

## **Redefining Humanitarianism: Proposing a New Scale for Measurement**

## **Redéfinir l'humanitarisme : Proposition d'une nouvelle échelle de mesure**

**MERSNI Soumaya**

Lecturer in Marketing

Higher Institute of Management of Tunis (ISG)

University of Tunis

ARBRE

Tunisie

**BAKINI Fatma**

Professor in Marketing

Higher Institute of Management of Tunis (ISG)

University of Tunis

ARBRE

Tunisie

**Date submitted :** 02/10/2024

**Date of acceptance :** 01/11/2024

**To cite this article :**

MERSNI S. & BAKINI F. (2024) «Redefining Humanitarianism: Proposing a New Scale for Measurement»,  
Revue Internationale des Sciences de Gestion « Volume 7 : Numéro 4 » pp : 1204 - 1226

## Abstract

The world is currently grappling with crisis-stricken contexts that profoundly affect people's lives, creating urgent needs for humanitarian interventions to help vulnerable populations survive. Humanitarianism, traditionally applied in times of crisis, is now evolving into a broader approach that integrates humanitarianism in daily activities. This shift aims to provide continuous support to people in need and alleviate the difficult conditions they face. At its core, humanitarianism represents the compassionate response to the suffering of strangers. While this variable has been in existence since time immemorial, it remains complex because it is poorly defined and lacks measurement. The purpose of this study is to develop and validate a new scale for measuring humanitarianism, designed to reflect contemporary realities and the evolving approach to humanitarianism. This scale is constructed following the methodological guidelines set forth by Churchill (1979) and Evrard et al. (2009). Data was collected from a total of 514 respondents across all research types. Based on this framework, we propose a new definition and a unidimensional scale that is both reliable and valid at exploratory and confirmatory levels. A five-items scale consisting of Likert type of five points ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

**Keywords:** Humanitarianism; everyday humanitarianism; Churchill's paradigm; scale measurement; scale development.

## Résumé

Le monde fait face à des crises bouleversant la vie des populations et exigeant des actions humanitaires pour soutenir les individus vulnérables. L'humanitarisme, autrefois limité aux périodes de crise, s'adapte désormais pour soutenir la vie quotidienne dans des contextes difficiles. Il se définit comme une réponse bienveillante envers des inconnus en situation de souffrance. Bien que cette notion existe depuis longtemps, elle reste complexe, mal définie, et manque encore d'une mesure adéquate. L'objectif de cette étude est de développer et valider une nouvelle échelle de mesure de l'humanitarisme, basée sur les directives de Churchill (1979) et Evrard et al. (2009). Les données ont été collectées auprès de 514 répondants. Suite à cela, nous avons développé une nouvelle définition et une échelle unidimensionnelle, fiable et valide, tant au niveau exploratoire que confirmatoire. Il s'agit d'une échelle à cinq items de type Likert, avec cinq points allant de fortement en désaccord à fortement d'accord.

**Mots clés :** L'humanitarisme ; L'humanitarisme du quotidien paradigme de Churchill ; échelle de mesure ; développement d'échelle.

## Introduction

Looking at the current global landscape, we observe past and ongoing events that continue to shape and influence our lives. Overlapping global crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic, refugee movements, famine, poverty, civil wars, international conflicts like the Russia-Ukraine war, governmental corruption and natural disasters such as the earthquakes in Morocco and Turkey, etc. have profoundly impacted people's lives (Allen et al., 2022, Taibi and Benabdelhadi, 2022, Hassas et al., 2022, Sellamil et al., 2023). For the first time, the world is facing multiple simultaneous challenges within a short time frame, intensifying global conditions and creating an overwhelming environment to navigate (Allen et al., 2022). These challenges have also created new and urgent needs for assistance and support in everyday life. Helping those in need has become an essential part of daily life, particularly as governments struggle to provide adequate solutions for their citizenry (Richey, 2018). As such, providing help has become essential to survive in such time. Humanitarian aid is known as humanitarianism and consists of the good-doing response to strangers who are suffering (Richey, 2018) appears as a suitable solution and response for these situations. Nowadays, humanitarianism is not only needed in situations of emergency, but it is also needed every day. In times of sustained economic instability, humanitarianism is needed as an ethical response to rescue people who have lost faith in their government due to the regression of the economic development and the political struggle. Humanitarianism is known as a complex concept that kept changing over time based on the ongoing movements that the world is witnessing (Richey, 2018; Berger and Scalmer, 2020). It has been shifting since the eighteenth century. Each century is characterized by particular movements such as: the anti-slavery movements in the eighteenth, the fight against the famine in the nineteenth, the help programs of refugee crises in the twentieth and the longer-term development and poverty eradication programs extended to the twenty-first (Hilton et al., 2018). Every situation of the mentioned above has its own specificities and requirements, and researchers in the field of humanitarianism kept insisting in studying this concept according to the words' situation and needs these days (Hilton et al., 2018; Richey, 2018; Berger and Scalmer, 2020). Thus, humanitarianism today deserves deeper study beyond its traditional understanding, especially in light of the crisis-stricken contexts we are witnessing (Richey, 2018). Moreover, in recent years, there has been a call for the development of everyday humanitarianism, as intervening solely during times of crisis is no longer producing effective results in these challenges environments. The idea of making humanitarianism an everyday concept requires a series of

