

International Comparison and Implementation of Slow City Success Determinants: The Case of Damyang Slow City, South Korea, and Seferihisar Slow City, Turkey

ALAN BROWN | CHONNAM NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

BONGHYUN JEONG | CHONNAM NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Utilising the Slow City approach to achieve sustainable rural development has been gaining prominence in South Korea. This paper presents a comparative study of two representative Slow Cities, Damyang in South Korea, and Seferihisar in Turkey. We first reviewed Slow City literature to identify and thematically group determining factors for successful Slow City implementation. The determining factors were applied as a framework to analyse the two Slow City areas and implementation strategies were developed for Damyang Slow City. We identified fifteen factors which fell into five themes: “The Local”; “Slow Tourism”; “Quality of Life”; “Resident and Cooperation and Participation”; and “Organisational Level”. The determining factors were applied to the two case study areas as a framework to compare the two Slow Cities and the following strategies suggested for Damyang Slow City: Two short term strategies are suggested: residents should receive training to take on the role of educators, empowering them to work alongside the master craftsmen and local experts who previously conducted the education; at an organisational level, linkages between the residents’ consultative group, administration, and experts should be formalised. Two medium term strategies are suggested: specific, enforceable standards should be developed for Slow City branded products and local residents should be trained in the field of quality assesment; apprenticeship programs should be developed and implemented to allow young people to train as master craftsman Two medium and long term strategies are suggested: appropriate tourist programs, to be implemented in the medium and long term, should be developed; future infrastructure design should remain true to its ‘ancient future, village of stonewalls and old houses’ ideal; and construction efforts should specifically reflect this.

Keywords: Slow City Determinants, successful Slow City implementation, Damyang Slow City in South Korea, Seferihisar Slow City in Turkey

Introduction

From the 1970's to late 1990's, Korea experienced breakneck economic growth, with annual rates averaging in excess of 7.5% during the same period. The development engendered by this growth followed an urban-centered strategy, which resulted in traditional rural communities suffering rapid collapse (Lee and Nam 2007). Unbalanced development led to continuous rural to urban migration, especially by the youth, which resulted in a loss of human resources and decreased prospects for intergenerational succession in the farming community. In addition, the swift liberalization of the Korean agricultural market opened the doors to intense international competition leaving agricultural communities more vulnerable and making agricultural production uneconomical.

A variety of rural development strategies have been explored and implemented in Korea. From the 1970's to the end of the 1990's, a government led approach to rural development was followed, with the Saemaul Undong (New Village Movement), originally implemented as a community modernisation program (Douglass 2013), which was favoured in the 1970's to early 1980's, and an integrated rural development approach being pursued from the late 1980's to 1997. The period following the IMF crisis has seen a more nuanced approach to rural development being followed, with aspects such as region-specific policies, residents' participation in policy formulation, and implementation of village-level tourism projects being emphasised (Lee and Nam 2007).

An alternative approach to securing rural development is the development and accreditation of Slow Cities, known internationally as Cittaslow. Slow Cities offer an approach to development which seeks to preserve and develop an area's unique characteristics in a sustainable way, and are seen as a means to secure livelihoods, protect local traditions and culture, and enhance the livability of a 'city'. Korea has been at the forefront of Slow City implementation in Asia, being the first Asian country to have 'cities' accredited as Slow Cities. The Slow City concept has been embraced with enthusiasm in Korea, with a total of twelve Slow Cities having been accredited in Korea between 2007 and the present. Similarly, Turkey is a dynamic country in terms of Slow City adoption. Following its first Slow City, Seferihisar, being accredited in 2009, a national Cittaslow network for Turkey was established in 2011, and the number of Slow Cities has increased to fifteen.

For this study, representative literature on Slow Cities was reviewed and thematic content analysis conducted to identify and thematically group determinants for successful Slow City implementation. Building on these themes, a framework of analysis was developed and applied to two representative Slow Cities, Damyang in South Korea and Seferihisar in Turkey. On the basis of the analysis, strategies for successful Slow City implementation in Damyang Slow City are recommended by the authors

