Local and Glocal: The specifics of the formation and development of tourism brands of industrial locations

Ekaterina Bugrova[1,*]

[1]Ural Federal University, Department of Social and Cultural Service and Tourism, 19 Mira St.,
 620002 Ekaterinburg, Russia

Abstract. Territory branding is a significant tool for promoting and increasing the tourist attractiveness of a region. An illustrative example is the "UNESCO World Heritage Site" brand, but this brand is not equally effective for every type of site, especially in industrialized regions. The solution to the problem of promoting such territories as tourist attractions can be the development of a generalizing brand of industrial cities, considering their specifics, demonstrating both the local identity and the global significance of industrial regions. The presence of such a brand will make it possible to include a greater number of industrial cities and monotowns in various tourist routes, as well as to dispel several stereotypes that negatively affect the perception of industrial cities. On the example of various forms of industrial tourism, the tourist potential of industrial cities is demonstrated, which, in turn, confirms the need for an integrated approach to promoting this type of tourism.

Key words: Place brand; Industrial tourism; Monotown; Industrial heritage; Industrial identity.

1 Introduction

One of the most important tools for attracting tourists is territory branding. The study of the influence of the presence of a brand on the tourist attractiveness of a city, region, country attracted many scientists from various scientific fields – economists, urbanists, cultural scientists, psychologists, anthropologists [1-5].

A brand allows one or another destination, region to become more recognizable, to stand out among a few similar destinations. Territory branding makes it possible to form a single consistent image based on the most characteristic attributes of the destination and creates a closer connection between the image and local identity. It also allows one to perceive the territory through simple associations, which contributes to the memorization and identification of this brand and, accordingly, this territory by tourists. Promoting one's own identity, the opportunity to use one's natural and cultural attractions to create additional value for one's region makes it possible not only to attract tourists, but also investors [6], which, in

---

* Corresponding author: ekaterina.bugrova@urfu.ru

turn, helps to keep the local population from possible migration to other regions and creates a positive narrative about the local community, its history and present.

One of the most recognizable brands for tourists is the brand of the UNESCO World Heritage Site. A number of studies give a contradictory assessment of this brand, in particular, noting that interest in such places arises only if there are several objects with such a status in the location [7], other authors, on the contrary, indicate that such objects have more high attractiveness for tourists than other objects, however, first of all, this is true for mass tourists who are not immersed in the specifics of the region, those who can be called "naive tourists" [8].

2 Concept review

It is worth acknowledging that the number of UNESCO World Heritage Sites, encompassing both natural and cultural sites, is expanding annually. Consequently, these sites become more accessible to the public and gain popularity by being featured in guidebooks, travel checklists, tourist destinations, and thematic collections. This helps to promote the sites, their history, and the regions they are located in. However, as the number of designated sites increases, the exclusivity and uniqueness of this label diminishes, particularly in the case of cultural sites included on the UNESCO World Heritage List.

To date, the UNESCO World Heritage List has a total of 1,157 World Heritage Sites (900 cultural, 218 natural, and 39 mixed properties) in 167 countries, including 43 transboundary sites [9]. All included in the World Heritage List cultural and historical sites are of outstanding universal value and meet at least one out of six selection criteria (i-vi in the Selection criteria list). One of these criteria (vi: association with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance) is recommended to use in conjunction with other criteria. Consequently, all objects throughout the history of mankind are formally considered according to the same criteria. However, when studying the entire list, one can see a certain imbalance: preference is given to objects more distant from the present as more appropriate for established criteria of outstanding universal significance [10]. This trend can be clearly seen in the example of industrial heritage sites, which currently include approximately 60 sites on the UNESCO World Heritage List. A half of these sites are associated with history of the 18–19th centuries (including around 10 sites established in the 19th – the early 20th centuries). Only 7 sites belong to the 20th century and only 2 are created after 1925: Trans-Iranian railway (1927–1938) and the industrial city of Ivrea (mostly the 1930–1960s) [9].

