

DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION AND SOCIAL MARKETING: TWO DISCIPLINES WITH ONE PURPOSE

Chahid Fourali

Abstract: This article discusses two disciplines, development education (DE) and social marketing (SM), that appear to be too similar in several ways to overlook the mutual learning that can be achieved by workers in these two areas. Both DE and SM advocates see in them a clear opportunity for reducing global disadvantages while enhancing mutual understanding, with a view to minimising world conflicts. Both DE and SM show scholarly traditions that can be of mutual interest to both disciplines. This article will introduce both disciplines before contrasting them at several levels and highlighting their strengths and opportunities for mutual enhancement. Finally, it will argue for the need for practitioners in both fields to work together to reap the respective advantages in each of the two disciplines.

Key words: Education; Development Education; Marketing; Social Marketing; Social Ills; Social Justice; Power and Conflicts.

Introduction

Although there is a significant body of work that is growing in the development education (DE) and social marketing (SM) sectors, the two disciplines appear to have developed separately (Elliott, Fourali and Issler, 2010; Fourali, 2014). Indeed, despite some attempts being made to introduce the educational community, including DE, to the relevance of social marketing (Fourali, 2010), there is still a lack of awareness among educators about the opportunities that this relatively new discipline presents. This article will briefly review the two disciplines with a view to showing how similar they are in several ways and how they could benefit from mutual co-operation. SM is a relatively new field of research and practice with the aim of using the powerful techniques of marketing,

and other disciplines, for the good of society (Fourali, 2016). DE is seen as education towards action and social change to address the challenges of inequality and injustice (McCloskey, 2014). The article will firstly introduce and systematically compare the two sectors at various levels and will conclude with some observations about how they could work together.

Similarities at definitional levels?

The excesses generated by an irresponsible application of the marketing principles affect all our society. However, how many critics of the ‘rampaging’ neoliberal doctrine primarily represented by a materialistic marketing philosophy stopped for a moment to ask: if marketing is such a powerful discipline that is affecting our society, can we harness such power for the good of society? It is this question that drove several socially responsible marketers to what is now known as SM. Several definitions have been proposed for SM but perhaps a simple way of defining it is to refer to a functional definition that addresses the purpose of SM as follows:

“To apply marketing alongside other concepts and techniques in order to influence individuals, organizations, policy makers, and decision makers to adopt and sustain behaviour which improves people’s lives” (Fourali, 2009: 21).

This definition differentiates marketing from both commercial marketing and socially responsible organisations. Indeed, while commercial marketing and socially responsible organisations may undertake some activities that intend to help address a social problem (e.g. causal marketing) their ultimate purpose is to make a profit and remain sustainable. This is to stress that some organisations get involved in charitable activities primarily to enhance their brand value with the view that such activities will encourage more customers to view them favourably, which in turn leads to an increase in profit. By contrast, SM’s

primary responsibility is to society.

How about DE?

DE was a considered response to the inequalities and injustices in society, both locally and globally, through awareness raising, critical analysis and action toward social change. Indeed, development educators realised that the aims of education can be much more targeted at serving humanity as a whole rather than adopting a neoliberal model of competitive individualism that not only overlooks the broader aims of education but transforms them into a very restrictive purpose of producing a workforce for current corporate needs (Denzin, 2015). Development education can therefore be seen as an attempt to reinstate the broader aims of education that include public values, critical content, and civic responsibilities. Development education's purpose has been described as the educational response to many global development concerns that called for urgent action (McCloskey, 2014). It advocates the development of a new paradigm that fosters a re-conceptualisation of knowledge with a view to promoting the transformative role of education (Tarozzi and Torres, 2016) so as to induce social change across nations guided by inclusive human values.

There are broad similarities between DE and SM. This should come as no surprise as some early practitioners of the SM discipline argue that it had its roots in public education (Kotler and Roberto, 1989) and suggest that as early as Greek and Roman periods, there have been initiatives, such as campaigns to free slaves and public health initiatives, that may be considered early instances of SM. Nonetheless, there appears to be a significant difference between DE and SM: while SM considers marketing as one of the disciplines that it could make use of to induce social good, DE appears to primarily focus on the role of education in achieving this social good. Perhaps another difference is that DE from the outset appears to adopt a more global perspective whereas for SM this is not always the case.

Similarities at philosophical/ethical level?

The definitional similarities appear to be reflected at the philosophical/ethical level. Most national and international organisations that represent SM's ethical position strive toward both personal and social good through their programmes. The programmes argue for consultation on how to implement such aims by referring to both deontological (rights and duties) and utilitarian principles (outcomes) which are not necessarily at odds with each other (Levenstein, 2013; Fourali, 2016).