The scope of the study is limited to the two case study Slow Cities, Damyang and Seferihisar. They were selected for the following reasons. Firstly, both Slow Cities were the first in their countries to be accredited. Damyang Slow City was accredited in 2007, at the same time as three others, Cheongsando, Jeungdo, and Jangheung. Seferihisar was accredited as Turkey's first Slow City in 2009. They therefore represent a pioneering approach to alternative development in each county. Both Slow Cities underwent re-evaluation by the Cittaslow organisation, and are therefore considered to be representative of the full cycle of a Slow City from accreditation to first re-evaluation. Secondly, the Slow Cities were chosen as they share common features. Both are Slow Cities whose economic base was traditionally focused primarily on agriculture. As such, Slow City accreditation was an opportunity to reinforce and promote local agriculture and related industries. Furthermore, both have historical sites that are attractive in terms of tourism but which are vulnerable to neglect or ill-thought-out development, necessitating well-thought-out tourism strategies. Finally, Seferihisar Slow City is considered "a fine example of implementing alternative development strategies in order to create a more livable and sustainable environment..." (Eser and Hepcan 2014, pp 334). In addition to being the first accredited Slow City in Turkey, it is considered Turkey's Cittaslow capital and has encouraged other cities in Turkey to carry out the 'Slow City/ Cittaslow' principles as a development model and an alternative lifestyle model. As such, it presents an opportunity to derive important implementation strategies for Damyang Slow City.

The time focus is from 2007, when Damyang Slow City received designation, to the present. This study presents a new perspective by situating determinants for successful Slow City implementation within their theoretical background. It presents practical strategies for successful Slow City implementation.

Preceding Research

Slow City literature commonly focuses on either its role as an alternative approach to development (e.g. Mayer and Knox 2006; Radstrom 2014; Semmens and Freeman 2012; Kim 2013), or places it within the scope of sustainable tourism (e.g. Lowry and Lee 2011; Broadway 2015; Su et al. 2017).

Within the first type of literature, Kim (2013) makes a comparative study of international and Korean Slow Cities to develop a sustainable small town model. Mayer and Knox (2006) view the Cittaslow movement as a viable alternative development option which addresses the interdependent goals of economic development, environmental protection, and social equity (Mayer and Knox 2006). Radstrom (2014) emphasizes the fundamental importance of place-sustaining, localisation, and identity. In a similar vein, Broadway (2015) focuses on how a Slow City is able to contribute to its sense of place, through its strong local food culture. Problems related to Slow Cities include lack of community support and being a superfluous brand (Semmens and Freeman 2012).

In terms of Slow Tourism, Slow Cities are seen as a vehicle for both environmental and social sustainability, focusing on the need for local community involvement and empowerment (Park and Kim 2016). In addition, for a Slow City to succeed as a Slow Tourism destination, the values of residents and visitors should converge through shared value (Kim and Min 2013), and the natural environment and local history should be protected (Su et al. 2017).

The abovementioned literature thus indicates the importance of local identity, citizen involvement and empowerment, and shared values. Furthermore, the protection of the environment and historical resources is stressed. Our paper addresses the abovementioned issues and incorporates them into our overall evaluation of determinants of Slow City success.

Slow City Concept

The Cittaslow movement was founded in 1999 as a global, member supported, non-profit association (Ekinci 2014). It is deeply rooted in the “Slow” movement, particularly the Slow Food movement, which aims “to prevent the disappearance of local food cultures and traditions, counteract the rise of fast life and combat people’s dwindling interest in the food they eat,

where it comes from and how our food choices affect the world around us” (Slow Food International 2015). It can be considered as a new social movement with philosophical links to the environmental, grassroots, anti-consumerism, grass-to-table and similar movements.

The Cittaslow movement is broader than the Slow Food movement, integrating the idea of “Slow” into a development alternative which seeks to preserve the quality of life integral to each city’s sense of place, in an environmentally sustainable way (Radstrom 2014).

As its starting point it takes the threats posed by modern capitalist development, which pushes for homogenisation of living space, food production, consumption, and culture. It seeks to fight back against this threat by providing a realistic alternative development path based instead on uniqueness. The assumptions which underpin the movement attempt to address the interdependencies between the environment, economy, and equity (Mayer and Knox 2006).

Bringing it down to the level of individual Slow Cities, the South Korean Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism (2014, p. 14) states that “a South Korean Slow City should be a reflexive alternative to speed, which is indefinite development, and it is a motive to recover the original speed of human life and nature, and to coexist with nature, tradition, and pursue happiness in harmony with the community.” The Slow City development path is a holistic approach to development which provides an explicit agenda of local distinctiveness (Mayer and Knox 2006). The concept of “sense of place” is emphasized in Slow City literature (e.g. Knox 2005; Broadway 2015), implying an identity which is felt by both residents and visitors. Because of this, the development focusses on the characteristics which make a local area unique and emphasises these through the connection to the unique features of a place. It is thus of central importance that development is not a zero-sum game in which the authenticity and sense of place of a community is lost in return for gains brought about by economic development. Slow City implementation initiates an open process, and harnesses the capacity of *local residents* to improvise (Pink 2015). It thus requires deep participation of the local population (Arikan and Arikan 2018).

