anticipate this type of violence or if they are a reaction to an isolated event. The responses to terrorism are both proactive and reactive in London. Crisis communication in global cities, like London, are a hybrid mixture of proactive brand-enforcement tactics and rebranding campaigns that change and adapt with major global events and crises. In 1995, the City of London conducted *The City Research Project*; the project's results convinced the City of London Corporation that terrorism should be viewed as something to be proactive against as opposed to responding in a reactive nature (Coaffee et al., 2009). Coaffee et al. (2009) state that London's resilience conveys a response to crisis which is proactive as well as reactive, with adaptability to deal with the fluid nature of the range of security challenges faced by major urban areas. London's public image has evolved in a proactive way. Nallanthiga (2011) claims major spaces like London evolve and position themselves to catch the eyes of key international players, especially in respect to FDI and business opportunities. In comparison, scholars like Kaika (2010) demonstrate the reactive nature of London's brand evolution and that reactions to major crises can shape the city's skyline. As previously discussed, Kaika (2010) states that crisis is so influential on the city of London that the architecture reflects changes in the country as a result.

Research Questions

In 2017, London has been targeted by multiple terror attacks. The city has had an incredibly interesting year considering these events along with Brexit talks. As city brands are built, threats to these place brands need to be evaluated and brand assets must be protected. As with any major brand, crisis communication for cities begins with planning for the worst scenario and adapting these plans to specific circumstances. Terror attacks are serious events that

change the communication process between key actors, communicators and key audiences. Additionally, the global nature of cities themselves adds a new dimension of cross-cultural communication considerations during crisis.

This evidence has led to the following research questions:

RQ1: How did relevant actors form crisis communication responses to address the 2017 terror events in London?

RQ2: What was the relationship between terrorism and the global city of London in the case of the 2017 London terror attacks?

RQ3: How have the repetitive threat of and successfully executed terror attacks changed the perception of London's place brand?

Chapter Two: Methods

Procedures

This research project will utilize a case study as the main method for analyzing London's city brand strength and evaluating recent strategic communications campaigns in London. A case study is a "systematic inquiry into an event or set of related events which aims to describe and explain a phenomenon of interest" (Bromley, 1990, p. 302). This case study will analyze text from government documents and responses as well the government initiated branding campaign, the #LondonisOpen for Summer campaign. Additionally, this case will examine place brand rankings and city data sets. This project will screen for indicators of terrorism's impact on London's place brand in the data sets and rankings.

This case study will focus on a single city, rather than multiple cases over time or compare isolated events in different cities. According to Zucker (2009), using a single case rather than multiple cases studies is beneficial in an extreme or unique case, which can employ a single use of analysis or multiple units of analysis. London is a unique case as a result of the intense two years that the city has had, which includes multiple terrorist attacks and the reworking of British law around the EU referendum. Additionally, London's consistently top ranked position as a city brand in both the Anholt City Brand Index and Resonance City Brand Ranking is a reason this city was examined. This case analyzes the Westminster attack and London Bridge and Borough Market attack due to their magnitude and high casualties, although the other Parson's Green and Finsbury Park attack will be contextually relevant to this project. Utilizing a single case is also due to certain limitations and constraints on this thesis, such as time and a lack of

funding to collect primary data. Documentation, archival records, and government texts are planned for use in order to contribute to this case study's units of analysis.

Government data and documentation released by the UK government are to inform this case study. The London Intelligence project, informed by London's municipal and UK's government data, will contain beneficial data about businesses and attitudes in London. As mentioned in the literature review, many city branding initiatives revolve around economic activity and meeting both private business and public goals. This will be valuable quantitative data to understand the momentum behind major campaigns in the capital, such as the #LondonIsOpen campaign. Files from London and Partners will be examined, as this organization is responsible for official branding and campaigns for London.

The researcher utilized UK government websites and London's government websites to find the documents that informed this case study. This case study examined online documents containing official United Kingdom government responses to the 2017 London terror attacks, which in large included policy and preparedness documents by the UK government. For the purpose of this study, government documents mean any document produced and published by a national government organization in the UK or a London government organization on a gov.uk website. This includes government supported organizations like London & Partners.

Additionally, content published on government websites or blogs were considered primary data.

The government documents also had to be collected from a government website, containing gov.uk in the domain or being linked out of an official gov.uk website, i.e. london&partners.com.

The primary websites used were gov.uk.com, london.gov.uk, londonandpartners.com, mi5.gov.uk, and npcc.police.uk. Online government documents were examined as they were

public record and readily available for research. The documents collected and analyzed ranged in type and included guidelines, oral statement transcriptions, press releases, requests for mayoral decisions, position descriptions, data sets, and communication campaign documents. These documents were selected for research because they contained official responses and information pertaining to the various government actors and organizations responsible for London's brand. Data from the London datastore were originally to be apart of research, but the 2017 facts and figures were largely unpublished for the public as raw data at the time this study was conducted. Rather, this study focuses on the data cited in government documents that had unprecedented access to this data before the general public, as well as the London Intelligence Project.

Keywords such as "terror", "terrorism", "attack", "counterterrorism"; or the location of the attacks such as "Westminster" or "London Bridge", were searched to find government materials pertaining to the attacks themselves. The filters and keywords used to search the [gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk) publications database were formatted as: "publications" about "crime and policing" and about "national security" by "National Counter Terrorism Security Office" to search for specific documents relevant to this case that met the research parameters, listed below.

For a government document to be selected for further evaluation, it had to (a) pertain to terrorism; (b) be relevant timeline of the attacks from the year 2017 or published in early 2018; (c) be a recent document in place for preparedness measures that was followed for the attacks within the last two years; (d) pertain some sort of response to the attacks; or (e) be a news story, press release, official statement, oral statement, policy paper, guidance document, or an official description on a government webpage; (f) descriptions of branches of the UK government, positions, or organizations were included as source material where necessary. Documents used

outside these parameters provided context or a further understanding of the response, branding, and/or counterterrorism efforts. For example, documents about the 2016 #LondonisOpen campaign were examined in the analysis.

Finally, various place branding journals are cited in this study to examine outside perspectives of changes to London's brand strength following the 2017 terror attacks, examining the years prior and the 2017/2018 rankings. Within these documents, information reflecting a significant drop in London's place brand and safety were included in the analysis section. The Anholt-GfK City Brand Index, Resonance World's Best Cities Ranking, and the Global Power City Index will be examined from the 2017/18 year and the data will be compared and contrasted to previous years to understand shifts in London's place brand.

Data Analysis

The researcher analyzed the data by reading the documents in full multiple times to best understand the document and become familiar with the relevant topic area. Documents were organized by date; terror event, as necessary; and by actor or organization of origin. Then, documents were analyzed and highlighted for key themes pertaining to the topics mentioned in the literature review and rationale. Documents were noted for (a) changes to plans, policies, branding tactics, and discourse; (b) the use of crisis management and brand management tactics mentioned in the literature review; (c) the similarities and differences between data from different actors and organizations; (d) similarities and differences between terror events; and (e) key themes of each document and its purpose. The researcher highlighted and recorded important quotes from each document. The researcher also noted key themes for later discussion based on prior research. With the different themes identified, the researcher organized the government data

and documents in chronological order to best understand the preparedness measures in place prior to the attacks; how each attack was responded to; and the evolution of official responses, crisis management, and brand management throughout the time period examined.

The final stage of the case study will analyze the case study findings (Zucker, 2009). This is where generalization comes in, which is a limitation of case study. The findings from London's case may not apply to all cases of terrorism and global crises in other cities, because the findings will be limited to this case itself (Zucker, 2009). But, the data may be linkable to certain types of cases or by utilizing extracted details to enhance reasoning, as Yin (1984) argues that theoretical generalization is to the domain of case study what statistical generalization is to the true experiment. This case study will meet Zucker's (2009) criteria of trustworthiness and authenticity by using credible sources, by examining how far the results can be generalized once acquired, and using other pilot case studies about place brand as a guide, and by asking questions such as: Do the findings of the study make sense? Are they credible to the places they study themselves or others? Are our conclusions transferable to other contexts? (Zucker, 2009). Because this case study will not have a 'control' due to the emergent and evolving nature of place branding, this case study will aim to build understanding and help the reader make connections and associations from the results, rather than making a broad generalization about place branding from this single case.

Chapter Three: Analysis

Background Information

This case examines the response by the key actors and organizations responsible for London's brand. Place brands are unique in the sense that they are collaboratively built and augmented by actors, corporations, and business leaders (Green, 2005). This section outlines a few of the more prominent actors responsible for protecting London's place brand in crisis communication at both a national and municipal level, but is not exhaustive. Additionally, relevant crisis-management and counterterrorism initiatives are outlined in the background section to provide a better understanding of the policies and programs in place prior to the 2017 terror attacks.

Prime Minister Theresa May. The head of the United Kingdom's government is Prime Minister Theresa May, who is a member of the Conservative Party and has been serving as the British Prime Minister since July 13, 2016 ("World Factbook", 2017). Theresa May plays a key role in leading the responses to terror attacks, as she works with Parliament and national counterterrorism organizations and leads the United Kingdom in the international community. May informs policies pertaining to matters such as international affairs, domestic security, and international security. As a national leader, Prime Minister May informs London's leaders and key organizations in the aftermath of crises.

The National Counter Terrorism Security Office (NaCTSO). The National Counter Terrorism Security Office (NaCTSO) is a police unit under the National Police Chief's Council (NPCC) that has a police unit of 10 with the support of 190 counter terrorism security advisors. NaCTSO is headquartered in London and is responsible for counterterrorism efforts throughout

the United Kingdom. The NaCTSO supports protection and preparation activities in accordance with the UK government's counterterrorism strategy. The primary responsibility of the NaCTSO is to provide help, guidance, and advice to stakeholders and the general public. A large role the NaCTSO played in the response to the 2017 terrorism attacks was increasing preparedness guidance and measures to reaffirm attitudes towards public safety and preparedness.

ACT: Action Counters Terrorism (ACT). The NaCTSO launched Action Counters Terrorism (ACT), an awareness campaign, just before the Westminster Attack on March 7, 2017. ACT is a national UK campaign that encourages the public to report suspicious activity to prevent attacks in the UK and overseas. According to a news release, the public "contribute intelligence to around a third of the most serious terrorism investigations" (NaCTSO, 2017a). The ACT campaign gives phone and online resources to report any suspicions. The campaign also gives advice and raises awareness on what to look out for and encourages the public to remain alert. At the time of publication, the news release noted that the threat of terrorism to the UK was at a severe level, meaning an attack is highly likely in light of other attacks on the European continent (NaCTSO, 2017a). Within weeks, the government saw an increased response from the public due to the campaign. By May 15, 2017, more than 3000 people had contacted the police with possible information related to terrorist activity and there were 300 online reports regarding online extremist material (NaCTSO, 2017e).