Among these objects, the following groups can be distinguished: industrial landscapes (for example, mining area of the Great Copper Mountain in Falun, Sweden, or the Tokaj Wine Region historic cultural landscape, Hungary), industrial objects themselves (mines, factories, etc., for example, the Zollverein coal mine industrial complex in Essen, Germany, or Verla groundwood and board mill, Finland) and engineering structures and infrastructure (bridges, railway tracks, for example, the Semmering railway in Austria). A combination of such objects can also be included – for example, Ironbridge Gorge (Great Britain), which includes mines, worker settlements, and a unique iron bridge. Most of these objects have now been museumified (i.e., converted into a museum) or turned into creative spaces.

In this regard, a certain difficulty arises, because for many industrial regions the industrial heritage is inextricably linked with the industrial present, it exists both "now" and "then" [11], and this duality, unfortunately, cannot be reflected in such statuses as a "UNESCO World Heritage Site", although it is the continuity and local industrial identity that turn out to be very important elements that emphasize the region's specificity. In addition, cities with industrial heritage often continue to develop actively and cannot preserve the entire space in an unchanged museumified, conserved form, striving to revitalize the space or modernize

industrial facilities (Fig. 1–2). The case of Liverpool, which lost its UNESCO World Heritage status ("Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City", which included several areas in the historic city center and the docks) in 2021, will be indicative here due to plans to redevelop the territory of the old docks [9].

Photographed by K.D. Bugrov.

Fig. 1. The fusion of industrial "then" and "now": The museumified old blast furnace at the territory of the Seversky Pipe Plant (Polevskoy).

Photographed by K.D. Bugrov.

Fig. 2. The fusion of industrial "then" and "now": The partly museumified Yegorshino state district power plant at the territory of the Artyomovskaya thermal power plant (Artyomovsky).

3 Discussion

Based on the analysis, it is evident that using a single brand for promoting a city or region with industrial heritage may not be the most effective approach. This is because such a brand may not accurately reflect the unique characteristics of an industrial area. However,

developing and implementing a common brand for industrial areas could be a promising solution to address various challenges encountered by regions that are developing industrial tourism, including monotowns (i.e., a planned town dominated by a single industry or company). Such an approach could help to solve multiple problems simultaneously.

Firstly, it can help overcome the lack of information coverage that many small towns face – tourists do not know what precisely this direction is interesting for and why they need to go there. Travel information today is extremely in demand, and users trust not only and not so much official information (like official guide for traveling and tourism websites, tourist information centers, websites of tour operators and travel agents), but user-generated content that seems more reliable, since, in theory, it is devoid of an advertising component and describes real impressions and reactions at different levels – cognitive, emotional, social and sensory – to all interactions before, during and after the trip [12, 13].

The presence of a generalizing brand will help monotowns stand out in the general flow of information, act as a kind of "attention hook", designating such a category as "monotowns" for potential tourists, while demonstrating their diversity (territory, industrial specialization, history). In addition, such a brand can rally the local community, enabling local residents to actively participate in broadcasting a narrative about the industrial identity of their hometown. Currently, the involvement of local communities in the promotion of place brands is necessary for a few reasons, in particular, in order to minimize possible conflicts between the local population and tourists, to create a positive image of the city not only for external audiences, but also for internal ones – to show that citizens really something to be proud of. Activists from among local residents can be considered as brand ambassadors and participate in the formation and transmission of local identity [4], as well as the memory of the city [14].

Secondly, this common brand for industrial areas could help monotowns to gain a foothold in the status of "anchor objects" on the map of a region. Often, various types of tourism develop around monotowns that are not related to industrial heritage, but the monotown itself does not arouse the same interest among tourists who are nearby, but at the same time ignore its historical and cultural significance due to the lack of habit to consider industrialism in a positive way. It will also play a role in the fight against stereotypes ("an industrial city is a dirty city", "all industrial cities are the same", "monotowns are depressed" [15]), which create a negative background in the information space and hinder the development of tourist attractiveness of monotowns. In the long term, the development and broadcasting of a general positive image of a monotown can increase the level of socio-cultural life of the local society and help reduce migration from monotowns, attract new investors, and create new industries, in particular, creative ones.