Determinants of Slow City Implementation

Slow City Accreditation Criteria

Prospective Slow Cities are subject to a stringent accreditation process. They are first expected to have a well-defined alternative development agenda and the institutional capacity to carry it through the transition stage. The Cittaslow Charter (Cittaslow International 2018) lists a series of goals that prospective members are expected to agree to and implement. As being accredited as a Slow City is not considered a static end goal, but the first step in continuous improvement, a future Slow City is not expected to have met the goals prior to accreditation, but is, however, expected to have 50% of these goals already introduced (Milutinovic 2010).

There are seventy-two required goals, subdivided into several macro areas: Energy and environmental policies; Infrastructure policies; Quality of urban life policies; Agricultural, touristic, and artisan policies; Policies for hospitality, awareness, and training; Social cohesion; and Partnerships (Cittaslow International 2018).

Slow Cities are subject to regular re-evaluations, with Korean Slow Cities requiring re-evaluation every five years. This ensures 'they continue to foster and support their alternative agendas, which in turn ensures continuity of the development agenda' (Mayer and Knox 2006, p. 332).

Determinants

An interplay of factors central to the Cittaslow philosophy and practice contribute to the success of a Slow City. Through a reading of literature related to Slow Cities, a thematic analysis on the material was carried out, following the approach detailed in Clarke and Braun (2014). First, following repeated readings of the literature, initial codes were generated through "open coding". As a second step, codes were combined and refined to eliminate redundancies. For example, initial codes representing "defense of small shops" (Oliveti 2012) and "using local products as mediators of economic sustainability" (Mayer and Knox 2006) were among those combined to form A1 (Encouraging local production and support for local businesses). For the next step, the codes were examined and themes were derived from their natural groupings. The derived themes were "The Local", "Slow Tourism", "Quality of Life", "Resident and Cooperation and

TABLE 1
SLOW CITY DETERMINANT DETAILS

Component	Determinant	Details
The Local	A1	Encouraging local production and support for local businesses
	A2	Preserving and building local assets
	A3	A strong 'sense of place'
Slow Tourism	B1	Developing appropriate tourism programs
	B2	Varied and sufficient accommodation
	B3	A strong sense of hospitality
Quality of life	C1	Enhancing local livability
	C2	Appropriate and sustainable urban design
	C3	Equitable development and income linkages
Resident cooperation and participation	D1	Resident cooperation
	D2	Public participation
	D3	Shared vision for the future
Organisational level	E1	Active civil society
	E2	Cittaslow organization and network
	E3	Government

NOTES.—Compiled by author from literature review

Participation”, and “Organisational Level” <Table 1>.

Framework of Analysis

The themes which emerged from the natural groupings of Slow City determinants were used as an analysis framework. In addition, the themes corresponded closely to the seven policy areas of the Cittaslow Charter’s (Cittaslow International 2018) goals, and the framework of analysis contains five components: ‘The Local’, ‘Slow Tourism’, ‘Quality of Life’, ‘Resident Cooperation and Participation’, and ‘Organisational Level’ <Table 2>.

‘The Local’ refers to those factors that strengthen a Slow City’s identity and economic base. ‘Slow Tourism’ provides or reinforces the economic base

TABLE 2
SLOW CITY DETERMINANTS

Factors/ Author	The Local			Slow Tourism			Quality of Life			Cooperation and Participation			Organisa- tional Level		
	A1	A2	A3	B1	B2	B3	C1	C2	C3	D1	D2	D3	E1	E2	E3
Ekinci	0	0		0	0		0								
Kim		0							0						
Mayer, Knox	0	0	0					0	0	0	0	0			0
Lowry			0												0
Ludlow	0	0		0			0		0	0	0	0	0		
Oliveti	0	0				0	0	0			0	0			
Radstrom	0	0	0												0
VIP Report 2008						0		0							
Seong et al.		0		0							0	0		0	0
Yang															0

NOTES.—Compiled from included Authors

SYMBOLS.—0 indicates presence of determinant

upon which the livelihood of residents is dependent. The concept of Slow Tourism is furthermore a core part of the Cittaslow philosophy. Slow Cities aim to enhance the ‘Quality of Life’ of residents through both physical infrastructural improvements as well as linking residents to the economy in an equitable manner. ‘Resident Cooperation and Participation’ is necessary to maintain the Cittaslow movement’s democratic aims and ensure a Slow City’s momentum continues. Finally, ‘Organisational Level’ links the Slow City with civil society, government, and the Cittaslow network. The analysis framework was applied to the two Slow Cities in question through a review of literature on Damyang and Seferihisar Slow Cities along with on-site investigations of Damyang Slow City.