Mayor of London Sadiq Khan. Sadiq Khan, the Mayor of London, is a key actor in promoting the city's global brand. Sadiq Khan began his Mayoral term on May 9, 2016. Khan's background has gained notoriety as he was born to immigrant parents and is London's first muslim mayor. Under Mayor Khan is the Met Police and municipal counterterrorism

organizations such as SO15. The Mayor holds an executive role in promoting London's economic development and wealth creation, social development, and promotes culture and tourism. The Mayor works closely with London's organizations to promote London's interests and brand internationally. One of the Mayor's promotional campaigns is the #LondonisOpen campaign with London and Partners.

London & Partners and the #LondonisOpen campaign. Khan recently launched the #LondonisOpen campaign to show that London is united and open for business following the EU referendum (“#London”, n.d.). In these campaigns, Sadiq Khan works closely with London and Partners, a non-profit organization, as the agency that oversees all promotional campaigns for London, both domestically and internationally (Stevens, 2012). London and Partners is funded by the Mayor of London's annual grant (Stevens, 2012). The agency's purpose is "to promote London internationally as the best city in the world" and its mission is "to tell London's story brilliantly to an international audience" (“#London”, n.d.).

Westminster Attack Response

Immediately following the Westminster terrorist attack on March 22, 2017, the National Counter Terrorism Security Office released “Updates and advice following the incident in Westminster” (NaCTSO, 2017c). Updates by the NaCTSO were common for all of the 2017 London terror attacks and provided the public with key safety information and reassurance that the situation was being addressed by key officials. The NaCTSO published new online guidance titled “Recognising the terrorist threat” on the UK government website in the two days following the incident. The NaCTSO communicated information to stakeholders quickly, which is key in crisis communication (Spence et al., 2014). The NaCTSO's updates to guidance documents

reflected a fluid, reactive approach to counterterrorism planning, although there were few significant changes to counter-terrorism policies and guidelines following the Westminster attack. Logically, updates to NaCTSO policies and documents followed the first successfully executed terror attack since the 7/7 underground bombing in 2005.

National and city level leaders spearheaded the official government response with statements and press releases in the moments following the attack. The press release communicates relevant messaging in order to maintain an organizations reputation in crisis communication (Spence et al., 2014). Digital press releases in this case allowed for a swift, controlled medium for the government to address the public (Cmeci & Miron, 2011; Spence et al., 2015). Prime Minister Theresa May gave a statement in the hours following the attack, where she confirmed emerging details surrounding the attack and safety instructions . Later, Theresa May delivered an oral statement to Parliament on March 23, 2017. Mayor Khan provided an official statement on the attack on March 23, 2017. Theresa May and Sadiq Khan reinforced the ‘severe’ threat level for the United Kingdom, praised the work of the emergency service and police, and imparted condolences to victims and their families. Leadership discourse reflects the government’s role in alleviating fear and emotions of the public — it reassurance of safety, the aspirations to regulate normal activities within the affected area, and continues diplomatic efforts in the international community with allies and stakeholders.

Theresa May elucidated the extremist’s motivation for targeting Westminster, calling it “no accident” (May, 2017c). May explained the attack in context and with consideration to the deeper symbolism associated with the terrorist’s target. The attack targeted the iconic Palace of Westminster, which houses the UK’s Parliament. Westminster is centrally located within London,

as prior literature explains the significance of major global cities in terrorism activities. As previously discussed by Coaffee et al. (2009), terrorists target locations based on their representations and for maximum impact. The Prime Minister explained the UK's capital city represents, "liberty, democracy, and freedom of speech", and the Palace of Westminster represents, "democracy, freedom, human rights, and the rule of law" (May, 2017c). Theresa May provided insight into the attack as one on Londoners' way of life as well as Western democratic states and institutions, as Westminster is "home to the world's oldest parliament...ingrained with a spirit of freedom that echoes in some of the furthest corners of the globe" (May, 2017c). Mayor Khan communicated the location's representation of "democracy, freedom, justice, and tolerance" (Khan, 2017a). Furthermore, Theresa May speculates the terrorist's "intention was to gain access to this building" (May, 2017a). This provides insight into the material significance of the attack.

The underlying symbolism of iconic spaces, like the Palace of Westminster, the Westminster Bridge, and London as a global capital city, provides insight into the motivation behind these attacks. This relates to Coaffee et al.'s (2009) claim that terrorist attacks affect global centers both materially and symbolically. The material significance of the Westminster attack was the material attempt to disrupt parliament, or as speculated, to injure individuals of political significance inside of the Palace of Westminster. Additionally, the target chosen is a popular tourism location, as Big Ben is attached to Westminster and is one of London's most famous icons (Yamato et al., 2016). This incited fear among possible visitors to the city a maximum publicity effect and where the media will be present.

Prime Minister May and the Mayor of London's statements thoroughly advertised safety in London and the preparedness for the attacks. Khan (2017a) states "London remains one of the safest cities in the world", "there is no specific information of a further threat to the public", and "do not be alarmed". Theresa May (2017a) utilizes phrases like "we are not afraid" and do not "be cowered by this threat", while calling for "a response that denies our enemies their victory". Repeatedly communicating themes of safety, preparedness, planning, and anticipation of the attacks, and praise for police and emergency services were methods of providing reassurance to locals, tourists, visitors, and businesses. These statements were reminders of the government's control and capacity to protect and prevent these sorts of attacks. Government communication responses to crises and safety concerns must work to alleviate the fears and emotions of their citizens and key stakeholders (Coaffee et al., 2009).

The return to normalcy emerged as a key theme in the official response to Westminster. Immediately following the attack, Theresa May declared:

"Tomorrow morning, Parliament will meet as normal. We will come together as normal. And Londoners - and others from around the world who have come here to visit this great City - will get up and go about their day as normal" (May, 2017c).

The London Assembly met on March 23, 2017 and released an unanimous motion:

"The London Assembly wishes to record on behalf of Londoners its condemnation of the attack in Westminster on 22 March, together with Londoners' clear determination that terrorists will never succeed in affecting our democratic way of life or undermining Londoners' tolerance and solidarity; and how we value the diversity of London's communities" (London Assembly, 2017).

Sadiq Khan communicated a similar message, “After yesterday, nothing must change” (Khan, 2017a). These communications response to crises aspire to regulate and continue business activities and sources of financial inflow. Furthermore, this resolute attitude reflects underlying cultural attitudes widely held by Londoners (M. Tracey, personal communication, March 16, 2018), indicating experienced composure derived from a population’s familiarity with terror attacks and the deep-rooted history of terrorism in London and throughout the UK. Mayor Khan accredits London’s preparedness to the city’s long-standing history with terrorism:

“We Londoners have experienced horrific attacks and tragedy before. We’ve suffered terrorist attacks in the heart of our city over many decades, including the 7/7 bombings and the cowardly murder of Fusilier Lee Rigby in Woolwich. Every time, without fail, those seeking to destroy our way of life have failed. Every time, Londoners have come together to show our resilience, our resolve and our determination: we will never be cowed by those who use terror to try to break us” (Khan, 2017a).

Khan and May reassured the world of London’s preparedness, detailing “13 attempted attacks foiled over the past four years”, the previous met commissioner warned “when, not if”, and describing London has been expecting a threat for some time (Khan, 2017a). The trio of official statements emphasized the preparedness and the training of the police, mentioning “emergency services regularly and meticulously prepare in case of attacks”, claiming “our police and security services are the best in the world” (Khan, 2017a). The police and emergency worker initial response is a power-based response, which includes strong shows of force as explained below (Richards, 2004). Throughout this case the emergency responders and police minimized

casualties due to proactive preparations and planning, receiving praises for the “work they have been doing to reassure the public” (May, 2017a).

The response to Westminster included power-based components. In the 24 hours following the attacks, seven people in six raids were arrested, a counterterrorism investigation was initiated, the Prime Minister and Mayor met with COBRA, the government's emergency committee, and various intelligence groups gathered. There was a decision to increase both armed police and unarmed police in crowded areas following the attacks. This produces a feeling of safety, law and order following the attacks. This power-based response demonstrates action in addition to verbal reassurance to the public, as government leaders must find the appropriate and compelling forms of spectacular power-based responses to terror in a values based atmosphere (Richards, 2004).

Mayor Khan announced and later attended a candlelit vigil for the attack's victims in Trafalgar Square. The vigil was a values-based response to the attack, where people gathered in solidarity to pay their respects, mourn, and to come together in a united front. The vigil appealed to the more emotional, passive, spectator type of public (Richards, 2004). This vigil facilitated a connection between government leaders and the public in a values-based response. The public joint response with the government conveyed British cultural values to the world as a counterterrorism measure.

Theresa May announced an increase in the scope and budget of counter-terrorism efforts and a national level following the Westminster attack:

“Over the next 5 years we will invest an extra £2.5 billion in building our global security and intelligence network, employing over 1,900 additional staff at MI5, MI6 and GCHQ

and more than doubling our global network of counter-terrorism experts working with priority countries across Europe, the Middle East, Africa and Asia” (May, 2017a).

The increases to counter-terrorism spending and the size of relevant organizations indicates the significance of and impact of terrorism in London.

Sadiq Khan visited Brussels and Paris on March 27, 2017, “to hold high-level talks on security cooperation with leaders and officials” (Mayor of London, 2017b). The visit was to cities with recent terrorism activity. Khan’s diplomatic visit reflects the importance of partnerships with Paris and Brussels and as a way to maintain London’s image and influence internationally. Diplomacy is a political dimension of place branding in which soft power is increased with a more favorable image internationally (Fan, 2008). Khan advanced his political position in Brexit talks with neighboring countries during these diplomatic visits according to the press release (Mayor of London, 2017b). By combining security talks with Brexit talks, Khan leveraged the camaraderie and sympathetic attitudes of London’s international allies created by the attacks (Friesen, 2007).

London Bridge and Borough Market Attack

The London Bridge and Borough Market Attack, alternatively known as the London Bridge Attack, was the second terrorist attack within a period four months in the London and the third attack of its nature within the UK - with the Manchester Arena bombing occurring on May 22, 2017. On June 4, 2017, Theresa May declared, “when it comes to taking on extremism and terrorism, things need to change” (May, 2017b). The Prime Minister’s discourse regarded the palpable threat of terrorism in a post 7/7, 9/11 world. The discourse surrounding terrorism

reflected the need for Britons, Londoners, and Westerners' self-reconciliation of extremism and terrorism within the context of their everyday reality.

This time, London's pause lingered in comparison to the business as usual attitude following Westminster. Despite the general election approaching later that week, the national campaigns were suspended out of respect for those lost in the attacks (May, 2017b). The Borough Market remained closed for 11 days after the attack, reopening on June 14, 2017. However, this could be attributed to intelligence investigations. The Prime Minister's call for change was stark in comparison to Westminster responses' decree of normalcy. May's response involved policy and political changes, corresponding to her role as a national political leader, as place brands are built on the reputations and actions of their leaders (Govers, 2011). With the third attack, May appeared resolute to legitimize and enhance her soft-power and influence politically (Alaimo, 2017).