Fourali (2017a) reminded us that there is a difference between marketing, responsible marketing and SM. Similarly, universities can be organised as either centres whose primary purpose is to make a 'decent' profit or institutions that combine making a profit with a sense of social responsibility by helping to address urgent social needs and contributing to socially-minded citizenship. Universities can, additionally, offer educational programmes that prioritise addressing human social issues within or across national boundaries. This approach has a strong SM flavour.

SM and DE therefore appear to be opposed to the excesses currently promoted through neoliberalism (Denzin, 2015). There were warnings against such excesses as far back as the 18th century by Wilhelm von Humboldt, who is generally acknowledged to be the father of higher education (Anderson, 2004; 2010). He argued that an inclusive educational model goes beyond vocational training since there are aspects of knowledge that are of a general nature (Clark, 1993; Staufenbiel, 1993) and, additionally, it is hard to imagine a genuine education that ignores the cultivation of mind and attitudes and exclusively focuses on vocational skills (Günther, 1988). So, an enlightened approach to education is nothing new.

Nevertheless, it is surprising that over 200 years later we are still facing the same challenges of market-driven inequality and injustice. Several writers lamented this situation (e.g. Giroux, 2015) when criticising the neoliberal approach to education that is becoming increasingly dominant. Bessie is one of those arguing for a more technically centred education in suggesting that the:

“Tech Titans’ passion for education reform has been avarice - that ultimately they are in public education to open up a new market, to privatize for profit, all sold to the public cynically in the name of social justice and basic human rights. In essence, this education philanthropy is a plutocratic power-grab” (Bessie, 2013: 3).

This led to a situation where, despite the political soundbites, the laudable educational aims of critical thinking, historical analyses, consultative dialogue and the development of capabilities to enable conceptualisation of alternative worlds, have been sacrificed at the altar of blind rational instrumentalism that is promoted by global corporations and ‘corporate submissive governments’ for the sake of short-term expediency.

However, most answers, as in this case, lie between an either /or perspective. Neoliberalism has its excesses but it is clear that a marketing perspective is not completely wrong. Indeed, ultimately, a marketing perspective is about serving the ‘target groups’. The issue becomes how best to serve these target groups and in the light of which stakeholders? The section below will elaborate more on this issue.

Neoliberalism and society

Neoliberalism holds that economic success comes from allowing the free intersection of market forces which are seen as the most rational and efficient ways of running economies. It advocates an individualist ideology that is built around free competition. Although the ideology has

been challenged on both historical and social grounds, its success has been such that large sections of any society perceive this ideology as the 'natural way of things'. Monbiot states:

“So pervasive has neoliberalism become that we seldom even recognise it as an ideology. We appear to accept the proposition that this utopian, millenarian faith describes a neutral force; a kind of biological law” (Monbiot, 2016: 2).

Irrespective of whether neoliberalism is just a hypothesis that is hugely supported by the very few so-called one per cent where the concentration of power and wealth resides (Neate, 2017; Frank, 2017), such ideology is seen by many social theorists as the biggest threat to democratic values, social protection and the formative cultures that are pre-requisite to them (Denzin, 2015).

Clearly from both an SM and a DE perspective, a radical neoliberal perspective does not seem to give too much consideration to humanitarian values of justice and inclusion, thus making it a target to establish a more caring system that values all members of society. DE has long worked to expose the insidious neoliberal views that can be found throughout our institutions so that they covertly support its systems of influence. Neoliberalism has even been accused of side-lining humanistic sciences that are the main source of the critical sciences so as to support the technical approach to education. Among some of the dominant theorists and exponents of DE are Paulo Freire (1970) who spent a large part of his life trying to help the poor learn basic skills whilst raising awareness among them of the 'enslaving ideologies' behind the structures that make up the institutions that govern our daily lives (e.g. governmental, economic, educational and even domestic and family lives) with a view to challenging them to make the world a better place.

On the other hand, SM does not at the outset reject a technical perspective to achieve its aims. Indeed, its eclectic perspective is open to

using tested technical tools to resolve human problems. Accordingly, SM opts to use all technical dimensions that make the capitalist model so powerful, including the successful techniques of marketing, and use them for the good of society. This approach helps ‘pacify’ the extremist cruel capitalism into a more benign capitalism. It also helps prevent replacing one extremist ideology with another one as happens in a revolutionary change. An evolutionary mode would seem to be wiser and may help prevent jumping from the proverbial frying pan into the fire.

Procedural similarities?

In this section I will look at both the strategic and methodological research dimensions of DE and SM. Starting with the use of critical research methodologies, a cursory look at DE publications (e.g. see Bourn, 2015) suggests that DE has demonstrated more readiness to adopt various discursive methodologies which appear to be hardly touched by SM. Perhaps this is partly due to the fact that education has already been at the forefront of the disciplines willing to adopt the latest qualitative methodologies. Nevertheless, DE’s very aims (e.g. transformative learning, social/economical justice, human rights and global citizenship) make it fertile ground for ideas that analyse power structures with a view to challenging them.