TABLE 3
FRAMEWORK OF ANALYSIS

Component	Details
The Local	Reflects 'sense of place'. Local products are used to facilitate local economic, social and cultural distinctiveness and sustainability (Mayer and Knox 2006). It is necessary to build on local and regional assets (Radstrom 2014). It is a foundation for sustainability.
Slow Tourism	Acts as one of the pillars of economic sustainability. Influences the quality of its appearance, environment, and image (Ekinci 2014). Accommodation quantity and variety, and strong sense of hospitality cater to the needs of visitors.
Quality of Life	'The Local' and 'Slow Tourism' provide impetus and economic support for enhancing local livability and sustainable urban design. Needs to be a focus on social equity and sustainability, not only community-level development (Mayer and Knox 2006).
Resident Cooperation and Participation	Slow City should be 'for the people, by the people'. Local residents should be actively involved in formulating policies (Oliveti 2012). Strengthens identity and 'sense of place' to foster 'The Local' and 'Slow Tourism'. Maintains accountability at 'Organisational Level'.
Organisational level	Provides a connection with Government, Cittaslow network, and civil society. Plays a steering role for Slow City policy implementation.

Operating Conditions and Determinants of Damyang and Seferihisar Slow Cities

Damyang Slow City Operating Conditions

Damyang Slow City is located in Samjinae village, Damyang County, to the north-east of Gwangju Metropolitan City. It was among the first group of Korean Slow Cities to be accredited in 2007, taking as its initial concept the idea of 'ancient future, village of stonewalls and old houses'. It has a relatively small population of 4,105. Damyang Slow City previously had an economy

TABLE 4
DAMYANG AND SEFERIHISAR SLOW CITY RESOURCES

Category	Damyang	Seferihisar
Natural resource	Wonbeong Mountain, Guardian Tree (zelcova sp.)	Hot springs
Historic/cultural resource	Samjicheon Stone Wall Road (Registered Cultural Asset No. 265), Sangweoljeong Pavilion, Namguekru Pavilion, Historic houses (the House of Go Jaeseon, Go Jaehwan, Go Jeongju)	Sigacik Fortress, Dionysus Altar, Agora, Theatre, Odeon, city walls and harbour ruins.
Tourism resource	Changpyeong Traditional Market, Traditional Seasonal Customs, Rice Taffy Experience Center, Slowfood Masters traditional local food)	Teos Marina, Blue Flag beach
Local product	Rice taffy, Hankwa (traditional Korean confectionary)	Tangerines, olives, cheese etc.
Programs offered	“Snail Market”, Folk -Culture Programs, Various Experience Programs	Organic bazaars, “Seed Trade Festival”, “75 plus parties”

NOTES.—Soeng, Tae-Gap, Haeng-Gu Kwak, Jun Kim, and Seon-Hee Kim 2010; Eser and Hepcan 2014; Gundus, Oner, and Knox 2016 (Adapted)

that was heavily reliant on agriculture as well as traditional food production, which is now supplemented by tourism income. Visitors to Damyang Slow City are able to experience the ambience of a traditional Korean village. Most houses are built in the traditional Hanok Style, and narrow lanes are lined with stone walls. Many local houses serve as restaurants and guesthouses. The village has a wide variety of local resources which attract tourists <Table 4>.

Seferihisar Slow City Operating Conditions

Seferihisar Slow City is located to the south-west of Izmir City, in the Aegean Region of Turkey. It was the first Slow City to be accredited in Turkey, in 2009, based on its urban texture and lifestyle focused on tradition and natural rhythms. It has experienced moderate population growth since it became a Slow City, with a population of 28,603 in 2009 which had increased to 36,335

by 2015. Seferihisar is a coastal town with an agricultural and tourism based economy. Agricultural produce including tangerines and artichokes is grown, and goat husbandry is practiced along with cheesemaking. Historical and archeological sites along with a distinctive natural landscape count among the local tourism resources <Table 4>.

