

A Discourse Analysis of Attempts to Strengthen Global Image through the 2011 World Athletics Championships*

Yorgason, Ethan**

스포츠 관광을 통한 대구의 세계화*
- 2011 대구세계육상선수권대회의 문화지리학적 분석 -

요거슨 이탄**

Abstract : In 2011, Daegu hosted the International Association of Athletics Federation Championships and attempted to use this event strengthen its global profile. Organizers hoped *Daegu 2011* would strengthen knowledge about Daegu internationally and help the city overcome recent economic stagnation by bolstering tourism and investment on the global scale. Written from the perspective of a foreigner living in Korea, this interpretive article uses mixed-method cultural geographic analysis to evaluate the momentum *Daegu 2011* produced in these directions. The article draws on a tripartite “territorialisation” approach to mega-event tourism’s production of space, focusing on representational efforts during the approach to the championships and the event itself. Promotional materials receive particular attention. Interviews with international tourists during 2011 strengthen conclusions drawn from analysis of promotional materials. After reviewing relevant conceptual literature, Daegu’s history, and the background of *Daegu 2011*, the article devotes three subsections to analysis. The first uses critical discourse analysis of a key promotional video to argue that Daegu’s self-promotions betrayed insecurity about the city’s place within the global tourism market. A second analysis subsection finds that additional promotional materials did not fully overcome that problem. These materials also produced an overload of Daegu images and aspirations. The third subsection further develops these arguments, pointing to a partial mismatch between images emphasized by promotions and experiences available in the tourism landscape. This subsection also argues that while *Daegu 2011* undoubtedly produced positive effects for the city, key challenges remain if Daegu will be placed on the map of globally acknowledged cities.

Key Words : Daegu, sports tourism, cultural geography, global image, landscape

요약 : 대구는 2011년에 세계육상선수권대회(IAAF World Championships)를 개최하였다. 조직 위원회는 이 대회를 통해서 대구에 대한 세계적인 인지도를 강화하고, 세계적인 스케일에서 관광과 투자를 촉진함으로써 최근 대구의 경기 침체를 극복하고자 하였다. 한국에 거주하는 외국인의 관점에서 쓰여진 본 논문은 문화지리 분석 방법을 혼합하여 세계육상선수권대회로 인해 파급된 관광과 투자의 영향을 평가하였다. 본 논문은 대구모 이벤트를 활용한 장소의 생산을 고찰하기 위해 세 단계의 '영토화(territorialisation)' 접근법을 적용하였으며, 특히 세계육상선수권대회가 개최되기 전과 개최되는 동안의 재현 활동(representational efforts)을 살펴보았다. 이 과정에서 웹사이트, 안내책자 등과 같은 대회 관련 홍보물이 주로 사용되었으며, 관광객을 대상으로 한 인터뷰를 통해 연구 결과를 보충하였다. 이와 관련한 문헌 자료, 대구의 역사, 그리고 Daegu 2011의 추진 배경을 검토한 결과, 본 논문은 세 가지 항목으로 도출되었다. 첫째, 비판 담론 분석(critical discourse analysis)을 통해 대회와 관련된 홍보 비디오를 분석한 결과 대구시는 세계 관광 시장에서 차지하는 대구의 지위에 대하여 불확실한 것으로 나타났다. 둘째, 관광지로서 대구의 위상에 대한 대구시 자체의 불확실은 홍보 비디오 이외의 다른 홍보물 분석에서도 여전히 나타났다. 이런 홍보물들은 대구시의 이미지와 미래를 향한 염원에 부담을 초래하였다. 셋째, 이런 논의를 확장시킨 결과 홍보물에서 보여지는 대구의 관광 경관은 실제 보여주는 경관과 부분적으로 차이가 나타나고 있었다. 이것으로 볼 때, 세계선수권대회는 대구시에 긍정적인 효과를 창출함과 동시에 앞으로 세계적인 도시로서의 위상을 확립하기 위해서 해결해야 할 과제를 남기고 있다.

주요어 : 대구시, 스포츠 관광, 문화지리학, 글로벌 이미지, 경관

1. Introduction : *Daegu 2011* Strengthens Daegu's Global Profile?

In late August and early September of 2011, world sporting attention focused on Daegu,

* This Research was supported by Kyungpook National University Research Fund, 2010

** 경북대학교 사회과학대학 지리학과 조교수(Assistant Professor, Department of Geography, Social Science College, Kyungpook National University)(yorgason@knu.ac.kr)

South Korea, with The International Association of Athletics Federation (IAAF), the leading global organization for track & field sports, holding its championships there. Perhaps the most memorable image from the event was of track and field's most famous athlete, Jamaican sprinter Usain Bolt, false-start disqualification from the championship's glamour event, the men's 100-meter race. Less prominent on television, surely, but nearly as prominent for those attending at the stadium, were large banners promoting the city of Daegu with messages of "Colorful Daegu" and "MediCity Daegu." These banners were more than just ways to hide the non-sold-out seats at the stadium, though they did that, but were also part of a concerted effort by Daegu and by South Korea to use the event to improve Daegu's (and to a lesser extent, Korea's) profile globally. The success of that endeavor cannot be fully known at this point and may never be fully determinable, but this paper assesses, through a mixed-methods approach centered around discourse analysis, what this event, named *Daegu 2011*, reveals about the city's aspirations within a globalized world. It also attempts, from the perspective of a non-Korean cultural geographer teaching in Korea, to provide preliminary evaluation of whether *Daegu 2011* helped Daegu become, as the city desires, a globally important urban area.

2. A Territorialization Approach to Sports Tourism and Place Representation

This research draws on concepts and concerns relating to place construction (especially place image), sports tourism, and the geography of tourism. It follows Chris Gibson (2008; see also Fredline, 2008) in asserting that tourism is crucially important to the study of culture and society because of its cross-cutting social,

political-economic, cultural, and environmental elements. It alters personal engagement with places and peoples while restructuring global, national, and regional relationships. Tourism is much more than an industry, even though it is fundamentally involved with the global capitalist system. It is also a key part of the cultural process of creating meaning. "The 'trick' of tourism capitalism," Gibson (2009, 529) writes, "is its ability to commodify entire places and all they contain; to spill outwards from the edges of organized capital to saturate all other elements of place. You and everything in your town are part of its commodification potentially as a tourist destination."

In a world of increased travel, ever more specialized recreations and entertainments, and stronger mass media connections, sports tourism has become an important element within the larger tourism phenomenon (Neirotti, 2003; Swart and Bob, 2007). Geographic concepts, such as space and place, assist in understanding the hierarchies and statuses that emerge in relation to sports destinations, as well as the kinds of identities and images that become assigned to certain parts of the world (Higham and Hinch, 2006). Mega-sporting events, in particular, have the ability to affect places and tourism in a variety of ways (Roche, 2000; Bale, 2002). Internationally, the Olympics and soccer's World Cup stand far above other mega-events in their impact on places because of the international attention they draw. The IAAF World Championships are likely the third most significant mega-sporting event, however. Daegu was clearly keen to use that event to publicize and rework its image both nationally and internationally.

I follow here what two Italian scholars call the "territorialisation" approach to mega-event sports tourism. Egidio Dansero and Matteo Puttilli (2010) argue that one of the most important

impacts of a mega event is its territorializing power. Rooted in Henri Lefebvre's (1991) ideas about the production of space, Dansero and Puttilli define mega-event territorialization as the production of territory that accompanies the process of carrying out the mega-event (p.325). From the moment a city announces that it will bid for the event, a "series of [spatially significant] transformations" result from the effort to make the games suitable for the event. The spatially significant events don't stop there, Dansero and Puttilli claim. Following the event, a period of de-territorialization occurs in which many of the infrastructures created are weakened or abandoned. Then, following de-territorialization, a phase of re-territorialization may occur when the place that organized the event is able to re-appropriate the event's legacy in some productive way and turn it into territorial capital, particularly for tourism (see also Swart and Bob, 2007). Ideally, for the place where the event is held, these three stages should take the form of a cycle, although there is never any guarantee that the linkages beyond de-territorialization will take place. Considerable obstacles lie in the path of maintaining territorial momentum after the event finishes, and in successful passage from de-territorialization to re-territorialization.

