Chapter 2

DEVELOPMENT COMMUNICATION -
A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW
Development communication originated in post-war (World War II) international aid programs to Third World countries (in Latin America, Asia and Africa), where poverty, illiteracy, poor health and a lack of economic, political and social infrastructures were rampant (Melkote and Steeves, 2001, Waisbord, 2000). At that time, these countries were in a hurry to find solutions to these most urgent needs of their people (Kumar, 1994). Development theories have their roots in the mid-twentieth century optimism that the post-colonial world could eventually ‘catch-up’ with the industrialised Western countries. As many African and Asian countries got freedom from the European empires in 1960s, the most important issue was to address the large disparities between the so-called ‘developed’ and ‘underdeveloped’ countries. Development perhaps meant the process by which these countries could become more like the Western ‘developed’ societies in terms of political system, economic growth, life expectancy, education etc. (Inkeles and Smith, 1974). The implicit assumption was that there was one form of development as visible in the developed world that underdeveloped societies needed to replicate.

Since then, different definitions of development communication were provided in numerous studies. However, development communication commonly refers to the application of communication strategies and principles in the developing world. Melkote (1991: 229) states that the goal of ‘development communication’ is to improve the quality of life of populations
and also increasing income levels, promoting well-being, eradicating social injustice, promoting land reform and freedom of speech, and establishing community centres for leisure and entertainment. Today, development communication encompasses a bigger role by facilitating removal of constraints for a more equal and participatory society.

MODERNIZATION THEORY AND THE DOMINANT PARADIGM

Research and projects addressing development communication flourished during the First ‘development decade’ in the 1960s. Different theories and strategies that emerged during this period, shared the premise that problems of development were basically rooted in lack of knowledge. Consequently, it was considered that interventions were needed to provide people with information to change behaviour.

The early studies in development communication were dominated by ‘modernization theory’, which suggested that cultural and information deficits were the root causes for development problems, and therefore could not be resolved only through economic assistance (a la Marshall Plan to resuscitate Europe in the post-war period) (Melkote and Steeves, 2001: 54). Existence of a ‘traditional culture’ in the Third World countries was looked at as a major factor that inhibited development. In other words, culture was viewed as the bottleneck that prevented the adoption of modern attitudes and behaviour. Based on this diagnosis, development communication proposed
that changes in ideas would result in transformations in behaviour. The low rate of agricultural output, prevalence of malnutrition, high rate of fertility and mortality, or the low rates of literacy found in the underdeveloped countries were attributed to the persistence of traditional values and attitudes that prevented modernization. Hence the goal to instil modern values and information through the transfer of media technology and the adoption of innovations and culture originated. Thus, the problem of underdeveloped regions was believed to be an information problem and communication was presented as the instrument that would solve it. Exposure to mass media was viewed as an important factor that could bring about modern attitudes. As theorized by Daniel Lerner (1958) and Wilbur Schramm (1964), communication basically meant transmission of information. And this knowledge-transfer model dominated the arena of communication for years. Emphasis was laid on media-centred persuasion activities that could improve literacy, which would, in turn, allow the populations to come out of traditionalism. The Shannon-Weaver model that set out to explain the transmission of information became extremely influential in communication studies. The other was the propaganda model developed during World War II which was termed as the ‘bullet theory’ by Schramm (1971) and ‘hypodermic needle theory’ by Berlo (1960). This model posited that the mass media had bullet-like effects in reaching the information to the communities and changing their attitudes and behaviour. The ‘stimulus-response’ model also explained the same (McQuail and Windhal, 1981). In these perspectives,
communication was portrayed as a linear and one-way process in which senders send information through media channels to receivers. Consequently, development communication was equated with the massive introduction of media technologies to promote modernization and to serve as agents of diffusion of modern culture. This obviously meant that the diffusion of media technologies meant that modernization could be measured and quantified in terms of media penetration (Lerner 1958, Inkeles and Smith 1974). Even the statistics produced by the United Nations Organisation regarded the penetration of newspapers, radio and television sets as proxies of development. National governments soon looked at media as instruments for the dissemination of modern ideas that would improve agriculture, health/ nutrition, education, and politics. So-called “small” media such as publications, posters and leaflets were also recommended as crucial to the success of what became known as Development Support Communication, that is, the creation of the human environment necessary for a development program to succeed (Agunga 1997).