Theresa May outwardly recognized Islamic extremism as problematic, her official statement insisted the problem would not cease anytime soon, "we are experiencing a new trend in the threat we face, as terrorism breeds terrorism" (May, 2017b). In reaction, Prime Minister May prescribed four points of change addressing terrorism within the UK: (1) turn people's minds away from radical ideologies and focus on Western and British values; (2) prevent extremism from spreading online; (3) take military action abroad and stomp out extremism within the UK; and (4) review and update Britain's counter-terrorism strategy.

May's pro-Western, pro-British discourse contains nationalist undertones and reflects a pushback against globalization.

“We turn people’s minds away from this violence — and make them understand that our values — pluralistic, British values — are superior to anything offered by the preachers and supporters of hate.” (May, 2017b).

May promotes London and the UK culturally, which is an example of a values-based response that utilizes western values in counterterrorism efforts (Richards, 2004). These undertones appeal domestically to Britons, as place branding promotes organizations in power in exchange of the articulation of collective identity (Kaneva, 2011). Likewise, a pro-Western discourse may inspire camaraderie (Friesen, 2007) with other countries that share similar Western values. The ongoing issue of terrorism is shared by other European nations, and by calling out these nations, May can enhance diplomatic goals internationally, which is key in her role as the leader of the UK (Fan, 2008, Alaimo, 2017).

The Prime Minister looks to defeat the spread of terror online with her second point. The rise of the internet changed how terrorism and extremist ideologies are spread and how people are radicalized (May, 2017b). The increased use of the internet to radicalize and spread extremist ideology changes the way terrorism is combated, demonstrated by updates to counterterrorism plans and policies. Similarly, changes to digital trends in communication responses justify the use of digital press releases in this case to effectively communicate with the public (Cmeciu & Miron, 2011).

Theresa May mentions the dual importance of both hard-power and soft-power in stopping islamic extremism in the UK. May mentions power-based military action targeting ISIS in Iraq and Syria throughout her statement, as she openly takes inventory of all extremes Britain can take as a response to terror. The possibility of a hard-power response by PM May sends a

message internationally. The Prime Minister's firm approach to terror positions the UK to garner an impression of legitimacy and strength internationally after the country had three major terror attacks within a short amount of time. Additionally, Prime Minister May targets extremism at home, stating there is "far too much tolerance of extremism in our country" (May, 2017b).

Theresa May aims to stomp out domestic extremism by encouraging the public to have challenging conversations encompassing terrorism's complex narrative. The mention of these "difficult and often embarrassing" (May, 2017b) conversations reflects cultural undertones in London and the UK, speaking to an emerging political divide among the public. Including the public in these conversations calls on the participatory power citizens have in Western democracies (Richards, 2004).

Finally, Theresa May calls for a review and overhaul of counterterrorism strategies to address the "more complex, more fragmented, more hidden" (May, 2017b) threat of terrorism. The UK government's augmentation of policy and counterterrorism measures was to ensure safety and protection of citizens and visitors after the first half of 2017. This final point illuminates the magnitude of the threat at hand and the abnormality in this case, especially considering multiple terror attacks in quick succession. Although London and the UK had proactive policies and existing preparedness plans in place, Theresa May and the relevant counterterrorism organizations realized that there must be a change to these policies with the evolution of the terror threat. The Prime Minister suggested deterrence by creating harsher custodial sentences for terrorism-related offenses, even for "less serious offenses" (May, 2017b). This, along with another increase in unarmed and armed police throughout London, are power-based responses (Richards, 2004). By re-evaluating counterterrorism policies, plans, and

preparedness, the government strived to keep London safe and to protect its own interests. May's statement expresses the need to update and respond to terror events in order to prioritize safety and prevention measures against attacks of this nature.

Mayor Khan's official statement regarding the London Bridge attack was brief in comparison to his response to the Westminster attack earlier in the year. He condemned the attacks and gave brief details surrounding the location of the attack, the number of casualties, and thanked emergency service and Londoners. The Mayor called the attack "cowardly" and broadcasted that Londoners will never let terrorists win (Khan, 2017c). Khan later stated that "the city remains one of the safest in the world" and there was "no reason to be alarmed" due to increased police and armed police presence around the city (Khan 2017c; Ellis-Peterson 2017).

Mayor Khan's response was criticized in the international community as lackluster, especially by United States President Donald Trump on Twitter. Khan's response was received as detached from the magnitude of terror threats conveyed by May. His response diverges from Theresa May's national messaging following the London Bridge and Borough Market attack. On the other hand, Mayor Khan's response concerned London's promotion and strived to convey safety and openness, which is appropriate given his position as London's Mayor. These prioritized concerns are confirmed by the #LondonisOpen for Summer campaign, which will be analyzed in this chapter.

A vigil was held on June 5, 2017, near City Hall for the victims of the terrorist attack (Khan, 2017b). The vigil was announced and led by Mayor Sadiq Khan, where he reinforced a unified London, "Our city is filled with great sorrow and anger tonight but also great resolve and determination. Because our unity and love will always be stronger than the hate of the

extremists” (Ellis-Peterson, 2017; Khan, 2017b). This is a value-based response to terrorism, as hundreds attended to pay their respects with flowers, signs, and messages promoting Britain’s values, such as tolerance and resilience, in defiance of terror (Ellis-Peterson, 2017). This values-based forum, held by London’s officials, appeals to the more emotional, passive side of the public and allows citizens to harness Western-values in counter-terrorism efforts (Richards, 2004).

Even in a relatively short timeframe, Terrorism resulted in physical changes to London’s landscape. Following the London Bridge and Borough Market attack, fences and barriers were erected on the Waterloo, Lambeth, and Westminster bridges (Gray, 2017). The erected protective bollards prevent vehicles from driving off the road and into pedestrian traffic, demonstrated in both the Westminster and London Bridge attacks. The change of the physical landscape of these spaces are reminiscent of the architecture paranoia was seen in the City of London’s ‘ring of steel’ following the IRA attacks (Coaffee et al., 2009; Kaika, 2010).

The Metropolitan Police issued ‘run, hide, and tell’ notices and asked for vigilance following the London Bridge and Borough Market Attack (Davidson, 2017). The ACT campaign proactively prepared this guidance, which promotes the public’s role in keeping London safe and reporting unusual activity. The use of ACT and ‘run, hide, and tell’ demonstrates the implementation of a proactive government campaign, as it was put to use immediately following a terror attack (Nallanthiga, 2011; Coaffee et al., 2009).

In a reactive manner, the NaCTSO launched the New Crowded Place Guidance on June 8, 2017 (NaCTSO, 2017b). The 174 page government document details plans and preparedness measures for a multitude of locations and business types and its purpose is to mitigate the threat

of terrorism in crowded places, assist in risk assessments and security planning (NaCTSO, 2017b). The NaCTSO announced the release of the new document in a press release to garner positive media attention and reinforce public opinion of the organization (NaCTSO, 2017d). This demonstrates the promotional use of the digital press release (Cmeciu & Miron, 2011).

Response to Multiple Attacks

In the weeks following the Westminster attack, the London Bridge and Brough market attack, and the Finsbury Park attack, national and municipal government officials reviewed multiple aspects of counterterrorism policy and communicated their efforts to enhance safety measures and openness in London. The discussion and messaging from key leaders and organizations discerned that the threat of terrorism in the UK is complex and ranges from lone actors carrying out simple but deadly attacks, like in the Westminster attack, to networks plotting more coordinated activities, as seen in the London Bridge attack. This case demonstrates the increasingly problematic nature of extremist ideology within the UK, which must be addressed in vigorous counter-terrorism efforts to prevent attacks before they happen. The narrative of the Westminster attack, which contained a theme of preparedness and boasted incredible safety in London, was challenged once the London Bridge and Finsbury Park attacks occurred. The terror attacks altered the city's safety and preparedness measures, as reviews were undertaken and counterterrorism measures were ramped up and influenced budgetary increases.

Following the three terror attacks in London and the Manchester attack, the British government pushed security advice and guidance to the public in order to create awareness and increase preparedness among businesses and the general public. The NaCTSO continued to promote ACT in government releases (NaCTSO, 2017d). Additionally, the NaCTSO promoted

safety and preparedness guidance with a Stay Safe film to the public in case of a firearms or weapons attack and released a number of security documents advising security managers in crowded places (NaCTSO, 2017b). Many of these documents are linked at the bottom of the news releases from the NaCTSO detailing information relevant to the incidents and attacks. The NaCTSO capitalized on the digital press release as an efficient means to communicate directly and efficiently with publics (Cmeciu & Miron, 2011).

Businesses were impacted by the terror attacks, indicated by Khan's promotion of London's economic brand and local businesses — "London's businesses situated close to terror scenes and the Grenfell Tower fire are amongst the hidden victims of the recent horrific events seen in the capital" (Mayor of London, 2017a). The Mayor of London announced a fund of £300,000 for businesses impacted by the three recent terror attacks on June, 29, 2017 (Mayor of London, 2017a). The Mayor requested the national government assist in funding and assistance measures for businesses effected by the terror attacks, demonstrating limitations to Khan's power. The funding was planned to be "available for businesses which have been unable to trade or otherwise directly affected following recent appalling events" (Mayor of London, 2017a). The Mayor offered advice and support to assist the businesses resumed operations swiftly. The fund would ideally help small businesses, especially those who operate in spaces like the Borough Market. Sadiq Khan's assistance to London businesses demonstrated effort to return business activities to a normal capacity following the attacks (Coaffee et al., 2009); furthermore, the Mayor's efforts to reinstate a sense of normalcy following the attacks was through the promotion of London's £36 billion tourism industry (MD2155, 2017).

#LondonisOpen for Summer campaign. Tourism and London's image of safety took a hit following the attacks, hence the introduction of #LondonisOpen for Summer campaign. With all eyes on London, the city's response, in conjunction with the national government, sought to project an image of safety, preparedness, and resilience. Following the failed attempt to attack Parsons Green in September, press releases boasted the actions London's leaders were taking to keep the city safe and remain vigilant on terror. Additionally, London's official promotional agency, London & Partners, boasted city rankings and noteworthy recognition of London's international appeal.

The #LondonisOpen for Summer campaign was launched on July 24, 2017 as a response to the terror attacks at Westminster, London Bridge, and Finsbury Park. The Greater London Authority and the Mayor of London, working with London & Partners, deemed a marketing and events campaign necessary after receiving reports of terrorism's negative effects from the Association of Leading Visitor Attractions and Transportation for London. According to a request for Mayoral Decision on funding for the summer campaign, reports noticed the terror attacks and heightened security concerns were negatively impacting the number of Londoners and international visitors visiting London attractions (MD2155, 2017). The negative effects of terrorism on the attitudes of visitors to London's attractions can be seen in the facts and figures presented to the Mayor of London in an official mayoral decision document:

1.1. "Early reports from tourism partners and stakeholders suggests that the recent terror attacks in London, the horrific fire at Grenfell Tower and heightened security concerns are impacting on visitor numbers to the city, particularly Londoners visiting London attractions" (MD2155, 2017).