As discussed below, qualitative research has developed a lot over the last 20 years or so (e.g. Denzin and Giardina, 2015; Fourali, 2017b). It has developed as an independent discipline which is no longer considered as an adjunct to the so called objective experimental quantitative approaches. It has also become a hot bed for many new innovative approaches that help address previously uncharted territories. These areas have been exploited by education in general and more particularly DE. The choices that are offered to the qualitative researcher are numerous (Fourali, 2017b). As argued by Denzin and Giardina (2015) such varieties were brought about by a number of milestone conflicts. First, it was the throwing down of the gauntlet by post-positivists and

constructivists against positivism (1970–1990). This was followed by the tripartite war between post-positivism, constructionism and critical theory paradigms (1990–2005). In turn these led to conflicts between those advocating evidence-based methodologies supporting mixed methods on the one hand, and those advocating more interpretivist or critical approaches (2005 to the present).

Denzin and Giardina (2015) also identified a new area of interest that is developing in parallel to the last, evidence-based methodologies, that is vying for recognition in the form of the ‘posts’ and critical methodologies. These include post-colonial, post-qualitative, post-humanists, postmodernists, poststructuralists as well as the various ‘critical methodologies’ (such as critical pedagogy, critical constructionists, feminists) and what became known as the performance studies.

Although DE seems to have ‘experimented’ significantly with most qualitative approaches, DE is yet to demonstrate its fluency with the latest approaches in the form of the later ‘post methodologies’. DE has developed some key principles characterising its approach to research such as the following (see Skinner, Blum, and Bourn, 2013; Rajacic et al., 2010):

- Developing a global perspective to the world;
- A value based approach to learning;
- Participatory and transformative learning processes;
- Competencies of critical (self) reflection;
- Supporting active engagement (for a more just and sustainable world);
- Active local and global citizenship with a view to encourage civil society and foster a living democracy.

Although the above aims look very worthwhile, it seems there may not be enough direction in terms of general steps for achieving the above.

What SM seems to lack in adoption of the critical perspectives (as evident in DE) appears to be compensated for by a more systematic and practical perspective that help it to achieve its aims. SM practitioners tend to be first and foremost action-led and their approaches include a careful analysis of the sources of influence on 'consumer behaviour' and the development of strategies for encouraging positive and adaptive changes in their target populations. Just like its sister discipline of marketing, SM brings the interplay of all disciplines' models and theories to help induce the changes. In fact, SM advocates have been trying to develop their general strategy for undertaking SM projects since the early days of this new discipline. Indeed, Fourali (2016), having looked at several models of strategic use of the SM methodology, derived one of the latest frameworks for undertaking an SM project. Accordingly, the following steps are advocated:

1. Problem identification: This would usually be highlighted by a government department, public bodies or NGOs.
2. Planning: This is a preliminary scoping of the problem including a broad understanding of the causes and stakeholders affected/concerned with it.
3. Purpose/mission: Here the general purpose of the project is highlighted. The purpose could range from raising awareness about a problem to changing attitudes in populations affected.
4. Situation analysis/market research: Here an in-depth analysis of the targeted population is undertaken. It should identify the key challenges and opportunities.
5. Target groups/obstacles: As a result of the above analysis the project would be in a position to identify the most affected target group(s) so that they represent the main focus of the projects. The target group is usually that most vulnerable to the problem at hand.
6. Objectives: At this stage, the objectives of the project are clarified with the purpose of facilitating the measurement of the

effectiveness of the project in achieving them. Types of objectives would clarify aspects such as how many people will become aware of, or change their attitude or behaviour with respect to the problem at hand.

7. The customer proposition: Here the project managers need to identify a worthwhile 'customer proposition' in the form of an attractive offer to the target group for changing their lifestyle to adopt a more constructive life style.
8. Selecting a marketing mix: Here the project needs to identify the details of the offer that should help the target population to change for the better.
9. Resources: Here the project managers will need to identify all resources available that can support the project. For example, this would include government support (e.g. through policies), academic advice, NGOs, responsible businesses and so on.
10. Implementation of the campaign: Here the project will implement the above decisions. The implementation will need to find a way of reaching/recruiting members of the target group(s) and inducting them through the steps of the change process.
11. Monitoring/evaluation: The process will need to be managed systematically with adequate monitoring of the effect it may be having on the target groups.

('SM planning steps' adapted from Fourali, 2016; Fourali, 2017a).

It is clear that the above steps may go through a number of iterations to make the necessary adjustments as the project proceeds.