helping actions that are able to make a difference outside the traditional boundaries of humanitarian activity (Richey, 2018). It should be a continuous practice, embedded in the daily behaviors of citizens. Furthermore, new avenues for humanitarianism continue to emerge as it adapts to the evolving global landscape. The rethinking of traditional humanitarianism has expanded into the marketplace, where organizations are now exploring innovative approaches that go beyond conventional humanitarian boundaries (Richey, 2018). This shift is evident in strategies like band Aid humanitarianism, which successfully integrates aid efforts with commercial ventures, making it a profitable model (Richey, 2019). As a result, humanitarianism has taken on a significant role within the marketplace, becoming increasingly commodified (Richey, 2019). Markets now serve as platforms for promoting humanitarian causes through diverse offerings and strategies that link product and service purchases to charitable actions (Zhang et al., 2018). According to the literature, humanitarian concerns are a key motivator for companies involved in humanitarian marketing, as their goals align with the broader aims of social impact (Zhang et al., 2018).

On a theoretical plan, studying and measuring this concept nowadays requires new research and findings. Based on the literature, few measurement scales have been developed to assess this concept, despite its complexity and ever-changing nature. Some of these scales, dating back nearly 80 years or around 30 years, were created in vastly different historical and social contexts. Given the profound changes the world has undergone since their inception, these scales may no longer be appropriate or reflective of the complexities of humanitarianism in the present day. This is particularly crucial as there are growing calls for a new humanitarianism one that is better equipped to address the evolving challenges and needs of our current global landscape. Given the scarcity of the developed scales, we identified a significant gap in the literature regarding the measurement of humanitarianism on a large scale that should be addressed.

From this standpoint, the present research states the following problem: How can humanitarianism be redefined and measured to reflect its evolving nature? Our research aims to develop a new definition and a new scale measurement of humanitarianism that reflects the changes and addresses the needs of the current global situation.

Based on our research objective, we followed the guidelines set forth by Churchill (1979) and Evrard et al. (2009), which outline three phases for developing a scale measurement. We started with a literature review to specify the construct's domain and to develop a new definition. In the exploratory phase, we used qualitative research to generate items, which

were then tested through quantitative research and refined using Principal Component Analysis (PCA). In the confirmatory phase, we conducted a second PCA, followed by confirmatory analyses and validity testing.

Our study begins with a comprehensive overview of humanitarianism, establishing the foundation and relevance of our research focus. Next, we detail the methodology applied in the development of the scale measurement, ensuring a clear understanding of our approach. Following this, we present and discuss our results, providing in-depth analysis. Finally, we conclude with recommendations aimed at advancing both academic research and practical applications, offering valuable implications for scholars and professionals alike.

## **1. Literature Review**

### **1.1 An overview of humanitarianism**

There has been an indisputable interest in the last decade in the history of humanitarianism (Richey, 2018). This field is witnessing a noticeable growth in interests and inquiries among academics (Hilton et al., 2018) to account for the change in humanitarian focus as the world's situation requires (Richey, 2018; Berger and Scalmer, 2020). Humanitarianism has been extensively discussed in the literature within several fields and is considered a cornerstone in consumer behavior research. It is highlighted as a compassionate response to human suffering that includes: donating essential supplies (Richey, 2018), promoting children's education, improving access to sanitation, and encouraging proper hygiene practices (Bardhan, 2006). Additionally, providing clothing and shelter (Norris, 2012), offering medical care, ensuring access to food and clean water, and supporting refugees and the homeless, especially during wars and disasters (Rose et al., 2013), are key aspects. In some cases, humanitarian assistance may also involve armed intervention (Richey, 2018), with the ultimate goal of protecting and preserving human rights (Radice, 2019). It emphasizes a benevolence granted to humanity: eliminating boundaries between in-groups and outgroups, creating an intrinsic connection between people, and developing a more profound implication of tolerance between groups (Oyamot et al., 2012). The human being deserves to live with dignity and have all basic requirements in their life met. However, this is not the reality we face on earth, and acts of humanitarianism aim to bridge this disparity between our ideals and reality.