1.2. "The Association of Leading Visitor Attractions (AVLA) has reported a significant fall in visitor numbers to attractions and theatres that cater predominately to young families and school groups" (MD2155, 2017).

1.3. “TfL figures show that since the recent terrorist attacks, the number of off-peak/non-commuter journeys has fallen, particularly into Zone 1 around key visitor attractions” (MD2155, 2017).

These facts and figures, which demonstrate terror’s impact, will be analyzed further in the next section of this chapter. The press release announcing the re-introduction of the #LondonisOpen campaign was transparent about the correlation to terror attacks, “London has demonstrated great resilience, unity and spirit in recent months following the terrible events at Westminster, London Bridge, Finsbury Park and Grenfell Tower. The Mayor has launched the ‘London is Open for Summer’ campaign to reassure visitors to the city that the capital remains open to all with a diverse range of events and attractions for everyone to enjoy” (London & Partners, 2017a). The press release messaging quickly redirects attention to the fact that London is a great place to visit during the summertime and lists off attractions and positive tourism statistics from the first part of 2017.

The Mayor of London and the GLA decided to promote visitor attractions with a continuation of the 2016 #LondonisOpen initiative and created #LondonisOpen for Summer to promote London as a tourist destination from mid-July 2017 to mid-October 2017 (MD2155, 2017). The summer campaign aimed to promote economic development and business continuity by targeting both London residents and international target markets:

1.5. “In exercising the GLA’s statutory powers to promote economic development in London, the Mayor wants to run a marketing and events campaign to encourage London residents, in particular, London families, to enjoy the wealth of cultural and sporting activities that London has to offer over the summer and autumn” (MD2155, 2017).

1.6. “This will complement activity by London & Partners (L&P) to promote London internationally as a city to visit and enjoy over the summer” (MD2155, 2017).

Key messaging of both the original #LondonisOpen campaign and the #LondonisOpen for Summer campaign was “celebrating London’s diverse cultures and communities to promote London’s values of openness and inclusiveness” (MD2155, 2017). Additionally, both campaigns sought cultural and sporting event promotion in addition to London’s permanent attractions:

2.4 "The campaign will consist of paid for advertising such as social media activity, Out of Home (OOH) media, events and promotion at large scale sporting and cultural events throughout the capital this summer (e.g. London 2017)” (MD2155, 2017).

The #LondonisOpen for summer campaign utilized video to deliver key messages to audiences featuring celebrities, such as Jimmy Fallon and Mayor Sadiq Khan, in various locations throughout London. The messaging showcases London’s international presence and diversity as celebrities discuss why London is great in the summertime (London & Partners, 2017a).

Additionally, the campaign created a special page on visitlondon.com to help visitors discover activities, events, accommodations, and provided helpful information. The GLA and London & Partners provided ‘special offers’ to attract visitors and used the campaign to promote these offers (MD2155, 2017). These special offers were included as boiler plates on the London and Partners press release announcing the summer campaign (London & Partners, 2017a), this shows the versatility in the digital press release (Cmeciu & Miron, 2011).

The summer campaign’s budget was £200,000 “to be spent on marketing, events, and associated production costs for the Summer in London Marketing & Events Campaign” (MD2155, 2017). This was £50,000 more than the original #LondonisOpen campaign budget of £150,000 for a campaign timeline that was two months longer than the summer campaign (DD2027, 2016). These budget increases and the need for a campaign in

response to the 2017 terror events in general reflect the magnitude and impact of the attacks on London's image.

London & Partners press releases. London and Partners supplemented the #LondonisOpen for Summer campaign with efforts to maintain a strong image of London by producing press releases and content showcasing London's high standings in city rankings and recent instances of positive recognition, as the press release can maintain an organization's image in the event of a crisis (Spence et al., 2014). The London & Partners press releases between May and November of 2017 promoted London's connectivity, record numbers of business travelers (London & Partners, 2017b), and record numbers of travelers (London & Partners, 2017e). These promotional elements of press releases help shape and reinforce London's identity (Cmeci & Miron, 2011). These press releases targeted international media outlets and audiences. Additionally, the organization boasted statistics. London & Partners cited record numbers of visitors due to cultural events "proving the city is open and welcoming visitors from all over the world" (London & Partners, 2017e; London & Partners 2017f); and a record number of overseas visitors of 4.5 million for quarter one of 2017 (London & Partners, 2017e); while boasting a jump in North American visitors driving tourism in London (London & Partners, 2017g). London & Partners took advantage of London's notoriety in various city ranking accolades, citing London's top rankings as the leading "dynamic city" in Europe on the Savillis IM Dynamic Cities index (London & Partners, 2017d) and London's sixth consecutive ranking as the Most Attractive City on the 2017 Global Power City Index (London & Partners, 2017c).

London & Partners actively defended the image, safety, and ‘openness’ of London in the media following terrorism events. Laura Citron, the CEO of London & Partners provided the following statement to *The Independent*:

“London is open to tourists from the UK and around the world. It remains a safe city to visit. There is an increased police and security presence around London and at the city’s visitor attractions. Londoners and visitors are resilient. While it’s impossible to predict the full impact on tourism we are confident that international visitors will stand by London. The latest data from Forward Keys, which is based on travel agent bookings, shows bookings for international arrivals this summer are up by 12 per cent compared to the same period last year” (Coffey, 2017).

Defending safety and security in London, insisting that the city is open, and providing data that shows London’s various tourism and business sectors on a positive trend is a predictable response from the official promotional organization of London. A caveat is that some of these statistics predated the attacks and reflect record tourism numbers that may be due to the weakened pound sterling following Brexit. These figures will be discussed further in the next section of analysis.

Effects of Terrorism

This study aims to better understand the perception of London’s place brand following the terror attacks and the effect terrorism events have on London’s perception. Data sets revealed some of the negative effects of terrorism in London. The London Intelligence Project by Centre for London began in 2017 and tracks various issues in London on a quarterly basis. The comparative data analysis reports are expected to run until July 2020, and studies five major

themes of demography, economy, infrastructure and housing, society, and health and environment. For the purpose of this research, relevant data in the areas economy and society were the most relevant. Data sources included London & Partners, Transport for London, Office for national statistics (ONS), among other relevant sources of data produced by UK government organizations and institutions.

International visitors into London during the last quarter of 2016 reflected a seasonably high growth of 8 per cent compared to the prior year, despite the established trend of international visitor numbers dropping off after the summer months (Colthorpe, 2017a). International spend per visitor was 3.7 per cent higher (Colthorpe, 2017a). In context, these unseasonably high rates of international visitors and spend is important because of Brexit and the fall in the value of the pound that followed, “this rise could reflect the fall in the value of the pound following the vote to leave the EU last year — the pound fell almost every month to the end of the year against other major currencies” (Colthorpe, 2017a). The rise in visitors continued through the first and second quarters of 2017, with 16 per cent growth through March and an 11 per cent growth in the second quarter from the same quarters of the previous year (Colthorpe & Brown, 2017b). Its worth mentioning that the second quarter ended on June 30, therefore the effects of the terrorism events in June may not have affected the results by the time the study was produced. Inflation-adjusted spending continued to rise through quarter one and two of 2017. Yet, by ‘peak summer’ months of July to September of quarter 3, there was a drop in international visits to the capital by 1.3 per cent, which could be related to the terror attacks in the first two quarters of the year (Colthorpe & Brown, 2018). Despite the drop in visitor numbers, spend continued to increase to a year-on-year rise of 25 per cent, reflecting the benefits

of a Brexit induced 'weak pound'. In contrast, the rest of England had a 2.7 per cent rise in visitors but a fall in spend of 10 per cent compared to Q3 of 2016 (Colthorpe & Brown, 2018).

The attractions monitor in the area of society is pertinent to this case. The attraction monitor is data compiled by London and Partners that monitors foot traffic at 63 of London's main attractions which include museums, galleries, stadia, and historical locations. Leading up to March, year-on-year growth was strong for London's attractions. "March saw an annualized drop of 7.6 per cent in the number of people visiting London's top attractions" (Colthorpe, 2017a). The drop was down 13 per cent in locations outside of Zone 1 and down 5 per cent in Central London. The intelligence report then states:

"Visitor numbers to over 60 of London's top attractions — including museums, galleries and stadiums — fell by nearly 5 per cent in the quarter to September when compared to the previous year. The sharpest fall was in the summer months, when international visitor numbers were also down, and is perhaps linked to the impact of terror attacks in London and Manchester" (Colthorpe & Brown, 2018, p. 23).

International and visitor traffic were not the only casualty of the attack. Surveys indicated that domestic attitudes and consumer confidence were shaped by the terror events in London.

The domestic perception of a place brand affects how external interest groups and competitors perceive a place. The size and diverse populations of place brands make them more challenging to control than a corporate-type brand (Moilanen, 2009); thus, they must not be ignored. Terrorism concerns domestically spiked following the terror attacks among British citizens. Terrorism was a prominent concern among UK consumers according to the GfK UK consumer survey conducted in September 2017, "from a list of 15 concerns terrorism was among

the top 5, reaching its peak in Summer 2017” (Gfk Consumer Life UK, 2017). In the survey, terrorism and Brexit were correlated, among those who voted remain ranked terrorism fourth out of the top eight concerns at 13 per cent (Gfk Consumer Life UK, 2017). Those who voted to leave saw terrorism as a grave concern, with terrorism the second highest concern at 18 per cent, up five percentage points among those who voted to leave (Gfk Consumer Life UK, 2017). This indicates a pushback against globalization and provides insight into the relationship between Brexit, globalization, and terror in the UK. The same study indicated that terrorism was a prominent threat that drove stress levels in consumers to a staggering 90 per cent (GfK Consumer Life UK, 2017). In a different study conducted in the UK, 72% showed concern about rising political or religious extremism (Edelman, 2018). Furthermore, terrorism concerns moved up by 6 rank changes as a threat from the outside world, which includes terrorism and natural disaster, showing that the 2017 attacks caused more room for concern over terror in the UK (GfK Consumer Life UK, 2017).

Place Brand Indices

The following place brand indices evaluate place brand strength utilizing different methodology. Each contains slight variations in the emphasized aspect(s) of place branding. This section will examine the Resonance World’s Best Cities Ranking, the Global Power City Index, and the Anholt-GfK City Brands Index (CBI) place brand monitors.

Resonance World’s Best Cities: A Ranking of Global Place Equity.

Year	Overall Rank	Place	Product	Program ming	People	Prosperity	Promotion
2017	1	10	1	1	15	23	1
2018	1	5	3	1	6	7	1

It is important to note that this evaluation of place brands has much more to do with brand equity than brand perception. The promotion category is the best attempt to understand international city brand perception, as it looks online for ratings and reviews of major city attractions. For the purpose of this study, the Resonance Index place category is most relevant to the influence of terrorism on a place brand, as safety falls under this category. Resonance sources safety information from the Office for National Statistics, Office for Regional Statistics, UN Office on Drugs and Crime, and Eurostat (Resonance, 2018). Moreover, the place category is saturated with the influence of four other sub-categories in addition to safety for this section, which jumped from 10 in 2017 to 5 in 2018 (Resonance, 2017; Resonance, 2018).

