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ABSTRACT

Human consumption of dog meat in South Korea has been a topic of international scrutiny since the 1980s. This paper presents the findings of a research into how Korean and international animal welfare organizations design and implement initiatives that aim to bring an end to the dog meat trade, increase civic engagement and affect social change. Fourteen animal welfare organizations’ strategies and activities were analyzed complemented by qualitative interviews with animal welfare professionals. Results were informed by the school of thought of advocacy, participatory versus diffusion approaches, social change, and civic engagement; elements often found in Communication for Development. Given the complexities inherent in measuring social change, this is largely an explorative study. Furthermore, literature on animal welfare in the field of Communication for Development is scarce; this research attempts to bridge this gap.

This research finds that Korean and international animal welfare organizations have employed a multitude of different strategies and engagement of civil society to mobilize social change and bring an end to the dog meat trade in South Korea. Yet as advocates for a specific cause there are limitations in conducting fully participatory based models. Nevertheless, these efforts contribute to a holistic approach that reaches different stakeholder groups, each with unique needs and motivations, for a greater impact than the sum of each organization’s efforts on its own.
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INTRODUCTION

Dogs for human consumption is a controversial subject. Opinions on whether it is right or wrong to eat dogs are varied. Some believe the right to eat dogs is tied to longstanding cultural norms. Others believe the trade and slaughtering of dogs are inhumane and should be illegal. There are many nuances in between. In parts of Asia, such as China, India, Indonesia, the Philippines, South Korea, and Vietnam, the custom of eating dogs is prevalent; in some countries it dates back centuries.

Whilst the dog meat industry stretches across numerous countries, the dog meat trade in South Korea, henceforth Korea, is the main focus of this research. More specifically, this paper looks at the advocacy work of international and domestic Animal Welfare Organizations (AWO) and their strategies to influence social change in Korea across anti-dog meat supporters, politicians, dog meat enthusiasts and professionals. Korea was selected for this research as it is the only country that actively farms dogs in inhumane conditions (HSI n.d.a). As such, the goal of many active anti-dog meat AWOs is prevention of suffering.

Academic literature on the quest of AWOs to end the dog meat trade in Korea is sparse. There is, however, some research on the history and cultural underpinnings of dog meat consumption, its legality and challenges to the trade, and transnational activism (see further elaborations in the literature review). The research focus of this study are the organizations’ strategic decisions, communication models, and how its efforts attempt to affect social change in key stakeholders to effectively end the dog meat trade in Korea. This thesis is rooted in schools of thought common in Communication for Development (C4D); advocacy, participatory and diffusion approaches, civic engagement, and social change. The limited breadth of research on this topic and the lack of animal welfare issues within the field of C4D makes this an area ripe for further exploration.
BACKGROUND, PURPOSE & RESEARCH QUESTION

There are approximately 30 million dogs slaughtered in Asia each year (HSI n.d. b). In 2014, the International Non-Governmental Organization (INGO) Change for Animals Foundation (CFAF) estimated that 2.5-3 million dogs were slaughtered in Korea alone (CFAF n.d.). Humane Society International (HSI), an INGO for animal welfare, ascertained that 17,000 facilities keep around 2 million dogs in Korea (HSI n.d. a). Author Claire Czajkowski (2014: 32) writes that annually Koreans consume an estimated 100,000 tons of dog meat. Research by Assistant Professor of Global Environmental Governance Rakhyun Kim (2008: 202pp) estimated that Korean consumers ate dog meat 4-5 times a year. That there were 6,484 registered dog meat restaurants (or bosintang) and the Korean government estimated more than 20,000, including those unregistered. The estimated annual value of the dog meat industry is two billion U.S. dollars.

HSI notes that dogs raised for meat are routinely portrayed differently than those raised to be pets. Dogs on meat farms are constantly bred and live in cramped, unclean, and inhospitable conditions. Many dogs suffer from disease, neglect, and malnutrition, and rarely, if ever, see veterinary care (HSI n.d. a). The treatment and slaughtering methods by electrocution, beating, and hanging of dogs are major arguments of AWOs such as HSI (n.d. a), Animal Welfare Institute (AWI n.d.), and Last Chance for Animals (LCA n.d.) seeking to end the trade.

This research tries to better understand what and how international and domestic AWOs advocate to influence social change and end the dog meat trade. As social change is difficult to measure (Wilkins 2018), this research is largely explorative. The AWOs might benefit from this research or look at what they are doing through a different lens. The C4D field who for a long time has been looking at humanitarian issues can broaden its reach and school of thought to the cause of animals.
To bridge the gap between the fields of animal welfare and C4D, I aim to answer the following research questions:

- How do South Korean animal welfare NGOs and INGOs’ strategic decisions to end the dog meat trade in South Korea influence social change in key stakeholders related to the trade?
  - How can advocacy based agendas utilize participatory and/or diffusion based approaches to facilitate social change?

This study investigates 14 transnational and Korean AWOs, their goals, strategies, activities, and accomplishments to affect the outcome of the dog meat trade. It explores how programmatic tools are used to communicate with supporters, to facilitate civic engagement, and to encourage social change. To enhance the understanding of AWO strategies and results thus far, a content analysis of the organizations’ websites was conducted and seven animal welfare professionals were interviewed.

**DISPOSITION**

To contextualize barriers to end the dog meat trade in Korea, this thesis starts by introducing common terminology and conceptual frameworks followed by a literature review that presents both general statistics and complexities around the dog meat trade in Korea. Thereafter theoretical framework and research methodology is introduced. This study includes interviews with both Korean and non-Korean organized animal welfare activists; content analysis of AWOs’ online advocacy presentations; and analysis of findings. The thesis is concluded by conclusion of findings and suggested avenues for further research.
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This thesis is highly anchored in concepts of animal welfare, advocacy, transnational activism, and civic engagement. The AWOs in this study are conducting advocacy communication to various stakeholders as they seek a ban on dog meat. Not only are these concepts relevant in this particular study, but they are also evident in previous academic literature found in the following chapter.

ANIMAL WELFARE

The definition of *animal welfare* is debated by scholars, veterinarians, advocates, and activists. Author David Fraser (1998: 56) writes that there are three main approaches to the definition of *animal welfare*: 1) Biological functioning; animals should be thriving, capable of normal growth, free from injury, malnutrition, and behavioral abnormalities, 2) Feelings; emphasis on quality of life, which requires animals to experience comfort, contentment, and normal pleasures of life, 3) Natural living; animals should be kept in natural environments and able to express their natural behaviors and capabilities. Author Tom Regan (1998: 42) writes that two opposing views have dominated contemporary discussions of non-human animals. Animal welfarists main point is that animals should be treated humanely whereas in the *animal rights* view non-human animals should not be utilized by humans in laboratories, on farms, or in the wild on the principle that it is wrong and should be abolished in practice. For the purposes of this research, all analyzed organizations are referenced as AWOs regardless of how they define themselves.

ADVOCACY

Concepts of advocacy are relevant to this research as many of the organizations mention ‘advocating for’ and ‘advocates for’ throughout their websites, and others have it in their name; Korean Animal Rights Advocates (KARA). Author Karin Gwinn
Wilkins (2014: 57) writes that *advocacy* engages the public in support of a specific cause and John G. McNutt and Katherine Mary Boland (1999: 443) write that advocacy is an important method for the nonprofit sector. Wilkins continues:

> Advocacy focuses our attention on strategic programs that attempt to change policies, through mobilizing direct support as well as shifting indirect normative social support, thus differentiating its approach from social marketing and other communication campaigns focused on individual behavior change. (Wilkins 2014: 57p)

As AWOs aim to engage stakeholders in order to shape public policies that are supportive of the solution and closure of dog meat farms (henceforth *farms*), Wilkins (2014: 60pp) writes that Non Governmental Organizations’ (NGOs) do so with clear communication strategies without any neutrality. Furthermore, the globalization component (as in this case with several US-based NGOs) has a risk to carry traces of neoliberalism where “Western” countries advocate for beliefs and ideologies that may not be shared by people or groups of individuals globally. However, Wilkins highlights that advocacy communication recognizes the fact that different accesses to resources contributes to varying groups being able to dominate public agendas and policies and thus enables the potential to negotiate between different interests. Another use for advocacy communication is to bring awareness to an issue or to encourage charity giving, not necessarily to encourage individual *behavior change*. Moving forward in this paper, behavior change will be called Human Behavior Change (HBC) as to not confuse with behavior change for animals.

Author Elske van de Fliert writes that advocacy communication implies advocating for the rights of a specific group or individual, which in this study will be applied to the group of dog meat dogs. van de Fliert continues by arguing that this form of communication can facilitate dialogue between opposing stakeholders and reinforce collective action (van de Fliert 2014: 134). However, to achieve its goal, most organizations will use more than one form of communication as advocacy communication in and of itself may not be enough and can benefit from
supplemental strategies such as *policy communication, participatory communication,* and *educational communication* (van de Fliert 2014: 134; Wilkins 2014: 58).

**TRANSNATIONAL ACTIVISM**

Whilst *transnational activism* is not a core element in this research it is of relevance as the INGOs with efforts in Korea work across borders. Marc Hooghe (2011: 7p) writes that transnational activism has been strongly used in issues such as sustainable development, peace, and human rights since 1999. Some organizations stress that targets should be aimed at the political decision makers while others focus on promoting lifestyle changes or international corporations (by applying pressure to reconsider support for unethical treatment of labor etc.). However, transnational activism is not without due criticism. It appears that this form of activism is difficult to sustain and is critiqued by inequalities as its participants from industrialized countries historically has more resources for this form of activism than their counterparts from the Global South (Hooghe 2011).

**CIVIC ENGAGEMENT**

When AWOs campaign, they also aim to garner support and engage civil society. In short, *civic engagement* refers to the activities engaged in by civil society, individually or collectively, to improve conditions within a community (Adler & Goggin 2005: 236). Joakim Ekman and Erik Amnå (2012: 288) argue that the term civic engagement has become somewhat of a catch-all concept, which complicates empirical research of the term. In this paper, civic engagement will be used in broad terms defined as “all activity related to personal and societal enhancement which results in improved human connection and human condition. […] experiencing a sense of connection, interrelatedness, and, naturally, commitment towards the greater community (all life forms).” (Diller by Adler & Goggin 2005: 240) Moreover, Adler and Goggin write about 19 “core activities” that serves as indicators for civic engagement which are then divided into three categories; *civic indicators, electoral indicators,* and *indicators of political voice* (Adler & Goggin 2005). These indicators
are used in order to identify different forms of civic engagement actions encouraged by the AWOs in this research. As electoral indicators are not relevant in this research, only two categories are displayed in table-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic indicators</th>
<th>Indicators of political voice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community problem solving</td>
<td>Contacting officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular volunteering for a nonelectoral organization</td>
<td>Contacting the print media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active membership in a group or association</td>
<td>Contacting the broadcast media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in fundraising run/walk/ride</td>
<td>Protesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other fundraising for charity</td>
<td>Email petitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written petitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boycotting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buycotting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canvassing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-1 show the civic indicators and indicators of political voice for civic engagement, electoral indicators have not been included in this table (Adler & Goggin 2005).
THE ‘STORY’ OF DOG MEAT IN SOUTH KOREA

To better understand the climate of the dog meat debate in Korea existing academic literature was reviewed. Whilst Korea is subject to significant international attention resulting from the dog meat trade, animal welfare INGOs had done relatively little on the global arena until the 1980s. With organizations like Humane Society United States, founded in 1954, and its sister organization HSI established in 1991; People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals founded in the 1980s; and United Kingdom (UK)-based World Animal Protection in 1950, the phenomenon of INGOs promoting animal rights is relatively new (Oh & Jackson 2011: 37).