Damyang and Seferihisar Slow City Determinants

As shown in <Table 4>, Damyang Slow City was able to generate a strong sense of the Slow City belonging to the community, thus achieving high levels of participation, cooperation, and a shared vision for its future (D2, D3). The aim of participation was achieved through its explicit incorporation into programs and Slow City related businesses. A residents' consultative group was established in 2009 to provide an avenue for residents to make their voices heard (D1). In addition to this a 'Snail Village School' was created, which provides residents with educational programs, conducted by master craftsmen and experts from the area. This helped promote a more positive image of the Slow City amongst residents (A3, D3).

A 'Snail Market' was established as a way to link participation with income generation (A1, C3). The market proved successful, with a high level of community participation. A second crucial element was the encouragement and promotion of local businesses (A1). Through careful management and strict quality standards, the Slow City brand can be a powerful tool for promoting local products, thereby securing local incomes and revitalising the rural economy. Efforts such as fostering the businesses and products of local master craftsmen, conducting brand strengthening through promotional materials, and the development of new products as well as visitor experience programs were successful in this respect (A1, A2, B3). At the organizational level, the policies of Damyang Slow City are in harmony with those of the Damyang County Local Government, which is considered to be a strength in terms of policy and administrative support (E3).

Seferihisar Slow City succeeded through supporting local agricultural producers and encouraging farmers to convert to organic farming. To introduce and promote organically grown local products, a series of meetings dealing with good agricultural practices were held and certification studies for organic farming were initiated (A1). Furthermore, organic open markets were established, and capacity building efforts allowed women to participate more fully as producers rather than consumers, selling the products they had

TABLE 5
DAMYANG AND SEFERIHISAR SLOW CITY DETERMINANTS

Component	Determinant	Damyang	Seferihisar
The Local	A1	0	0
	A2	0	
	A3	0	0
Slow Tourism	B1		
	B2		
	B3	0	
Quality of Life	C1		0
	C2		0
	C3	0	0
Resident Cooperation and Participation	D1	0	0
	D2	0	
	D3	0	
Organisational Level	E1		
	E2		
	E3	0	0

NOTES.—Compiled by author from literature review and on-site investigation (Damyang)

SYMBOLS.—0 indicates presence of determinant

produced, and thus empowering them financially as well as ensuring their inclusion in community life (A1, C3, D2).

To develop a strong sense of place, public education and promotional programs were undertaken, including a project to put into writing an oral history of Seferihisar to supplement existing brochures and books. A city council was formed by the local municipality to create public awareness and participation in the Cittaslow implementation principles through a participatory process (A3, D1, D2).

The quality of life of residents was an area successfully addressed by Seferihisar Slow City. A new biological waste treatment plant and a recycling plant were constructed with a capacity to serve 50,000 people, and segregation of solid wastes was encouraged by providing recycle bins to separate different types of waste and constructing a new recycling plant (C1). Visual pollution

was also reduced through the appropriate redesign and replacement of old, visually chaotic signboards (C2).

Problems of Damyang and Seferihisar Slow Cities

For the continued advancement of a Slow City, it is necessary for cooperation to be promoted at the organisational level. While the residents of Damyang Slow City were active at an individual level, there was a need for cooperation between residents, experts, and the administration to guide the Slow City through future development. Without meaningful cooperation at the organisational level, the direction of the Slow City would be dominated by a few outsiders, leading to a loss of ownership for the residents. For Slow Tourism projects, a medium to long term view needs to be taken with respect to developing sustainable tourist attractions in harmony with the Slow City. A steep growth in visitor numbers is indicative of the potential of Slow Tourism. However, without a concrete strategy to sustain and channel the influx of tourists into appropriate projects, the risk of falling into the trap of “quick-fix” tourism solutions, inappropriate to the principles of the Slow City, exists. For example, the construction of excessive tourism facilities focused on the increase of tourists may lead to the destruction of tourism resources. A third problem was the relative lack of policies to ensure the integrity of streetscapes and the construction of buildings that are sympathetic to the the Slow City ambience. These two issues impact on the quality of life of residents as well as tourism. Slow City visitors and residents expect an authentic sense of a Slow City, which should be maintained. On the other hand, residents are concerned about restrictions of their property rights being imposed on them (e.g. not being allowed to install solar panels which would impact the ambience and historic integrity of traditional houses). Solutions balancing both aspects need to be devised.