London's top spot has existed in both the 2017 and 2018 ranking, indicating a strong, well rounded brand and a spot in the top 10 of all six categories in 2018. The publication of the 2018 study, conducted in Q3 of 2017, came with a brief analysis of the top ranked cities and their brand equity. London remained constant or moved up in all categories except for product, where London dropped two spots. Resonance explained London has been reaping the rewards of the 2012 Olympics and breaking records for visitor numbers. Additionally, the study mentioned current events in London, Openness of London is why "60% of the city voted to stay in the EU in the Brexit both in 2016" and "why after every terrorist attack, the city's streets seem to grow denser and its population more vigilant but also more empathetic to the sanctuary sought in the city" (Resonance, 2018, p.10). Furthermore, this index credits openness, Mayor Khan's diverse background and initiatives for London's tourism to London's success in spite of 2017's unusual circumstances.

The Resonance World's Best Cities Ranking captures a broad picture of critical components to brands and brand assets, especially in the aspects that may give a brand a competitive advantage (Govers, 2011). But, the caveat here is although London has these brand assets, the promotion category cannot entirely capture how London and these six categories and sub-categories are perceived. Just because this is how London's place brand, in principle, should be perceived or understood doesn't mean that it realizes the practical application of brand equity. This caveat is applicable to most place branding paradigms. Overall, London's brand was rounded in this index and indicates London's strong equity in all categories.

Global Power City Index (GPCI).

	Overall Ranking	Economy	R&D	Cultural Interaction	Livability	Environment	Accessibility
2017 Ranking	1	2	2	1	17	7	2
2017 Score	1560.1	301.6	165.1	333.1	328.3	188.0	244.0
2016 Ranking	1	2	3	1	22	8	1
2016 Score	1511.5	307.5	162.4	338.9	274.4	183.3	245.0

Safety and security fall under the livability function for the Mori Memorial Foundation Institute for Urban Strategies Global Power City Index, with 14 total indicators influencing livability such as unemployment, housing costs, number of doctors, retail and restaurants, in addition to safety and security. London's livability function was substantially lower than other functions, as London ranked within the top ten for each of the five other urban functions. When compared to other global cities, London's livability was ranked number 22 and 17 in 2016 and 2017, respectively (Yamato et al., 2016; Yamato et al., 2017). London's weakness in the area of

livability is not influenced by safety alone. For example, London is notoriously expensive to live in, which may negatively affect livability. Otherwise, London's strong performance in the five other categories indicates why the city historically ranks high on the GPCI. Annually, London was overall ranked second from 2008-2011 and first from 2012-2017 (Yamato et al., 2016; Yamato et al., 2017). Interestingly enough, the 2017 GCPI Summary details that in the livability category, Paris tumbled from first to seventh in the livability category, as "The number of victims in the 2015 Paris terrorist attacks has significantly impacted the city's score for Number of Murders per Million People" (Yamato et al., 2017, p. 3). This insinuates terrorism has negative effects on place brands. Also, it is unclear from the summary document whether or not the information for the 2017 report took the 2017 London terror events into account at the time of publication.

Anholt-GfK City Brands Index (CBI).

2017 rank	City	2015 rank	Score change 2017 vs. 2015
1	Paris	1	+0.51
2	London	2	+0.52
3	Sydney	4	+0.97
4	New York	3	+0.67
5	Los Angeles	5	+0.91
6	Rome	6	+0.65
7	Melbourne	9	+1.64
8	Amsterdam	8	+1.36
9	San Francisco	n/a	+n/a
10	Berlin	7	+0.75

CBISM score range from 1-100. Score changes: small: +/-0.26-0.50; medium: +/-0.51-1.00; large: > +/-1.00

London is ranked second in the 2017 Anholt-GfK City Brands Index (CBI) ranking (GfK, 2018). The biennial study was conducted in September and October of 2017 (GfK, 2018).

London remained in the second place spot from 2015, which is when Paris took the top ranked spot from London (Volos & Marin, 2016). The key dimensions and scoring breakdowns of the CBI were unavailable for the researcher to further evaluate the level of perceived safety of a city, as this is a consideration that influences ‘the people’ portion of the index (Anholt, 2006). The fall of London’s place brand from first to second place may reflect a downward trend in recent years.

The data presented by the above indices of global cities and their brands demonstrates some of the different approaches to evaluating city brand equity. The rankings indicate London’s consistently strong and well-rounded place brand that sets the city ahead. London’s brand strength consists of many different aspects, examined by the studies mentioned, and each contribute to the brand strength and resilience of the city. Thus, terrorism and safety concerns, when evaluated, are not a front-running category that will affect the city’s place brand ranking in its entirety. A common trait of the brand indices that has been consistent year to year is how well rounded London is, as a IPSOS describes, London is ‘the all-rounder’ and all around preferable to live, to play, and to visit.

Chapter Four: Discussion and Conclusion

The 2017 London terror attacks and subsequent responses provide insight into the importance of protecting a major place brand in the midst of global crisis. This case study demonstrates the importance of the cultural, political, and economic dimensions of place branding (Fan 2008), as seen by London's response to crisis. This case also highlights the importance of crisis management in protecting and further promoting the cultural, political, and economic dimensions of London's place brand in the midst of tumultuous times. This case's crisis management response adheres to Anholt's (2008, in Kaneva) two schools of nation branding, with communications-based and policy-based responses. This case study demonstrates an extensive response that meets both of these schools. Political and contextually important themes outside of the terror issue emerged in the analysis of this case, demonstrating the influence of the circumstances in which a crisis occurs. This will be further discussed in this chapter.

Results

RQ1: How did relevant actors form crisis communication responses to address the 2017 terror events in London?

Crisis communication responses addressing terrorism were informed by the dimensions and concepts posed in previous literature in the space of place branding, brand management, and crisis mitigation. This case utilized prior place branding literature and provided an application of crisis management concepts in a situation where key leaders needed to protect and promote a place brand following terror related crises. The channels and tools utilized to promote and protect

London's place brand correlated with academic writing and theories on the subject of place branding and crisis management, as discussed in the literature review.

Political dimension. Fan (2008), Alaimo (2017), and Kaneva (2011) pose the conceptual importance of the political dimension in the field of place branding. The crisis itself is political in nature, therefore, the political dimension is highly relevant to this case study. National leader Prime Minister Theresa May and municipal leader Mayor Sadiq Khan hold political positions of power and inform safety policies and measures, economic goals, and promote cultural aspects of their place brand. In this case, May and Khan alleviated fear and emotions of the public (Coaffee et al., 2009), worked to regulate normal activities within London, and continued diplomatic efforts in the international community with allies and international stakeholders (Fan, 2008). Frequent and honest communication efforts by May and Khan, among other actors, aimed to reduce uncertainty and maintain London's reputation in a way that is typical of traditional corporate crisis communication (Spence et. al). The responses of Theresa May and Saqiq Khan were not always collaborative, as the role and scope of Prime Minister Theresa May and the Mayor of London Sadiq Khan differ - Theresa May is a national government leader and Khan is a city government leader.

As the attacks continued, the Prime Minister and Mayor's messaging efforts diverged, the differences in their positions and their goals emerged thereafter. The divergence in May and Khan's messaging left room for improvement in this case. Furthermore, Mayor Khan and Prime Minister May's differing roles, capabilities, and responses demonstrate one of the challenges of place branding - there are a multitude of actors that affect the place brand of London (Molianen, 2009; Green, 2005). A challenge of place branding that differentiates it from the concept of

traditional branding is the fact that there are many actors and organizations who influence the image of the place (Moilanen, 2009; Green, 2005). The intentions of these leaders and their affiliated organizations reflects a strategic understanding of how stakeholders conceptualize London in relation to terror attacks and broader issues in the context of the attacks' timeframe (Anholt, 2006). In this case, these responses and intentions varied based on differing leadership agendas. The responses of these leaders and their underlying messaging will be discussed throughout this chapter.

Prime Minister Theresa May's response informed actors locally in London and nationally within the UK of how to react to crisis. Theresa May was instrumental in promoting national counter-terrorism policy changes and updates. As a national leader, May holds influence over the activities, scope, and funding of counterterrorism organizations and counterterrorism policies. May's hardline response to terror, seen in the analysis of the London Bridge attack, was an attempt to show the UK's strength and power in a situation where the nation's vulnerabilities were exposed by non-state actors. May intended that London and the UK were not seen as vulnerable domestically or internationally after repeated attacks, therefore Theresa May promoted the UK's strengths and was committed to addressing terrorism in the face of crisis. The role of cultural brand aspects, such as values, pro-British and pro-Western discourse by Theresa May, will be discussed further in this chapter.

Sadiq Khan's goals and messaging promoted London's brand following the terror events. In his discourse, Khan attempted to best promote his political and economic goals and vision for London. Khans' response was especially concerned with London's economic brand and harnessing the idea of safety in order to regulate London's business and tourism industries.

Additionally, Khan's discourse and promotional campaign intended to prove London was open following the EU referendum and the UK's pushback against globalization. The Mayor's political and economic role will be discussed throughout this chapter, and it is important to note that Khan's position as a municipal leader is limited in scope in comparison to Prime Minister May. Khan's response was primarily concerned with promoting London's image following the negative impact of terror on London's economic dimension and continuing to portray London as open following Brexit.

As the terror issue progressed throughout the course of 2017, the way in which political activities were conducted provided insight into the political brand of the UK. Recall that London is politically significant, as Parliament and the Prime Minister both operate in the capital city. The fact that the British Parliament met the day following the Westminster attack, at the location of the attack, is testament to the resolute and resilient attitude of the nation's political leaders. In contrast, the pause in campaign activities leading up to the general election in a period of respect, mourning, and solidarity for the victims of the London Bridge attack demonstrated the grave nature of the repeated terror attacks following the Westminster, Manchester, and London Bridge attacks. National leadership took this time to step back and reevaluate a plan moving forward, as there needed to be reputation management following the attacks, (Kaneva, 2011).

Diplomacy and soft power. Diplomatic dimensions, especially considering the major brand asset that is London's status as a capital city, drives place branding efforts (Fan, 2008). Diplomacy, a political subset of place branding, contributes to a place's soft power by creating a more favorable image among international audiences, helping the place achieve its goals in international affairs (Fan, 2008). Khan engaged in diplomatic meetings with neighboring cities to

enhance his soft power. The Mayor made the most of his diplomatic capabilities with a visit to Brussels and Paris, where terrorism and security concerns were discussed in addition to promoting Khan's agenda to keep London open amid Brexit talks. The tension between Khan and Theresa May's differing political agendas can be seen in diplomatic efforts made on both ends - Khan utilized publicity to convey London's image as open while positioning London as an outlier from the controversial Brexit talks. In contrast, Theresa May conveyed a more pro-British image.