It is worth reminding the reader that DE does refer to some broadly similar steps but what seems to be lacking is clarity on what may happen in each of these steps. For example, Bourn (2014) suggested the steps of: identification of issues, investigating them, seeking solutions,

carrying out actions and evaluating impact. Additionally, some frameworks were suggested for identifying areas of focus of DE such as a 'global outlook', 'recognition of power and inequality', a 'belief in social justice' and a 'commitment to reflection and dialogue' (Bourn, 2014: 2). However, neither the previous steps nor these areas of focus by DE represent clear enough advice about the various options at each level of these dimensions and, more accurately, guidance on how to undertake a DE project.

There should be no reason why DE does not adopt a more practical and strategic perspective to helping realise its aims of social justice. However, for some reason such a perspective does not come across as clearly in DE publications (e.g. Bourn, 2014) as opposed to the SM publications. Perhaps DE wants to avoid being too prescriptive to allow plenty of flexibility to its practitioners; or is it because the work tends to be unduly interpretive in exposing 'symptoms of injustice' that it may sacrifice (perhaps intentionally) the clear steps needed for implementing solutions? Indeed, such an approach seems to be highlighted in some DE work that suggests suspicion towards what could be considered 'instrumentalist approaches'. As Skinner et al suggest (2013: 8) development education 'indicates a need to reaffirm the social purpose of education, placing an emphasis on the learning processes themselves, rather than inputs and outputs'.

At the risk of upsetting some DE colleagues, one might argue that this may be an approach that misses the opportunity to offer a better model of addressing the problem with the hindsight of a DE analysis. Indeed, the point was made elsewhere (see Elliott, Fourali and Issler, 2010) that arguing for the need to accord equal consideration to all groups of populations, especially those traditionally disadvantaged, does not preclude us from choosing a set of values and linked methodologies that we could work together with until we decide to change them. Being overly wary of all methodologies may mean missing the opportunity for

convergence or worse, getting to a situation of stagnation. Such an approach that considers DE as primarily an opportunity for shooting down in flames all suggested solutions without producing alternatives will do a disservice to its constituents. Helping develop possible practical solutions can be helped by referring to the SM approach.

Conversely, there may be several areas where DE can support the delivery of SM. In particular, it may help highlight the critical aspects associated with the underpinning 'philosophy' of a project (e.g. individualist or inclusive?), the assumptions made about the targeted populations, the policies (and social culture) that may focus more on changing the victims rather than the general system that helped create the identified problems.

How about the respective effectiveness of DE and SM?

Perhaps this is the most challenging area in comparing the two approaches. This is because while there are many examples of effective approaches to measuring SM projects (Kotler and Lee, 2008; Robinson et al, 2014; Fourali, 2016), as shown below, there seems to be a comparative paucity of such studies in DE. Although there have been systematic attempts at demonstrating the effectiveness of DE, these tend to be either patchy or not systematically included.

There appears to be a strong awareness of the need for developing tools for measuring the effectiveness of DE (e.g. McCollum et al, 2001; Storrs, 2010). Already in 2001, McCollum provided useful advice on measuring the impact of DE when she advised that demonstrating effectiveness should take the form of three questions with a view to, one, clarify why are we engaged in development education; two, determine the actions that need undertaking towards our goals; and, three, demonstrate how we are going to plan, organise and manage our activities. A few years later Annette Scheunpflug and Ida McDonnell (2008) produced what may be seen as the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

(OECD) manifesto for the need to demonstrate the effectiveness of DE's work. In particular, they derived an evaluation cycle framework that was adapted from Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007) that demonstrates the purpose and criteria for adequate evaluation.

The framework is very similar to an action research framework which again supports the view that, just like SM, DE is best supported by an action-based type of research agenda. The report also referred to a number of evidence-based 'good practice initiatives' including one that highlighted the need for measuring public support in the form of a web-diagram reflecting influence on knowledge, opinion, participation, development of civil society and political support. In parallel and subsequent to this call for action, a number of initiatives were undertaken to demonstrate the effectiveness of DE (e.g. see Youthnet, 2010). In particular, two reports may be worth referring to. One is by Allum et al. (2008) who highlighted the need for measuring attitudinal change to demonstrate the impact of teaching initiatives (such as classroom resources). Storrs also (2010) articulated a very strong argument for the need to adopt evaluation tools whilst addressing resistance to such adoption. He argued that without such systems it would be difficult to demonstrate the impact of DE initiatives. Storrs argued for the adoption of an evaluation system akin to the 'balanced scorecard' (Kaplan and Norton, 1992). Other papers also referred to the need to adopt measurement strategy tools (e.g. IDEA, 2011; Graugnard and Oliveira, 2009).