Humanitarianism has garnered significant attention from scholars due to its multifaceted nature. Aullón de Haro and Mombelli (2020) define it as a philanthropic ideology, while

Bornstein and Redfield (2007) describe it as a complex mix of values rooted in moral principles, ethical claims, political strategies, and a call to action. Humanitarianism is seen as a responsibility (Feldman and Steenbergen, 2001) and a duty (Bornstein and Redfield, 2011) to enhance the well-being of those in need. It reflects a concern for others (Steenbergen, 1996), grounded in the belief in the equal value of all human beings (Loudat and Khan, 2021). Furthermore, Bornstein and Redfield (2011) considered it as the urgent assistance in crises, aimed at alleviating suffering, improving living conditions, and saving lives. Barnett (2005) highlights its impartiality and independence in helping those in immediate danger, while Stamatov (2013) characterizes humanitarianism as action directed at assisting distant strangers, driven by individuals involved in social actions and organized efforts. Despite the growing body of research, the definition of humanitarianism remains elusive. It is broadly considered “*an ethos, a cluster of sentiments, a set of laws, a moral imperative to intervene, and a form of government*”. Ultimately, humanitarianism is about doing good by improving the difficult conditions faced by individuals (Ticktin, 2014). To conclude, humanitarianism has become a powerful term that links values and principals, and justifies the practices of human beings and governmental organizations (Ticktin, 2011). Given the numerous global challenges and crises that the world is currently facing, there has been an increasing call and emphasize to develop everyday humanitarianism (Richey, 2018). This approach advocates for integrating humanitarian actions into daily life, beyond the traditional aid typically provided by governments and organizations, and emphasizing the community-driven efforts to help. Everyday humanitarianism involves simple yet powerful acts of kindness as donating essential items, organizing fundraisers, combating diseases, and protecting the environment and scarce natural resources; actions that ordinary individuals can integrate into their daily lives. The core idea is that these actions should become a regular part of life, moving beyond the conventional understanding of humanitarianism as a response to emergencies. Instead, everyday humanitarianism should be a continuous practice, embedded daily practice. This shift fosters hope and empathy, and leads individuals to imagine themselves in the shoes of those in need, fostering a sense of daily responsibility to help alleviate their suffering. This change expands the concept of humanitarianism, making it a central, active part of people everyday existence (Fassin, 2012; Redfield, 2012; Schwittay, 2015 and Richey, 2018).

The traditional vision of providing aid only in emergencies is no longer viable, given the alarming state of the world, with around 2 billion (Tamburini, 2024) people pliving in poverty. Economic instability and political conflicts have driven society to explore new ways

of providing assistance, often stepping in where ineffective governments have failed (Richey, 201). The marketplace has begun thinking out of the box by surpassing the traditional boundaries of humanitarianism (Richey, 2018), creating diverse forms of humanitarian action to encourage people's involvement (Richey, 2018). Brand Aid humanitarianism, for example, is considered one of the most effective and impactful branding strategies (Richey, 2019). By integrating humanitarianism with branding, this approach enables consumers to help those in need through their everyday purchases. When people buy products linked to social causes, they directly contribute to providing aid.

Furthermore, as the world evolves, new events, concepts, and inequalities continuously reshape our understanding of humanitarianism. Many existing definitions are closely tied to the occidental sociopolitical context (Feldman and Steenbergen, 2001), which may not hold true in other global contexts. These observations underscore the need for a new, more comprehensive definition and measure of humanitarianism that reflects its multi-faceted and global nature.