It was not until the 1990s that animal activists in Korea started forming local Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO). In 1991, Korean Animal Protection Society (KAPS) was founded, with the aim to help injured animals. KAPS advocated for the Animal Protection Act (APA) that passed in 1991 and played a key role in anti-dog meat protests (Oh & Jackson 2011: 42). In 2002, a group of activists formed Coexistence of Animal Rights on Earth (CARE) in Korea, which in 2015 registered as a charitable 501(c)3 organization in the United States (US) (CARE n.d.).

THE SOUTH KOREAN DOG MEAT TRADE

The history of dog meat in Korea dates back centuries. To demonstrate what makes dog meat such a controversial topic, this review addresses the history of dog eating, the legalities, classifications of dogs, moral debates, statistics, an insight to the dog meat debate, and INGOs presence throughout.

BRIEF HISTORY OF DOG EATING

Anthony L. Podberscek, a veterinarian with a Ph.d. in animal behavior and human–animal interactions, describes the history of dog meat consumption, specifically in Korea. The first domesticated animal was the dog, occurring around
15,000 years ago in East Asia. Theories of its domestication include to assist in hunting, guarding, for its meat, or that the dog sought human company (Podberscek 2009: 615pp). Anthrozoologist Hal Herzog (2010: 185) cites archeological evidence suggesting that humans have eaten dogs for thousands of years. Dogs have often been fed human leftovers, and slaughtered when protein was scarce.

Dogs for human consumption is not restricted to East and Southeast Asia; records of dog-eating are found in parts of Africa, North and Central America, and the Pacific islands. Evidence of dog-eating was also widespread in Europe during the Neolithic and Bronze Ages (Podberscek 2009: 615pp). According to Podberscek (2009: 615pp) and CFAF (n.d.), dog-eating can presently be found in Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Korea, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. Some reports write that dog meat was still eaten in Switzerland in 1996. Dog-eating was outlawed in the Philippines in 1998 and in Taiwan in 2017, where sale of cat and dog meat was banned in 2011 (Wang 2017).

In Korea, dog-eating originated during the Samguk era (Three Kingdoms, 57 BC to AD 676). However, it did not grow in popularity until the Choson Dynasty (1392-1910). Not only is dog considered food in Korea, as dog meat has historically been used as medicine (Podberscek 2009: 619p). The promotion of some dogs as food dogs in Korea may explain the commonly-held belief that pet dogs and meat dogs are inherently different. Podberscek (2009: 622) writes that dog meat can be found year round and nationwide in Korea, but is typically eaten during the hot summer months, especially on what are believed to be the three hottest days of the year, called boknal “dog days”. Dog meat is considered a hot food and historically Koreans believe you “fight fire with fire”. Podberscek (2009: 619) writes that some recipes are bosintang (“invigorating soup”) and gaesoju (meaning “dog liquor”). The history of legally controlling dog meat is more recent and will be discussed next.

**LEGAL HISTORY & STATUS**

Under the Livestock Act 1963, dogs in Korea are legally defined as "domestic animals" and not included in the Livestock Processing Act 1962 (LPA). Their
exclusion from the LPA means that dogs are not formally considered a source of meat nor livestock and therefore no regulations in the LPA pertain to the farming and slaughtering of dogs (Kim 2008). The first attempts to restrict dog meat sales were initiated in 1983 by the Korean government for fear of negative media attention. In 1984, dog meat was outlawed in Seoul and classified as a disgusting food, yet the rule was not backed by long-term commitments nor rigorously enforced. According to Kim (2018: 210p), the act of classifying dog meat as a disgusting food may have had the most influence over the prohibition of dog meat by effectively banning the sale of dog meat. Podberscek (2009: 620) writes that in the run-up to 1988 Seoul Olympics, local and international AWOs, foreign governments, and international media pressured the Korean government on the dog meat trade.

A court case in 1996 Food Sanitation Act established dog meat as food given its wide consumption in society. Yet the Korea Food and Drug Administration, under the Ministry for Health, Welfare and Family Affairs does not recognize dog meat as consumable meat (Kim 2008: 209). It is not illegal to raise and slaughter dogs for human consumption, as long as the general anti-cruelty clauses of the APA are not violated (Kim 2008: 213). The APA applies to pet animals like cats and dogs, but not to livestock or hunted animals. Traditionally dogs were hung and/or beaten to death. Yet since the APA’s enactment in 1991, it is rarely enforced (Podberscek 2009: 620p). South Korea’s Livestock Safety Management Act states that slaughterhouses are only permitted to slaughter animals which they are registered for. There is thus no legal basis upon which to slaughter dogs (Czajkowski 2014: 36).

The APA was significantly amended in 2007. Whilst improved, according to Czajkowski (2014: 45), it still has major flaws. Articles that previously stated that no person shall kill, inflict pain, injure, or abandon an animal without “rational reason” (Kim 2008:213), was updated to “justifiable reason” (Czajkowski 2014: 45). Moreover, anyone that intends to produce, import, or sell animals must obtain a license, and dogs may not be killed in an open area, in front of other animals or “in a cruel way such as hanging” (Czajkowski 2014: 44). In 2008, dogs were added to the Night Soil Disposal Act, requiring farms larger than 60 square meters to have a
sanitation system and report to local authorities. The APA was updated again in 2011, increasing the punishments for violations and adding stronger mechanisms to monitor animal welfare (Czajkowski 2014: 45, 57).

The major obstacle to a viable solution on the dog meat question is the divergent views of interested stakeholders. Dog meat enthusiasts are pushing for dogs to be classified as livestock; animal welfare activists strongly oppose attempts to make dog-eating meat more accessible, which facilitates increased consumption and demand, resulting in more dogs suffering (Kim 2008: 233). Outreach work by NGOs like CARE aims to remove any distinction between pet dogs and meat dogs (Oh & Jackson 2011: 42). With recent changes in law, many AWOs believe they are paving a way for a future where a ban on dog meat can be accomplished (Czajkowski 2014: 47). Additional updates of recent laws are discussed under Legislative Advances.

**TO EAT OR NOT TO EAT**

Dogs on farms come in different shapes, sizes and a variety of purebreds. Some are farm-bred while others are obtained from the streets (strays) or stolen (pets). The most commonly dog found on farms is the *nureongi*, known as the “yellow dog”, “which is mid-sized, short-haired, and yellow-furred” (Podberscek 2009: 627).

The thought of eating dogs in the West, of eating “man’s best friend”, is an unfamiliar and foreign concept. Herzog writes that “taboos on eating dogs stem from two opposing facets of the human-animal relationship: Humans don’t eat animals they despise and they don’t eat animals they dote on.” (Herzog 2010: 187) In Europe and North America, dog meat is taboo because of dogs long-standing relationship with humans as a companion. Lien claims that many AWOs working on these campaigns focus on *animal rights* and *animal suffering* rather than *food taboos* (Lien 2004: 4pp). An issue of increasing urgency around the dog meat trade is *human health* with risks of communicable diseases between human and non-human animals. The dogs are usually fed human food waste, often decaying, where human-related and other bacteria may be ingested. Other risks are unregulated and overuse of antibiotics, steroids, and lack of parasite control are common (Czajkowski 2014: 34p).
In Korea, the largest dog meat market is the Moran Market, where dogs are brought from all over Korea to be sold alive and later slaughtered (Czajkowski 2014: 37). Author Julien Dugnoille (2018) confirms the bond felt between buyers and sellers and their shared appreciation of the health benefits of consuming dog meat in an extensive article about dog meat enthusiasts at markets. Furthermore, Lien (2004: 3) notes that dog meat can be considered both a culturally-accepted dish and a social one which one partakes in to feel group identity. With arguments for and against the trade, the next section reviews public opinion of dogs for human consumption.

**STATISTICS OF PUBLIC OPINION**

Keeping dogs as pets in Korea made its breakthrough in the 1990’s as the “economy rapidly improved, standards of living rose, and people had more disposable income.” (Podberscek 2009: 624) Ahead of the 1988 Olympics the Korean government encouraged citizens to keep dogs as pets in a bid to stave off negative international image. In 2004, according to the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry 758,000 households in Korea kept 2.23 million pets such as cats and dogs in their homes, nearly a fifth of the population. Podberscek (2009: 623pp) carried out a survey of 1,502 Koreans that were randomly selected across three Korean cities. Findings showed that 60% of respondents approved of keeping dogs as pets or companions, 55% of respondents disapproved of using dogs for food, yet only 24% of respondents supported a ban on dog meat. Of the respondents, 83% had eaten dog meat at some time in their life and 40% of respondents ate dog meat 2-3 times per year for health reasons. An online survey done by Empas (a web portal in Korea) with 4,600 responses found that 43% of respondents said they do not eat dog meat yet do not support a ban (Kim 2008: 208).

**A HISTORY OF THE DOG MEAT DEBATE**

It is thought that Korea’s first president Syngman Rhee’s Austrian-born wife, Franziska Donner, was the first to oppose dog meat for human consumption. Her suggestion to ban dog meat was unpopular but led to name changes of dog meat dishes in 1945 (Podberscek 2009: 619p). Today, local and global forces shape the debate of dog meat consumption in Korea, one in which the Korean government
appear to be caught right in between. On the one hand you have AWOs and activist vouching for the end of the dog meat trade, and then you have those who defend it and want to preserve it such as the Dog Meat Association (DMA) which was setup in 2002 by 150 dog meat restaurants (Podberscek 2009: 621). There are INGOs who want to impose general global norms in an effort to abolish dog eating. Counter argued by some Koreans who claim it is a ‘cultural right’ and that it is not ‘Western’ people’s place to push their values onto Koreans (Oh & Jackson 2011: 33p).