Seferihisar Slow City is increasingly reliant on tourist trade, and as such, a strong sense of hospitality is essential. However, training courses for local hospitality providers to improve the quality of their service were lacking. In addition, tourist operators and storekeepers were not made sufficiently aware of the need for transparency of prices. One of the central aspects of the Slow City philosophy is the need for meaningful resident participation. Although attempts have been made to include local Seferihisar Slow City residents and stakeholders, a perception exists among the public that they are still not fully part of the process (Gunduz et al 2016). In addition, investment and effort

have been focused on the historic district of Sigacik, leaving residents of other parts of the Slow City dissatisfied. As Slow Cities emphasise equity and inclusion, exclusion, or perceptions thereof, would be detrimental to their success.

Findings

Our findings, based on the derived Slow City determinants, are as follows <Table 5>. In terms of “The Local”, both Slow Cities showed strength in this area, with Damyang Slow City having all three determinants present and Seferihisar Slow City lacking only in A2 (Preserving and building local assets). The “Slow Tourism” component shows cause for concern, with both Slow Cities showing an absence of B1 (Developing appropriate tourism programs) and B2 (Varied and sufficient accommodation), and Seferihisar Slow City showing an absence of B3 (A strong sense of hospitality). An area of concern for Damyang Slow City was “Quality of Life”. Whereas Seferihisar Slow City had all three determinants present, Damyang Slow City showed an absence of C1 (Enhancing local livability) and C2 (Appropriate and sustainable urban design). Damyang Slow City showed strength in “Resident Cooperation and Participation”, having all determinants present, whereas Seferihisar Slow City showed an absence of D2 (Public participation) and D3 (Shared vision for the future). For Damyang Slow City, the strength of resident involvement could be used as the basis of an implementation strategy. Finally, for “Organisational level”, both Slow Cities showed an absence of two determinants E1 (Active civil society) and E2 (Cittaslow organization and network).

Damyang Slow City Implementation Strategy

To further improve the operation of Damyang Slow City, an implementation strategy is presented based on the derived determinants and the example of Seferihisar Slow City. An implementation strategy for Damyang Slow City should take into account what has already been achieved with further development being implemented to promote further improvement. Building on the strength of resident participation, steps should be taken to ensure this momentum is not lost <Table 6>.

S1: Specific, enforceable standards should be developed for Slow City

branded products, and in the medium term local residents should be trained in the field of quality assessment. Following the example of Seferihisar, studies on organic certification standards should be carried out. This would result in meaningful participation by residents being deepened, reinforcement of the quality of Slow City products, and increased awareness amongst producers.

S2: A strategy to be implemented in the medium term, with long term payoffs, is the development and implementation of apprenticeship programs to allow young people to train as masters. This will ensure that important traditions and the skills to produce local specialties are passed on to future generations and the vitality of Damyang Slow City is maintained. S3: With regards to tourism programs, the substantial increase in visitor numbers to Damyang Slow City necessitates the development of appropriate tourist programs in the medium term, to be implemented in the medium and long term. This will ensure that rapidly increasing tourist numbers do not erode the 'Slow' nature of tourist programs undertaken. Examples of suitable Slow Tourism programs are farm work/stay programs, guided heritage exploration programs, and bicycle gastronomic tours.

S4: As a medium-long term strategy, future infrastructure design should remain true to its 'ancient future, village of stonewalls and old houses' ideal, and construction efforts should specifically reflect this. Unrestricted development of identical buildings in the center of Seferihisar has left an eyesore that is difficult to remove and detracts from the atmosphere and

TABLE 6
DAMYANG SLOW CITY IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

Strategy	Time Period		
	Short term	Medium term	Long term
S1 Develop enforceable standards		0	
S2 Ensure intergenerational continuity		0	0
S3 Suitable Slow Tourism programs		0	0
S4 Infrastructure design		0	0
S5 Residents as educators		0	
S6 Organisational linkages	0		

NOTES.—Written by author

SYMBOL.—0 indicates time period

image of the Slow City. However, this should be done in collaboration with residents, to assuage their concerns regarding property rights.

S5: In the short term, residents can receive training to take on the role of educators at the 'Snail Village School' This will empower them to work alongside the master craftsmen and local experts who previously conducted the education. The base of participation will be broadened, and human capital amongst residents will be increased

S6: As with Sefefihisar Slow City, Damyang Slow City needs to include residents and stakeholders in all aspects from planning to operation. At an organisational level, linkages between the residents' consultative group, administration, and experts can be formalised in the short term through regular meetings between the three parties. Through this, strategy can be formulated and information channels can be reinforced.