Nevertheless, it may be fair to say that there is still a long way for the DE performance movement to go before it reaches a credible degree of maturity. This is because, despite large steps taken over the last ten years or so to demonstrate the effectiveness of DE initiatives, there is still a lot of ground to cover before a systematic strategy is adopted. A strategy that does not shy away from borrowing tools routinely from best practice in any discipline as long as their relevance is not only made clear but

threats or limitations highlighted. What is meant here is not just a strategy that measures before and after changes of attitudes (as done, for example, by Allum et al., 2008), although this is welcome, but a strategy that starts from the broad aims of DE and how these have been translated into practice and have been achieved.

A key question on achieving aims is to decide on the steps that need undertaking in order to achieve them. One great advantage of DE over SM is that it has commonly agreed goals. This means that two levels of evaluations may be undertaken as follows: one, macro level evaluation, can measure changes of attitudes, behaviour, politics etc., as a result of the number of DE projects undertaken in a country, or even, economic area (such as the European Union). Indeed, one might argue that there are natural links between the various aims of DE such as justice, liberty, global citizenship, as they mutually support each other. Consequently, one project purporting to effect change in one area would affect change in the other areas. A second level of measurement can be undertaken at the micro level focusing on the specific achievement of a particular project, in the short and long term, in the targeted populations. Unfortunately, there still remains a lot of work to be done to meet the above aims but perhaps one of the starting points for DE practitioners is to review best practice, e.g. in the form of ‘meta-analyses’ (in the broadest sense) and associate it with certain performance measurements.

Notwithstanding the above arguments, perhaps one should highlight some possible causes of reluctance/hesitation on the part of some DE practitioners that may have slowed down the adoption of performance related frameworks, which in turn could become the basis for cumulative DE wisdom that can be contributed to by all practitioners. Such slow development may be due to a number of reasons including:

- 1 Suspicion of ‘business-related’ tools which may be seen as the tools of the neoliberal enemy.

- 2 Perhaps linked to the last point, is the view that many educational measurement initiatives tend to restrict the educational enterprise to a limited practical and vocational aim with no other purpose than preparing the learner for a job.
- 3 DE studies tended to be more of the critical, interpretive nature rather than focusing on empirical support.
- 4 DE tends to focus primarily on specific, unique contexts that prevent comparison. Such a view may lead to a unique methodology (participatory approaches to action research) which may not be appropriate for other situations.
- 5 Another reason, referred to earlier (Storrs, 2010), is the fear of evaluation.

Indeed, all the above points appear to relate to each other. For instance, all points appear to have at their base either cognitive (e.g. perception of educational evaluation), emotional (suspicion, fear) or behavioural (DE methodology) dimensions that reflect a basic distrust of measure orientated methodologies. Nevertheless, these may be seen as lame justifications. Even the argument that some methodologies may not apply to all contexts does not preclude the possibility of extrapolation from one situation to the other.

SM, by contrast, has offered several studies demonstrating its effectiveness (see Fourali, 2016). Since SM tackles a variety of social issues, ranging from smoking and obesity to mental health and citizenship, it needs to study its effectiveness in all the areas it tackles. These include 54 interventions associated with health issues (Stead et al., 2006), a NESTA (2008) study with 81 case studies and 21 literature reviews in order to identify the most effective characteristics of SM, and more recently a study carried out by the Centre for Disease Control and Prevention covering 22 studies focusing on 25 different groups (see Community Guide, 2015; Robinson et al., 2014). Most studies

demonstrated the significant effect of SM interventions as well as areas that maximised the effect of SM.

Derived lessons and the way forward

Overall, both DE and SM are disciplines that seem to have derived from a 'mother' discipline in order to focus specifically on more humanitarian goals. They both can benefit each other at a number of levels. At a philosophical level, DE has more developed traditions, emanating from generations of studies on educational goals, on principles and philosophies that can help create a more just and equal society. At a methodological level, DE also has a longer tradition of using and evaluating research through in-depth analyses that adopt a variety of qualitative approaches.

On the other hand, SM has plenty of hard-fact systematic studies borrowed from marketing, its predecessor guide, but is now developing its armamentarium by borrowing from a variety of social sciences. It is eclectic with a view to maximising the effect of its programmes. SM has also demonstrated a higher sensitivity to demonstrating its effectiveness. There is no surprise here since it is derived from marketing that was meant to serve very commercially-minded masters who would be very loath to undertake any activity unless its effectiveness has been demonstrated. Accordingly, SM has always been keen to take steps back both within and between projects to review the degree of effectiveness of its projects.

It is worth noting here that SM social workers decided to adopt the marketing principles not as a submission to the neoliberal philosophy (profit before people). Rather they adopted the effective tools of the neoliberal philosophy, especially the marketing approach, with a view to ensuring that their work is more efficient and effective. SM tendency is not to be limited in its methodology as long as the purpose is being served. However, it is also important to offer practitioners options about the steps

and how to implement them so that they can decide which framework may apply more to their context. In SM for example while many marketers are happy looking at a contextualised marketing mix (quality of service, cost of change in a wide sense, ease of access and adequacy of communication with stakeholders), others would prefer to adopt one of the newly derived marketing mixes (alternative to standards definitions) as they believe they better serve their purposes (see Fourali, 2016).