Theresa May's pro-Western discourse following the attacks reflected the pushback against globalization and openness in the United Kingdom following the attacks. Note that soft-power's function is interconnected with the attractiveness of a country's culture, political ideas, and policies (Aliamo, 2017). Theresa May's response promoted British culture and policies, as well as political ideas following the attacks. This will be discussed further under the cultural dimension section of the discussion. In a diplomatic sense, May's pro-Western discourse promoted camaraderie between the UK and its allies that have experienced extremist attacks firsthand (Friesen, 2007). Soft-power in respect to the promotion of the cultural brand of UK and Western values will be explored further in this section, nevertheless, soft-power holds diplomatic significance to London's political brand.

Policy-based approaches. Policy-based responses in the London case sought to instill a sense of safety correlated with protecting the political aspects of London's brand. Coaffee et al. (2009) attribute London's reliance to a crisis response which is both proactive and reactive, with adaptability to deal with the fluid nature of the range of security challenges faced by major urban areas. The NaCTSO's updates and changes to counterterrorism policies and guidance is an

example of this, as Theresa May mentioned, the terrorism threat evolved, especially considering the role of the internet and home-grown extremism. Theresa May conducted reviews of and overhauled counterterrorism policies and augmented relevant organizations, such as MI5. Following Westminster, increased budgets and expansions of counter-terrorism government organizations such as NaCTSO and MI5 allowed for safety concerns to be alleviated, which is a key role of the government (Coaffee et al., 2009). The augmentation of counter-terror policies and funding is a factor of the success of crisis mitigation in this case, “If brand management informs policy making and becomes implicit in the way the country is run, it can dramatically accelerate change” (Anholt, 2008, in Kaneva p.23). With better counter-terrorism and safety programs and policies in place, London appears more safe to stakeholders. Accordingly, if these policies are seen as legitimate in the eyes of others, soft-power is enhanced in this case (Alaimo, 2017).

Power-based responses. Power-based responses to terrorism, jointly with values-based responses, work to appeal to participatory-spectator publics through police and military responses and increase an atmosphere of law and order following chaotic moments (Richards, 2004). The first response following all of the attacks were power-based responses. Additionally, both armed and unarmed police units were increased in crowded areas to reassure those weary of repeated attacks. Theresa May suggested harsher terrorism sentences in the UK following the London Bridge attack, which is also a power-based response within the area of policy. Police raids, arrests, and efforts by intelligence organizations were critical in the moments following the attacks. For example, there were six raids and seven people arrested within the 24 hours of the Westminster attack. Quickly identifying adversaries provided reassurance and a sense that justice

was served to the public. Furthermore, the fact that the adversary groups were not at large contributed to a sense of security. The swift power-based response was done well in this case, and the police and emergency service praise in the analysis section were not without merit. Security reinforcements and increased police protection demonstrated the government was amenable to security improvements.

Information availability. Information availability and safety advisories were well communicated at national levels and locally in London. Spence et al. (2014) state crisis communication should be frequent and honest to reduce uncertainty. The NaCTSO provided an official update after each incident where emerging information was posted. Information was relayed quickly through official organizations following the attacks at various levels, often through digital press or news releases, which allowed organizations to more directly communicate with key stakeholders and audiences (Cmeciu & Miron, 2011). The NaCTSO's transmissions allowed the intelligence agency to control the narrative and prevented the spread of false information. The NaCTSO linked guides and relevant information at the bottom of news releases to help keep audiences in London safe. This demonstrates the evolution of digital media in crisis communication efforts. The availability of guidance, threat level breakdowns, emerging information, and safety advice were critical in controlling the conversation around the attacks and kept rumors and hysteria at bay. Campaigns by the NaCTSO such as ACT were successful, as a significant amount of calls were received due to the campaign. The NaCTSO reported that "a significant number of calls were made following the Westminster attack" this shows the success of the ACT campaign in transmitting information reports to and from the public (NaCTSO, 2017e).

The above political measures were all communicated through press releases, official statements, and were promoted in the media following the attacks. By communicating the political efforts made by government officials and organizations, those responsible for safety measures and counterterrorism appeared accommodating to safety concerns. Leaders promoted an idea of reinforced safety to audiences with concerns over safety and instability following an unusual high amount of terrorism activity. In this case study, the response of the government and official organizations at all levels were documented exceptionally well in official press releases and statements. According to a study by Spence et al. (2014), the more direct communication with the public increases public perception of and trust in actors.

Cultural dimension. The cultural dimension of London's place brand was communicated and negotiated through the response to terrorism crises events. The cultural dimension and values of London were accentuated in official statements, speeches, and campaigns. The cultural dimension of London's place brand overlaps with soft power discourse within the political dimension of London's brand, as previously discussed. The domestic audiences are reassured under a collective identity and in exchange, the collective appears to be a united front against antagonists. As stated by Aronczyk, (2008), place "branding promotes a particular organization of power, knowledge and exchange in the articulation of a collective identity" (as cited in Kaneva, 2011, p. 46). Additionally, culture and values discourse promoted the desires of a commodified idea of British culture by the tourist's gaze (Kaneva, 2011). Actors promoted London's culture and identity in order to maintain London's brand economically in non-domestic markets, as seen with the #LondonisOpen for Summer campaign. British and

Western value discourse following the attacks promoted London's cultural brand and appealed to the emotional side of the public, especially in values-based responses.

Values-based responses. Values based responses, such as the vigils following each of the attacks, were put on to appeal to the more emotional, passive, spectator type public outlined by Richards' (2004) theorizations. Values-based responses were mixed with the previously mentioned power-based public relations responses and they utilized Western values in counter-terrorism efforts (Richards, 2004). Additionally, the promotion of Western and British values in Theresa May, Sadiq Khan, and other official organizations responses were all examples of harnessing and promoting Western-values in counter-terrorism efforts. This, along with the promotion of London's culture to accommodate the tourist gaze internationally and build identities domestically, shows the interconnected nature of the cultural, political, and technical-economic dimension of place branding — the three inform and contribute to the other.

Economic dimension. Mayor Khan's efforts pressed for business and economic activity following the attacks. Khan worked with London & Partners in promoting the economic brand of the capital city, with the launch of the #LondonisOpen for Summer campaign and the £300,000 fund for businesses effected by the terror attacks. The re-launch of the #LondonisOpen campaign tailored to London's summer season compensated for the negative impact of terrorism on London's tourism and cultural attractions, as outlined in the analysis. The #LondonisOpen for Summer campaign harnesses the positive cultural aspect to London's place brand in an attempt to sell the tourist's gaze of London (Kaneva, 2011). This is true considering Khan and London & Partners pushed the open and diverse culture of London in the summer campaign. Likewise, Khan aspired to promote London as open following the trend in increased opposition to

globalization, a consequence of terrorism and the political atmosphere surrounding Brexit.

Therefore, the continuation of the 2016 #LondonisOpen campaign, which was a response to the referendum vote, would naturally convey openness and promote London's brand internationally following the 2017 terror attacks.

The Global City and Terrorism

RQ2: What was the relationship between terrorism and the global city of London in the case of the 2017 London terror attacks?

London's 2017 terror attacks are a notable case due to the history of terrorism in London in addition to the unusual context of that year's events. This case serves a broader purpose of examining the relationship between terrorism, globalization, and the globalized city. London's global status explains the unusually high number of terror events in a short amount of time and contains deeper symbolics of the individual attacks examined by this project.

Terrorists target global cities for a maximum impact due to their large audiences and global significance. According to Richards (2004) and Coaffee et al. (2009), terrorists target locations for maximum PR, publicity, and media attention. London is the United Kingdom's champion city, as seen in city rankings. Cities impact national success in the contemporary globalized world (Fan, 2008; Nallathga, 2011). London is a top-tier center of cultural, economic, and political value. London's massive population, political and economic significance contributed to why terrorists targeted London. Likewise, there is a heavy media presence and crowded areas in London, the draw is that the large audience maximizes extremist actions. The multiple terror attacks within a short time frame fueled fears of imminent attacks and disrupted

multiple aspects of life in London, which most negatively affected London's image and brand in this case.

May's Westminster statements confirmed the idea that terrorist attacks affect global centers materially and symbolically (Coaffee et al., 2009). Symbolically, the Westminster attack targeted the Western values of democracy, liberty, and freedom of speech. Westminster is a major democratic center and home to the world's oldest parliament. Materially, May and intelligence officials insinuated the terrorist wanted to gain entry into Parliament and harm those of political significance. Meanwhile, iconic spaces like Big Ben and the Shard, the tallest building in Europe, represent London's strengths and popularity to potential visitors and investors (Nallathiga, 2011). Additionally, the attacks affected London's tourism spots materially, attempting to disrupt visitors to these tourism spots. Big Ben, near Westminster, was ranked the third most used keyword to describe London in a city perception survey (GCPI, 2016). As a whole, London's diverse and tolerant population reflects an attitude of openness and acceptance, the terrorism attacks were a pushback against these progressive attitudes and widely held ideals in the capital city.

Preparedness and resilience. As previously mentioned, this case examines the relationship between London's long-standing history of terrorism and preparedness for the 2017 terror attacks. The responses in place were proactive yet were augmented as time progressed, as Coaffee et al. (2009) described that terrorism should be viewed as something to be proactive against as opposed to responding in a reactive nature, but have the adaptability to deal with the fluid nature of the range of security challenges faced by major urban areas. This case exhibits the dually proactive and reactive nature of London's responses, with preparedness as a positive

feature in the responses to terrorism. In part, preparedness can contribute to London's commendable resilience throughout 2017's hurdles.

Leadership communicated preparedness through all of the attacks, but this was especially evident in Khan's statements and the Westminster attack response. May and Khan both boasted the police preparedness and that London had been expecting attacks for some time. The fact that emergency services were praised overall following the attacks reflected that they were prepared and trained for these types of crises, once again speaking to London's resilience in crisis. From a critical perspective, this conveys that the attacks perhaps could have been prevented, but Theresa May had mentioned the attacker was not apart of the current intelligence picture. This can be seen as contradictory in the messaging from London's political leadership, which could hurt credibility from leaders. Overall, the emergency and first responders in this case reacted appropriately and according to preexisting procedures, although prior knowledge of the attacks cannot be completely ruled out.

The city's preparedness and ability to continue as normal is reflected in Mayor Khan's reference to "terrorist attacks in our city over many decades, including the 7/7 bombings" (Khan, 2017a). The longstanding history of terrorism in London has been influential in counterterrorism policy and crisis management. London's resilience predates this case. The city overcame the bombings during World War II, decades of IRA bombing campaigns, and the July 7, 2005 underground bombings. London's history of terror events, as outlined by Khan (2017a), explains why the city developed an informed response to these sort of crises; the experience and history of terror is nothing new, and these threats perpetuated London's ability to navigate these sorts of situations. If London's historic narrative differed, without the IRA campaigns and underground

bombing in 2005, perhaps the response following the 2017 events would not have gone smoothly.