Conclusion

This study conducted a thematic analysis of existing literature to identify determinants for successful Slow City implementation. We identified fifteen determinants which fell into five themes "The Local", "Slow Tourism", "Quality of Life", "Resident and Cooperation and Participation", and "Organisational Level". The determinants were used to develop an analysis framework which was applied to the two case study areas. It was found that both Slow Cities showed weakness with regard to "Slow Tourism" and "Organisational level", Damyang Slow City showed strength in "The local" and "Resident Cooperation and Participation", and Seferihisar Slow City showed strength in "Quality of life".

Short-term, medium-term, and long-term strategies for successful Slow City implementation were then suggested for Damyang Slow City, with strategies to reinforce what it had already built and ensure continuity of the Slow City required. In the short term, residents should receive training to take on the role of educators, empowering them to work alongside the master craftsmen and local experts who previously conducted the education; at an organisational level, linkages between the residents' consultative group, administration and experts should be formalised between the three parties. In the medium term, specific, enforceable standards should be developed for Slow City branded products, and local residents should be trained in the field of quality assessment; apprenticeship programs should be developed and implemented to allow young people to train as masters. For the medium and

long term, appropriate tourist programs, should be developed; future infrastructure design should remain true to its 'ancient future, village of stonewalls and old houses' ideal, and construction efforts should specifically reflect this.

This paper makes an academic contribution by developing a framework of determinants which may be useful for future analysis of Slow Cities. In particular, future quantitative and qualitative research to confirm the framework for other Slow Cities is suggested. A limitation of this study is that its conclusions are based on a review of existing Slow City literature and the study includes only two Slow Cities.

(Submitted: May 30, 2018; Revised: October 30, 2018; Accepted: November 14, 2018)

References

- Arikan, Alev DüNDAR, and İrfan Arikan. 2018. "Cittaslow Philosophy in Yedi Bilgeler Winery—Turkey." In *Innovative Approaches to Tourism and Leisure*, Pp. 351-361. Springer, Cham.
- Cittaslow International. 2018. "Cittaslow charter." Retrieved August 14, 2018. (<http://www.cittaslow.org/section/association/charter>).
- Broadway, Michael. 2015. "Implementing the slow life in Southwest Ireland: A case study of Clonakilty and local food." *Geographical Review* 105(2): 216-234.
- Clarke, Victoria and Virginia Braun. 2014. "Thematic analysis." Pp 6626-6628, in *Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research*, edited by Alex C. Michalos. Springer, Dordrecht.
- Douglass, Mike. 2013. "The Saemaul Undong: South Korea's Rural Miracle in Historical Perspective." *Asia Research Institute Working Paper Series* 197: 1-34.
- Ekinci, Mehmet. 2014. "The Cittaslow philosophy in the context of sustainable tourism development; the case of Turkey." *Tourism Management* 41: 178-189.
- Eser, Nihal and Serif Hepcan. 2014. "Successes and failures of the first Slow City in Turkey: The case of Seferihisar." *Landscape Research Record* 1: 333-344.
- Gunduz, Can, Asli Oner, and Paul H Knox. 2016. "Social Resilience in Aegean Slow Cities: Slow City Seferihisar." *Universal Journal of Management* 4(4): 211-222.
- Kim, Jude O. 2013. (In Korean) "Jisokganeunghan sodosiroseoui seullositi model guchun -seullogwangwangeul jungsimeuro [The model of sustainable small town to encourage the slow tourism in Slowcities]." *Seullositiyeongu [Journal of Cittaslow]* 9: 11-24.
- Kim, Ok-Hee and Woong-Ki Min. 2013. (In Korean) "Seullogwangwang mokjeokjiroseoui seullositiui jeongcheseongwa jangsomakingui ganeungseong [Slow