In the case of tourism glocalization means flexibility and ability to represent local heritage and culture to ever-changing global audiences with different preferences and travel motivations [16].

Tourism glocalization helps to present a lot of areas, including industrial cities, as attractive product for tourists (from neighboring regions during the first stages) and ensures the gradual sustainable development of local hospitality and leisure sector. The local cultural values integrate into the global context and maintain a specific at the same time. The local business projects attract investors from over the country and create new opportunities for local community [17].

Considering the strong legacies of modernization and industrialization in Russia, industrial city brand development seems to be perspective and in-demand, and beneficial for business. It also would demonstrate the cultural value of Russian industrial heritage of the 20th and even the 21st centuries.

The Russian industrial city culture is a great material for constructing the necessary narratives to attract tourists, demonstrate local identity and authenticity in the context of the

country's industrial history, and thus the industrial cities could become centers of glocal tourism and creative industries [18].

It is important to understand that industrial tourism involves various forms and is not limited directly to visiting existing industries or museum-fitted industrial facilities. Monotowns can host various thematic events. Vivid examples include the Ural Industrial Biennale of Contemporary Art, which covered several industrial centers of various profiles at once, or the street art festivals in Vyksa (Vyksa Festival) or Satka (Satka Street Art Fest) (Fig. 3).

Photographed by K.D. Bugrov.

Fig. 3. The 19th century iron mill in Satka monotown.

City-forming enterprises that play an important role in the life of local communities can also become providers of various kinds of tourist services, offering themed excursions outside industrial areas. Here, the example of the Magnitogorsk Metallurgical Plant is indicative, which has in its arsenal a tour of the city pond, in which tourists can see all the iconic objects of the city, including, of course, the metallurgical plant itself. So, the whole history of the city is revealed, and not just one enterprise.

It also seems important to promote the aesthetics of industrial spaces within the framework of the common brand of industrial cities. A case in point is the popular Japanese trend *kojo moe* ("factory love"), triggered by the release of Ken Oyama and Tetsu Ishii's photo album (2007), containing photographs with views of chemical plants, oil refineries, steel and cement works, portal cranes and list of viewing locations [19]. As a result of the great success of the book, organized night-time factory viewing tours (so called "kojo yakei") appeared in the travel market. These excursions were actively supported by the local municipal authorities, who used it to improve the image of enterprises. Japan also has hosted the National Factory Night View Summit since 2011, and currently 13 cities (like Fuji, Sakai, Amagasaki et al) are members of the National Factory Night View City Council and provide the information about *kojo yakei* for tourists on Council official website [20]. This case also proves that working with different formats of industrial tourism also helps fight negative stereotypes ("the industrial zone is ugly", "it is dangerous to be near the industrial zone at night") and makes the industrial territory more attractive. These aspects also need to be considered when developing a generic brand. It should be noted that some Russian monotowns have great potential for such formats of industrial tourism and are already

popular with tourists, for example, the observation deck near the Asbestos quarry (Asbest town) has existed for many years and is a local infamous attraction.

Modern architecture and design can also be a good tool for turning an existing industrial facility into a recognizable landmark, which, in turn, positively affects the image of both the enterprise and the city. Let us take two waste incineration plants as an example. The first of them, the Spittelau waste incineration plant, is located in the center of the capital of Austria, Vienna. The famous Austrian artist and architect Friedensreich Hundertwasser, who has a very recognizable extravagant style, was engaged in the design of its external appearance. The second object is the waste incinerator and power plant in the Danish city of Roskilde, designed by the Dutch architect Erick van Egeraat, whose style is classified by experts as modern baroque style. The unusual outlines of the plant attract attention and turn the building not only into a landmark, but also into a recognizable landmark, which can also be used to create a brand of industrial cities [21]. It should be noted that the works of Erick van Egeraat can also be found in Russia, including in such a large industrial center as Surgut. Here van Egeraat designed the "Vershina" shopping center.