### **1.2 Scale measurement of humanitarianism**

Humanitarianism, as an evolving concept, remains complex and challenging to measure (Richey, 2018; Berger and Scalmer, 2020). Upon reviewing the literature on humanitarianism scale measurements, we identified a significant gap. Few scales have been developed to assess humanitarianism, and among the existing scales, several stand out. Steenbergen (1996) introduced a five-point Likert scale with six items, which has since been adapted by numerous researchers, including Feldman and Steenbergen (2001), Shen and Edwards (2005), and Nisbet et al. (2008). Katz and Hass (1988) developed a combined six-point Likert scale with ten items to measure both egalitarianism and humanitarianism. This scale was later adapted by Goh et al. (2016) and Fraser and Murakami (2022) and partially used by Oyamoto et al. (2012) to measure humanitarianism. Additionally, Ferguson (1944) created a scale specifically within the context of war and rebellion. It is important to note that most of these scales were developed over several decades, with some originating nearly 80 years ago, and others emerging more recently within the past 30 years. Many scales were developed by making minor modifications to existing ones and were often created within specific contexts, particularly in Western societies, such as war and rebellion, racial issues, and social welfare policies, which makes them challenging to generalize on a global scale. Given the profound changes the world has experienced, these scales are increasingly misaligned with



contemporary realities. These findings emphasize the urgent need for a new, updated scale that reflects the current global landscape and the evolving nature of humanitarianism. Table 1 provides an overview of the characteristics of the scales developed in the literature.

**Table N°1: Summary of Scale Measurement Characteristics**

| Scale measurement    | Number of items   | Scale type                     | Context                   | Psychometric quality |
|----------------------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Ferguson (1944)      | Twenty-five items   | Thurstone-type attitude scales | War and rebellion         | 0.85                 |
| Katz and Hass (1988) | Combined 10 items for egalitarianism and humanitarianism together | Six-point Likert scale         | American racial attitudes | 0.84                 |
| Steenbergen (1996)   | Six items   | Five-point Likert scale        | Social welfare policy     | 0.805                |

**Source:** Authors

As shown in table 1, all the scales were developed in diverse, context-specific settings, with varying numbers of items, ranging from 6 to 25. Despite this variation, all the scales demonstrate excellent psychometric properties.

## 2. Methodology and results

In order to create a reliable and valid measurement tool of humanitarianism, we followed Churchill's (1979) paradigm, which is the most robust (Cheung et al., 2011) reliable and accepted method for scale development (Evrard et al., 2009). Based on the guidelines proposed by Churchill (1979) and Evrard et al. (2009) the scale development procedure is divided into three phases: the specification of the construct's domain, the explanatory phase which aims to purify the scale measurement, and the validation phase which aims to confirm the internal reliability and the validity of the scale. Table 2 provides an overview of the Churchill paradigm applied in our research.



**Table N°2 Churchill's Procedure for Scale Development**

| <i>Phases</i>                             | <i>Steps</i>                       | <i>Description</i>  |
|---|------------------------------------|---|
| <i>Definition of the construct domain</i> | <b>Specify domain of construct</b> | Literature review search<br>Proposition of a new definition of humanitarianism  |
| <i>Phase1: Exploratory phase</i>          | <b>Generate sample of items</b>    | The generation of items is grounded in the humanitarianism literature based on the inductive approach (Roussel and Wacheux, 2005).<br><b>Research type:</b> qualitative research<br><b>Sample size:</b> 24 directive interviews<br><b>Results:</b> nine items generated |
|   | <b>Collect data</b>                | <b>Research type:</b> quantitative research<br><b>Simple size:</b> 90 respondents   |
|   | <b>Purify measure</b>              | Principal component analyses + Cronbach alpha   |
| <i>Phase2: Confirmatory phase</i>         | <b>Collect data</b>                | <b>Research type:</b> quantitative research<br><b>Simple size:</b> 400 respondents  |
|   | <b>Assess reliability</b>          | Principal component analyses + Cronbach alpha   |
|   | <b>Assess validity</b>             | Confirmatory analysis<br>Rho of Joreskog, and the convergent validity   |

**Source:** Authors

### 2.1 Specification of the construct's domain

According to the literature, humanitarianism has been largely discussed but has no commonly accepted definition (Ticktin, 2014). This step aims to define humanitarianism through an exhaustive literature review (Roussel and Wacheux, 2005), highlighting both the elements included and omitted in various definitions found in the literature (Churchill, 1979). According to Mackenzie et al. (2011), a definition should indicate the studied construct's nature; a thought, an emotion, a perception, an action, a result, or a feature. Based on these points discussed, we propose a new definition of humanitarianism inspired and based on different authors such as: Steenbergen (1996); Feldman and Steenbergen (2001); Barnett (2005); Bornstein and Redfield (2007); Stamatov (2013); Ticktin (2014). We propose that *“humanitarianism may be defined as the everyday propensity to help people in need. It may be shaped through a set of emotions, a sense of responsibility, and a moral obligation felt by*