One of the ways in which SM can benefit from DE is the strong awareness of the effect of early education on the attitudes of pupils and, later on, adults. DE is very well aware of the concept of power and its insidious effects in our societies. In particular, DE does not withhold from questioning how such powers can be reflected through a number of institutions including what may be called the triple domination bottom line of media, finance and political hegemony. DE would provide the critical ability that goes beyond the here and now finding of the solutions. Questions such as why some crimes go 'legally' unpunished while lesser criminals may spend years behind bars (consider the irresponsible behaviour of many financial executives associated with the onset of the last economic recession)? DE has a tradition of helping change perceptions of groups of people that may have been victims at one or more levels. Consider for example the hundreds of thousands of migrants fleeing the Middle Eastern wars who, after months of life and death challenges, reached European countries to only be regarded as terrorists (Crone et al, 2017; Osiewicz, 2017). The irony becomes even more real when many European intellectuals consider that some of the greatest recent terrorist acts have been perpetrated by western powers (e.g. see Chomsky, 2014; Chomsky, 2015; Euronews, 2015). For example, Palestinians suffered the double victimisation of being robbed of their country and being regarded as terrorists if they dared resist the persecution by an enemy whose power is only trumped by its blindness to the generations it is claiming to protect (Pruszynski, 2016).

As in principle the procedure of SM is compatible with DE's approach (e.g. link between principles and practice, action research, evidence based decisions etc.) one way forward could be an integration between the two approaches. For example, an SM worker may add the DE dimensions to inform the project (not only critical awareness of the reasons that led to a state of play) but also the importance of considering education as one of the targets for developing balanced opinions and healthy attitudes. As an example, projects that aim to address cigarette smoking or responsibility towards the environment should not only be undertaken *after* people pick up the habits but rather prevention should be a long-term aim of such projects. Conversely a DE project could consider how the SM procedure can be incorporated into the DE project by considering the systematic analysis of a problem, how it affects various target groups and what would constitute attractive 'offers' that would not only make the learning more appealing but the impact more apparent.

There is clearly a lot in common between the two disciplines. They both aim for the welfare of humanity as a whole and aim to use approaches that are consultative and action-based because of the very nature of their similar philosophies. DE wants to give a voice to the disadvantaged while SM argues that there is a developing technology for addressing effectively social ills. It also argues that unless the target groups (the customers) see the benefits of its offer, the projects will not work. It is important to remind ourselves that whilst blind humanism is ineffective, blind instrumentalism is misguided. Indeed, it was Paulo Freire (1970) who suggested that the answer should not lie in the rejection of the machine but rather in the humanisation of man. Hence while the human dimension should be the guide, both facets are needed for effective action.

This article has argued that with the benefit of mutual learning between these two very humanistic disciplines, their work should become

more effective thereby helping transform our societies for the better, more quickly.

References

Allum, L, Lowe, B and Robinson, L (2008) *How Do We Know It's Working: A toolkit for measuring attitudinal change*, Reading: Reading International Solidarity Centre (RISC), available:

<https://www.google.pl/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwiYkMzf4LHYAhWIC5oKHXvADxIQFggxMAE&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.myro.sk%2Fsk%2Fe-kniznica%2Fcategory%2F2-publikacie%3Fdownload%3D1355%3Ahow-do-we-know-it-s-working&usg=AOvVaw30UputN2JHM4rUyHtXfaYS> (accessed 30 December 2017).

Anderson, R D (2004) *European Universities from the Enlightenment to 1914*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, R D (2010) 'The "Idea of a University" Today', *History and Policy*, available: <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/policy-papers/papers/the-idea-of-a-university-today> (accessed 22 December 2017).

Bessie, A (2013) 'The Answer to the Great Question of Education Reform? The number 42', *Truthout*, available: <http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19356-the-answer-to-the-great-question-of-education-reform-the-number-42> (accessed 02 January 2018).

Bourn, D (2014) 'The Theory and Practice of Global Learning', Development Education Research Centre Research Paper No.11, London: Institute of Education, University of London.

Bourn, D (2015) *The Theory and Practice of Development Education: A pedagogy for global social justice*, London: Routledge.

Chomsky, N (2014) 'In U.N. Speech, Noam Chomsky Blasts United States for Supporting Israel, Blocking Palestinian State', *Democracy Now*, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zWaLuVQ_LCc (accessed 13 January 2018).

Chomsky, N (2015) 'The Crimes of U.S. Presidents', *Resident Dissident*, available: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NdD9uSrNFT4> (accessed 13 January 2018).

