

# SUMMARY

## The 2016 “terminology webinars”

---

JANE SHERMAN, MELISSA VARGAS

*How do we get to this?*



What do we call the work we do to help people to eat better? Globally there are several schools of thought and practice, such as *social behavior change communication*, *(food and) nutrition education*, *social marketing*, *health promotion* and *IEC* (information, education, communication). Although they have a lot in common, there are differences in reputation, spread, ideology, practice and effect, and (conspicuously) in terminology. Different names are customary in different parts of the world, some names are widely misinterpreted and misused even within the profession, and those responsible for deciding strategies to raise the health of the nations (governments, donors, aid organizations, investors) seldom know what the terms mean or how to choose between them. In opening a discussion to increase mutual professional understanding, we therefore felt it best to start with the terminology, so that we would all know what we were talking about.

In April - May 2016 two parallel “terminology webinars” were held, hosted by the Society for Nutrition Education and Behavior (English) and the RED ICEAN for nutrition educators (Spanish). Each consisted of six expert presentations on different approaches to the design and implementation of programs aiming at voluntary improvements in food practices. The presenters characterized each approach through definition, explanation, examples and key elements, and for each the audience indicated in polls how far they agreed with the profiles presented and what elements they saw as keys to success.

The two webinars attracted large audiences with participants from a wide range of countries and organizations. Impressions gained from polls, registration information and questions were that the best-known approaches had a small core of well-informed support in the audience. The majority of participants were uncertain about most of the approaches at the start but picked up a lot of insights and clarifications from the webinars. The audience also appeared to favour “empowerment” approaches (e.g. building independent choice and capacity), a strong community base, practical learning and “attractive choices”.

We hope to continue the dialogue between the different schools of thought and practice, focusing on identifying what we have in common and where we differ and on the keys to success, so that we can enhance our impact, develop useful outputs and coordinate advocacy efforts.