*an individual to be involved daily in improving the welfare, alleviating suffering, and procuring a decent life for needy people. It is also a belief that civil societies' actors such as charities, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and fortunate people, etc. should continuously help destitute people, who are suffering from ongoing poor living conditions and who are facing unexpected crisis situations, making humanitarianism a constant and integral part of daily life".* This new definition highlights the role of humanitarianism as a responsibility for everyone including civil society actors, not just governments, in helping those in need. It underscores that humanitarianism should be an integral part of daily life, reflected in everyday actions rather than being limited to crisis situations. The emphasis on personal and ongoing involvement broadens the concept of humanitarianism, extending it beyond its traditional boundaries.

## **2.2 Exploratory Phase**

The exploratory phase of the Churchill's (1979) paradigm contains three steps which are: generating items sample, the data collection, and tests of the validity of the construct.

### **2.2.1 Items generation**

In order to generate items, deduction techniques were used, such as literature searches, surveys, and interviews (Selltiz et al., 1976). According to the research objectives, we used the inductive approach because the existing literature does not provide enough insights into humanitarianism.

Qualitative research was conducted using an interview guide with eleven questions on humanitarianism, inspired by definitions and scales measurement of Steenbergen et al. (1996) and Feldman and Steenbergen (2001). The questions were validated by university professors with expertise in the subject. The interview guide was administered face-to-face with respondents through semi-structured interviews. Twenty-four structured interviews were conducted, and data collection was halted upon reaching saturation, as suggested by Luborsky and Rubinstein (1995). At this point, no new information emerged, and respondents consistently provided similar responses. The content analysis resulted in nine items, as presented in table 3.

**Table N°3: Items generation**

|   |
|---|
| <b>HUM1:</b> I believe that supporting disadvantaged people is an everyday responsibility.  |
| <b>HUM2:</b> For me, helping to fulfill the vital needs of poor people is a daily way to preserve their dignity.                  |
| <b>HUM3:</b> I have the impression that providing daily help to less fortunate people facilitates their integration into society. |
| <b>HUM4:</b> I am committed to improving the living conditions of marginalized people in my everyday actions.                     |
| <b>HUM5:</b> I believe it is everyone's daily responsibility to assist those in need.   |
| <b>HUM6:</b> I feel that supporting the needy people allows them to escape the delinquency.                                       |
| <b>HUM7:</b> I see that participating in associative work is important to save the lives of poor people.                          |
| <b>HUM8:</b> I feel satisfaction and pleasure when helping people less fortunate on a daily basis.                                |
| <b>HUM9:</b> I feel a daily obligation to address the difficult living conditions of marginalized people.                         |

**Source:** Authors

### 2.2.2 Data collection

We developed a survey for data collection, which was administered to 90 Tunisian respondents using a non-probabilistic sampling method. The questionnaire included nine items, and we used a Likert scale following the guidelines of Steenbergen (1996).

Results displayed in table 4 show that the majority of respondents were female, representing 54.9%, while males accounted for 45.1%. Most respondents (65.9%) were between 18 and 34 years old, followed by 24.2% aged 35 to 46, 7.7% aged 47 to 60, and 2.2% over 60. In terms of profession, 60.4% were senior executives, 16.5% were students, 8.8% were businesspeople, 7.7% held intermediate occupations, 4.4% were traders, and 2.2% were retirees.

**Table N°4: Sample Size and Characteristics**

| <i>Characteristics</i> | <i>Modality</i>         | <i>Number</i> | <i>Percentage</i> |
|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| <b>Gender</b>          | Female                  | 50            | 54.9%             |
|                        | Male                    | 41            | 45.1%             |
| <b>Age</b>             | 18-34                   | 60            | 65.9%             |
|                        | 35-46                   | 22            | 24.2%             |
|                        | 47-60                   | 7             | 7.7%              |
|                        | over 60 years           | 2             | 2.2%              |
| <b>SPC</b>             | Senior executives       | 55            | 60.4%             |
|                        | Businessman             | 8             | 8.8%              |
|                        | Trader                  | 4             | 4.4%              |
|                        | Intermediate occupation | 7             | 7.7%              |
|                        | Students                | 15            | 16.5%             |
|                        | Retirees                | 2             | 2.2%              |

**Source:** Authors

### 2.2.3 Measurement purification

We used an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) by Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with oblique rotation using SPSS 18 to test the humanitarianism dimension loadings and to assess the reliability of each factor.