Clark, B R (1993) *The Research Foundations of Graduate Education*, Oxford: University of California Press.

Community Guide (2015) 'Health Communication and Social Marketing: Health Communication Campaigns that Include Mass Media and Health-Related Product Distribution', *The Community Guide*, available: www.thecommunityguide.org/healthcommunication/campaigns.html (accessed 10 July 2015).

Crone, M, Felicia, M, Tammikko, F and Tammikko, T (2017) 'European citizens, not refugees, behind most terrorist attacks in Europe: The terrorist-migration nexus and ways forward for Schengen border policies', DIIS Report, available: <https://www.diis.dk/en/research/european-citizens-not-refugees-behind-most-terrorist-attacks-in-europe> (accessed 13 January 2018).

Denzin, N K and Giardina, M D (2015) 'Introduction' in N K Denzin (ed) *Qualitative Inquiry: Past, Present, and Future*, London: Routledge.

Denzin, N K (2015) *Qualitative Inquiry: Past, Present, and Future*, London: Routledge.

Elliott, G, Fourali, C and Issler, S (2010) *Education and Social Change: Linking Local and Global Perspectives*, London: Continuum.

Euronews (2015) 'Chomsky says US is world's biggest terrorist', *The Global Conversation*, available: <http://www.euronews.com/2015/04/17/chomsky-says-us-is-world-s-biggest-terrorist> (accessed 02 January 2018).

Fourali, C (2009) 'Developing World-Class Social Marketing Standards: A Step in the Right Direction for a More Socially Responsible Marketing Profession', *Social Marketing Quarterly*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 14–24.

Fourali, C (2010) 'Social Marketing' in G Elliot, C Fourali and S Issler (eds.), *Education and Social Change: Linking Local and Global Perspectives*, London: Continuum.

Fourali, C (2014) 'Review of *Human Development and Capabilities: Re-imagining the University of the Twenty-First Century*', *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 74-78.

Fourali, C (2016) *The Promise of Social Marketing: A Powerful Tool for Changing the World for Good*, London: Routledge.

Fourali, C (2017a) 'Social Marketing and the protection of the young consumer' in A Gbadamosi (ed.) *Young Consumer Behaviour: A Research Companion*, London: Taylor and Francis.

Fourali, C (2017b) 'Determining a Robust Qualitative Research Approach: Reviewing the methodological and data gathering options' in R Benzo, M Mohsen, and C Fourali, *Marketing Research: Planning, Process and Practice*, London: Sage.

Frank, R (2017) 'Richest 1% now owns half the world's wealth', *Inside Wealth*, available: <https://www.cnn.com/2017/11/14/richest-1-percent-now-own-half-the-worlds-wealth.html> (accessed 23 December 2017).

Freire, P (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, New York: Herder & Herder.

Giroux, H (2015) 'Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University' in N K Denzin (ed) *Qualitative Inquiry: Past, Present, and Future*, London: Routledge.

Graugnard, G and Oliveira, A (2009) 'Education au developpement et à la solidarité internationale : Comment Auto-évaluer ses actions', *Guide méthodologique Educasol*, available: http://www.educasol.org/IMG/pdf/guide_methodologique_auto_evaluation_des_actions_d_ead-si.pdf (accessed 30 December 2017).

Günther, K-H (1988) 'Profiles of Educators: Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835)', *Prospects*, Vol. 18, pp. 127–136.

IDEA (2011) 'Paper on Quality and Measuring the Impact of Development Education. IDEA task group on Quality and Impact', Dublin: IDEA, available:

https://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwjO17KQh9bYAhXLKMAKHWSYA90QFggnMAA&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ideaonline.ie%2Fuploads%2Ffiles%2F2011_IDEA_paper_on_Q_and_I.pdf&usq=AOvVaw1GdRqjCgrHeZ-LND_fXEzP (accessed 13 January 2018).

Kaplan, R S and Norton, D P (1992) 'The Balanced Scorecard – Measures that Drive Performance', *Harvard Business Review*, January/February 1992, pp. 72-79.

Kotler, P and Lee, N (2008) *Social Marketing: Influencing Behaviours for Good*, London: Sage.

Kotler, P and Roberto, E L (1989) *Social Marketing Strategies for Changing Public Behavior*, New York: The Free Press.

Levenstein, M (2013) 'A Third Way? Unifying two long-opposed philosophical schools could have far-reaching practical implications', *Royal Society of Art*, Vol. 4, pp. 26–29.

McCloskey, S (ed.) (2014) *Development Education in Policy and Practice*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

McCollum, A, Bourn, D, Billingham, E, Kanji, S, McKenzie, A, and Wood, J (2001) *Measuring Effectiveness in Development Education*, London: Development Education Association.