Across these three phases, three major types of territorializing acts occur: naming, reification, and organization. Naming is taking symbolic control of the territory, through acts such as giving new names to places, or through logos and opening ceremonies that attempt to define, give new meanings or create new images for the territory. Like the other types of acts, these naming acts occur during the territorialization phase, but also may recur in de-territorialization and re-territorialization. Reification, to Dansero and Puttilli, refers to the material transformation of the territory: new buildings, new infrastructure, cleanup efforts, attempts to make certain spaces

"friendlier" for tourists, increased and altered security, etc. Organization produces milieus and conduits through which territorial programs and strategies are accomplished. This may include such things as newly mobilized sets of actors or new networks between actors within and across various scales. In the analysis that follows, I make reference to aspects and concerns from many of these nine categories, but give particular attention to naming territorializations. While emphasizing phenomena within the territorialization phase, I attempt to hint at how these acts to assert symbolic control of the territory may or may not lead into successful de- and re-territorialization strategies for Daegu.

This article thus concerns Daegu's attempts to create, re-create, and promote its global image. In other words, it asks about the prospects for *Daegu 2011* to enhance Daegu's global cultural capital. In doing so, it explores part of what Hollinshead, Ateljevic and Ali (2009, 429) call tourism's worldmaking capacity. They vividly define this as:

the power of tourism to wittingly/under-wittingly ... re-narrativize and remould the image of places and the 'self-identifying' of peoples, the power of tourism to ideologically reframe the inheritances of groups and communities, the power of tourism to reify certain events, spaces and personalities as being worth of rich celebration or spectacularization, and the power of tourism to give not just sight-seeking tourists but inheritance-illuminating locals whole new libidinal ideas and energies through which they can transform themselves and/or their-tribal-hoods.

This project thus fits partly within tourism geography's "critical turn," especially through its assumption of the importance of representation and discourse within tourism. Others have suggested that this critical stance needs to be

extended toward the political economic changes and cultural hegemonies asserted within the regional, national, and global tourism industries (for example, Waitt, 1999; Bianchi, 2009; Hollinshead, 2009). Although I sympathize with that position, this article does not directly take up that larger task. Rather it more simply adopts a critical perspective toward the discourse and representation used in *Daegu 2011* promotions to foreigners in order to ask whether these promotions achieved organizers' goals.

3. Daegu in Historical, Economic, and Cultural Context

Located about 60km away from Gyeongju, the capital of the great ancient Silla Kingdom (57 BCE – 935 CE), Daegu has historical importance as regional center in Korea. As Korea's political geography focused on Seoul during the Joseon Dynasty (1392~1897 CE), Daegu developed into the most important administrative and trade center in Korea's southeast. It became the administrative capital of Gyeongsang Province in 1601. When debt to Japan began to loom over Korea during the early twentieth century, and as the prospect of a colonial takeover grew, an anti-colonial debt-repayment movement began in Daegu to try to stave off Japanese power. Daegu nevertheless retained its importance as an administrative center and rapidly modernized during the colonial period (Kim, 2008). During the Korean War, the Nakdong River, just to the west of Daegu was a key line of defense against early communist incursions. Daegu residents remain proud of the fact that their city was never taken, even temporarily. As the war proceeded and eventually cooled under armistice, thousands from more devastated areas migrated to the city for its security and relative economic opportunity. Daegu's population increased by nearly three

times between 1950 and 1970 and then more than doubled again by 1990, rates much higher than the growth rates for South Korea as a whole—which increased by approximately 50 percent during each of these twenty year periods—though a bit less than the average growth rates of Korea's major urban areas during those periods (Nordpil).

The economy was bleak for all of South Korea during the decade after civil war's outbreak. Clear economic improvement came only in the 1960s. Daegu played a major role in the advances. President Park Chung Hee, hailing from the nearby city of Gumi, undertook a regional political strategy. Many of his early export-led industrialization policies gave political and economic preference to Gyeongsang North Province, including to the city of Daegu. Large numbers of advisors and cabinet members originated from that area, and Park understood that his chances of maintaining power increased as the area's key power brokers knew he was watching out for his home region. Industry and other economic activity began to flow into the Yeongnam region (southeastern part of Korea). Highway 1, connecting Daegu with Seoul, was built in 1968. Regional politicians understood their indebtedness to Park's conservative Democratic Republican party, and the region, especially Daegu itself, began to be associated with conservatism (대구·경북역사연구회, 2001). This regional conservatism remains today, although ideology often seems secondary to regional loyalty in its expression (however, on the slowly increasing importance of ideology, see Chang, 2009).

During South Korea's period of export-led industrialization, Daegu industrialized rapidly and was the Samsung chaebol's home turf. It became known particularly as a center of textile production and other light manufacturing during the 1970s and 1980s. For a time, with a

combination of political influence, economic power, and population, it remained a vital city in South Korea's urban hierarchy. It was South Korea's third largest city—smaller than Pusan, but in some ways more influential.

However, by the mid 1990s Daegu was clearly declining, for a number of reasons. The textiles and other light, labor-intensive manufacturing that Daegu's economy depended upon were no longer globally competitive. Seoul's gravity was increasingly felt, as strong out-migration accelerated. Population growth stagnated and then began to decline. The economic power that remained outside of Seoul shifted toward coastal cities and, to a lesser degree, to cities of the Southwest. A couple of urban tragedies during the 1990s further damaged Daegu's reputation. Conservatives lost national power in 1999, and the regionalist largesse that Daegu had depended on for four decades no longer existed. By 2011 Daegu found itself with far and away the lowest gross regional domestic product per capita of all the regional administrative units in Korea, at 60% of the national average, (KOSIS). In the absence of effective substitutes (its knowledge-based industry is below the national average, and its level of foreign direct investment is the lowest of all the country's regional units), it has appeared to be trying to hang on to what is left of its textile and other light manufacturing production, to a significant extent though cheap imported labor (Lee and Park, 2008, 116).

While Daegu's importance domestically has always been acknowledged, its image internationally has never been strong. Especially within international tourism discourses, Daegu struggles to assert its significance. If known at all, Daegu has been recognized as a staging ground to other places, such as the Silla sites in Gyeongju or the traditional, Confucian heritage sites of Andong, as much as for being a place worth visiting in its own right. A 1985 *Lonely Planet*

tourist guidebook (Crowther, 1985, 111), for example, stated that Daegu “is usually just an overnight stop for travellers,” mentioning little beyond that it was a convenient place to stay when visiting the famous temple and monastery of Haeinsa dozens of kilometers away. A bit over a decade later, another guidebook agreed that few tourist attractions drew travelers to the city itself (Nilsen, 1997, 375–377); Daegu served more as a gateway to other places. The entry on Daegu mentioned a few attributes, such as textiles, apples, light industry, basin-induced seasonal temperature extremes, medicinal herbs, administrative role, and political clout. It characterized residents as low-key and hard-working, with Daegu's women receiving special mention as strong-willed and beautiful. But it asserted that very little of more than local significance occurred in Daegu historically. Even today, many of these themes—including that Daegu's tourism value resides strongly in its staging-site function—persist within tourism literature (Frommer's).

Thus Daegu, still Korea's fourth largest city with almost 2.5 million people, attempts to find new relevance in the twenty-first century. Korean cities began significantly utilizing neo-liberal governance strategies only after the 1997 financial crisis. Such strategies included attempts to attract increased global investment through financial and regulatory incentives, as well as strong city promotion/branding. Daegu lagged behind in this movement, only beginning to undertake such strategies in the middle of the first decade of the 2000s. In some senses, Daegu now casts about for an international identity, promoting slogans such as Colorful Daegu, Fashion City, Smart Economy Hub, Beauty City, and Apple City in tourist literature. Daegu has become heavily involved with hosting international festivals, such as the World Body Painting Festival and the annual International Opera

Festival, and hosting international conventions, particularly at its impressive exhibition center.

Perhaps most importantly, the South Korean government in 2009 named Daegu as one of two cities in which new high-technology medical complexes would be built (Korea Times, 2009. 10.08). This investment adds to the city's prior hopes of using medical tourism as the city's growth engine. Significant investment has been poured into that sector, and initial industry growth looks promising. But the development is still preliminary; it remains to be seen whether the efforts will produce the expected results. Medical tourism in Daegu was less than ten percent of total medical tourism in Korea in 2010—6,300 of 82,000 visitors (Daegu Metropolitan City, 2011.06.15), and medical tourism to Korea remained far below its Asian competitors: Thailand 1.5 million, Singapore 720,000, India 730,000 (Yonhap News Agency, 2011.07.29; although the definition of “medical tourist” can vary substantially between countries, Novosans). Here, as in other related efforts to create a new knowledge-based economy, Daegu remains more in envisioning and promotion stages than in establishing “facts on the ground.”