Murals can also become interesting elements of the exterior of industrial facilities, as, for example, in the case of the Vyksa Steel Works (Vyksa), several workshops of which are decorated with graffiti, and on one of the walls of the Stan-5000 metallurgical complex you can see the largest graffiti in Europe. These recognizable images can also be considered as part of the development of an industrial city brand.

4 Conclusion

Thus, it can be concluded that generalizing the brand status of Russian industrial cities, by analogy with the brand "UNESCO World Heritage Site", but considering the specifics of industrial heritage, can act as one of the ways to update the most important glocal narratives that unite industrial cities (especially – monotowns) into a single network, while making it possible to maintain their local identity. The use of various tools that increase the attractiveness of an industrial city, from eliminating the lack of information about its uniqueness by involving the local community as brand ambassadors to improving the urban environment, will make industrial centers convenient for the local population and interesting for a wider audience, in particular tourists who will be able to contribute not only to the economic development of the territory, but also to the preservation and transmission of the cultural memory of the visited city (leaving feedback about their trip, sharing photos on social networks). This approach seems to be more promising and complex than the promotion of certain types of industrial tourism or several types of tourism that are not related to each other.

Acknowledgments

References

1. G.G.F. Almeida, L. Cardoso, Sustainability **14**, 6669 (2022) https://doi.org/10.3390/su14116669
2. A. Bonakdar, I. Audirac, J. Plan. Lit. **35**, 147 (2020) https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412219878879

3. C.-T. Chiang, Y.-C. Chen, Sustainability **15**, 3254 (2023) https://doi.org/10.3390/su15043254

4. Y. Zhao, X. Cui, Y. Guo, Sustainability **14**, 5852 (2022) https://doi.org/10.3390/su14105852

5. M. Kavaratzis, G. Ashworth, Town Plan. Rev. **86**, 155 (2015) https://doi.org/10.3828/tpr.2015.10

6. V. Onésimo Cuamea, R. Arely Bermúdez, Int. J. Adv. Res. **5**, 919 (2017) https://doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/6039

7. Y.-W. Su, H.-L. Lin, Tourism Management **40**, 46 (2014) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.04.005

8. B.A. Adie, C.M. Hall, G. Prayag, J. Sustain. Tour. **26**, 399 (2017) https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1359277

9. World Heritage List, https://whc.unesco.org/en/list. Accessed 30 April 2023

10. Managing Cultural World Heritage, https://whc.unesco.org/en/managing-cultural-world-heritage. Accessed 30 April 2023

11. K. Berkenbosch, P. Groote, A. Stoffelen, J. Heritage Tour. **17**, 327 (2022) https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2022.2026364

12. I.P. Gârdan, A. Mauri, I. Dumitru, D.A. Gârdan, S.Ş. Maican, D. Moise, Electronics **11**, 2570 (2022) https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics11162570

13. T.T.T. Nguyen, S. Tong, J. Market. Anal. (2022) https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-022-00174-7

14. M.L. Shub, The culture of memory of residents of industrial cities in the space of regional media: Types of local identity, in Proceedings of the 1st sci.-pract. conf. *User Content in Modern Communication*, 22–23 April 2021, Chelyabinsk, Russia (2021)

15. L.M. Musina, M.U. Neucheva, IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci. **107**, 012132 (2018)

1. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/107/1/012132

16. N.B. Salazar, Ann. Tour. Res. **32**, 628 (2005) https://doi:10.1016/j.annals.2004.10.012

17. A. Ivona, A. Rinella, F. Rinella, Sustainability **11**, 4118 (2019) https://doi.org/10.3390/su11154118

18. K.D. Bugrov, Tempus et Memoria **3**, 13 (2022) https://doi.org/10.15826/tetm.2022.2.033

19. H. Orange, J. Contemp. Archaeol. **4**, 59 (2017) https://doi.org/10.1558/jca.31290

20. Kojo yakei INFO, https://kojoyakei.info. Accessed 11 May 2023

21. A. Starzyk, K. Rybak-Niedziółka, P. Łacek, Ł. Mazur, A. Stefańska, M. Kurcjusz, A. Nowysz, Sustainability **15**, 2599 (2023) https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032599