Oh and Jackson (2011: 33p) argue that dog meat consumption is experiencensing both supression and submergence at the same time and that Koreans’ are finding themselves in a bind to either endorse or distance themselves from the practice. It is particularly evident around larger international events like the 1988 Olympics and the 2002 World Cup. Podberscek (2009: 627) and Oh and Jackson (2011: 48) argue that evidence of a larger cultural shift in support of dog eating. However, Czajkowski (2014: 39) argues that the rising popularity of pet dogs, a lowered tolerance for animal cruelty, increased interest in animal rights, and shifts in perception of dog meat shows that Korea is capable of change, in just one generation. To gauge current attitudes toward dog meat, recent surveys will be reviewed in the analysis.

**TRANSNATIONAL ACTIVISM**

Lien argues that it is primarily INGOs and transnational activist networks who are actively working against the dog meat industry in Korea. Where the internet is extensively used through tools like email petitions, websites, and a space for political mobilization which is imperative for the activist network itself. Lien calls this “globalisation-from-below” (Lien 2004: 4p). With that said, Lien’s paper was written in 2004 and arguably much has happened since. For example, several Korean AWOs such as CARE, KAPS, Korea Animal Protection and Education Society (KAPES), KARA, Korean Animal Welfare Association (KAWA), and Save Korean Dogs (SKD) were founded in Korea since the 1990’s until today. There are also plenty of animal shelters in Korea today, but they have not been included here unless they have websites in English and work explicitly to end the dog meat trade.
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This section will explain the theoretical framework in which this thesis is grounded and which lens this research will be conducted through. As such, this study researches the strategies the organizations take to reach this goal, how they advocate, and what communication approaches they take with stakeholders, through the parameters of participatory and diffusion models, in order to facilitate social change and the change of public perceptions of meat dogs. This thesis’ relevance to C4D can be traced to core elements of advocacy, participatory and diffusion models of communication, social change, civic engagement, and of transnational activism.

COMMUNICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

In order to provide context and an understanding of C4D it is important to break down core concepts in the field such as definitions, brief historical context, and common approaches. Martin Scott writes that the definition of development in the field of C4D ranges between “a narrow focus on targeted, measurable change in audience knowledge, attitude and practice (brought about by external change agents), to change that is unpredictable and driven by people themselves.” (Scott 2014: 9). The concept C4D’s meaning is not always agreed upon, where its interpretations come in abundance, are extensively discussed, and contested. In 2006 C4D was defined by the Rome Consensus from the World Congress on Communication for Development as:

“a social process based on dialogue using a broad range of tools and methods. It is also about seeking change at different levels, including listening, building trust, sharing knowledge and skills, building policies, debating and learning for sustained and meaningful change.” (Scott 2014: 2)

Author Karin Wilkins (2008) explains that historically, development has often been associated with developing countries and those who have fewer resources than
wealthier countries. Recently, the development field has taken a more broadly defined interest in social change within promoted areas from progress in economics, politics, social discourse and/or cultures. Scott (2014: 48) argues that when accepting that the world order in the ‘West’ is not the universal one we should thus not blindly go to other countries and implement ‘development’ programs and projects without considering cultural and community dynamics. This should provide us with a platform to understand that development varies and that the scope, the needs, pace and nature of change, should be defined by the people in the communities.

Whilst C4D encompasses all modes and forms of communication with anything from community radio to digital storytelling, it is essentially about the people rather than the technologies. Highlighted interpretations of C4D include two-way communication/dialogue, planned communication techniques, allowing communities to speak out and be heard (Lennie & Tacchi 2013: 5). The authors Wendy Quarry and Ricardo Ramírez (2009: 25pp) emphasizes the processes in C4D rather than the product – by using the tools, techniques, and media as means to help people toward full awareness of their situation, their options for change, solving conflicts, ability to reach consensus, and to become self-sufficient. Through their work, Quarry and Ramírez (2009: 25pp) learned that good development facilitates good communication and that simply having a planned communication strategy is not enough without having a proper dialogue with those affected by the decisions. Lennie and Tacchi reference Rogers (1976) who “described development communication as the study of social change brought about by communication research, theory and technologies, with development understood as a participatory process of social change.” (Lennie & Tacchi 2013: 5) Participatory approaches are often mentioned and closed linked to C4D, which will be discussed next.

**DIFFUSION AND PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES**

This thesis will in large part analyze the AWOs' processes for social change. Analyzing whether the organization simply impose their goals on civil society and targeted stakeholders or if they involve target communities to come up with a solution. Tufte (2017: 22 of 200) writes that two opposing concepts have long
dominated the C4D history and its school of thought, and they still do; *participatory approaches* alongside with *diffusion approaches*. Diffusion theories encompasses strategies to solve the problem of ‘lack of knowledge and information’ and approach the issue by expert-driven, linear, one-way communication with little room for participation. This approach is characterized by bottom-up, dialogues, and a root in that the target communities are involved in both identifying the issues as well as coming up with the solution. Furthermore, participatory approaches also brings in “issues of globalization, transnational networking, new media and governance, into the thinking of strategic communication [...]” (Tufte 2017: 22 of 200)

Participatory approach definitions are often vague (Lennie & Tacchi 2013: 10; Scott 2014: 47), and there are many models available for guidance. A comprehensive one, that includes both diffusion and participatory approaches are presented by Scott in table-2. The same table will help categorize strategies and actions taken in the campaigns to end the dog meat trade and it will be applied in analyzing the data found on the researched websites and as elaborated on in interviews.

Scott (2014: 55) argues that participatory models may be difficult to fully adopt due to organizations’ structures, interest, donors, need for cost-effectiveness, and targets. Tufte (2017: 26 of 200) argues that each approach must be determined upon the issue at hand, if the problem is lack of information, then the selected solution should be information dissemination. If the issues are more complex, then another strategy must be composed to include considerations of underlying causes such as individual behavior, cultural norms, and values.

Participation based approaches are oftentimes closely associated with local development processes, and there can be certain risks with romanticizing the local over the general, political, and economic structures (Tufte 2017: 68 of 200). With this in mind, the organizations’ tendencies to participatory and/or diffusion approaches will be researched and analyzed to see how they and the stakeholder may benefit from one or the other.
As mentioned alongside both C4D and two of its core approaches, social change is highly intertwined with C4D and will be the theoretical lens in which this analysis is conducted. Tufte (2017: 24 of 200) writes that Communication for social change (CFSC) is used to strategically address an issue with the goal of social change through models such as participatory and bottom-up approaches. Wilkins (2014: 9) write when contemporary development ideas emerged after World War II, development and social change meant becoming more like the ‘West’ and ‘catching up’. Those deterministic goals remain prevalent in dominant development agendas. Wilkins defines social change as “non-linear, dynamic, emergent and complex. Social change in complex systems such as communities occurs through multi-level,
interconnected, interdependent, non-linear and unpredictable relationships and processes.” (Wilkins 2014: 9) To effectively understand social change you need to look at multiple levels such as political, economic, and cultural. Its multiple complexities makes it hard to evaluate as it is difficult to measure based on linear processes. Yet to evaluate C4D and social change Wilkin’s writes that it “requires attention not only on the potential benefits and possibilities of communication, technologies and media in terms of development and social change, but also on the particularities of the contexts through and in which they are shaped and experienced.” (Wilkins 2014: 9)

In places like Korea, which would be considered a resource-rich community considering its economic wealth, even though some farmers may live in resource-limited communities, social marketing to affect HBC has been particularly popular in health communication programs (Wilkins 2014: 64p). When discussing participation in social change, Tufte (2017: 60pp of 200) writes that it may encompass anything from resistance toward governing bodies to citizen engagement in processes to make themselves heard. Historically, participation has mostly been in reference to development on the local community level, and there are difficulties in transferring this model to national or transnational processes of change. Furthermore, Tufte (2017: 161 of 200) criticizes the limitations of communication for social change as the marginalized groups, their interests, and their points of views are often not included in the conversation. Communicative interventions often lack sustainable solutions to include all stakeholders.
METHODOLOGY

In order to answer the research question the research design is based on organizations that have been selected based upon a pre-set criteria (see below). In order to accumulate data on how organizations strategize to end the dog meat trade in Korea, their websites have been reviewed to derive data which was coded in order to conduct content analysis (see Content analysis). In order to get an in-depth understanding of thoughts behind identified strategies, qualitative interviews with animal welfare professionals was selected as one of two primary research methods. Furthermore, this study also includes research from earlier academic studies, opinion polls, and news articles pertaining to the dog meat industry. Whilst C4D encompasses many varieties of communication to bring about change, including traditional media and social media, the people as active actors (Lennie & Tacchi 2013: 5) are the main focus in this research.

In this research the stakeholders are identified and defined per Ronald Isaksson’s definition: “Any identifiable group or individual who can affect the achievement of an organisation’s objectives or who is affected by the achievement of an organisation’s objectives.” (Freeman & Reed 1983 by Isaksson 2006: 634) As such, the stakeholders identified in the case of dog meat in Korea are considered the general public, dog meat farmers, government/policy makers/law enforcement, corporate businesses, dog meat restaurants, dog meat traders, and the animal welfare community.

A total of 55 organizations’ websites were reviewed in the process of finding organizations that fulfilled the below stated criteria. The organizations were found through Google, Facebook, through references, or on lists of partnering AWOs. In order to narrow down the number of organizations and to ensure that they were of relevance for this research four criterias were created. Criterias to fulfill were: 1)
English language based website, 2) Work to end the dog meat trade, 3) Program focused on Korea, and 4) Registered organization (either confirmed and/or claimed). 14 international and Korean AWOs matched the criteria. One exception is CFAF who actively worked in Korea from 2011-2016.¹ See table-3 for the list of researched organizations. Informal advocacy groups and organizations based outside of Korea that only work with receiving dogs from the Korean dog meat market have been excluded from this research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Based in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Animal Liberation Wave</td>
<td>ALW</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Animal Welfare Institute</td>
<td>AWI</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Change for Animals Foundation</td>
<td>CFAF</td>
<td>UK (and international offices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coexistence of Animal Rights on Earth</td>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Korea (and international offices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dogs of Violence Exposed Project</td>
<td>DoVE</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Free Korean Dogs</td>
<td>FKD</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Humane Society International</td>
<td>HSI</td>
<td>US (and international offices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>In Defence of Animals</td>
<td>IDA</td>
<td>US (and international offices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>International Aid for Korean Animals</td>
<td>IAKA</td>
<td>US (and international offices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Korean Animal Welfare Association</td>
<td>KAWA</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Korean K9 Rescue</td>
<td>KK9R</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Last Chance for Animals</td>
<td>LCA</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Save Korean Dogs</td>
<td>SKD</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Soi Dog Foundation</td>
<td>SDF</td>
<td>Thailand (and international offices)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-3 lists the names, acronyms, and details of where the organizations’ head office/primary place of registration are located. Only one place of registration has been listed even though some of the organizations with international offices may have one or more registered organizations in other locations (Appendix I).