4. *Daegu 2011*: World Athletics Championships

1) Preparations for the Event

Amid these efforts, Daegu also sought to re-image itself as a sports city. Korea's hosting of World Cup soccer in 2002 included building an impressive stadium in the southeastern outskirts of Daegu, and the city has tried to build on this asset ever since. *Daegu 2011*, the International Association of Athletics Federation Championships, has been the pinnacle of this sports-city strategy. Neither Daegu specifically nor South Korea more generally have a reputation

for excellence in athletics (track and field). In a survey of about 240 Daegu residents I conducted at various high-traffic public spaces in spring 2011, athletics was tied for fifth most enjoyable to watch among seven sports (behind soccer, baseball, basketball, and ice skating; tied with tennis, and ahead of golf.) But organizers intended *Daegu 2011* to be the vehicle to place Daegu more firmly on the international map and bring athletics more strongly into the nation's sporting consciousness.

According to *Daegu 2011*'s official website, efforts to attract the IAAF championships originated in 2003 with the city's success in hosting the Summer Universiade Games in 2003. Daegu notified the IAAF in 2004 of its intent to apply for hosting consideration. That same year Daegu Metropolitan City created a government-level bidding committee along with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, the Korea Association of Athletics Federations, the Korean Olympic Committee and other agencies. From 2005 until 2011, Daegu held a Colorful Daegu Pre-Championships Meeting (athletics competition) to increase local interest in athletics. Daegu withdrew its initial bid for the 2009 championships, in large part because it was Europe's “turn” to host, but the successful 2011 bid was announced in 2007. The strength of Daegu's application seems to have been its success in hosting previous international events at the stadium, the mobilization of pledges of citizen support, and the opportunity for the IAAF to strengthen athletics in a country without a strong athletics tradition.

Federal government support under the newly elected conservative government increased in 2007 and 2008 with the passage of the Championship Support Act although, in a relative sense, some analysts regarded the federal support as only lukewarm (대구일보, 2007.04.11; 위드런, 2008.11.30; 매일신문, 2011.09.15). Massive

promotion within Daegu and Korea, including an official 1000-days-until-championships countdown, began in late 2008. I moved to Daegu in early 2009 and immediately noticed publicity at many sites around the city. While clearly aimed at foreign visitors, as advertisements often utilized English as prominently as Korean, the publicity also signaled to Daegu's residents the city's desire to build its international reputation. Publicity increased in the year before the event, inundating the city's landscape; it dominated advertising on every form and at every node of public transportation in Daegu, with a healthy representation in Seoul, as well. Improvement projects likewise ensued. Among others, these efforts included removal of unlicensed vendors from downtown streets; road and bus terminal improvements; mandatory store-front sign upgrades along certain streets, especially the marathon route; construction of a new "athletes village;" a massive tree-planting campaign that was linked to Daegu's already-existing sustainability initiatives; and the downtown distribution of cards with behavior advice for representing Daegu well.

The metropolitan city government led the preparations; Daegu's current and former mayors were Local Organizing Committee co-presidents. The committee very clearly desired *Daegu 2011* to improve the city's international reputation. It anticipated that 1,000 foreign tourists (not counting athletes, coaches, and others officially part of the event) would stay in the city each day of championships (email interviews with Organizing Committee workers, October 2010). While that number pales in comparison to the 65,000-seat Daegu Stadium, the more central aim was that the publicity, broadcast across the world, would bolster Daegu's global reputation. One committee worker I interviewed hoped *Daegu 2011* would be the city's "first step" in introducing itself as an international city, allowing it to "join the ranks of advanced countries by

hosting this world event." Another committee worker emphasized Daegu's need for globalization. A good model, the worker argued, was Nagoya, Japan, which after a period of decline within the Japanese urban hierarchy "sprang out of the doldrums" through development of areas adjacent to subways and has shifted from a "hick town" to the "City of Adolescence." Thus, organizers further hoped, by getting its name known internationally Daegu would attract additional investment. The event was expected to provide many benefits to the city and region (이춘근, 2007).

Local residents had similar hopes. My pre-event survey (see above) indicated that far more local residents had positive than negative attitudes toward *Daegu 2011*. They held relatively high hopes that the event would strengthen Daegu's image. When asked to identify the benefits they expected, the most common answers were improving Daegu's image within Korea and the world, and fostering local economic development. Many quite specifically hoped for an updated city image beyond textiles and apples.

2) Analysis of Image Shaping

When *Daegu 2011* came, Daegu was ready. The event ran smoothly (부평신문, 2011.11.02). While the stadium was not always filled, strong attendance marked the games; more than 450,000 tickets were sold to the 14 sessions that took place over nine days. Foreigners bought approximately 29,000 tickets (communication with *Daegu 2011* Organizing Committee, 23 November 2012; see also Korea Herald, 2011. 09.05). Daegu proved a capable host with abundant services, including cultural events and tours, easily available for foreigners. The strong handling of the championships themselves presented Daegu with a fairly uncluttered image space to shape its international reputation. (Some Seoul-

based media highlighted minor problems and downplayed the event as a local rather than international event [오마이뉴스, 2011.09.04; 부평신문, 2011.11.02], but those conclusions seem to be more the result of regional rivalry than measured analysis.)

To what extent did this image shaping succeed? This article attempts at least a partial answer. We must first examine key sites where that image building took place along with major arguments used. I explored as many sites as I could through research, but focus here on two types: advertising and other literature oriented toward foreign tourists before and during the championships, and the championships themselves. This final major section of the paper critically explores material oriented toward foreign tourists (or non-tourist observers) in two subsections before turning in a third subsection to a more direct assessment of *Daegu 2011*'s possible impacts. The first subsection provides a close examination of a single promotional item, while the second offers broader analysis of multiple image-making efforts (for similar analytic approaches, but with somewhat differing methodologies, see Zhang and Zhao, 2009; De Jager, 2010; Hunter, 2012).

(1) Close Discourse Analysis of a Key Promotional Video

A promotional video on the *Daegu 2011* English-language website (*Daegu 2011*), merits thorough examination. The close attention given to this relatively short video does not mean that it was the only important promotion. Nevertheless this video was a particularly prominent invitation to the Championships for foreign visitors. Its high production quality, compared to most other promotions, indicates that organizers intended it as a centerpiece of promotional efforts. It likely represents the most carefully thought-through introduction to Daegu for foreign visitors. The

method of critical discourse analysis broadly conceived (Fairclough, 1995), suggests that such paradigmatic “texts” can particularly help identify and highlight key elements within cultural discourses. Thus this video receives special attention for the insight it sheds on organizers' promotional intentions, as well as because it effectively distills many of the key attributes and issues raised by *Daegu 2011* promotions more broadly. I analyze it in detail here before addressing other promotional sites more generally. I use the tools of critical discourse analysis to elucidate the large cultural conversations and questions the video addresses.

This nearly four-and-a-half-minute video utilizes no words aurally, other than a song, “Beautiful Country” (아름다운 나라), sung in Korean. While some modest labeling (in English) of key points and themes occurs, a fast-paced movement from image to image dominates the video and builds excitement and anticipation, and blends effectively with the calm confidence of the song. The video clearly has multiple goals, including representing both Korea and Daegu favorably, showing pride in the sports history of Korea and Daegu and demonstrating their capacity to host the Championships, as well as generating excitement for the event's upcoming athletic performances. A stimulating and compelling promotion, there can be little doubt that the video worked positively toward these objectives. I analyze it closely here in order to specify more carefully the type of image projected for Daegu and ask what the building of that image may tell us about Daegu's global aspirations and insecurities.

One important feature of the video is the way in which it effectively conflates Daegu with Korea. Close observation reveals that Daegu is distinctly shown at key points of the video, set off from other images of Korea. But most in the foreign audience unfamiliar with Korea would

have virtually no way of knowing, in the rapid-fire of images, which scenes come from Daegu and which do not. In fact, the casual observer would have little way of identifying the detail of most of the scenes, given the speed at which they replace one another. Even though a loose narrative can probably be casually detected, the video seems much more intent on conveying mood than narrative or exposition. Perhaps the only places that a potential visitor might discern Daegu from the rest of Korea are in the various and frequently recurring shots of Daegu Stadium (though it is never named or labeled) and in the opening visual highlighting of Daegu's role as 2011 host city.