**Diffusion of Innovations**

Among the modernization theories, Everett Rogers's (1962, 1983) “diffusion of innovations” theory became one of the most influential ones. Having reviewed over 500 empirical studies, he proposed that there are five stages through which an individual passes before an innovation is adapted, viz., awareness, knowledge and interest, decision, trial, and adoption/rejection. Rogers’ premise was that innovations diffuse over time
according to individuals’ stages of adoption of an innovation. He divided populations in different groups according to their propensity to incorporate innovations and adopting them – innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority and laggards. According to him, the early adopters act as models to emulate and create a favourable climate for acceptance and change. The slow adopters were called laggards (Rogers, 1969). This latter category was used to describe a majority of the population in the Third World.

According to Rogers (1962), development communication entailed a process by which an idea is transferred from a source to a receiver with the intent to change his/her behaviour. He theorized that the source usually wants to alter the receiver's knowledge of some idea, thereby changing his/her attitude toward the same and thus, finally persuading the receiver to adopt the idea as part of the regular behaviour.

Moving away from media-centrism that was reflected in earlier theories, the “diffusion” studies emphasized that although media had a great importance in increasing awareness, interpersonal communication and personal sources were also vital in making people adopt innovations. In a way, the ‘opinion leader theory’ put forth by Katz and Lazarsfeld (1955) contributed significant insights to this new outlook. They found that interpersonal relations were crucial in channelling and shaping opinion. According to the ‘opinion leader’ theory, there are two steps in information flow viz., from the media to opinion leaders, and from leaders to the masses.
indicating that the audiences rely on the opinions of members of their social
groups rather than solely on the mass media. This insight was incorporated in
diffusion studies. Scholars like Hornik (1998) established the effectiveness of
extension workers in agricultural development projects highlighting the
importance of interpersonal networks in disseminating innovations (Hornik
1988). As a result of these, the role of change agents and beneficiaries was also
seen as crucial along with that of communicators.

In the mid-1970s, the need to review some basic premises of
modernization theories was felt. In a widely quoted article, Rogers (1976)
admitted “the passing of the dominant paradigm.” He concluded that it was
necessary to be sensitive to the specific socio-cultural environment in which
communication took place. Consequently, Rogers’s definition of
communication showed important changes. Development was looked at as a
participatory process of social change. Communication was no longer
focussed on persuasion or transmission of information between individuals/
groups, but was understood as a process by which participants create and
share information with one another in order to reach a mutual understanding
(Rogers 1976).
OTHER THEORIES IN THE TRADITION OF DOMINANT PARADIGM

Social marketing

Social marketing has been one of the approaches that have carried forward the premises of diffusion of innovation and behaviour change models. Since the 1970s, social marketing has been one of the most influential strategies in the field of development communication.

The concept of social marketing was first introduced by Kotler and Zaltman (1971: 5) and was defined as “the design, implementation and control of programmes calculated to influence the acceptability of social ideas and involving considerations of product, planning, pricing, communication, distribution and marketing research”. It was clearly a product of specific political and academic developments in the United States that were later incorporated into development projects. Among various reasons, the emergence of social marketing responded to two main developments: the political climate in the late 1960s that put pressure on various disciplines to attend to social issues, and the emergence of non-profit organizations that found marketing to be a useful tool (Elliott, 1991). Social marketing consisted of putting into practice standard techniques in commercial marketing to promote pro-social behaviour. It imported theories of consumer behaviour from marketing and advertising into the field of development communication. The analysis of consumer behaviour required an understanding of the influences that create consumer needs and how those
needs can be met (Novelli 1990). Influences include environmental, individual, and information-processing and decision making. At the core of social marketing theory is the exchange model according to which individuals, groups and organizations exchange resources for perceived benefits of purchasing products. The aim of interventions is to create voluntary exchanges. What social marketing brought was a focus on using marketing techniques such as market segmentation and formative research to maximize the effectiveness of interventions. More recently, Andreasen (1994: 110) has defined it as “the adaptation of commercial marketing technologies to programs designed to influence the voluntary behaviour of target audiences to improve their personal welfare and that of the society of which they are a part.”