Furthermore, cultural responses are informed by the history and accomplishments of a place (Govers, 2011). London's history with terror has been influential in the response and cultural attitudes of Londoners. This can be interpreted as why the cultural dimension of London's response to the terror attacks emphasized resuming life as normal. According to Dr. Michael Tracey, a British-born professor of Media Studies at the University of Colorado, "There is a basic British value of we will not be cowed and that life will go on... it is a part of the UK brand in a sense" (M. Tracey, personal communication, March 16, 2018). Culturally, the attitude of 'business as usual' is prevalent in aspects of London life unaffiliated with terrorism, but the history of terror in London's past only perpetuates this unmistakably dauntless component of the British identity.

Globalization. Globalization has been a provocative force in the field of place branding. Nallathiga (2011) and Fan (2008) argue the importance of globalization is the increased competition between nations and the increasing role of cities internationally. The rise of the global city can be accredited to the increase of globalization, as discussed by Fan (2008). What is also critical to the context of this case is the pushback against globalization, as terrorism is a pushback against globalization (Richards, 2004). The paradoxical nature of this case is that the same force that has helped London rise to its magnificent cosmopolitan status around the globe is the same force that motivates the belligerent terrorism groups that attempt to destroy it. Furthermore, The complexity of the globalization dialectic exists further with the Brexit narrative and the pushback against globalization within domestic stakeholders and groups.

The Brexit narrative is relevant to this case for a few reasons. One, the #LondonisOpen for Summer campaign was launched in response to the EU referendum, to convey London's diverse cultures and to promote openness and inclusiveness. The London Assembly, London & Partners, and the Mayor of London all sought to promote these messages following the terror attacks. From an economic perspective, the need to relaunch the #LondonisOpen campaign reflected the overwhelming pull by Londoners to remain in the EU. Khan's narrative infers that Brexit and terrorism harmed London economically. Thus, the messaging from a national level versus a city level reflected differences in attitudes towards globalization and current political events. Khan's messaging exemplifies London's position amid the pushback against globalization, Brexit will remove London's EU institutions as well as business perks of EU membership. Meanwhile, Theresa May's pro-British remarks following the London Bridge attack tells another narrative. With mild nationalist undertones, her plan to crack down on terrorists and nonexistent tolerance for extremism parallels the sentiment that resulted in the UK's split from the EU. London's differing messaging approaches to the terrorism events coincided with efforts to mitigate the impending effects of Brexit.

Place branding and the effects of terrorism

RQ3: How have the repetitive threat of and successfully executed terror attacks changed the perception of London's place brand?

London has consistently been regarded highly in various place and city brand rankings. This was consistent across the place branding indexes examined in research, London's place brand performed relatively well in the majority of areas studied by place branding experts. London's consistency in these rankings provided a decent reason for the brand to hold up well

against any events that could negatively impact the brand, such as terrorism. Additionally, many of the place brand rankings do not excessively survey the idea of safety as its own factor in itself, and it is often a subset of other factors. Moreover, many of the place branding indices indicate the potential of a place brand and brand assets, culture, and population. The place brand rankings lack an authentic evaluation of the reality of a place brand or how it is perceived, despite preexisting positive or negative brand attributes. The place branding evaluations analyzed in this case do not effectively indicate the actual perception and understanding of a place brand. Current realities of a place are left out of the picture. The most recent rankings don't evaluate terror events and lack polished safety evaluations. After analyzing various place brand indexes and rankings, including those not included in this study, this research comes to a conclusion that a more accurate evaluation of current socioeconomic factors and political dimensions and the reality of a place brand are necessary. Just because a brand in theory has the potential to translate positively to internal and external audiences does not mean it is perceived that way in practice. This research suggests some sort a risk analysis of place brands would be a beneficial contribution within the space of place branding, as much is left to be said in this area.

Anholt claims that terrorism attacks may temporarily affect people's behavior, most of the time the images of cities and nations are stable year to year (S. Anholt, personal communication, December 6, 2017). This place brand index research analysis correlates with Anholt's statement about the stability of a place brand year to year, but other data sets reveal the complex relationship between terrorism and the perception of a place, confirming changes in people's behavior following the attacks. What is left unsaid by Anholt and other studies of nation branding is the response to terror attacks. In this study, national policies were changed, funding

to counter-terrorism efforts were increased by £2.5 billion, and London's government launched a £300,000 fund to assist businesses following the attacks as well as re-launched the #LondonisOpen campaign to protect and promote London's brand following the attacks, spending an additional £200,000. These numbers are not exhaustive of the increased spend and scope of responses to the 2017 terror attacks. Those in charge of branding London acted quickly and strategically following the attacks, and if terrorism is a minuscule factor in the way London is perceived as Anholt claims, these efforts would be unnecessary. A minimal response perhaps would have enforced Anholt's claims better.

The effects of terrorism can be more clearly understood through key datasets provided by the London Intelligence Project. The London Intelligence project demonstrated that terrorism did affect the tourism sector, despite the boom in tourism just before the terror attacks due to the dip in the pound sterling following Brexit. Furthermore, the negative effects of the terror attacks were seen during the height of London's tourism season. Additionally, domestic concerns over terrorism were evident, and the domestic audiences are just as important as tourism or business stakeholders.

Conclusion

London's global status as a cosmopolitan place brand is one that is unrivaled throughout the corners of the globe, as seen by London's dominance in place brand indices. London's continued international domination as a cosmopolitan magnet has survived and thrived for a multitude of reasons, including the city's longstanding history and experience navigating crises such as terrorism. London's branding activities, preparedness plans, and crisis management

initiatives can provide an overall positive exemplar of authentic communication and place branding.

This case provides insight into the relationship between globalization and the global city of London, including the challenges a globalized space faces with shifts in attitudes towards globalization. Globalization has contributed to the rise of nation branding and city branding. The London case exhibits the familiar pushback against globalization from the adversary groups that attacked London, as well as an emerging Western attitude that is more cautious towards globalization and an interconnected world. London's adaptation to changes and events in international affairs, especially considering Brexit, could influence London's future place brand evolution.

Place branding has a ways to go as an academic concept, especially considering evaluations of how place brands are perceived by domestic and external audiences. Yet, the relationship between global crises, such as terrorism, provides insight into how audiences conceptualize and understand places. Furthermore, crisis management and communication practices in response to crises such as terrorism in London provide insight into how key actors and organizations protect and promote a place brand during critical moments. Additionally, London's 2017 crisis management demonstrated the emergence of political and socio-economic themes that are ever-present with place branding. This research positions these intertwined themes as a unique point of difference that separates place branding from traditional product or corporation branding. As global cities like London continue their reign internationally, place branding should be understood by the actors and agencies branding London, especially

considering crisis management. Finally, this case exhibits the need for a better reconciliation between major global events, such as terrorism in London, and place brand evaluations.

Limitations

This study's methodology contained limitations. One of the limitations is the amount of time that passed between the terrorism events and the study. Research took place between September 2017 - March 2018, which may only provide short-term insight into the attack's effects. At the time of study there was no evaluation documents of the progress or results of the #LondonisOpen for summer campaign, which would have been valuable to evaluating the results and successes of the campaign.

There were limitations with the city and place rankings utilized by this study. First, the researcher was not able to gain access to all of the results of these studies, such as the Anholt-GfK City Brands Index (CBI). Other peer reviewed place branding studies, such as the Saffron City Brand Barometer, were not consistently published, due to the novelty of place branding. This study was not used due to its inconsistencies in recent years. Place branding studies have their own limitations in terms of methodology and scope, which all could have imposed limitations on this study.

Due to the nature of a place brand, many outside factors affect London's brand and perception and the response to terrorism. Brexit was a constant outside factor in research, in the place brand rankings, and was also very influential in datasets. For example, the attacks in context of Brexit can explain some of the rises in visitor numbers and spend around the time of the attacks. The pound sterling drop can explain a lot of the foreign visits and spending increases, and terrorisms negative effects are not standalone due to the nature of place brands.

Future Research

This study has implications for possible areas of future research. Future research could include long-term effects of the 2017 terror attacks. Additionally, terror attacks may be examined from other points in time in London's history. The 7/7/2005 bombings in London could be analyzed, including the response and effects of the attack on London's perception and reputation prior to this case study. Another research suggestion includes other terror attacks, their response, and effects in other cities from similar time periods in a comparative study to note a more universal standard of responses as well as similarities in the effects of these attacks. An independent study of the international perception of governments, business stakeholders, and outside governments before and after the 2017 London terror attacks may be useful in evaluating the perception of London's place brand before and after the terror attacks. Furthermore, Brexit's controversial relationship to London's place brand perception and place branding indices would be an area of further research and understanding to this case study.

References

- Alaimo, K. (2017). *Pitch, Tweet, or Engage on the Street: How to Practice Global Public Relations and Strategic Communication*. New York: Rutledge
- Anholt, S. (2006). The Anholt-GMI City Brands Index: How the world sees the world's cities. *Place Branding*, 2, 18-31. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.pb.5990042>.
- Boisen, M., Van Gorp, B. (2011). The selective nature of place branding and the layering of spatial identities. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 4, 135-137.
- Bromley, D.B. (1990). Academic contributions to psychological counseling: I. A philosophy of science for the study of individual cases. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly*, 3, 299-307.
- Caldwell, N., & Freire, J. R. (2004). The differences between branding a country, a region, and a city: Applying the Brand Box Model. *Brand Management*, 12, 50-61.
- Casciani, D. (2017, September 16). Parsons Green: What do the police do next? *BBC*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-41288400>
- Clark, G. (2014). *The making of a world city: London 1991 to 2021*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.
- Cmeciu, C. & Miron, L. (2011). Press releases: A discursive means of gaming culture. Case Study: The National Museum of Art of Romania. *Journal of Media Research*, 2, 61-71.
- Coaffee, J., Wood, M., & Rogers, P. (2009). *The Everyday Resilience of the City: How Cities Respond to Terrorism and Disaster*. Basingstoke ; New York : Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coffey, H. (2017, June 19). Is London safe to visit? Statistics and official advice for travelers. *The Independent*. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/travel/news-and-advice/>

[is-london-safe-terror-attacks-finsbury-park-westminster-visit-travel-tourist-advice-stats-a7796946.html](https://www.centreforlondon.org/publication/the-london-intelligence-issue-1/a7796946.html)

Colthorpe, T. (2017a, July 18). *The London Intelligence Issue 1*. Centre for London. Retrieved from <https://www.centreforlondon.org/publication/the-london-intelligence-issue-1/>

Colthorpe, T., & Brown, R. (2017b, October 31). *The London Intelligence Issue 2*. Centre for London. Retrieved from <https://www.centreforlondon.org/publication/the-london-intelligence-issue-2/>

Colthorpe, T., & Brown, R. (2018, January 31). *The London Intelligence Issue 3*. Centre for London. Retrieved from <https://www.centreforlondon.org/publication/the-london-intelligence-issue-3/>

Davidson, H. (2017, June 4). Met police use 'run, hide, tell' warning for the first time doing London terrorism attack. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2017/jun/04/met-police-use-run-hide-tell-warning-for-first-time-after-london-terrorist-attack>

DD2027. (2016, July 14). *DD2027 #LondonIsOpen Marketing & Events campaign* [Directors decision]. Retrieved from <https://www.london.gov.uk/decisions/dd2027-londonisopen-marketing-events-campaign>

Edelman. (2018, January 22). *Edelman Trust Barometer 2018 - UK Findings*. Retrieved from <https://www.edelman.co.uk/magazine/posts/edelman-trust-barometer-2018/>

Ellis-Peterson, H. (2017, June 5). Hundreds gather to pay respects to victims of London Bridge attack. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/gallery/2017/jun/06/vigil-for-the-victims-of-london-bridge-attacks-in-pictures>

Fan, Y. (2008). Soft power: Power of attraction or confusion? *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 4:2, 147-158.