That opening shot begins with satellite-type view of northern Europe. A ray of light streams out from Berlin, site of the immediately previous (2009) IAAF Championships, and is quickly joined by other rays of light from around the world, which, as the globe rotates, all converge on Daegu. These variously colored rays of light then morph into the brightly colored curves of the *Daegu 2011* logo. In addition to establishing a direct connection for Daegu with IAAF history, this scene asserts for the city a status it wished to pursue through the Championships as a world-class destination, a city of significance on the global scale.

After this introduction, Korean tradition is the video's first major theme. A gate slowly opens onto a pavilion at Gyeongju's Bulguksa, the region's most famous Buddhist temple. This is followed by a short clip of female dancers, wearing traditional *hanbok* dresses, dancing near a traditional pond. Shots of Gyeongju's most prominent heritage sites and these female dancers continue for about 15 seconds, visually establishing a sense of deep history for Korea. (Although males also appear in connection with Korean tradition, it is noteworthy in a society known for a strongly patriarchal heritage, that women

play a stronger role as the face of Korean heritage in this video. Arguably, men similarly are the somewhat stronger, though not exclusive, face of Korean modernity in this video.) Such scenes occasionally punctuate the video thereafter, sometimes quite briefly, sometimes for a few seconds at a time, reminding the viewer of Korea's rich cultural tradition.

The choice of Gyeongju as the setting for such images is curious (though, again, very few foreign observers would know where these images come from within Korea). Why not film in Seoul, for example? Seoul could match or exceed Gyeongju in the splendor of its historical sites, but is 300 km away from Daegu. It may also be that the video's makers mostly avoided Seoul in resistance to the potential connotation of Daegu as simply an adjunct to the larger city. But more to the point, why not use Daegu to represent "traditional Korea"? Why rely on Gyeongju instead? Daegu's more immediate environs could have sufficiently communicated "traditional Korea" to an international audience. Perhaps the choice expresses an assertion of Daegu's provincial/regional dominance, an attempt to claim for Daegu some ownership of or at least connection with Gyeongju's world-class heritage. Perhaps the choice betrays a lack of confidence in Daegu's own cultural heritage as internationally relevant. Or perhaps, more simply, the videomakers sought for the most iconically resonant images possible nearby (even though the icons would not have been known to most viewers). In any case, the choice asserts an unstated regionalization of how Daegu wishes to be seen.

After establishing the theme of deep tradition, the video takes ten seconds or so emphasizing high-tech modernity. Brief shots of the Incheon International Airport, the KTX (Korea's bullet train), and a busy freeway interchange both point to the ease of travel within Korea and

establish for the video a sense of rapid movement. Images of English-language blackboard scribbles from a science classroom and of a high-technology, robot-dependent factory environment assert Korea's forward-looking credentials. None of the pictures are yet clearly identifiable with Daegu. Short (less than one-second), interspersed shots of the traditional female dancers serve as a thread tying traditional to modern Korea. A screen caption reading "Korea: Land of the Morning Calm" also bridges the second half of the heritage section with the first half of this high technology segment.

In the brief transition to the video's next major theme, images of traditionally clad male drummers mix with scenes of the female dancers. One shot of the drummers takes place on the grounds outside Daegu Stadium, marking the first clear appearance of the Daegu landscape itself in the video. Following this transition, the video uses half a minute to highlight Korean sporting, especially athletics, history. (Although, as another reminder, with very little to identify the spotlighted athletes as Korean—and with no accompanying names or labels—the video gives most viewers only thin hints that they are seeing a history of Korean sports). Korea's greatest successes in athletics reside in a single event, the men's marathon. The video first features Sohn Kee-chung's victory in the 1936 Berlin Olympics, a victory made especially poignant since he was compelled to race under the Japanese flag as a colonial subject. Hwang Young-cho's 1992 Olympic win in Barcelona comes next, as he outduels Japan's Koichi Morishita for the victory. Lee Bong-ju's 2001 Boston Marathon victory follows. Then after scenes highlighting Korea's hosting of world sporting events (1988 Seoul Olympics, 2002 World Cup, 2003 Universiade Games in Daegu), the video shows two prominent recent Olympic champions in non-track-and-field sports: swimming's Park Tae-hwan and

figure skating's Kim Yuna.

Soon thereafter the video's most narrativizing captions appear: "27 March 2007" followed by "Daegu was selected as the Host City of the 2011 IAAF World Championships in Athletics." Accompanying images include the jubilant Daegu delegation as the hosting announcement was made, a few shots of Daegu Stadium, and the starts of two sprinting races, at least one of which appears to have taken place at a Daegu pre-Championships meet.

Then—almost two minutes into the promotion and interspersed with a bit of transition through the female dancers and continuing scenes of the stadium—images of Daegu beyond the stadium finally appear (though with no overt signal that they represent Daegu). The male drummers, for example, perform with Woobang Tower as a backdrop. This 202-meter high tower is Daegu skyscape's most recognizable structure. As scenes from Daegu proceed, a caption reads, "The 2011 IAAF World Championships in Athletics will transcend all boundaries." This is a second rather direct reflection of organizers' aims through the Championships that Daegu will more fully inhabit the global stage. After the caption fades, scenes of nighttime excitement rush by: happy shoppers, a brightly lit festival, rushing cars, fireworks, tall buildings, etc. All convey the mood of fast-paced, modern life. This message of urban modernity is arguably Daegu's most confident assertion about itself in the video.

Two more aspirational captions appear soon thereafter (accompanied by stadium, race, and opening-ceremony scenes): "Creating a lasting legacy for athletics," and "Mecca of Korean Athletics." Organizers clearly hoped that the *Daegu 2011* event would establish a distinctive reputation for Daegu, especially within Korea and East Asia, as Korea's most important city for athletics and even sports more generally. These scenes and captions were followed by a

2-second shot of what appears to be the runway modeling of opening ceremony uniforms. Seeming a bit out of place among the other images, perhaps this was a nod to Daegu's textile/fashion history. Or maybe it was simply one more way to build anticipation for the start of the competition.

The focus then returns to regional tourism, beginning again with Gyeongju's traditional heritage before featuring the Donghwasan Buddhist temple and Gatbawi Buddha statue in the more strictly Daegu environs. More modern Daegu scenes follow, including of the decade-old and architecturally striking exhibition center (EXCO) and of a couple driving a convertible into a modern semi-covered stretch of roadway. Images of subways, trains, airports, and hotel front desks emphasize the ease of travel awaiting the international visitor.

Throughout the production, the video effectively blends a few major moods: calmness (of Korea's heritage, for example), confidence (in Korea's past and globalized present), comfort (of modern life), and excitement/anticipation. An extended transition to the video's final major theme heightens these moods. Scenes include a European-style opera performed by Korean performers; additional traditional female dancers, though partly now on stage as well as in the landscape; the male drummers, now on Daegu Stadium's track; and sped-up nighttime shots of passing cars. That final major theme is the speed, power, excitement, and joy of athletic performance. Led off by male 100-meter sprinters coming out of the starting blocks during the world-record-setting performance of Usain Bolt in the 2008 Beijing Olympics, the 50-second segment features more than 40 shots of athletes running, jumping, throwing, and exulting, along with the jubilation of coaches and fans. Accompanying this rapid-fire of scenes are occasional appearances of captions: "DREAM," "CHALLENGE," and "PASSION." For three

seconds in the middle of these athletics images the male traditional drummers reappear, a reminder that the championships will be geographically and culturally placed.

The video concludes by tying together the production's various moods. After another shot of Daegu stadium, this time through a thin screen of a waving Korean flag, traditional Korean mask dancers—most iconically related to the city of Andong—briefly perform in an urban setting. A foreign couple, perhaps European, applauds. Several rapid-fire scenes continue to link a traditional to an exciting, welcoming, and globalized modern Korea: a multi-ethnic drum troupe, complete with various exotic costumes, performing on an auditorium stage; smiling Korean schoolchildren with arms outstretched toward the overhead camera; a single male Korean drummer, dressed in modern urban style (tight tank top, jeans, bandana), playing a new and modern, yet simultaneously traditional Asian drum; five female Korean ballet dancers performing at a new-yet-traditional public square; and two male, urban Korean dancers with tank tops and baggy jeans in front of a traditional building. The Championship's motto captions the scenes: "Sprint Together for Tomorrow." The final three video images, captioned by "See you in *Daegu 2011*," come from Daegu stadium: with fireworks, with the traditional female dancers dancing outside the front entrance, and from an oblique overhead angle.