Social marketing suggested that the emphasis should be put not so much on getting ideas out or transforming attitudes but influencing behaviour. For some of its best-known proponents, behaviour change is social marketing’s bottom line. Unlike commercial marketing, which is not concerned with the social consequences of its actions, the social marketing model centres on communication campaigns designed to promote socially beneficial practices or products in a target group. Social marketing’s goal is to position a product by giving information that could help fulfil, rather than create, uncovered demand. It intends to “reduce the psychological, social, economic and practical distance between the consumer and the behaviour”
Social marketing’s focus on behaviour change, understanding of communication as persuasion (transmission of information), and top-down approach to bring about change suggested an affinity with modernization and diffusion of innovation theories (Waisbord, 2000).

Critics of social marketing have pointed out that social marketing often manipulates populations as it is solely concerned with goals without regard for means. In the name of achieving certain goals, social marketing justifies any methods (Buchanan, et. al., 1994). Others argued that social marketing is a non-participatory strategy because it treats most people as mere consumers. Because it borrows techniques from Western advertising, it shares its premises, namely, a concern with selling products rather than participation. Social marketers have brushed aside these criticisms, emphasizing that social marketing is a two-way process and that it is genuinely concerned about community participation (McKee, 1994). As Novelli (1990) puts it, “the marketing process is circular.” This is why input from targeted communities, gathered through qualitative methods such as focus groups and in-depth interviews, is fundamental to design campaign activities and content.
Health promotion and health education

The concept of health promotion was also originally founded in the United States and was later applied for interventions in developing countries. The same approaches that were used to battle chronic diseases, high-fat diets, and smoking in the United States in the 1970s and 80s, were adopted in development interventions such as child survival and other programs that aimed to remedy health problems in the Third World (Waisbord, 2000). Health promotion was dominated by the view that individual behaviour was largely responsible for health problems and, consequently, interventions should focus on changing behaviour (Terris, 1992).

The prevalent view was that changes in personal behaviours were needed to have a healthier population. Although the imperative of institutional changes gained some ground, a good number of studies were offered as conclusive evidence that personal choices determined changes in health behaviour.

This highly individualistic perspective was initially criticized in the context of developed countries for ‘blaming the victim’ and ignoring social conditions that facilitated and encouraged unhealthy behaviours (Waisbord, 2000). To its critics, individual-centred health promotion ignores the surrounding social context within which individual health behaviours take place (Minkler and Wallerstein, 1997). They pointed out that the overall context needed to be considered both as responsible and as the possible target.
of change. Today, international organisations such as the World Health Organization seem to be moving away from the individualistic views and they stress that the goal of health promotion is to provide and maintain conditions that make it possible for people to make healthy choices.

‘Health education’ is an important component of health promotion. It refers to learning experiences to facilitate individual adoption of healthy behaviours (Glanz et al., 1990). The evolution of health education was also more like that of health promotion. Initially dominated by conventional educational approaches that emphasized knowledge transmission and acquisition as well as changes in knowledge, attitudes and beliefs, theories and strategies that stressed the importance of social and environmental changes gradually gained relevance. This meant that both health education and health promotion became more broadly understood. More recently, health education has come to encompass a variety of interventions, including conventional education, social marketing, health communication, and empowerment actions (Stetson and Davis, 1999). Today health promotion includes the promotion of public policies that are responsible for shaping a healthy environment. The goal of health promotion is to facilitate the environmental conditions to support healthy behaviours (WHO, 1986).

**Entertainment-education**

Entertainment-education is a communication strategy to disseminate information through the media. As applied in development communication, it
was originally developed in Mexico in the mid-1970s and has been used in 75 countries, including India, Nigeria, the Philippines, Turkey, Gambia, and Pakistan. Paradigmatic examples of this approach have been soap operas in Latin America (telenovelas) that were intended to provide information about family planning, sexual behaviour, and health issues. In India, television broadcasts of the soap opera Hum Log (We People) had positive results in promoting certain socially desirable behaviour -- women's equality and smaller family size. Developed by Doordarshan, India's government television system, Hum Log was telecast in Hindi consisted of 156 episodes of 22 minutes each, and ran for 17 months during 1984-85. At the end of each program, an epilogue lasting 30-50 seconds summarized the social concepts and provided guides to action (Singhal and Rogers, 1989). Literacy and agricultural development have also been central themes of several entertainment education efforts in some countries.