¹ CFAF worked in Korea from 2011-2016. From 2016 one of CFAF’s employees took on a role with HSI to continue the work through HSI rather than as a partnering organization. CFAF has been included based on previous work and one of their employees still actively working in Korea (CFAF n.d.).
In order to gain a deeper insight to the AWOs’ strategic plan to bring an end to the dog meat trade in Korea, all 14 organizations were contacted at least once by email or their website contact form, but also through other mediums of communications such as by phone. Each organization, unless they responded, were contacted twice in relation to this research.

CONTENT ANALYSIS

As online advocacy campaigns and programs on websites was reviewed the content available has been analyzed to identify strategies to end the dog meat trade. Author Heidi Julien defines content analysis as the:

"intellectual process of categorizing qualitative textual data into clusters of similar entities, or conceptual categories, to identify consistent patterns and relationships between variables or themes. [...] This analytic method is a way of reducing data and making sense of them—of deriving meaning.” (Julien 2008: 2)

The method can be applied to a variety of data such as interviews, transcripts, responses to open-ended questionnaire items, textual data, media, and photographs. The common fundamental principle is that content is recognized, regardless of the level of depth of inquiry (Julien 2008: 2). The content analysis have been applied to the textual data acquired not only from the 14 organizations’ websites, but also in parallel to qualitative data from the in-depth interviews conducted, thus derive similar themes of narratives and objectives. Julien writes that a qualitative approach often performs deep close readings of content attempting to find subtle nuances (Julien 2008: 3). This content analysis has gathered data in three parts: 1) Arguments to close down the dog meat trade in Korea, 2) Entire website search for an overall view of strategic efforts and accomplishments to close down the dog meat trade, which have been categorized by 3) Modes of approaches based on diffusion and participatory models.

The textual data is considered qualitative and each word/phrase/activity has been divided into codes. The codes were partially pre-set based on expertise of area, as
well as open modeled in order to find emergent codes during research (Center for Evaluation and Research n.d.) (see table-4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic strategies/ activities/ tools as found on the organizations' websites*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Information gathered during interviews in addition to information on the websites have been included here. There are a couple of exceptions which are stated within the respective boxes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research date: May 16-20, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage (English based news through Google News search)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlighting specific cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case information on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative work/ working with government officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog meat farm closures in cooperation with farmers (whole farm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4 displays the pre-set and emergent themes of explicit strategies, activities, and tools found to end the dog meat trade in Korea during the research of the organizations' websites (Appendix I).

A grid system was created to code activities related to each organization’s strategies and activities to bring an end to the dog meat trade. Each activity identified (eg. closing down a dog meat farm) was then categorized, collapsed into thematic approaches (Center for Evaluation and Research n.d.) based on stakeholder target. They are then analyzed per concepts of advocacy and civic engagement, Scott’s model of diffusion and participatory based approaches, and through theories of social change. The value for each activity conducted has been valued at one point, regardless of the overall reach/impact due to difficulties in finding actual and/or validated data outcomes.
QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS

Interviews can take many forms, and these interviews have opened up an opportunity for in-depth perspectives, opinions, and personal meaning, conscious ones as well as subconscious ones (Fägerborg 2011: 85ff). Aside from one structured email interview, the interviews were all semi-structured, as I sought to answer certain questions and retain some control over the direction of the conversation, yet I wanted to leave room for the interview to go to places I would not anticipate (Cook 2008: 2). Afterwards, the interviews were partially transcribed through the online tool oTranscribe. It is important to emphasize that in-depth interview as a research method is highly qualitative and in this case cannot be considered definite or representative for entire organizations and their work (Cook 2008: 2). In addition to that, it may be difficult to identify clear patterns, yet it can provide a better and deeper understanding of the work that is conducted and results from the content analysis. Other insights are how it affects a few individuals that are involved, how they see/view their work, and how they think it affects recipients and potential stakeholders. Thus the interviewees can potentially serve as a small snapshot into a larger majority (Fägerborg 2011: 97).

Seven animal welfare professionals, who were involved, or previously involved, with various aspects of the Korean dog meat trade, participated in interviews and in answering questions across five different organizations; HSI, CFAF, SKD, IDA, and one anonymous organization. In order to protect the participants, whilst still providing context for programmatic processes, their names, but not their organizations, have been kept anonymous (see table-5). The mode of interviews were largely based on geographical proximity.
RESEARCHER’S ROLE

As with all heavily qualitative form of information it is important to recognize that the researcher inevitably steer the conversation and key points of the data gathering. However hard a researcher tries to stay objective, we too operate consciously and subconsciously, and affect the research to some extent. The interviewer who conducts qualitative interviews is always subjective to questions concerning objectivity, validity, reliability, and generalizability, which will be an important part to clarify and explore (Brinkmann 2008: 4). My experience in animal welfare can here be both of benefit, as I have a general understanding of the field, as well as it can hold preconceived notions about the dog meat trade. One of the drawbacks of being too close to your topic of research is that of being accused of placing values ahead of scientific neutrality (Padgett 2008: 4pp). As such I have had to remind myself of my personal views as I created both interview questions and as I processed the data. However, I am still further removed as I am not personally vested in the animal welfare work of the dog meat trade.
LIMITATIONS

This research is not without its limitations. The country at the center point is Korea, and the topic revolves around the dog meat trade. Neither which are in close proximity to my own location nor my previous work in animal welfare. I have not had the ability to travel to Korea which potentially would have been able to provide further depth to the data collection and expand representation in AWOs work.

Whilst there are numerous stakeholders involved in the Korean dog meat trade, the scope of this research did not allow for extensive research into all different stakeholder groups and their perspective. It should be stated that only researching the side of anti-dog meat advocates is highly objective and one-sided. This has been addressed to the best of my abilities by including academic literature and news articles pertaining to the dog meat industry in Korea.

There are obvious language barriers that limits this research as I do not speak or read the Korean language, nor has a translator been used in the research process. As such research materials like websites, local social media content, news articles, and even Korean activists that could have been useful in this study have been forfeited. However, there are 14 organizations’ website content and strategies to end the dog meat trade included in the research, and seven interviewees’ perspective. There is a possibility that some organizations that would meet the selection criteria have been overseen due to difficulties in finding them. Which means this research will be able to give an insight to some current strategies and trends to end the dog meat trade in Korea, but it cannot be considered fully representative.
ADVOCACY FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

The 14 organizations included in this analysis have a history of working to end the dog meat trade in Korea, starting with International Aid for Korean Animals (IAKA) in 1997\(^2\), through to Animal Liberation Wave (ALW), founded in 2017 by LCA as a Korean based sister organization (ALW 2017). Ten out of 14 of the studied organizations advocate and work for various causes, with the remainder singularly focused on ending the dog meat trade. The founder of Free Korean Dogs (FKD) notes that dogs from puppy mills “who no longer serve the breeder’s purpose run the risk of being sold to a dog meat trader.” (Park 2018) A claim supported by the Korean K9 Rescue (KK9R) which website states that they rescue dogs from both the dog meat trade and puppy mills as the industries are highly intertwined in Korea (KK9R n.d.). As such, organizations with a primary focus of rescuing dogs from the dog meat trade, but examples of puppy mill rescues are included in the analysis. Moreover, to give context to Korea’s position, development, and response to suggested change it is worth mentioning that Korea’s economy has rapidly grown since the Korean war in 1950-1953. According to the World Bank (n.d.), Korea was ranked as the 11th largest economy in the world in 2016. Per the Central Intelligence Agency (n.d.), Korea is considered an economic success story, a high-technology society, and a globally-connected country. This is of due considerations for organizations when promoting progress in politics and social change in a wealthy country (Wilkins 2018) like Korea.

\(^2\) IAKA’s founder Kyenan Kum has been involved in the anti-dog meat movement since the late 1980’s) (IAKA n.d.)
The next section presents the motivations of these 14 organizations for seeking to end the trade followed by strategies based on stakeholder groups. Thereafter the general current state of the debate are presented and analyzed.

TO END THE DOG MEAT TRADE

Scholars cite various reasons for ending the dog meat trade, including viewing dogs as “man’s best friend”, trusted companions, or members of the family (Herzog 2010: 187; Lien 2004: 4pp). A review of the websites of the 14 organizations included in this analysis trended toward four different core principles for why there should be a ban on the trade, 1) Inhumane treatment of dogs, 2) Inhumane slaughter methods, 3) Health risks, and 4) Environmental risks (see figure-1). For the purposes of this analysis, dogs as a companion was not included as the concept can be considered a grey area as an organization can work for legislative changes under the basis that dogs are companion animals and therefore should not be consumed.

Figure-1 illustrates the arguments cited by researched organizations for an end to the dog meat trade in Korea.
The most common argument for banning the dog meat trade, as stated by all 14 organizations, is the poor treatment of dogs, followed by 12 organizations that cited inhumane slaughter methods. Some may argue that “treatment of dogs” includes slaughter methods, but for the sake of this research only explicitly-written website content was included in the analysis. Eight of the organizations cited human health risks and two noted environmental impact. This finding indicates a sharp strategy change from the 2002 World Cup where many organizations focused on the Korean people’s ‘barbaric’ act of eating dogs (Participant; Participant-3; Participant-4).

The 14 organizations conduct advocacy communication on their websites and in the outreach work that they do with different stakeholders. On their websites, they advocate for an end to the human consumption of dog meat in Korea. The following sections examine the different organizations’ strategies, types of communication as related to C4D, and examples of specific advocacy campaigns.

STRATEGIES TO END THE DOG MEAT TRADE

A total of 35 different strategies and activities were identified in a review of the 14 organizations’ websites, news content, and featured articles. Some activities were only marginally different in approach, but characterized as distinct in that they conduct communication differently and work with different stakeholder groups. Thus potentially facilitate outcomes or affect the ability for further work differently. For the purposes of this analysis, strategies have been divided into those directly initiated by the AWOs and those that rely on broader engagement of civil society.

Primary actors and actions were categorized into eight groups based on actor (AWO or civic engagement based action) and on stakeholder target group (see figure-2). Figure-3 shows how many actions were linked to the organizations studied as a whole. As stated in the Methodology chapter the primary stakeholder groups are: the general public; the animal welfare community; the government/policy makers/law enforcement; the dog meat farmers; the dog meat restaurant owners; and corporate

3 For example, working with dog farmers to transition them out of business or working with law enforcement to close farms down.
businesses. No explicit strategies to work with/against dog meat traders were disclosed for which that stakeholder group was not included.