The video thus invites viewers to a place of deep history and vibrant, global culture. The calm confidence and exciting nature of the world's top performers in athletics will, it is implied, mirror the qualities of the host country, region, and city (for comparison, see Waitt, 1999). Daegu presents itself as globally significant and competent. Yet this image emerges at least partly through misdirection, or at least conflation. The video never explicitly identifies characteristics of

Daegu as a city/place. Aside from the many scenes of/at Daegu Stadium, the ordinary non-Korean viewer would have no means to identify which images refer to the host city itself. Indeed, such a viewer would likely not even suspect that many of the images, especially those representing a traditional Korea, come from elsewhere. While the video strongly implies that within Daegu all of the best features of Korea are to be found, features appropriate for a global-class city, it does so by erasing Daegu's specificity and obscuring Daegu's insecurities.

(2) The Discourses of Broader Promotions

Another view of these insecurities, as well as of Daegu's aspirations, emerges from additional *Daegu 2011* promotional materials. This section analyzes, a small but representative subset of those materials. Partly similar to the video analyzed above and partly different, these materials present Daegu as a place where Korean traditional culture fits comfortably with vibrant, forward-looking economic leadership. I visited, for example, the Daegu Sports Museum on the Daegu Stadium grounds in early October 2010, 11 months prior to *Daegu 2011*. Amongst wall panels on the sporting history of Daegu and the timeline of the *Daegu 2011* bid were several describing Daegu. Clearly designed for a Korean audience, as most writing was in Korean, the major headlines in the section "Goals of the City" also appeared in English :

- "Daegu: a great place to do business"
- "Daegu: a city that cares for its people"
- "Daegu: a city with an open, honest government"
- "Daegu: environmentally friendly for a better quality of life"
- "Daegu: alive with culture for everyone"

Though containing admirable sentiments, these

aspirational slogans could, of course, have been written for almost any city. For the international visitor unfamiliar with Korean, the display provided nothing distinctive or memorable about Daegu, nor did it convey the sense that concrete characteristics stood behind the city's hopes.

Daegu 2011 received similarly strong emphasis at the Daegu Airport's Tourist Information Center (September 2010 visit). Here English and Korean more equally shared promotional space. The most prominent display highlighting Daegu itself was much more concrete than the Sports Museum's exhibit. It emphasized six themes—tourist attractions, shopping, food, exhibitions, festivals, and sports—picturing and naming three examples of each. Daegu's "traditional" elements, such as the Herb Medicine Market Street, joined more modern features, such as Daegu's International Optical Show and its International Fashion Fair.

The *Daegu 2011* English-language website likewise devoted a section to Daegu and its history. Under the heading of the city's "Colorful Daegu" slogan, the site emphasized transportation links, livability (high resident satisfaction, "green" orientation, physical location amid rivers and mountains) and historical leadership in Korea (Gyeongsang Province capital, Debt Repayment movement, 1970s~1980s industrial growth through textiles). Another section titled, "Daegu, the Hub of Korea's Industrial Growth" noted textile, machinery, fashion, and design industries; pointed to the city's convention center; and (rather generously) called Daegu a "central management point" for the vibrant industry of such surrounding cities as Gumi, Ulsan, Pohang, Changwon-Masan, and Daejeon. Elsewhere on the site, a description of the *Daegu 2011* logo included references to the city's "passion and vision," its "ideals of peace and harmony amid the colourful festivities," as well as its eco-friendliness. The logo, representing the harmony between East and West, "truly represents the

essence of Daegu.” The logo explanation added that “through the dynamic image of the city brand ‘Colorful Daegu,’ the LOC [Local Organizing Committee] tries to create a sporting festival where global values and cultures mingle with the energetic Daegu, a city of vibrancy and harmony.”

Befitting an event of unusual magnitude, many promotions clearly were created to be read or observed in the context of *Daegu 2011*. In other words, they differed somewhat from tourist advice provided in non-*Daegu 2011* contexts by Daegu's tourism agency. However, an IAAF World Championship bulletin (Bulletin, 2011) in part followed the more usual fare quite closely, listing officially-established bus and walking tours within Daegu, and pointing to attractions in neighboring cities (pp.52-55). Within this section, and with an odd non sequitur, “Daegu, the Global Village” headed a description of the new *Daegu 2011*-decorated double-decker tour buses (p.52). The bulletin also emphasized the city's transportation accessibility; ecological friendliness; high-technology in communication, science, and medicine; and hosting of sporting and convention events. Key summarizing phrases included (pp.50-51) :

- “The blending of Daegu's reverberating history, culture and art allows one to experience an Oriental sophistication unlike any other city.”
- [The new science/technology institute] “will elevate Daegu as a metropolitan, cutting-edge city.”
- “Daegu's transformation from a famous textile industry in Korea to an internationally-acclaimed city will take off with the hosting of the IAAF World Championships *Daegu 2011*.”

While the *Daegu 2011* website promotional video that I analyze above made no explicit

attempt to identify Daegu's uniqueness, a second video from the site took up that task. (A well produced promotional video blending many of the themes from the two already mentioned *Daegu 2011* website promotional videos was also available on the Daegu Metropolitan City website.) Entitled “Daegu, City of Innovation,” it emphasized happiness (high satisfaction rankings within Korea as a livable city, for example), environmental friendliness, and the role the city expects to play in the global knowledge economy. It labeled Daegu a “Free city of the global knowledge economy,” based on the 2008 creation of the Daegu-Gyeongbuk Free Economic Zone, and highlighted the forthcoming creation of the Science and Industrial Park, a park expected to drive regional development. Thus it characterized Daegu as a city “drawing a beautiful tomorrow.” The video ended with a curious slogan: “Daegu, a part of the world.” The fact that videomakers deemed the phrase necessary to mention at all and especially to stress, seems once again to reveal a lack of confidence in Daegu's role within global society.

These examples suggest that the city utilized a whole variety of images and slogans, more of a “shotgun” approach than a carefully targeted strategy. An advertisement from an American tour company specializing in track and field tours likewise illustrates the trend (Ludus Tours). After describing city size and location, it suggested, undoubtedly drawing from the city's own promotional literature, that Daegu “is making efforts to be the center of fashion and high-tech industries.” It added, “Due to its status as a cultural center, there are many nicknames for the city including, ‘Apple City’, ‘Beauty City’, ‘Textile City’, ‘Fashion City’ and also ‘Gotham Daegu’” (foreigners likely sense little of the dark humor and even shame that Daegu residents associate with the latter label).

Similarly, a 2011 Daegu Medical Tourism

promotional video added (Daegu Medical Tour) :

- “The happiest medical city in the world”
- “Health city Daegu”
- “Beauty in Daegu” (emphasizing Daegu's reputation for beautiful women and the plastic surgery industry that helps others obtain their looks)
- “Enjoy City Daegu”
- “Colorful Daegu”
- “MediCity Daegu”
- The home of Asia's largest opera festival

Although it does not appear to be directly connected with *Daegu 2011*, this video mentioned Daegu's hosting of the IAAF championships. And it ended with an image similar to those in the athletics promotions: “A city with a different type of charm, and the world's best medical services, Medical City Daegu represents Korea, not only for Koreans alone, but for the rest of the world as well.” With these and other promotional materials (for example, 4,000 English-language pamphlets, highlighting many of the themes already mentioned, were to be distributed at various tourist locations during *Daegu 2011*; Cyber Tour), messages about Daegu were readily available to foreign tourists.

The opening and closing ceremonies of *Daegu 2011* reinforced these high, somewhat vague, and multitudinous aspirations. The ceremonies featured traditional songs and dances along with K-pop performances, accentuating the blending of the traditional and globalized modern. An opening ceremony video emphasized the slogans: “Beautiful city,” “Dynamic city,” “Exciting city,” and “Colorful Daegu.” Later in the ceremony, Mayor Kim Bum-il spoke of how Daegu was working diligently to become an important city in the global knowledge economy. In the closing ceremony he expressed hope that the event made Daegu a more globalized city. And, as mentioned already, huge signs in the stadium

advertising for MediCity Daegu and Colorful Daegu added to the effect.