Entertainment-education is not a theory but a strategy to maximize the reach and effectiveness of health messages through the combination of entertainment and education. It subscribes to the Shannon-Weaver model of communication of sender-channel-message-receiver. Like diffusion theory, it is concerned with behaviour change through the dissemination of information. It is based on Albert Bandura's (1977) social learning theory, a framework currently dominant in health promotion. Entertainment-education is premised on the idea that individuals learn behaviour by observing role models, particularly in the mass media.
Entertainment-education refers to “the process of purposely designing and implementing a media message to both entertain and educate, in order to increase audience knowledge about an educational issue, create favourable attitudes, and change overt behaviour” (Singhal and Rogers, 1999: xii).

**CRITIQUES OF THE DOMINANT PARADIGM**

**Dependency theory**

One of the most powerful critiques of modernization/diffusion theories came from the dependency paradigm. Contrary to the modernization theories, the dependency theorists argued that the problems of underdevelopment were not internal to Third World countries but were determined by external factors and the way they were being attempted to be integrated into the world economy. For instance, Andre Gunder Frank (1969) based on his studies in Chile and Brazil chose to view ‘development’ from a structuralist and socioeconomic perspective and suggested that imperialism and development were tied to the unfolding of capitalism. In one of his essays he wrote, “for all regimes, democratic and non-democratic alike, it is dependence within the global system which establishes the framework for policy and political practice. Even the ‘choice of people’ is determined by economics” (Frank, 1991:21). In fact, it was argued that the developed countries attempted to control economic power and political decisions in all the countries around the world. The social and economic consequences of such attempts kept the Third World countries underdeveloped and
maintained their dependency. Thus, the Third World countries were politically and culturally dependent on the West. While these represented the external problems, the internal socio-economic and political scenarios were also partially responsible for the problems of underdevelopment (Kapoor, 2002). It was argued that the development programs failed to address structures of inequality and targeted individual rather than social factors and that the problems of the underdeveloped world were more political rather than the result of the lack of information (Hornik, 1988). Unequal land distribution, lack of credit for peasants, and poor health care services were some of the limiting factors. Consequently, interventions were doomed due to lack of basic conditions that could make it possible for people to adopt new attitudes and behaviours.

Experts also argued that in singling out the mass media as having a central role in introducing innovations, modernization theorists ignored the issue of media ownership and control. Some of them felt that powerful interests controlled the media that was supposed to promote development. A few others opined that the media were not interested in championing social goals or helping underprivileged populations but in transmitting entertainment and trivial information (Shore, 1980). Thus the dependency theorists brought forward the role of interrelationship between the media structure, content and the context in the Third World countries which were in a way ignored in modernization theories (Melkote and Steeves, 2001). They
believed that solution to underdevelopment problems was essentially political, rather than merely informational. It can be said that the Dependency Theory has not yet provided a plausible theory of successful approach to underdevelopment. However, a moral critique on the resultant problems of the development dominance was brought forward by the thinkers who subscribed to the dependency paradigm. They have also expedited the exploration for alternative models for mass human welfare (Nair and White, 1994).

**Participatory theories**

Modernization paradigm was criticized on the grounds that it promoted a top-down, ethnocentric and paternalistic view of development. The participatory theorists argued that the diffusion model proposed a conception of development associated with a Western vision of progress. They have also criticized traditional approaches for not involving local people in preparing and implementing development interventions. For instance, Governments often decided what was best for agricultural populations, without giving them a sense of ownership in the systems that were introduced (Mody, 1991; Servaes, 1989; White 1994). In a way these approaches were ‘top-down’ in nature, which implicitly assumed that the knowledge of governments and agencies was correct, and that indigenous populations either did not know or had incorrect beliefs. For participatory theorists and practitioners, development communication required sensitivity
to cultural diversity and specific context that were ignored by modernization theories. The lack of such sensitivity accounted for the problems and failures of many projects.

As an alternative to both the modernization and dependency paradigms of development communication, the participatory development communication approach emphasizes the importance of people’s participation in the process of communication design, implementation and evaluation. Many communication scholars (Bordenave, 1994; Moemeka, 1994; Servaes 1996) believe that involvement of people would stimulate two-way communication and enhance the likelihood of success of the programme. The rationale behind participatory communication is that it eliminates a one-way, prescriptive, and expert-centred approach to development. It involves the development recipients in two-way dialogical interactions in the design, development, implementation and evaluation of development projects (Khadka, 2000).