As indicated in figure-3, some organisations exhibit a larger variety of actions in efforts to end the dog meat trade. Conducting a greater number of actions does not necessarily yield greater success than a more refined approach. There is also a seventh group, which makes up the stakeholder group who take part through civil action in support of ending the dog meat trade. This group’s civic engagement will be discussed separately after AWO based actions. The strategies identified will be analyzed through the theoretical lens of social change, to highlight how the former might affect the latter across multiple levels (Wilkins 2014: 9).

**ANIMAL WELFARE ORGANIZATION BASED APPROACHES**

All 14 organizations engage with six various stakeholder groups to advocate for their preferred causes (Appendix I) (see figure-2 above). The strategies, actions, and approaches which are analyzed below, starting with the general public.

**THE GENERAL PUBLIC**

Nine of the 14 organizations conducted Korean-based educational outreach and/or public awareness campaigns. Other actions to facilitate public awareness were
participating in traditional media coverage, activities including celebrity activism, highlighting specific cases, and intensified efforts around the 2018 Pyeongchang Winter Olympics. Ten of the 14 organizations' produced their own updates, press releases, or featured external media articles pertaining to the organization’s work (Appendix I).

Furthermore, twelve of the 14 organizations cited a need for change in public perception of meat dogs (Appendix I). In this section, three advocacy campaigns are highlighted. They are either immersive, named, and/or action-driven. HSI and KARA launched an advocacy campaign in Korea in January 2018 that features a Virtual Reality (VR) bus that opens on the side and displays images, educational information, and a VR experience with films of the dog meat farms (see image-1 and image-2). Participant-6 said people were surprised to see the state of the farms (Participant-6). This example shows an innovative approach to affect social change using technology to shape and affect the individual’s experience (Wilkins 2014: 9) rather than at a macro-level. This approach may offer important potential for HBC through this form of social marketing (Wilkins 2014: 64p), yet it is difficult to measure the impact. The same applies to the next two examples.

Image-1 to the left show HSI and KARA’s VR truck in Korea. Image-2 to the right shows a woman interacting with the VR campaign experience (PerK/ Korea Exposé 2018).

The “Flower Dog Project” is a joint campaign by ALW and LCA, featuring mobile outdoor art installments. The project, displayed in various locations throughout the 2018 Olympics, featured eight uniquely-painted dogs, each about one meter tall, with each dog symbolizing a specific character of basic rights for dogs (water, field to
run on etcetera). The flower dogs were inspired by the old Korean saying ‘walk on the flower path’ when wishing someone happiness (ALW 2018). See image-3 and image-4 for installments of the project.

Another advocacy campaign initiated by SKD in partnership with Soi Dog Foundation (SDF) and Lady Freethinker featured anti-dog meat advocacy messages on billboard advertisements and bus banners across select cities in Korea in efforts to make the cities “Dog Meat Free” (Participant-5). Buses targeted by the campaign were those that covered routes to and from dog meat markets (see image-5).

SKD started the initiative in 2016 in the city of Bucheon, the first city to ultimately go dog meat free in May 2018, according to SKD’s Facebook page (SKD Facebook n.d.). Participant-5 says that in order for a city to go dog meat free, the government
officials need to be the driving force to create *sustainable* change (Participant-5); not only on a societal level, but on a political level as well (Wilkins 2014: 9). Thus this strategy work with two major stakeholders - the public and the government. SKD only has the capacity to work on one city at a time (Participant-5), showing limitations with this strategy, not based on the method itself but because of the groups’ capacity and resources. Through open dialogue, the mayor and anti-dog meat advocates agree on the dog meat being an issue and on how they should solve it (Scott 2014: 57). Whilst this can be considered a participatory approach, it appears to leave out the wider community in conversations of change. Perhaps the deterministic goal of a dog meat free city in a dominant development agenda (by SKD) on a political level (the mayor) is necessary to eventually create social and cultural change (Wilkins 2014: 9).

The three above-mentioned campaigns provide visual and textual advocacy communication to engage the public around a specific cause (van de Fliert 2014: 134). Advocacy typically mobilizes direct support, but in all of these examples they may be able to shift indirect normative support (Wilkins 2014: 57p). HSI/KARA and ALW/LCA’s campaigns are both interactive and have the potential for impact through their ‘experience’ based approached. They are also mobile which means they are less likely to be seen by the same people twice. Whereas SKD’s advocacy campaign is not interactive, it presents an interconnected approach to social change (Wilkins 2014: 9) as it is immersed in daily life activities. Participant-3 says that Korean [public awareness] campaigns are having success and through reducing demand, supply will also decrease. If farmers cannot make money, they will cease to farm (Participant-3). Wilkins argues that social change is difficult to measure based on its many complexities (Wilkins 2014: 9) for which all three campaigns are difficult to evaluate in terms of their impact.

What all of these campaigns have in common is that they rely on diffusion approaches to transfer information to the general public with the intention to facilitate social change. They can only be considered participatory as a means (when people interact with the art) and not as an end (Scott 2014: 57). On the other hand, adopting
a participatory approach when the stakeholder group is of significant size would likely not be cost-effective (Scott 2014: 55) nor would it directly address a potential lack of information (Tufte 2017: 26 of 200). The organizations would likely benefit from taking the time to shape these public campaigns as to specifically address underlying issues to individual behaviors and cultural norms (Tufte 2017: 26 of 200) to affect social change. Whether that has been done or not is unclear.

THE ANIMAL WELFARE COMMUNITY
All 14 organizations, except for AWI, has some form of presence in Korea. Some organizations are established in the country (ALW, CARE, KAWA, and SKD), some established sister organizations in Korea (IAKA and LCA), HSI has hired local staff, and others travel to Korea for specific missions like Dogs of Violence Exposed Project (DoVE) FKD, and IDA (Appendix I).

Furthermore, twelve of the 14 organizations collaborated with either local and/or international groups (Appendix I). The dynamic between collaborating Korean NGOs and INGOs can facilitate transnational networking but also provide the INGOs with a better understanding of the target communities and barriers (Tufte 2017: 22 of 200) to end the dog meat trade. The domestic NGOs are closer to the work on a daily basis, and may be able to increase an understanding for local cultural norms and community dynamics (Scott 2014: 48) that otherwise might escape INGOs.

As it is difficult to assess whether organizations were part of a coalition because of their efforts in Korea or for the sake of other campaigns, this approach was not included in the research. However, Participant-1 is a strong advocate for coalitions and, as part of Asia for Animals Coalition, she sees the benefits of open dialogue on issues in the region. Whilst not a reality yet, she sees the advantages of a coalition taking on campaigns as a unit (Participant-1). Advantages include a larger mass and a unified voice in the dog meat debate where transnational networking, new media and governance contribute to strategic communication (Tufte 2017: 22 of 200).
THE GOVERNMENT, POLICY MAKERS & LAW ENFORCEMENT

Eight of the 14 organizations work to impact legislative changes, whether by encouraging, pressuring, or through active dialogue with government officials (Appendix I). As McNutt and Boland write, advocacy is an important method for NGOs (McNutt & Boland 1999: 433), and one that several AWOs embody as they attempt to strategically change policies through engagement with policy makers (Appendix I; Wilkins 2014: 57p; Scott 2014: 2).

In a different approach from the previous strategy to make cities dog meat free, Participant-5 at SKD rescues dogs by identifying farms that are in violations against environmental laws, rather than the APA (Participant-5), as little can be done with the current law (Participant-3; Participant-5; Podberscek 2009: 620p). Common violations are fecal and urine matter that contaminates water around the village (Participant-5) and sometimes dog farmers have a livestock license, but not a slaughter license. Slaughtering dogs on the premises is a violation and if they have a slaughter license it has to be done elsewhere (Czajkowski 2014: 36; Participant-5). In Participant-5’s experience it has been easy to ensure the closure of these farms by bringing violations to local authorities (Participant-5). As Kim writes, AWOs may chose to direct its efforts to make an impact on real legislative change through the APA (Kim 2008: 213), yet Participant-5’s example show that there are different actions to take when APA’s reach is inadequate.

HSI representatives work with politicians in other capacities. They meet with them, share information, and make themselves a stakeholder in the policy making conversation. Once, a congresswoman’s visit to a farm with Participant-6 lead her to propose a bill that would close down local farms and help farmers transition. Whilst the bill did not pass (Participant-6), this example show that by engaging with stakeholders at a political level (Wilkins 2014: 9) and disseminating information you can evoke potential change (Scott 2014: 57).

4 SKD’s strategy to close down dog meat farms by bringing violations to local authorities is directed at two main stakeholders - law enforcement and dog meat farmers, but only discussed under The government, policy makers & law enforcement to avoid redundancies.
THE DOG MEAT FARMERS

Nine out of 14 organizations were found to work in ways that have direct animal impact, i.e. directly saving an animals life by rescuing individual dogs from farms and markets or by closing down entire farms (Appendix I). Whilst it can be argued that “all” approaches in one way or the other attempts to save lives, some strategies may do so long-term yet not in the immediate interim.

Participants said that the dog meat debate for a long time was without much progress as dog meat supporters and anti-dog meat activists failed to come to an agreement (Participant-1; Participant-6). Whilst they still have not come to an agreement, HSI’s approach is done in cooperation with farmers to transition them out of dog meat production (Participant-1). From January 2015 to May 2018, HSI\(^5\) rescued a total of 1,201 dogs from the Korean dog meat trade through farm closures. HSI has also worked together with FKD and has assisted them with select farm closures (HSI n.d.a).

CFAF and HSI’s strategy to close down and transition farmers developed from several years of research. Participant-1 says that when she met a farmer they would say ‘I will close tomorrow, but I need you to help me, this is all I have ever done’. Many farmers inherited the farm from their parents, but often saying ‘now my children are ashamed, and I need your help’ (Participant-1). Traders at the markets would say similar things. Those components contributed to a community based strategy in which to work with people in the industry. Creating these models for change illustrate a way to transition into more humane and sustainable livelihoods (Participant-1), which is important as the farmers often are uneducated (Participant-3). It is a model of change in that you can facilitate dialogue and come to agreement with those of opposing views (van de Fliert 2014: 134), regardless of motives.

\(^5\) HSI worked in cooperation with CFAF until 2016, when a CFAF employee took on a role with HSI (CFAF n.d.).
CFAF and HSI’s model for change builds on ideologies of participatory communication, before change is approached. Participant-6 shares that initially HSI would seek out farmers, now farmers seek out the organization (Participant-6). Which indicate trends of a shift to bottom-up approaches where HSI’s strategy for social change is initiated on a community level (Tufte 2017: 24). This strategy aligns with Scott’s (2014: 2) theory of listening, building trust, sharing knowledge, and engaging with those you are trying to help for sustainable change.