McCollum, A (2001) 'Measuring Effectiveness in Development Education: Responding to the Challenges', *The Development Education Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 3-4, available: https://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwjQtqf8-7jYAhUJa1AKHdLdDPEQFggxMAE&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.dochas.ie%2FShared%2FFiles%2F4%2Fmeasuring_effectiveness_of_development_education.pdf&usq=AOvVaw0DtalfTnplyWkEmKHqMnp (accessed 02 January 2018).

Monbiot, G (2016) 'Neoliberalism: the ideology at the root of all our problems', *Guardian*, 15 April, available:

<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2016/apr/15/neoliberalism-ideology-problem-george-monbiot> (accessed 7 November 2017).

Neate, R (2017) 'Richest 1% own half the world's wealth, study finds', *Guardian*, 14 November, available: <https://www.theguardian.com/inequality/2017/nov/14/worlds-richest-wealth-credit-suisse> (accessed on 23 December 2017).

NESTA (2008) *Selling Sustainability: Seven Lessons from Advertising and Marketing to Sell Low-Carbon Living*, London: NESTA.

Osiewicz, P (2017) 'Europe's Islamophobia and the Refugee Crisis', *The Middle East Institute*, 19 September, available: <http://www.mei.edu/content/article/europe-s-islamophobia-and-refugee-crisis?print=> (accessed 13 January 2017).

Pruszyński, S (2016) *Israel: An American Catastrophe*, Warsaw: IWKIP.

Rajacic, A, Surian, A, Fricke, H-J, Krause, J and Davis, P (2010) 'DEAR in Europe – Recommendations for Future Interventions by the European Commission: Final Report of the Study on the Experience and Actions of the Main European Actors Active in the Field of Development Education and Awareness Raising', Brussels: European Commission. available: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/aidco/images/d/d4/Final_Report_D_EAR_Study.pdf (accessed 31 October 2013).

Robinson, M.N et al. (2014) 'Mass media Health Communication Campaigns Combined with Health-Related Product Distribution: A Community Guide Systematic Review', *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, Vol. 47, No. 3, pp. 360–371.

Scheunpflug, A and McDonnell, I (2008) 'Building Public Awareness of Development: Communicators, Educators and Evaluation', OECD Development Centre Policy Brief No. 35. Paris: OECD.

Skinner, A, Blum, N and Bourn, D (2013) 'Development Education and Education in International Development Policy: Raising Quality through Critical Pedagogy and Global Skills', *International Development Policy | Revue internationale de*

politique de développement, Vol. 4.3, available: <https://poldev.revues.org/1654> (accessed 8 September 2017).

Staufenbiel, R W (1993) 'German Education in Mechanical Engineering from the perspective of the RWTH Aachen', *International Journal of Engineering Education*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 29-42.

Stead, M, Gordon, R, Angus, K and McDermott, L (2006) 'A systematic review of social marketing effectiveness', *Health Education*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 126–191.

Storrs, G (2010) 'Evaluation in development education: Crossing borders', *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 11, Autumn, pp. 7-21, available: <https://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue/issue-11/evaluation-development-education-crossing-borders> (accessed 15 January 2018).

Stufflebeam D L and Shinkfield A J (2007) *Evaluation Theory, Models, and Applications*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing.

Tarozzi, M and Torres, C A (2016) *Global Citizenship Education and the Crises of Multiculturalism: Comparative Perspectives*, London: Bloomsbury.

Youthnet (2010) 'How do we know it's working? Supporting Youth Organisations to plan for and demonstrate the outcomes of their work', Report on a conference held on 25 November 2010, available: http://www.youth.ie/sites/youth.ie/files/How_do%20we_know_its%20working_Conference_Report_web.pdf (accessed 30 December 2017).

Chahid Fourali (IoE-UCL) has backgrounds in psychology, education and marketing and has published in all three areas. He led a consultation with the United Kingdom (UK) Government to set up the Marketing and Sales Standards Setting Body, which he then led for eight years. He also led the development of three sets of world-class national occupational standards (in Marketing, Sales and Social

Marketing) that were supported by many internationally recognised marketing/business gurus. These standards are now the basis for all nationally recognised qualifications in the UK in the three professional areas.

Chahid is also Senior Lecturer in Management at the London Metropolitan Business School and is examiner/subject expert for Cambridge University and University of Hertfordshire. He achieved Fellowship or professional membership status from several international organisations including Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, Fellow of the Chartered Institute of Marketing, British Association of Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy. His recent book *Social Marketing: A Powerful Tool for Changing the World for Good* received very encouraging reviews and was selected for one of the Levitt Group '5 Great Minds' events organised by the Chartered Institute of Marketing.

Write to: Guildhall Faculty of Business and Law, 84 Moorgate, London, EC2M 6SQ

Email: chahidfouali@learning4good.co.uk