These messages to foreigners differed somewhat from publicity oriented toward the domestic audience. Significant overlap existed in themes, slogans, and images, of course. But domestic publicity needed neither to introduce Daegu itself nor create a role for it as representative of Korean culture. Such publicity also put less emphasis on a new economic identity for the city. *Daegu 2011*'s key Korean promotional video, for example, relied on images of youthful trendiness by showing stylish young women finding fun in Daegu (shopping, at resorts, and playfully experimenting with athletics events). More generally, the domestic promotions more strongly stressed the notion of Daegu as Korea's leading sports city. Thus organizers and publicists clearly held different objectives for different audiences. The publicity for the foreign audience was especially designed to augment Daegu's place in global business and global tourism. Yet the variety of images, claims, and slogans—as well as the fact that these quite manifestly often reflected aspirations of the city as much as current characteristics—make it difficult to believe that foreign visitors took a clear, coherent message about Daegu home with them.

(3) Interpreting the Promotional Discourses through Survey and Phenomenological Evidence

We can now return to the concepts introduced earlier in the paper in asking about Daegu using *Daegu 2011* to bolster its global image. How effective were the naming strategies described above, not only in the initial territorialization phase but also in preparing for de-territorialization and possible re-territorialization stages? I evaluate three types of evidence: evidence from foreign visitors at *Daegu 2011*, phenomenological

evidence that comes from my own attempts to experience *Daegu 2011* as an international tourist might have, and evidence drawn from analysis of the promotional materials described above. My answers are, by necessity, not scientific in the sense of stemming from statistical significant quantitative results. I do not have access a properly scientific sampling of visitors. In addition, not all elements of the question are amenable to “objective” analysis. Thus, while I attempt to appropriately draw from the evidence available, the answers I present are more interpretive, suggestive of important issues and processes as well as inducements to further discussion.

I spent significant time observing and surveying visitors at Daegu Stadium and at the marathon site during *Daegu 2011*. Some characteristics quickly became clear. First, even if the IAAF Championship is the world’s third most important athletic event after the Olympics and the World Cup, *Daegu 2011* attracted a narrow range and limited number of foreign visitors. While 29,000 tickets went to non-Koreans, large numbers of foreigners at the event were credentialed or otherwise operating with priorities above being fans. In comparison to Koreans, who comprised the vast majority of the fans, foreign visitors were much less frequently there to enjoy the atmosphere. Many were athletes; national and sub-national level coaches and athletics officials, media, agents; and IAAF officials and staff. A British sports agent confirmed my suspicion: most such people, even if impressed by how smoothly the Championships ran, had little time or inclination to consider Daegu as a place. Relatively few foreigners were “true sports tourists,” motivated by fan interest in athletics; most came with responsibilities. I have no statistics, but it seems likely that the number of foreigners who came more strictly as fans was not more than the thousand the

organizing committee hoped for. Even among these foreign fans, a significant percentage—half or more, I estimate—were foreigners already living in Korea. Many already had experience with Daegu and/or came the city only for the championships without spending a night. Thus only a relatively small number of true foreign visitors—perhaps around 500—had the kind of time and experiences that allowed them to freshly consider and assess Daegu as a place beyond being the site of an athletics event. Some of the approximately 4,000 foreigners expected on “business” (Trade Daegu, 2011.07) may have also found the opportunity for a somewhat thinner experience of Daegu beyond the athletics. (Of course many times more people—those who considered coming, or those following the event through mass media—likely heard elements of the promotional messages.) The group of true foreign tourists was small enough that I began recognizing many of the same foreigners over the course of the championships. I ended up interviewing 37 people from 19 different countries, by no means a scientific sample but enough to reveal key trends, I believe. Though I specifically tried to target fans, perhaps 15–25 percent of the foreigners I interviewed were not fans, but people attending on business.

A second characteristic of these foreign visitors was that their knowledge about Daegu was not high. More than 60 percent were not first-time visitors to Korea, yet only about 35 percent of interviewees had heard of Daegu before hearing about the championships (or before coming to Korea to live). A fair number who had heard about Daegu were people whose positions/jobs put them in the international sports travel circuit. Finally, most interviewees enjoyed their visits. Seventy-six percent told me they would recommend Daegu as a place worth visiting. There were very few complaints about the city itself, other than about relative lack of

English and the heat; many who said they would not recommend Daegu were interviewed on a particularly warm afternoon.

Recognizing that the size of the audience was limited, it still seems reasonable to argue that with the lack of knowledge foreigners had prior to their visits as well as their fairly high satisfaction with the visits, *Daegu 2011* offered Daegu a strong opportunity create a globally relevant image for itself. Yet, I suspect, it probably had only modest success. In comparison with its expectations, Daegu faces significant challenges to capitalize on its hosting of this athletic event as it moves into de-territorialization and possible re-territorialization phases. I base this conclusion on the foreign interviewees' responses to questions about Daegu, combined with the already described overload of images Daegu gave of itself with little concrete backing. I discuss these in reverse order.

As noted above, promotion of Daegu took a "shotgun" rather than focused approach. It perhaps did so by necessity as the city seems to lack a single image or dominant set of images (for a similar challenge in a different tourism context, see Hashimoto and Telfer, 2006). "Textile city" might make the most historical sense, yet cheap, low-wage textiles neither draw international tourists nor drive future economic vibrancy in a G-20 country. Daegu's small machinery-based manufacturing faces similar problems. The city's dilemma was that possible successors to its economic heritage, while in envisioning and planning stages, were not solidly part of the 2011 landscape. The city bus tours mentioned in the IAAF bulletin, for example, did not stop at the high technology science and medical facilities, the centerpieces of Daegu's hoped-for future growth. Few concrete signs within the landscape spoke of a future knowledge economy. Even Daegu's image as a sports city-promoted more at the national than international

scale—was embodied almost entirely in Daegu Stadium. Beyond the stadium itself, little suggested excellence in sports to visitors.

Daegu's promotion of a "green" image was likely more persuasive in actual landscape. With no prompting beyond the question of what they will remember about Daegu, a few visitors I interviewed spoke of their positive impression of the city's cleanliness, picturesque setting, and general orderliness. The beautiful green mountains encircling Daegu create a basin that often traps pollutants and obscures the views of those mountains. But whether due to weather patterns or a concerted effort to reduce industrial pollution, air quality was remarkably clean over the nine-day championships. I cannot recall another week-long period during my four years in Korea with as striking views of the mountains as I experienced during *Daegu 2011*. Thus, I suspect, Daegu's "green" image-making efforts likely succeeded. Nevertheless my sense from the interviews is that visitors from highly developed countries were probably more simply pleased with Daegu's beauty than enthralled to the extent that it becomes an image powerful enough to drive future tourism.

Daegu doubtless also had some success in presenting itself as a place of Korean culture. Numerous cultural elements involved in *Daegu 2011*'s staging suggested the grace, beauty, historical depth, and modern bona fides of Korean culture. Yet Daegu promotions particularly manifested the shotgun approach with regard to culture. Simply put, Daegu did not exemplify cultural significance in one or a few leading sites. No single cultural theme rose above others, either in promotions or the landscape itself. Confucianism, Buddhism, anti-colonial movements, oriental medicine, traditional markets, historical museums, opera, historical heroes, fashion, food, international exhibitions, festivals, modern shopping, and many other cultural elements all

vied for attention, but none grabbed the spotlight. Thus, we can argue, Daegu, as represented through *Daegu 2011*, stood out within Korea neither in traditional nor modern cultural offerings. None of the attractions seemed particularly “world-class.” The city’s most pervasive branding effort, “Colorful Daegu,” attempts to bring these various elements together under a single memorable label and erase the previous global-scale ignorance and apathy toward the city (on tourism marketing of places with few positive images, see Avraham and Ketter, 2011). But lacking clear referents to particularly iconic elements within the tourism landscape, it is questionable whether this label signals much more to foreign tourists than vague aspirations. Differentiation from other areas allows exposure to translate into tourist interest (Green, Costa, and Fitzgerald, 2008). Such cultural differentiation was mostly absent from foreign visitors’ exposure to Daegu. Nothing in particular put Daegu on the global cultural tourism map.

Thus when I asked foreign visitors about the main image of Daegu they would remember, or the basis of recommending Daegu as a place worth visiting, the overwhelmingly leading answer was friendliness and hospitality. They were impressed by their hosts as Koreans, indeed as people more generally. But no attraction, feature, or tangible theme beyond the athletic event grabbed visitors’ attention. Natural beauty and cleanliness was closest. I found very little evidence that visitors left with the sense that Daegu was an important global city, either for tourism or for business/economy (for a similar analysis on mismatch between tourism promotion and tourist perception, see Zhang and Zhao, 2009).