Participant-2 believes that farmers become a part of influencing change by making these decisions and working with international groups. That it sends a strong statement to make this personal change, to talk to the media, and being a part of the campaign (Participant-2). Participant-6 tells of a farmer who told her that whilst he adored his pet dog, he said that the pet dogs and meat dogs were different to him, that the latter was just livestock. The experience of seeing activists interact with the dog meat dogs changed the farmer and now he advocates for change persuading other farmers to transition (Participant-6). Having internal community members speaking with other farmers can be a catalyst for change (Scott 2014: 57) as the participant beneficiaries (farmers) have two-ways conversations with other community stakeholders. Furthermore, the rescued dogs also become ambassadors for public awareness outreach. Participant-1 explains that the dogs rescued would refute claims that dogs for meat are different from pet dogs, and that dogs of all different breeds fall victim to the trade (Participant-1), refuting a long held argument by dog meat enthusiasts that pet dogs and dog meat dogs are different (Oh & Jackson 2011: 42). Participant-2 believes that it is an important aspect of the campaign in order to change public perception of dog meat dogs, by talking about and showing dog meat dogs in ‘typical’ companion animal environments (Participant-2). In essence, not only do the dogs themselves become ambassadors for changing public perceptions, but the adopters can be too by shifting indirect normative social support (Wilkins 2014: 57p).

Moreover, the accounts of participation, ability to reach consensus, and to become self-sufficient are all cornerstones of the success in HSI’s strategy which Quarry and
Ramírez (2009: 25pp) emphasizes in the case of good development. Participant-1’s example of the developed strategy points to horizontal models where dialogue is sought after and where participation and ownership are considered vital for sustainability (Scott 2014: 57). However, it should be added that the case for advocacy, when a specific goal drives the entire dialogue (closing the farm), contradicts a fully participatory approach (Scott 2014: 55). However, it is a costly endeavour (Participant-6) and with twelve farms closed down by May 2018, the closure of the industry’s estimated 17,000 farms will need additional strategies (van de Fliert 2014: 134; Wilkins 2014: 58).

Organizations like CARE, DoVE, HSI, IDA, and KK9R work to rescue individual dogs from farms, markets, or partnering organizations (Appendix I). In Defense of Animals (IDA) rescues dogs in partnership with Jindo Love, a local Korean group, based on an overriding belief that it is a key strategy to build positive relationships in Korea in order to move people into action (Participant-7). By empowering local advocates in the communities IDA actively works to build trust and seek change not only on a legislative level, but a community level as well (Scott 2014: 2, 48).

In 2017 IDA transferred 47 dogs to the US through the partnership, and aims to rescue a total of 200 in 2018 (Dawes 2018). Regardless of where the dogs come from IDA believes “A life saved is a life saved” (Participant-7). Whilst it on the one hand can help alleviate immediate symptoms of suffering dogs and indeed save direct lives, real impact on the effects of banning the dog meat trade are difficult to measure. On the other hand, the rescue and adoption promotion of dog meat dogs can contribute to changes in public perceptions (van de Fliert 2014: 134), and like in the case of HSI, shift indirect normative social support (Wilkins 2014: 57p).

A major argument for rescuing dogs is that you are saving a life (Participant-1; Participant-4; Participant-7), yet there are three major differences in the way this is conducted 1) Closing down farms in cooperation with the farmers, 2) Closing down farms enforced by law enforcement, and 3) Rescuing single dogs individually or through partnering organizations. Organizations take vastly different stances to
rescuing dogs as a method for change. The LCA write on their website that they do not believe saving one dog at a time is the answer to ending the dog meat trade (LCA n.d.). However, both mentioned approaches by facilitators (participatory approach) and external change agents (diffusion approach) can be a catalyst for change (Scott 2014: 57), to illustrate that there are people who think differently about dogs from meat farms. The latter, whilst saving a life, appears to be a symptomatic response to a larger issue which can be honorable, does not address the underlying issue.

THE RESTAURANT OWNERS
In 2015 and 2016 Participant-5 used to go to markets and restaurants to try convince owners to stop keeping and serving dogs for human consumption. Whilst she did not find that approach to work, she currently works to make cities dog meat free she has been working with 23 dog meat restaurants in the city of Bucheon. She has encouraged them to change their menus and signs, and help them find new recipes. Similar to the farmers, the restaurant owners and traders have told her that this is all they know (Participant-5). This social change in attitude show signs of being non-linear and emergent based on the complex cultural environment (Wilkins 2014: 9) around the consumption of dog meat and the shifting paradigm. Participant-5 claims that restaurant owners have witnessed numbers dropping and that dog meat no longer is good business. Whilst many cooperated with her, some did not and therefore she does not consider the job complete (Participant-5). By disseminating information, but working with the restaurants, and on their terms, Participant-5’s effort lies in that of listening and helping based on individual needs (Scott 2014: 2), yet still with an agenda of removing dog meat off the menu. Whilst SKD’s strategy is not to outright ban markets, but to see them close down once initiated by city mayors, CARE, IAKA, and SDF all state on their website that they take actions to ensure the closure of dog meat markets (Appendix I).

THE CORPORATE BUSINESSES
Participant-7 writes that through IDA’s second strategy they put pressure on government levels to outlaw the dog meat trade through corporate relationships
In terms of IDA’s current approach of partnering with large corporations in Korea Participant-7 claims that:

“regardless of what some animal protection groups might claim, markets and restaurants were shut down during the 1988 Olympics not because of civil action - threatened boycotts and the like. A call was made from the CEO of a major Seoul-based corporation to the president.” (Participant-7)

Today IDA aims to accomplish the same but in a permanent way (Participant-7). IDA being an expert in the field and an external change agent (Scott 2014: 9) has identified a main stakeholder that potentially can affect change based on an economic paradigm (Wilkins 2018; Tufte 2017: 68 of 200).

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT BASED APPROACHES

All 14 organizations’ websites encouraged some form of civil action, whether it was through donations, volunteering, fostering, and/or adopting - to support the animal welfare community; to sign letters and petitions; or call government officials and policy makers (Appendix I).

THE ANIMAL WELFARE COMMUNITY

One of the biggest contributions perhaps civil society can do is to donate and fundraise for the cause. To support not just the campaign, but also the organizations working to end the dog meat trade. Civic engagement that is identifiable through civil actions as are supporting the cause by donating, volunteering, fostering, or adopting (Adler & Goggin 2005) directly and indirectly help the animals. Yet their actions, and participation in the cause grow the pool of people to raise their voice for the animals. Civil society’s support in order for the organizations to be able to carry out their missions and as such advocacy communication may not be utilized here as a form to encourage HBC, but to increase awareness of the cause and as a plea for donations (Wilkins 2014: 64p).
Moreover, seven of 14 organizations, fly dogs to the US, UK, and Canada to ultimately complete international adoptions (Appendix I) based on difficulties in finding placements for these dogs in Korea due to stigma around dog meat dogs, small apartments inadequate for large dogs, and overwhelmed local shelters (Participant-1; Participant-2; Participant-3; Participant-5; Participant-6). Taking in 20-250 dogs at one time is a huge undertaking where INGOs potential relief actions can be a symptom of inequalities (Hooghe 2011: 7p) or limited support for local NGOs by their own government and potential donors.

THE GOVERNMENT & POLICY MAKERS
Protests and demonstrations can be targeted against several different stakeholders such as corporations, opponents, and the government. In the past IAKA and SKD has organized protests (Appendix I), and more recently CARE organized a silent protest at the closing ceremony of the 2018 Olympics as a part of their ‘I Am Not Food’ campaign (CARE 2018) (see image-6 and image-7).

Participant-5 believes petitions send a unified message and a small action that anyone can take (Participant-5). Contacting officials through letters, petitions, and protests are all indicators of political voice and as such contribute to civic engagement of the cause (Adler & Goggin 2005). By this definition, each action whether it has an impact on the overall outcome or not is difficult to predict. On the other hand, supporters add numbers to the voice of those who want to see a change.

Image-6 to the left show CARE’s silent protest at the 2018 Olympics closing ceremony. Image-7 to the right show a close up of a dog meat trade dog being tortured (CARE 2018).
to the plight of the dog meat dogs and can as such be utilized by organizations to substantiate their claims of a need for change on a political level (Wilkins 2014: 9; Hooghe 2011: 7p). Several organizations encourage supporters to either sign petitions or letters. A few organizations facilitated electronic letters to Korean government officials (Appendix I). Even if a small action, people make their voices heard this way (Participant-1), and whilst these particular actions may not be deciding factors in change it adds numbers to those who are trying to effect change, and can serve as an example of experiencing a connectedness with others and the community to affect social change (Wilkins 2014: 9). Whilst advocacy communication may be able to help further the cause on both a national and international level, complementary strategies such as policy communication may be of benefit (van de Fliert 2014: 134; Wilkins 2014: 58).

PARTICIPANT REFLECTIONS ON SOCIAL CHANGE

Whilst none of the 14 organizations explicitly work through a specified change theory based model per their websites, twelve analyzed websites state a need for change in public perception or that they work to create change (Appendix I). Yet CFAF and HSI participants spoke of change models based on actively listening to members of target communities, where dialogue serves to determine stakeholder group needs, and participatory approaches are developed to create sustainable solutions (Participant-1; Participant-4). Initiating or being open to dialogue, listening to the needs of communities (Tufte 2017: 22) (e.g. farmers explaining they need help in order to stop farming dogs), is key for true involvement by communities in the change that organizations’ seek to influence and achieve. Furthermore, the analyzed organizations showed little evidence of grounding their work in communication research and/or a given theoretical framework to facilitate social change (Lennie & Tacchi 2013: 5). Whilst this does not explicitly indicate a lack of theoretical backing, it may be implicit in the work they do. It rather appears that many AWOs have learned from mistakes made in Korea nearly two decades ago (Participant-4).
Participant-4 explains that HBC in animal welfare is a relatively new concept, particularly in relation to companion animals which emerged five to six years ago (Participant-4). In speaking of HBC, participants refer to working with an entire community from the start. This promotes a greater understanding of the needs and motivations of that community to ultimately develop a project or campaign with messaging that speaks to the community (Participant-1; Participant-4). The purpose is not to decide what the problem is and solve it, but to understand why people in a community behave in the way they do, and what you can do, or help them to do to change their behaviors and address their needs, beyond an animal welfare issue one might be involved in (Participant-4). This largely participatory approach to community engagement emphasizes listening and two-way communication (Tufte 2017: 22 of 200), to build trust and share knowledge and skills for sustained, meaningful change (Scott 2014: 2).