Friesen, K. (2007). The effects of the Madrid and London subway bombings on Europe's view of terrorism. *Review Digest: Human Rights & The War on Terror - 2007 Supplement*. S-10-S-17.

GfK. (2018, January 30). *Paris continues its reign as highest rated city* [Press release].

Nuremberg. Retrieved from <http://www.gfk.com/insights/press-release/paris-continues-its-reign-as-highest-rated-city/>

GfK Consumer Life UK. (2017, September). *Searching for Solace: UK consumers one year on*.

1-23. Retrieved from [http://insights.gfk.com/hubfs/Landing_Pages_PDF/UK/](http://insights.gfk.com/hubfs/Landing_Pages_PDF/UK/2017_Consumer_trends/)

[2017_Consumer_trends/](http://insights.gfk.com/hubfs/Landing_Pages_PDF/UK/2017_Consumer_trends/)

[GfK_Consumer_Trends_Search_for_Solace_what_are_consumers_behaving_now.pdf](http://insights.gfk.com/hubfs/Landing_Pages_PDF/UK/2017_Consumer_trends/GfK_Consumer_Trends_Search_for_Solace_what_are_consumers_behaving_now.pdf)

Govers, R. (2011). From place marketing to place branding and back. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 7, 227 – 231. doi: 10.1057/pb.2011.28

Gray, J. (2017, June 5). London terror attack: Security barriers erected on some of capital's

busiest bridges. *Huffington Post UK Edition*. Retrieved from [https://](https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/entry/london-terror-attack-security-barriers-bridges_uk_593537efe4b0c242ca2580d4)

[www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/entry/london-terror-attack-security-barriers-](https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/entry/london-terror-attack-security-barriers-bridges_uk_593537efe4b0c242ca2580d4)

[bridges_uk_593537efe4b0c242ca2580d4](https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/entry/london-terror-attack-security-barriers-bridges_uk_593537efe4b0c242ca2580d4)

Green, S. (2005). Defining West London: a case study of the initial stages of strategic place branding exercise. *CoDesign*, 1(4), 277-287.

- Hanna, J. (2017, September 15). The London train explosion is the latest of 5 terror incidents in 2017 in the UK. *CNN World*. Retrieved from <https://www.cnn.com/2017/09/15/world/uk-terror-events-2017/index.html>
- Kaika, M. (2010). Architecture and crisis: re-inventing the icon, re-imag(in)ing London and re-branding the City. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographies*. Royal Geography Society, 454- 472.
- Kaneva, N. (2011). Nation branding: Toward an agenda for critical research. *International Journal of Communication*, 5, 117-141.
- Kavaratzis, M. (2009). Cities and their brands: Lessons from corporate branding. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*. 5, 26,37.
- Khan, S. (2017a, March 23). *Londoners will stand together against this attack on democracy* [Oral Statement]. Retrieved from <https://www.london.gov.uk/city-hall-blog/sadiq-khan-londoners-will-stand-together-against-attack-democracy>
- Khan, S. (2017b, June 4). *Sadiq Khan to hold vigil to honor victims of London Bridge terror* [Press release]. Retrieved from <https://www.london.gov.uk/press-releases/mayoral/vigil-to-honour-victims-of-london-bridge-terror>
- Khan, S. (2017c, June 4). *Statement from the Mayor* [Press release]. Retrieved from <https://www.london.gov.uk/press-releases/mayoral/statement-from-the-mayor>
- London & Partners. (2017a, July 24). *#London is Open for Summer* [Press release]. Retrieved from https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/md2155_londonisopen_for_summer_campaign_signed.pdf

London & Partners. (2017b, May 10). *London's connectivity is key to record numbers of business travellers* [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.londonandpartners.com/media-centre/press-releases/2017/20170510-londons-connectivity-is-key-to-record-numbers-of-business-travellers>

London & Partners. (2017c, October 12). *London named World's Most Attractive City for sixth consecutive year* [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.londonandpartners.com/media-centre/press-releases/2017/20171012-london-named-worlds-most-attractive-city-for-sixth-consecutive-year>

London & Partners. (2017d, June 27). *London tops new index ranking Europe's most dynamic cities* [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.londonandpartners.com/media-centre/press-releases/2017/20170627-london-tops-new-index-ranking-europes-most-dynamic-cities>

London & Partners. (2017e, May 18). *London sees record number of visits after a blockbuster year of cultural events* [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.londonandpartners.com/media-centre/press-releases/2017/20170518-london-sees-record-number-of-visits-after-a-blockbuster-year-of-cultural-events>

London & Partners. (2017f, February 8). *Mayor to take message to Europe that 'London is open'* [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.londonandpartners.com/media-centre/press-releases/2017/20170208-mayor-to-take-message-to-europe-that-london-is-open>

London & Partners. (2017g, October 12). *North American visitors drive record tourism in London* [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.londonandpartners.com/media-centre/press-releases/2017/20171012-north-american-visitors-drive-record-tourism-in-london>

London Assembly. (2017, March 23). *Terrorists will never succeed* [Press release]. Retrieved from <https://www.london.gov.uk/press-releases/assembly/london-assembly-terrorists-will-never-succeed>

#London is Open. (n.d.). Retrieved from: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/londonisopen>

May, T. (2017a, March 23). *PM Commons statement on Westminster attack: 23 March 2017* [Oral statement to Parliament]. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-commons-statement-on-westminster-attack-23-march-2017>

May, T. (2017b, June 4). *PM statement following London terror attack: 4 June 2017* [Speech]. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-statement-following-london-terror-attack-4-june-2017>

May, T. (2017c, March 22). *Prime Minister's statement following attack in Westminster*. [Press release]. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/prime-ministers-statement-following-attack-in-westminster>

Mayor of London. London Assembly. (2017a, June 29). *Mayor plans £300,000 fund for businesses impacted by recent tragedy* [Press release]. Retrieved from <https://www.london.gov.uk/press-releases/mayoral/sadiq-launches-fund-for-local-businesses>

Mayor of London. London Assembly. (2017b, March 27). *Mayor to visit Brussels and Paris for security and Brexit talks* [idk]. Retrieved from <https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/mayor-london/mayor-visit-brussels-and-paris-security-and-brexit-talks>

MD2155 (2017, August 31). *Request for Mayoral Decision - MD2155 #LondonIsOpen for summer campaign* [Request for Mayoral Decision]. Retrieved from <https://>

www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/

[md2155_londonisopen_for_summer_campaign_signed.pdf](#)

Moilanen, T., & Rainisto, S. (2009). *How to Brand Nations, Cities, and Destinations: a planning book for place branding*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 3-197.

Nallanthiga, R. (2011). Cities Under Competition: The Role of City Image(s) in Brand Building for Investment Inflow. *The IUP Journal of Brand Management*, 8, 26-33.

National Counter Terrorism Security Office. (2017a, March 7). *Action Counters Terrorism* [News story]. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/action-counters-terrorism>

National Counter Terrorism Security Office. (2017b, June). *Crowded places guidance* [Guidance]. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/crowded-places-guidance>

National Counter Terrorism Security Office. (2017c, March 23) *NaCTSO Westminster security update* [News release]. Retrieved From <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/westminster-incident>

National Counter Terrorism Security Office. (2017d, June 8). *New Crowded Places Guidance launched* [News story]. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-crowded-places-guidance-launched>

National Counter Terrorism Security Office. (2017e, May 15). *Public ACT following call from Counter Terror police* [News release]. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/public-act-following-call-from-counter-terror-police>

Papp-Váry, A. (2011). The Anholt-GMI City Brand Hexagon and the Saffron European Brand Barometer: A Comparative Study. *Regional and Business Studies*, 3, 555-562.

- Phillips, J. (2004, March 16). Spain's retreat after the Madrid bombings reward terrorism. *The Heritage Foundation*. Retrieved from <https://www.heritage.org/europe/report/spains-retreat-after-the-madrid-bombings-rewards-terrorism>
- Resonance. (2018). World's Best Cities 2018. A Ranking of Global Place Equity. 1-46 Retrieved from [resonanceco.com](https://www.resonanceco.com)
- Resonance. (2017). World's Best City Brands 2017. A Global Ranking of Place Equity. Retrieved from [resonanceco.com](https://www.resonanceco.com)
- Richards, B. (2004). Terrorism and Public Relations. *Public Relations Review*, 30, 169-176. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2004.02.005.
- Spence, P. R., Lachlan, K. A., Omilion-Hodges, L. M., & Goddard, A. K. (2014). Being first means being credible? Examining the impact of message source on organizational reputation. *Communication Research Reports*, 31, 124-130.
- Stevens, A. (2012, October 20). *The London brand: 2000 years young*. Retrieved from: <http://www.citymayors.com/marketing/london-brand.html#Anchor-Campaigns-11481>
- Volos, V. & Martin, A. (2016). *Paris wins back 'most admired city' from London* [Press release]. GFK SE. Nuremberg, Germany.
- Working with the Mayor of London*. (n.d.). Retrieved from: <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/about-the-city/the-lord-mayor/Pages/working-with-mayor-of-london.aspx>
- "World Factbook, The". (2017). Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency, 2017. Retrieved From <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.htm>
- Yamato, N., Hori, H., Ito, K., Dustan, P., & Isogaya, H. (2016) *Global Power City Index 2016 Summary*, 1-20. Edited and Published by Institute for Urban Strategies, the Mori

Memorial Foundation. Retrieved from http://mori-m-foundation.or.jp/pdf/GPCI2016_en.pdf

Yamato, N., Hamada, Y., Matsuda, M., Dustan, P., & Taki, N. (2017). *Global Power City Index 2017 Summary: GPCI 10th anniversary special edition*, 1-19. Edited and Published by Institute for Urban Strategies, the Mori Memorial Foundation. Retrieved from <http://mori-m-foundation.or.jp/english/ius2/gpci2/index.shtml>

Yin, R. (1984). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.

Zucker, D. (2009). How to do case study research. *College of Nursing Faculty Publication Series*, 2, Chapter 14.