Of course achieving an image of friendly and capable hospitality, or even merely greater name recognition, must not be minimized. With relatively few foreigners outside of East Asia

having had any knowledge of Daegu, the event’s success clearly makes Daegu more visible across the world (even among people who only watched or heard about the event and never came to Korea). Even if identifying “must-see” attractions or global significance was difficult, the event showed Daegu to be competent and hospitable, a place worth visiting if opportunity arises. The number of people who caught glimpses of these messages or merely vaguely associate Daegu with an important sporting event may be limited—the world athletics championships are much less noticed than the Olympics—but is not insignificant. Quite the contrary: more than 200 countries/territories received the television broadcast (IAAF General News, 2011). IAAF General Secretary Essar Gabriel has stated that around 5 billion television viewers tuned into *Daegu 2011* events (Sports Business, 2012). Even though that figure includes multiple viewings by fewer individuals; even if the figure is exaggerated, which I suspect; and even if many viewers paid little attention to the championship’s host city (Sealy and Wickens, 2008), the number of people exposed through *Daegu 2011* to some aspect of Daegu is still staggering. It may be that Daegu’s greatest success came in 2007 with the hosting decision, since that decision essentially guaranteed massive, if quite thin, exposure. Subsequent promotion—with perhaps exceptions of opening/closing ceremonies—may thus have produced only quite marginal impacts in terms of number of people reached. Nevertheless those subsequent promotions’ thicker images do matter. As images diffuse they potentially turn knowledge of Daegu internationally into decisions to visit/do business there.

Daegu faces challenges in moving global-image achievements from territorialization into de-territorialization and possible re-territorialization phases. For one thing, it will likely not recapture the global sports spotlight. The city already

hosted two of the top three global sporting events in less than a decade. Its stadium may remain a key site for regional sporting events, but is unlikely do so for top global events, at least for many years. World-class sports hosting is just too competitive these days (Roche, 2000; Shoval, 2002). Daegu wants to become a “Mecca of Asian athletics” (Korea Herald, 2010.11.11). An Athletics Promotion Center, featuring training and indoor competition facilities (Trade Daegu, 2010.03; 스포츠조선, 2011.05.12), was completed more than a year after *Daegu 2011*. But with little prior reputation or infrastructure beyond event hosting and stadium facilities, and little sense of historical/cultural depth for athletics (see Hinch, 2006), Daegu’s movement into this role is hardly assured. Attempts to build on *Daegu 2011* to integrate Daegu globally will likely thus also play out significantly within other sectors.

Daegu is currently attempting to maintain as much global attention as possible and retain the image it fostered during *Daegu 2011* as globally competent and environmentally conscious. The 2013 World Energy Congress offers the next large opportunity, with Daegu adding its name to the list of recent hosts alongside such cities as Montreal, Rome, Sydney, Buenos Aires, Houston, and Tokyo (on tourism strategies of event hosting and association with more prestigious places, see Avraham and Ketter, 2013). Using *Daegu 2011* to bolster the city’s re-invention as a knowledge-centered economy may be a more difficult task. Competence in event hosting does not easily transfer to the creation of urban economic engines. Daegu began promoting itself as a medical city in late 2008 and early 2009 and was awarded the country’s High-Tech Medical Cluster Project in August 2009, about two years before *Daegu 2011*. Promotions for *Daegu 2011* only slowly linked up with the MediCity Daegu label. But ties grew over time,

culminating in the large banners displayed at the stadium throughout the championships. While both projects aim to increase international tourism, and while the city’s increased name recognition through *Daegu 2011* cannot hurt MediCity Daegu, one wonders whether sports and medical tourism complement each other as tourism projects. In other words, do the subcultures that attracted people to *Daegu 2011* overlap much with the subcultures of those who travel for medical tourism (see Smith, 2005; on marketing sporting events through subcultural identity, see Green, 2008)? I have my doubts. According to Lim In-taek, the Korean Health Ministry’s head of the Bureau of Health Industry, the most targeted origins for medical tourists are Russia, Mongolia, Hong Kong, and Vietnam (Christian Science Monitor, 2011.03.23). Among these, only Russia has a strong athletics tradition. MediCity Daegu may need to create its own international audience.

5. Conclusion: Successes and Limits of Raising Daegu's Global Profile

Economic geography teaches that the paths to regional development within neo-liberal, developed economies are complex combinations of governmental support, relative location, regional expertise, and a culture/society supportive of effective network building (Hudson, 2004, 2005; Best and Xie, 2006; Flew, 2010). These characteristics—along with Daegu’s history of recent stagnation, relative global anonymity, and reliance on regionally-oriented federal largesse—remind us that Daegu’s growth will not come easily. Cultural images matter to development efforts. Organizers hoped *Daegu 2011* would place Daegu more strongly “on the map” as a city of global significance. The sheer exposure through *Daegu 2011* of hundreds of millions of people around the world to the city’s name surely aids its

cause. This article suggests, however, that Daegu likely did not fully create the confident and distinctive image that drives international tourism and contributes to inclusion in knowledge-based industrial circuits. Insecurity and uncertainty about Daegu's image marked promotions toward international visitors. Interviewed visitors had a difficult time creating memories of Daegu beyond as a friendly host for the championships. Translating the gains in global awareness of and attention toward Daegu to sectors outside of athletics may prove challenging (on such challenges, see Sealy and Wickens, 2008).

I have tried to use the evidence as carefully as possible in reaching these conclusions. Nevertheless, it is worth a reminder that this article comes from a particular (non-Korean) perspective, covers only part of the larger issue of Daegu's place image, and is meant to provide interpretation more than definitive answers. For example, language constraints meant that most of the research utilized English-language sources. Research also focused more on the likely reception of place-focused discourses rather than their production. And large-sample-size scientific surveys to test the hypotheses were not available. Analyses utilizing additional perspectives and methods would surely add nuance to the conclusions presented here.

Still, I believe that it is important to recognize that while *Daegu 2011* was not a failure, it may not vault Daegu into global prominence as hoped. It likely did not give the city a strong and coherent global tourism image. The sobering reminder that much work remains if Daegu is to turn the successful hosting of a major international athletic event into productive re-territorialization strategies is useful. To date, nearly two years after *Daegu 2011*, there is reason to worry that de-territorialization shows few signs of transforming into successful re-territorialization. To be sure, the city continues to host an annual

national-level athletics meet. But I see little evidence that Daegu citizens are more strongly incorporating athletics into their cultural identity. And while the city continues to host global conferences, the yearned-for high technology growth and global reputation exist still more as vision than reality. But building on *Daegu 2011* will be slow and challenging work, remaining still very much in the phase of strengthening name recognition.

Nevertheless potential remains, if used carefully within a larger territorial strategy, for the event to contribute to a turnaround in Daegu's fortunes. As one example, with the international following of athletics strongest among Europeans, initiatives to promote investment, sister-city ties, and tourism from Europe should be emphasized. The creation of stronger ties within Daegu between athletics hosting and a more general sporting (particularly natural resource-based recreation) ethos could form a key element of the process. The region's strong enthusiasm for hiking and recent development of river trails, for example, may appeal to the type of international travelers who learned of the city through *Daegu 2011*. Along with continuing and strengthening the city's emphasis on opera and medicine, this focus could help create a growing European connection and consolidate the city's brand around an upper/upper-middle class tourism culture that mediates between East and West. This is a brand that, if successfully nurtured, could contribute to steady income generation and a growing global awareness for Daegu.