Several participants said they found it ineffective to outright tell people what to do (Participant-1; Participant 4; Participant-6). Participant-1 explains that a lot of time is spent with farmers trying to foster changes to deeply embedded behaviors. “It’s worth the investment as these are meant to be ambassadors for the campaign as well, and they obviously have access to more of the farmers and those involved in the industry than we do.” (Participant-1) By adopting participatory, community-based approaches, the animal welfare field can foster greater human connection and interrelatedness, and build strong roots in target communities (Tufte 2017: 22 of 200; Adler & Goggin 2005). This may ultimately result in greater civic engagement by stakeholders targeted for social change.

Participant-4 said that whilst some organizations take a very pragmatic approach to bringing solutions to the dog meat trade it is important to “recognize that the role that every one of these potential solutions plays, because you are reaching different audiences with each one.” (Participant-4) In doing so there are more opportunities to

---

6 Brooke was and is one of the leading organizations in HBC according to Participant-4. The INGO works by strengthening communities to increase the welfare of equines. For more information: Brooke. (n.d.): How we do it: Our theory of change. [https://www.thebrooke.org/about-brooke/our-strategy/how-we-do-it-our-theory-change](https://www.thebrooke.org/about-brooke/our-strategy/how-we-do-it-our-theory-change)
create social change across multiple levels, because the strategies have been
developed and shaped to address each particular stakeholder group (Wilkins 2014:
9). Participant-4 believes that this range of campaigns and project direction aimed at
different solutions to the dog meat trade is no longer as singular as it once used to
be which is a key reason that the cause has been more successful lately
(Participant-4).

In the case of transnational activism, Participant-4 says that large campaigns
designed outside country sometimes seek to treat symptoms rather than provide
long-term sustainable change. Whilst the pursuit of long-term change is preferred, if
given the ability of a quick solution from outside, it may automatically change the
dynamics of a given community and their perception of dogs because you have
addressed their needs (Participant-4). As Tufte (2017: 26 of 200) states, strategies
must be designed to address underlying causes which is evident in Participant-4’s
example that show a clear dominant versus participatory approach to C4D.
Participant-4 refers to this as “tipping the HBC scale”, where AWOs have to
understand the context to design the best suited approach, which is something the
field is still learning (Participant-4) which is emphasized by Wilkins (2014: 9). Whilst
the quick, symptom-oriented route may have some advantages, it limits knowledge
sharing, discourages learning, and marginalizes communication (Lennie & Tacchi
2013: 6, 145).

When reflecting on community based approaches, Participant-4 explains that a lot of
the work he does with International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) is humane
community development. IFAW works with communities to strengthen individuals’
knowledge and skills to address a given issue. Through capacity development within
communities, as a facilitator IFAW aims for individuals to affect and implement
change themselves and to empowers local groups to develop their own projects
(Participant-4). IFAW’s model for change aligns with Quarry and Ramírez (2009:
25pp) who state that proper dialogue with those affected by the change is key, as
good development facilitates good communication.
Moreover, Participant-2 states that HSI’s initiative to transition farmers away from dog meat farming may have inspired similar approaches used by smaller Korea-based AWOs. In these cases, farms have been closed, dogs rescued and local organizations seek “flight volunteers” (to facilitate transport of dogs for international adoptions). Participant-2 says, that for her, “that is how I can see that it is working. As a Korean group, they take ownership and they become a movement, which is important because it is their country and they get to decide.” (Participant-2)

Whether the approach is to change the minds of the public or not, international AWOs strategies may have promoted an increase in civic engagement amongst local groups through the past three decades of activism. It serves as an example for social change in interdependent and complex systems (Wilkins 2014: 9) where explicit partnerships does not necessarily exist but where inspiration, strategies, and approaches may be developed because the organizations exists in the same professional sphere.

Conversely, Participant-3 strongly believes that change must come from the Korean people themselves. She argues that international dog rescues and adoptions provide great stories, but do not change Korean people’s minds. One reason may be the nationalistic tendencies of people not interested in foreign opinions. Participant-3 reiterates an approach where Korea-based organizations file complaints with local authorities against farmers that violate laws as a better example of success and one where Koreans mobilize to make this their movement (Participant-3). Participant-3 says she is slowly seeing a change in Korea, and that the educated younger generation caring about animals will eventually make an impact (Participant-3). As the evolution of social change in the context of the dog meat debate shows us, it is important to remember that social change is always contextual (Wilkins 2014: 9), cannot be forced, and occurs at its own pace (Scott 2014: 48).

As Korean organizations have assumed a larger role in the anti-dog meat campaign, it is difficult to gauge whether Koreans have been motivated on their own by the plight of dog meat dogs, wanting to take ownership of the movement, or because they have been empowered by INGOs. Other factors, such as economic and
educational advancement over the past three decades are likely to have contributed to the movement’s progress. It is unknown whether the movement would be more or less successful if it were an entirely Korea-driven change.

Evidence supports claims that change is taking place in Korea, albeit slowly. Whilst organizations are driven by a singular goal, each takes a unique approach to achieve it. Some of those approaches promote engagement with the communities they are trying to change. Others charge ahead with limited involvement of marginalized groups most affected by the change (Tufte 2017: 161 of 200).

CURRENT STATE OF DOG MEAT IN SOUTH KOREA

This section presents additional data and progresses in the current state of the dog meat debate in Korea, aside from the 14 organizations’ specific work. Furthermore, it includes legislative advances, recent public opinion polls and surveys, and changes in transnational approaches over the last two decades for the purpose of providing additional context to this research and to fill the gap from previous empirical research.

LEGISLATIVE ADVANCES

As noted earlier, there are often amendments to the APA and other laws that may impact the dog meat trade in Korea. In 2017, for example, an APA amendment included conditions for dogs raised for human companionship, as opposed to those raised for human consumption. Owners are now required to register their dogs to local governments; ensure their contact information is on dog tags; and leash their dogs. Failure to comply with these conditions is punishable by law, with rewards to anyone who reports owner transgressions (Library of Congress 2018). Whilst not directly applicable to dog meat dogs, these conditions can limit the chance of pet dogs ending up in the trade.

In an opinion poll conducted by HSI through Korean RealMeter in March 2018, 64.3% of respondents supported an amendment to the constitution that included
animal protection (HSI 2018), but as I have not been able to verify the research nor seen the outline for the sample group I hesitate to rely on such data.

**TRENDS IN PUBLIC OPINIONS FOR AND AGAINST THE DOG MEAT TRADE**

Organizations’ websites like HSI (n.d. b) and AWI (n.d.), and several participants state that they see social change in younger generations’ declining interest in dog meat or in taking an active stance against it, and that the trade is slowly dying out (Participant-1; Participant-2; Participant-3; Participant-5; Participant-6). Participant-6 recalls a mega-farmer that used to have 1,000 dogs, is now down to 200, and has decided to close his farm. Other farmers told her that it is a dying industry and will soon be history (Participant-6). Whilst these accounts are often based on anecdotal evidence from organizations’ staff, whether interacting with farmers or even lawmakers, more and more empirical evidence can be found to support these claims. IDA and CARE collaborated on an independent poll of 1,000 Koreans in 2016 to gauge consumption and perception of dog meat. Results indicated that 57% opposed the dog meat trade, an increase of 2% from 2007, and 60% had never eaten dog meat. Three quarters of respondents in their twenties had never eaten dog meat, an uptick of 15% from 2007 (IDA 2016). Journalist Kim Jae-heun (2018) cites another poll, by LCA, of 1,000 participants that shows slightly different findings: 40.5% of respondents said they had never tried dog meat, 24.8% said they ate bosintang in the past but not anymore, 18.8% said they would keep eating dog meat, and 1.2% eat it every month.

Assuming the polls could be considered as representative for the consensus in Korea, they indicate that change is a slow process, yet nevertheless occurring, particularly in younger generations. Participant-6 recounted an experience of friends being embarrassed they had eaten dog meat when confronted (Participant-6), showing signs of shame where it may not have existed in the past. Journalist Jae-heun (2018) cited an interviewee stating that his friends have made him more reluctant to eating dog meat. Today, it is mostly people in their 50s and 60s that eat dog meat. Jae-heun (2018) writes that according to Seoul Metropolitan Government, there has been a significant decrease in dog meat consumption and an increase in
animal rights awareness. As a result, 40% of dog meat restaurants in Seoul closed between 2005 and 2014, and others changed their menus or ‘hid’ bosintang from public view.

Yet it is not not without resistance that this perceived change is happening. Jae-heun (2018) writes that in May 2018 DMA supporters protested in front of the National Assembly, insisting that dogs be recognized as food and livestock. The DMA has traditionally had notable financial backing for which participants say increases the volume of their voice (Participant-3; Participant-5) in outreach and in legislative conversations. As Wilkins (2014: 60pp) highlights, advocacy organizations recognize that different access to resources contributes to the public agenda and policies, as well as the negotiating interests. van de Fliert’s (2014: 134) argument that advocacy communication can facilitate dialogue between opposing parties seems misplaced when so much is at stake for the farmers, as no support system exists in the case their livelihood disappears.

CHANGE IN APPROACH BY TRANSNATIONAL ACTIVISTS
Participants reiterates what much of existing academia has noted from AWOs’ previous attempts of affecting change in Korea’s dog meat customs. During international pressure ahead of the 1988 Olympics the Korean government responded by trying to hide the dog meat industry, appeasing the international community (Podberscek 2009: 620). When the same kind of international condemnation was executed around the 2002 World Cup it was defended as culture, and evoked a sense of national pride (Participant-1; Participant-4), even from those who otherwise did not particularly support the trade (Participant-1). Participant-1 continues by saying that:

I think a lot was learned after the huge backfire after the 2002 campaign. [...] And that's why I think the messaging was very different leading up to the 2018 Winter Olympics. At least by the bigger international organizations. [...] The messaging is far more inclusive rather than us versus them. (Participant-1)
The past experiences of AWOs campaign efforts from the 1988 Olympics and the 2002 World Cup show remnants of neoliberalism (Wilkins 2014: 60pp) as transnational activists condemned a whole society for a custom executed by a smaller portion the population. Today, INGOs and transnational activists involved in the dog meat debate target multiple stakeholder groups, including policy makers, corporations, and the public to promote change in perception of dog meat dogs (Hooghe 2011: 7p). None of the researched websites promoted hostile slander toward Koreans and Participant-7 clearly states “Denigrating Koreans as barbaric […], threatening boycotts and so on only cause decision makers in an extremely nationalistic country to dig in their heels.” (Participant-7) Based on past incidents, there is clear evidence that show INGOs coming in or talking about a country based on their ‘universal’ norms, without regard for cultural differences (whilst cultural is also debatable in this case as indicated by several INGOs; Appendix I; Participant-3). Furthermore, it gives basis to what Scott (2014: 48) explains - that we should not blindly go to other countries and condemn without considering what is at hand. Participant-3 argues that it is time for Koreans to take care of the dog meat debate and that the approaches in 2002 may have set the progress back (Participant-3). Evidence show that at least the researched organizations are not repeating the same contentious approach (Appendix I). Whether it is difficult to sustain or not as Hooghe (2011: 7p) argues, there are certainly both local activists and members of the Korean public that argue against transnational activism in their country. Yet other Korean activists see the benefits of transnational partnerships, for several reasons; expertise, funding, and an international adoptions base (Participant-5; Participant-6). Hooghe (2011: 7p) writes that issues of funding and resources precisely has been one of the criticisms of transnational activism as it may shift the power dynamics.
CONCLUSION

To conclude this research, analysis, and to answer my research question ‘How do South Korean animal welfare NGOs and INGOs’ strategic decisions to end the dog meat trade in South Korea influence social change in key stakeholders related to the trade?’ and the sub-research question ‘How can advocacy based agendas utilize participatory and/or diffusion based approaches to facilitate social change?’ I would like reiterate that social change is difficult to measure based on its many complexities (Wilkins 2014: 9). This has in large part been an exploratory research to see how AWOs strategic decisions may influence social change in the stated stakeholders. By researching strategies and methods, independent news articles, and interviewing animal welfare professionals the findings all help paint a picture of interconnected actions that may influence social change. There are four core themes identified in this analysis: 1) Multiple strategies and approaches to affect social change and bring an end to the dog meat trade, 2) Organizations’ use of participatory and diffusion approaches as a scalable tool, 3) Advocacy communication and its effect on approaches, and 4) Civic engagement as a tool for social change.