In short, participatory theories considered necessary a redefinition of development communication. One set of definitions stated that it meant the systematic utilization of communication channels and techniques to increase people’s participation in development and to inform, motivate, and train rural populations mainly at the grassroots. Bordanave (1994) defines ‘participatory communication’ as that type of communication in which all the interlocutors
are free and have equal access to means to express their viewpoints, feelings and experiences. Collective action aimed at promoting their interests, solving their problems and transforming their society is the objective.

For others, development communication needed to be human rather than media-centered. This implied abandonment of the persuasion bias that development communication had inherited from the theories of dominant paradigm.

At this juncture, it is necessary to discuss the work of Brazilian educator Paulo Freire (1970) in the 1960s and early 1970s, particularly in relation to literacy training, which challenged the conceptions of development communication. He argued that development programmes had failed to educate small farmers because they were interested in persuading them about the benefits of adopting certain innovations. Development programmes tried to domesticate foreign concepts, to feed information, to force local populations to accept Western ideas and practices without asking how such practices fit existing cultures. Freire felt that the goal of communication should be ‘conscientization’, which Freire defined as free dialogue that prioritized cultural identity, trust and commitment. His approach has been called “dialogical pedagogy” which defined equity in distribution and active grassroots participation as central principles. Freire’s ideas ran against fundamental principles in the diffusion model - the sender-focus and
behaviour bias. He diagnosed the problems in the Third World as problems of communication, not information as persuasion theories proposed.

Studies in a variety of Third World rural settings found that marginal and illiterate groups preferred to communicate face-to-face rather than through mass media or other one-way sources of communication (Okunna, 1995). The recommendation was that development workers should rely more on interpersonal methods of communication rather than national media and technologies, and that they should act as facilitators of dialogue. People, not change agents, were central to community participation. It stressed on indigenous knowledge and aspirations in development and downplayed the role of expert and external knowledge. Communication was viewed as a horizontal process and not as a vertical model that placed knowledge in the domain of a few experts.

Participatory communication encourages community participation in decision-making, implementation, and evaluation of projects. This, researchers said, would give a sense of involvement and ownership and skills that they can use beyond the timetable of development projects (Kavinya, et.al., 1994).

Community empowerment has become one of the main contributions of participatory theories to development communication. Empowerment is
possible only if community members critically reflect on their experiences and understand the reasons for failure and success of interventions (Bradford and Gwynne, 1995).

Even participatory communication was criticized on many counts. One problem in participatory models was that it was not clear that communities needed to be involved for certain results to be achieved. In some cases such as epidemics and other public health crises, quick and top-down solutions could achieve positive results. Participatory communication ignores that expediency may also positively contribute to development. Shirley White (1994:18) says, “approaching through grassroots decision-making process could often be a slower process than centralized decisions, rendering participation unviable method in cases that require prompt resolutions”. Another problem was that participation in all stages does not have similar relevance. If decisions were made outside of the community and the latter was assigned the role of implementing and evaluating results, participation was limited to instances that depended on decisions previously made (White 1994; McKee 1994).

The focus on interpersonal relations in the participatory approach also underplayed the potential of the mass media in promoting development. Little attention was paid to the uses of mass media in participatory settings, an issue that is particularly relevant considering that populations, even in remote areas, are constantly exposed to commercial media messages that
stand in opposition to the goals set by programs. This lack was particularly evident in Freire’s theory of dialogical communication that is based on group interactions, setting aside the role of the mass media (Waisbord, 2000).

Moreover, people can be manipulated into participating. This would violate local autonomy and the possibility that members might not be interested in taking an active role. Critics argued that participatory communication, could be seen as foreign, pushing for certain goals and actions that have not resulted from inside communities.

Servaes (1996:23) admits that “participation does not always entail cooperation nor consensus. It can often mean conflict and usually poses a threat to extant structures...Rigid and general strategies for participation are neither possible nor desirable.”

**Media advocacy**

Media advocacy is another approach that questions central premises of the traditional paradigms. Media advocacy is the strategic use of mass media to advance social or public policy initiatives (Wallack, et.al., 1993). Its goals are to stimulate debate and promote responsible portrayals and coverage of development issues. Advocacy requires mobilization of resources and groups in support of certain issues and policies to change public opinion and decisions. It consists of the organization of information for dissemination
through various interpersonal and media channels towards gaining political and social acceptance of certain issues (Stuart and Achterberg, 1997).