- city identity as a Slow Tourism destination and the potential for place marketing]. *Gwangwangyeongunonchong [Journal of Tourism Studies]*
- Kılıç, Sibel E, and Muhammed Aydoğan. 2015. "Sustainable Tourism and Heritage in Sigacık/Seferihisar." *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic and Management Engineering* 9(1): 310-313.
- Knox, Paul L. 2005. "Creating ordinary places: Slow cities in a fast world." *Journal of urban design* 10(1): 1-11.
- Küçükaltan, Ebru G. and Ige Pirnar. 2016. "Competitiveness factors of a tourism destination and impact on residents'quality of life: The case of Cittaslow-Seferihisar." *Journal of Tourism, Heritage and Services Marketing* 2(1): 22-29.
- Lee, Seong-Woo and Sou-Yeon Nam. 2005. "Agro-tourism as a rural development strategy in Korea." *Journal of Rural Development* 29(6): 67-83.
- Lowry, Linda L, and Misoon Lee. 2011. "CittaSlow, Slow Cities, Slow Food: Searching for a Model for the Development of Slow Tourism." *Travel and Tourism Research Association Annual Conference Proceedings* 42: 4-6.
- Matos, Rafael. 2004. "Can slow tourism bring new life to alpine regions." Pp. 99-103, in *The tourism and leisure industry: Shaping the future*. Edited by Klaus Weiermair and Christine Mathies. Philadelphia: The Haworth Hospitality Press.
- Mayer, Heike and Paul Knox. 2006. "Slow Cities: Sustainable places in a fast world." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 28(4): 322-342.
- Milutinovic, S. 2010. "Ludlow case study." *U.K. Urban Sustainable Development: A European Perspective*: 1-9.
- Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism of South Korea. 2014. (In Korean) "Seullosit igwangwangjawonhwa-saengtaegwangwang10daemodel saeobui pyeongga mit hyanghu chujinbanghyang yeongu [Slow City Recreation & Ecotourism Top 10 Model Business- Evaluation and Future Directions]: 1-369.
- Oliveti, Pier G. 2012. "The sharing of social responsibilities in practice- The experience of two towns of the Cittaslow network." Pp. 157-178, in *Trends in Social Cohesion, No. 24*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Park, Eerang and Sangkyun Kim. 2016. "The potential of Cittaslow for sustainable tourism development: enhancing local community's empowerment." *Tourism Planning & Development* 13(3): 351-369.
- Pink, Sarah. 2015. "Ethnography, co-design and emergence: Slow activism for sustainable design." *Global Media Journal: Australian Edition* 9(2): 1-10.
- Radstrom, Susan. 2014. "A PlaceSustaining framework for local urban identity: An introduction and history of Cittaslow." *Italian Journal of Planning Practice* 1(1): 90-113.
- Semmens, Jaimee and Claire Freeman. 2012. "The value of Cittaslow as an approach to local sustainable development: A New Zealand perspective." *International Planning Studies* 17(4): 353-375.
- Slow Food International. 2015. Retrieved August 13, 2018. <http://www.slowfood.com>
- Soeng, Tae-Gap, Haeng-Gu Kwak, Jun Kim, and Seon-Hee Kim. 2010. (In Korean)

“Jeonnamjiyeong seullositi siltaewa baljeonbangan [An analysis of the actual conditions of and a strategy for the development of Jeollanamdo Slow Cities].” *Rijeoninpo* [Regioninfo] 227: 10-33.

Su, Wei-San, Cheng-Hung Huang, Chao-Chun Hsu, and Lan-Fang Chang. 2017. “Cittaslow: A new pattern of sustainable tourism development in Taiwan.” *International Journal of Organizational Innovation* 9(4): 90-102.

ALAN BROWN is an Integrated Masters/ PhD candidate in the Department of Regional Development at Chonnam National University. He recently authored “Life satisfaction as mediator between social capital and happiness in South Korea: evidence from the World Values Survey”, which was published in the *Journal of the Korean Urban Management Association*, and “A Study on the Effect of Social Capital on the Subjective Well-being of Older Adults -Focusing on the Mediating Effect of Financial Satisfaction”, which was published in *The Journal of Asian Studies*. His research interests include local development, social capital, and gerontology. *Address*: Department of Regional Development, Chonnam National University, 77 Yongbong-ro Buk-gu, Gwangju, 61186, South Korea. [*E-mail*: sanikangi@gmail.com].

BONGHYUN JEONG is a professor in the Department of Regional Development at Chonnam National University. He holds a BA in economics from Chung-Ang University, a master’s degree in urban planning from Seoul National University, and a Ph.D. in town and country planning from Sheffield University, UK. He worked as a researcher at KAIST, Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements (KRIHS) and Korea Maritime Institute (KMI), and as a visiting researcher at Transportation Research Institute (IST), UC, Berkeley. He has served as an exchange professor at Sheffield University in UK, University of West Virginia in US, and both University of Waterloo and University of Toronto in Canada. His major books include *New Transportation Policy in Regional Metropolitan City* (2005), *SOC and Regional Development* (2010), *Metropolitan Transport Problems and Policy* (2015, English), and *SOC Management and Development Policy Directions* (2018, co-author), and has written a number of papers in the fields of transportation, logistics, tourism and social overhead capital. *Address*: Department of Regional Development, Chonnam National University, 77 Yongbong-ro Buk-gu, Gwangju, 61186, South Korea. [*E-mail*: bhjeong7@hanmail.net].