As demonstrated, the organizations in this research have adapted multiple strategies to affect social change and the outcome of the dog meat trade. Organizations like IDA focus both on legislative impact, and on rescuing individual dogs. HSI and SKD work to close down farms, by participatory versus law-enforcement based strategies. ALW and LCA, CARE, HSI, and SKD have explicit public awareness campaigns in order to affect societal changes in the perception of dog meat dogs. Others encourage civic actions through protests, petitions, and letters. SKD work to holistically complete social changes for cities to become dog meat free. These approaches serves as examples that many organizations not only differ from each other in strategies, but that they can adapt two to a multitude of different approaches (Appendix I). With multiple approaches concerted efforts are spread out which in
effect, create a comprehensive solution, one which oftentimes would be impossible as a single unit due to the extensive reach the dog meat trade has and the individual efforts of each AWO. Several of the AWOs mention that they aim to change public perception, others state that they need to change through joint efforts with varying stakeholders or the community as a whole (Appendix I). Organizations whether, consciously or subconsciously, work in the same sphere and create a larger reach and bigger impact for change by cheer numbers. While there are some collaborations and partnerships, many of the studied organizations operate in a smaller vacuum in which they may limit their potential impact on social change.

Whilst HSI’s method of closing down farms surely risks romanticizing the work on a local level (Tufte 2017: 68 of 200) with direct impact for the animals, the participants speak of this as only a piece of a larger effort as they show the government that a transition would also serve in the best interest of the farmers (Participant-1; Participant-6), which will especially be applicable in the case of an outright ban on the trade. Furthermore, it provides an excellent example of a highly participatory approach grounded in research (Scott 2014: 48, 57).

Overall, multiple approaches by the organizations contribute to a holistic approach to ending the trade. It ranges from civic engagement to targeting governing bodies, and whilst social change might be easier to trace in select local communities (Tufte 2017: 60pp of 200) and public perception perhaps it is reasonable that change occurs differently at a legislative level. In line with this, I would argue that the participatory and diffusion models are not only applicable differently in different projects, but that they are scalable within each project and activity. This highly relates to what Wilkins (2014: 9) write; that social change is complex, multi-leveled, unpredictable, interconnected, and interdependent and as such these multiple approaches may all influence individual, social, and legislative change. Not only can we see this in the evolution of the Korean dog meat trade but that several different approaches, at different times, have had an impact.
The advocacy campaigns in this research provide an insight to efforts to change public perception of dog meat dogs through a diffusion approach by disseminating information and sharing knowledge (Scott 2014: 57). Yet, in all of the different approaches, advocacy communication without neutrality has its limitations (Wilkins 2014: 60pp). The AWOs’ goal is to end the dog meat trade and whilst the methods to get there might be flexible and leave room for influence through participatory models, the ultimate goal is not and due to the AWOs interests, a fully participatory approach is difficult to attain (Scott 2014: 55).

When looking back at the history of the dog meat debate ‘starting’ in the 1980s the advocacy has for a long time been driven by international AWOs conducting transnational activism. Whether the approach is to change the minds of the public or not, international AWOs strategies may have promoted an increase in civic engagement amongst Korean groups regardless of whether the mobilization has been to take ownership of the social change and plight of the dog meat trade, or because they have been empowered to do so.

Moreover, with many organizations working towards the same goal it is on the one hand surprising that there are not more collaborations, and on the other hand not surprising as the organizations are pursuing a variety of venues in what they consider being the ultimate solution. Whilst not researched here, joint campaigns across a large number of organizations through a coalition (Participant-1) would potentially be more impactful to address the dog meat trade as the anti-dog meat activists lack the unified front that the DMA has.

Finally, Participant-4 has a friend that once said “Any improvement in animal welfare is an improvement in animal welfare” and whilst CFAF as an organization tries to look at the big picture in the course of change, they find that every once while an animal needs to be helped (Participant-4). This is oftentimes, yet not always, the underlying consensus amongst many AWOs as the ultimate goal is to end the suffering of dogs in the dog meat trade and to ban the dog meat trade altogether.
SUGGESTED FURTHER RESEARCH

This research has its limitations, and with adequate time, resources, and in collaborations with native Korean speakers this topic alone could be further studied, especially by including Korean based AWOs that have not been a part of this research. It could also be of value to research visual material, campaign material and content to see what type of message really connects with those minds these AWOs are trying to change. Another topic that emerged in interviews and research is the state of transnational activism versus home-based activism on the argument that nationalistic values are deeply rooted in Korea. This would be a valuable research to conduct in order for INGOs to understand their role in the conversation, whether it is to inform them for in-country work or to invest in local activists and organizations.
### INTERVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Date</th>
<th>Participant # Reference</th>
<th>F/M</th>
<th>Primary organization</th>
<th>Secondary organization</th>
<th>Interview form</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-05-10</td>
<td>Participant-1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CFAF</td>
<td>HSI</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>Undisclosed, Indonesia and Washington DC, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-05-10</td>
<td>Participant-2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>HSI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Washington DC, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-05-10</td>
<td>Participant-3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Anonymous INGO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Face-to-face via Skype</td>
<td>Undisclosed, USA and Washington DC, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-05-15</td>
<td>Participant-4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CFAF</td>
<td>IFAW</td>
<td>Face-to-face via Skype</td>
<td>Undisclosed, Portugal and Windhoek, Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-05-16</td>
<td>Participant-5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>SKD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook phone</td>
<td>Undisclosed, South Korea and Windhoek, Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-05-19</td>
<td>Participant-6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>HSI</td>
<td></td>
<td>WhatsApp phone</td>
<td>Undisclosed, USA and Windhoek, Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-05-22</td>
<td>Participant-7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>IDA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Undisclosed, USA and Windhoek, Namibia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disclosure: All interviews were conducted by the researcher and stored in their possession.

### WEBSITE CONTENT ANALYSIS

#### Website research of organizations' strategies to close down the dog meat trade (references informed results in Appendix I)

Research date: 2018-05-01 through 2018-05-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Organization name</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Animal Welfare Institute</td>
<td><a href="https://awionline.org/dogmeat">https://awionline.org/dogmeat</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Change for Animals Foundation</td>
<td><a href="http://www.changeforanimals.org/southkoreascrueldogmeatindustry?gclid=Cj0KCQw8YXXBRDUXARIsAMzSzQuU1C4mQIREwAA1Tkm4UJKQVD4UnsDUnfWhYQxvK93i8U3nolCiaQ4aAmfFEALw_wcB">http://www.changeforanimals.org/southkoreascrueldogmeatindustry?gclid=Cj0KCQw8YXXBRDUXARIsAMzSzQuU1C4mQIREwAA1Tkm4UJKQVD4UnsDUnfWhYQxvK93i8U3nolCiaQ4aAmfFEALw_wcB</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DoVE Project</td>
<td><a href="https://www.dove-project.org/">https://www.dove-project.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Free Korean Dogs</td>
<td><a href="https://www.freekoreandogs.org/about/">https://www.freekoreandogs.org/about/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Humane Society International</td>
<td>[<a href="http://welcome.hsi.org/dog-meat/?&amp;utm_source=googlegrant&amp;utm_medium=cpc&amp;dt">http://welcome.hsi.org/dog-meat/?&amp;utm_source=googlegrant&amp;utm_medium=cpc&amp;dt</a> a_tracking_id=googlegrant-cpc-US-Dog-Meat-Korea&amp;utm_content=Dog-Meat-Korea &amp;gclid=Cj0KCQw8YXXBRDUXARIsAMzSzQuXl68C761E7dVorU.JkrRZ6Mw3mJQ3y1T0aKFBs0l.gWvC-0eDOHTF0oaAq11EALw_wcB](<a href="http://welcome.hsi.org/dog-meat/?&amp;utm_source=googlegrant&amp;utm_medium=cpc&amp;dtata_tracking_id=googlegrant-cpc-US-Dog-Meat-Korea&amp;utm_content=Dog-Meat-Korea">http://welcome.hsi.org/dog-meat/?&amp;utm_source=googlegrant&amp;utm_medium=cpc&amp;dtata_tracking_id=googlegrant-cpc-US-Dog-Meat-Korea&amp;utm_content=Dog-Meat-Korea</a> &amp;gclid=Cj0KCQw8YXXBRDUXARIsAMzSzQuXl68C761E7dVorU.JkrRZ6Mw3mJQ3y1T0aKFBs0l.gWvC-0eDOHTF0oaAq11EALw_wcB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>In Defence of Animals</td>
<td><a href="https://www.idausa.org/campaign/dog-meat/">https://www.idausa.org/campaign/dog-meat/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>International Aid for Korean Animals</td>
<td><a href="https://koreananimals.org/about/history/">https://koreananimals.org/about/history/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Korean K9 Rescue</td>
<td><a href="http://www.koreank9rescue.org/about/">http://www.koreank9rescue.org/about/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Save Korean Dogs</td>
<td><a href="http://savekoreandogs.org/about/">http://savekoreandogs.org/about/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Soi Dog Foundation</td>
<td><a href="https://www.soidog.org/content/about-us">https://www.soidog.org/content/about-us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Last Chance for Animals (n.d). ‘Every year, a million dogs are brutally slaughtered in S. Korea for meat while the government turns a blind eye’. Retrieved on March 26, 2018 from http://www.stopdogmeat.com/
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