References

- 대구·경북역사연구회, 2001, 역사속의 대구 대구 사람들, 중심, 서울.
- 이춘근, 2007, 대구 세계육상선수권대회의 경제적 효과와 발전과제, 스포츠와 법, 10(2), 1-42.
- Avraham, E. and Ketter, E., 2013, Marketing

- destinations with prolonged negative images: towards a theoretical model, *Tourism Geographies*, 15(1), 145–164.
- Bale, J., 2002, *Sports Geography*, Routledge, New York.
- Best, M.H. and Xie H., 2006, Discovering regional competitive advantage: Route 128 vs. Silicon Valley, Paper presented at DRUID Summer Conference, Copenhagen.
- Bianchi, R.V., 2009, The ‘critical turn’ in tourism studies: a radical critique, *Tourism Geographies*, 11(4), 484–504.
- Bulletin, 2011, *IAAF World Championships Daegu 2011*, 3 (April).
- Chang Y.S., 2009, Left and right in South Korean politics, in Chang Y.S., Seok H.H., and Baker, D.L. (eds.), *Korea Confronts Globalization*, Routledge, London, 173–191.
- Crowther, G., 1985, *Korea and Taiwan: A Travel Survival Guide*, Lonely Planet Publications, South Yarra, Australia.
- Dansero, E. and Puttilli, M., 2010, Mega-event tourism legacies: the case of the 2006 Torino Winter Olympic Games – a territorialisation approach, *Leisure Studies*, 29(3), 321–341.
- De Jager, A.E., 2010, How dull is Dullstroom? Exploring the tourism destination image of Dullstroom, *Tourism Geographies*, 12(3), 349–370.
- Fairclough, N., 1995, *Critical Discourse Analysis: Papers in the Critical Study of Language*, Longman, New York.
- Flew, T., 2010, Toward a cultural economic geography of creative industries and urban development: introduction to the special issue on creative industries and urban development, *The Information Society*, 26, 85–91.
- Fredline, E., 2008, Host and guest relations in sport tourism, in Weed, M. (ed.), *Sport & Tourism: A Reader*, Routledge, London, 393–409.
- Gibson, C., 2008, Locating geographies of tourism, *Progress in Human Geography*, 32(3), 407–422.
- Gibson, C., 2009, Geographies of tourism: critical research on capitalism and local livelihoods, *Progress in Human Geography*, 34(4), 527–534.
- Green, B.C., 2008, *Leveraging subculture and identity to promote sports events*, in Weed, M. (ed.), *Sport & Tourism: A Reader*, Routledge, London, 362–376.
- Green, B.C., Costa, C. and Fitzgerald, M., 2008, Marketing the host city: analyzing exposure generated by a sport event, in Weed, M. (ed.), *Sport & Tourism: A Reader*, Routledge, London, 346–361.
- Hashimoto, A. and Telfer, D.J., 2006, Selling Canadian culinary tourism: branding the global and the regional product, *Tourism Geographies* 8(1), 31–55.
- Higham, J. and Hinch, T., 2006, Sport and tourism research: a geographic approach. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 11(1), 31–49.
- Hinch, T.D., 2006, Canadian sport and culture in the tourism marketplace, *Tourism Geographies*, 8(1), 15–30.
- Hollinshead K., 2009, ‘Tourism state’ cultural production: the re-making of Nova Scotia, *Tourism Geographies*, 11(4), 526–545.
- Hollinshead, K., Ateljevic, I. and Ali, N., 2009, Worldmaking agency–worldmaking authority: the sovereign constitutive role of tourism, *Tourism Geographies*, 11(4), 427–443.
- Hudson, R., 2004, Conceptualizing economies and their geographies: spaces, flows and circuits, *Progress in Human Geography*, 28(4), 447–471.
- Hudson, R., 2005, Region and place: devolved regional government and regional economic success?, *Progress in Human Geography*, 29(5), 618–625.
- Hunter, W.C., 2012, Projected destination image: a visual analysis of Seoul, *Tourism Geogra-*

- phies, 14(3), 419-443.
- Kim I.S., 2008, Colonial modernization of the traditional city of Daegu, *Korea Journal*, 48(3), 77-103.
- Lee S.C. and Park S., 2008, Spatial regeneration and beyond: Daegu Korea, in Kidokoro, T., Harata, N., Subanu, L.P., Jessen, J., Motte, A. and Seltzer, E.P. (eds.), *Sustainable City Regions: Space, Place and Governance*, Springer, New York, 101-125.
- Lefebvre, H., 1991, *The Production of Space*, Blackwell, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Neirotti, L.D., 2003, An introduction to sport and adventure tourism, in Hudson, S. (ed.), *Sport and Adventure Tourism*, The Haworth Hospitality Press, New York, 1-26.
- Nilsen, R., 1997, *South Korea Handbook*, 2nd ed., Moon Publications, Chico, California.
- Roche, M., 2000, *Mega-events and Modernity: Olympics and Expos in the Growth of Global Culture*, Routledge, London.
- Sealy, W. and Wickens, E., 2009, The potential impact of mega sport media on the travel decision-making process and destination choice—the case of Portugal and Euro 2004, *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 24(2-3), 127-137.
- Shoval, N., 2002, New phase for the competition for the Olympic gold: the London and New York bids for the 2012 games, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 24(5), 583-599.
- Smith, A., 2005, Conceptualizing city image change: the 're-imaging' of Barcelona, *Tourism Geographies*, 7(4), 398-423.
- Swart, K. and Bob, U., 2007, The eluding link: toward developing a national sport tourism strategy in South Africa beyond 2010, *Politikon*, 34(3), 373-391.
- Waitt, G., 1999, Playing games with Sydney: marketing Sydney for the 2000 Olympics, *Urban Studies*, 37(7), 1055-1077.
- Zhang L. and Zhao, S.X., 2009, City branding and the Olympic effect: a case study of Beijing, *Cities*, 26, 245-254.
- 대구일보, 2007.04.11, "세계육상대회 정부 적극 지원하라", <http://www.idaegu.com>
- 매일신문, 2011.09.15, '명색이 국제대회인데...' 대구 세계육상 정부 무관심 너무해, <http://www.imaail.com>
- 부평신문, 2011.11.02, 2011대구세계육상선수권대회, 도시브랜드 상승·지역민 결집 효과, <http://www.bpnews.kr>
- 스포츠조선, 2011.05.12, 대구, 세계선수권 끝나도 '한국 육상중심지', sports.chosun.com
- 오마이뉴스, 2011.09.04, 서울vs대구, '언론싸움'으로 변진 대구세계육상대회, www.ohmynews.com
- 위드런, 2008.11.30, 대구세계육상 정부 지원, 현실은 '생색내기', <http://www.withrun.com>
- Christian Science Monitor, 2011.03.23, South Korea's boom in medical tourism, <http://www.csmonitor.com>
- Cyber Tour & Culture in Daegu City, <http://global-tour.daegu.go.kr/eng/guide/>
- Daegu 2011, www.daegu2011.org
- Daegu Medical Tour, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kwtIALanTl0>
- Daegu Metropolitan City, 2011.06.15, Daegu, a Korean Mecca in the medical care industry, <http://english.daegu.go.kr/cms/cms.asp?Menu=903&BoardId=12760&Action=view>
- Frommer's, Introduction to Daegu, www.frommers.com/destinations/daegu/4012010001.html
- IAAF General News, 2011.8.26, 2011 IAAF World Championships to be broadcast in over 200 territories worldwide, www.iaaf.org/competitions/iaaf-world-cross-country-championships/news/2011-iaaf-world-championships-to-be-broadcast
- KOSIS, <http://kosis.kr/eng>
- Korea Herald, 2010.11.11, Daegu strives to become Asia's athletics center, <http://www.koreaherald.com>

Korea Herald, 2011.09.05, Daegu inspires athletics in Korea, <http://www.koreaherald.com>

Korea Times, 2009.10.08. Osang, Daegu picked for medical complex project, <http://www.koreatimes.co.kr>

Ludus Tours, http://www.trackandfiledtours.com/daegu2011_about.html

Nordpil, World database of large urban areas, 1950–2050 (2010 update), <http://nordpil.com>

Novosans, <http://novosans.com>

Sports Business, 2012, IAAF's Gabriel rejects talk of sea-change for athletics, <http://www.sportbusiness.com/news/>

Trade Daegu: Daegu Metropolitan City International Trade Magazine, 2011.07, http://www.energyplus.or.kr/mailzine/1107_mailzine/pdf/110701-Trade_Daegu.pdf

Trade Daegu: Daegu Metropolitan City International Trade Magazine, 2010.03, Ground broken to build 'Daegu Athletic Promotion Center,' <http://www.kpi-bcs.com/community/>

web_mail_trade_daegu1/gallery/view.php?page=2&NO=229&src_name=&src_value=

Yonhap News Agency, 2011.07.29, Korea getting a handle on medical tourism industry, <http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr>

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank 김정윤, 권미영, and 진지혜 for research and translation assistance, as well as 김영원 for translation assistance. Many thanks also to the several students who helped conduct the survey of Daegu residents. My understanding of Daegu has been strengthened through discussions with colleagues, especially Professor 전병운, at Kyungpook National University. I greatly appreciate their insight. This research was supported by Kyungpook National University Research Fund, 2010.

(접수: 2013.04.18, 수정: 2013.07.10, 채택: 2013.07.24)