Like education-entertainment strategies, media advocacy rejects the idea that the media can be a source of only anti-social messages, and instead, proposes to include socially relevant themes in entertainment. Unlike education-entertainment, which has been mostly concerned with directly influencing audiences, media advocacy centres on shaping the public debate on various issues.

According to media advocacy theory, campaigns are not the panacea not only because their effectiveness is questionable, but also because they ignore the social causes of behaviour. Media advocacy adopts a participatory approach that emphasizes the need of communities to gain control and power to transform their environments. It assigns the media a pivotal role in raising issues that need to be discussed and putting pressure on decision-makers. However, advocacy is not solely concerned with media actions.

In summary, advocacy consists of a large number of information activities, such as lobbying with decision makers through personal contacts and direct mail; holding seminars, rallies and news making events; ensuring regular newspaper, magazine, television and radio coverage and obtaining endorsements from known people (Wiasbord, 2000).
Social mobilization

Social mobilization is a term used by the United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund (UNICEF) to describe a comprehensive planning approach that emphasizes political coalition building and community action (UNICEF, 1993). It is the process of bringing together all feasible and practical inter-sectoral social allies to raise people’s awareness of and demand for a particular development programme and to strengthen community participation for sustainability and self-reliance.

Mobilization is a process through which community members become aware of a problem, identify the problem as a high priority for community action, and decide steps to take action (Thompson and Pertschuk, 1992). It starts with problem assessment and analysis at the community level and moves to action on chosen courses, involving many strategic allies at all levels in a wide range of support activities. Central to social mobilization interventions is empowerment or the process through which individuals or communities take direct control over their lives and environment (Minkler and Wallerstein, 1997).

Social mobilization suggests that wide community participation is necessary for members to gain ownership so innovations would not be seen as externally imposed. McKee (1999) says that social mobilization is the glue that binds advocacy activities to more planned and researched program
communication activities. At the same time, he time reiterates that social mobilization programs require that government agencies, NGOs and donor agencies need to meet and review the objectives and methodology of the research, follow its progress through periodic briefings and give feedback on the final report.

**Development Support Communication**

Emphasis on greater participation of beneficiaries in the process of development in general and message development in particular, has prompted a relook into the role of communication in development. There is a shift from ‘the concept of ‘development communication’ with its emphasis on top-down, media-centred communication to ‘development support communication’ focused on co-equal, little-media-centred government-with-people communication’ (Ascroft and Masilela, 1989). In the context of absence of common language of communication between the administrators, technical experts on the one hand and receivers on the other, scholars of development support communication are focusing on constructing communication models, which would make development communication messages comprehensible and relevant to the user-receivers (Melkote, 1991: 262). Although some scholars have written an obituary for Development Support Communication (Hornik, 1988), Melkote and Steeves (2001) argue that the very concept of ‘development’ if re-conceptualised to mean ‘empowerment’, entails a new role for specialists in development support communication.
ESSENTIALS FOR SUCCESS OF DEVELOPMENT COMMUNICATION

In conclusion, it can be said that whatever be the differences among theories and approaches, one point of convergence is that political will is necessary in order to bring about change (Hornik, 1988). Development communication should not only be concerned with working for specific outcomes but also aim at community empowerment. This requires coming up with a set of indicators that measure the impact of interventions in terms of empowerment. While empowerment lacks a single, conclusive definition, it may refer to communities making decisions for themselves and acquiring knowledge (e.g. about health issues). Whereas for participatory/advocacy approaches empowerment may mean changes in power distribution, advocates of social marketing suggest that marketing empowers people by providing information and having constant feedback from consumers.

Practitioners seem to have realized that a multi-pronged approach with diverse strategies is needed to improve the quality of life of communities in developing countries. Rather than promoting specific theories and methodologies regardless of the problem at stake, there has been an emerging consensus that different techniques are appropriate in different contexts in order to deal with different problems and priorities.

It would be interesting to understand how the trends in theory and practice of development communication have impacted nutrition education
and communication. However, before venturing into the historical aspects of nutrition communication research and practice, it would be pertinent to understand how nutrition research evolved in India.