According to results displayed in table 5, the results of the PCA are valid since the KMO is above the recommended value of 0.50, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is significant at the 5% risk as recommended by Jolibert and Jourdan (2006), which means that the correlation matrix is different from the identity matrix. As such, the relationship between the observed variables and the factor model is validated. Regarding the quality representation we found that some items present a good factor loading (higher than 0.5) and some items present a bad factor loading (lower than 0.5). Items HUM1, HUM2, HUM4, HUM5, HUM7, HUM8, and HUM9 are grouped under humanitarianism dimension with an Eigenvalue (>1). Together, these items account for a total explained variance of 56.675%, capturing 57% of the total information. Thereby, seven items are retained (HUM1, HUM2, HUM4, HUM5, HUM7, HUM8, and HUM9) and two items are deleted (HUM3 and HUM6).

**Table N°5: Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Humanitarianism scale**

| <b>KMO and Bartlett's Test</b>              | <b>Selected items</b>   | <b>Loading</b> | <b>Eigen value</b> | <b>Variance</b> |       |        |
|---|---|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| KMO= 0.843<br>Bartlett Significance = 0,000 | <b>HUM1:</b> I believe that supporting disadvantaged people is an everyday responsibility.  | 0.751          | 3.883              | 43.147          |       |        |
|   | <b>HUM2:</b> For me, helping to fulfill the vital needs of poor people is a daily way to preserve their dignity.                  | 0.731          |                    |                 |       |        |
|   | <b>HUM3:</b> I have the impression that providing daily help to less fortunate people facilitates their integration into society. | <b>0.340</b>   |                    |                 |       |        |
|   | <b>HUM4:</b> I am committed to improving the living conditions of marginalized people in my everyday actions.                     | 0.640          |                    |                 |       |        |
|   | <b>HUM5:</b> I believe it is everyone's daily responsibility to assist those in need.   | 0.540          |                    |                 |       |        |
|   | <b>HUM6:</b> I feel that supporting the needy people allows them to escape the delinquency.                                       | <b>0.353</b>   |                    |                 |       |        |
|   | <b>HUM9:</b> I feel a daily obligation to address the difficult living conditions of marginalized people.                         | 0.524          |                    |                 |       |        |
|   | <b>HUM7:</b> I see that participating in associative work is important to save the lives of poor people.                          | 0.613          |                    |                 | 1.218 | 56.675 |
|   | <b>HUM8:</b> I feel satisfaction and pleasure when helping people less fortunate on a daily basis.                                | 0.610          |                    |                 |       |        |

**Source:** Authors

According to the results of the component matrix shown in table 6, we have two axis and items are divided as follows: Axis 1 presents items HUM1, HUM2, HUM4, HUM5 and HUM9 and Axis 2 presents items HUM7 and HUM8. This result indicates that humanitarianism could be unidimensional or bidimensional variable. In order to verify its

dimensionality, we studied the reliability of each axis. According to results, axis1 presents an excellent Cronbach's alpha which is higher than the recommended 0.70 (Nunnaly, 1978) and indicates an acceptable reliability at the exploratory level. Axis 2, with a bad Cronbach's alpha value lower than the recommended 0.70, does not present an acceptable reliability at the exploratory level and cannot be retained. Finally, results conducted us to retain only five items (HUM1, HUM2, HUM4, HUM5, and HUM9) and to consider it as a unidimensional variable.

**Table N°6: Component matrix results**

| Items  | Axis1        | Axis 2       |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| <b>HUM1:</b> I believe that supporting disadvantaged people is an everyday responsibility.                       | <b>0.832</b> | -0.242       |
| <b>HUM2:</b> For me, helping to fulfill the vital needs of poor people is a daily way to preserve their dignity. | <b>0.802</b> | -0.295       |
| <b>HUM4:</b> I am committed to improving the living conditions of marginalized people in my everyday actions.    | <b>0.781</b> | -0.173       |
| <b>HUM5:</b> I believe it is everyone's daily responsibility to assist those in need.                            | <b>0.717</b> | 0.161        |
| <b>HUM9:</b> I feel a daily obligation to address the difficult living conditions of marginalized people.        | <b>0.720</b> | -0.077       |
| <b>HUM7:</b> I see that participating in associative work is important to save the lives of poor people.         | 0.454        | <b>0.638</b> |
| <b>HUM8:</b> I feel satisfaction and pleasure when helping people less fortunate on a daily basis.               | 0.414        | <b>0.662</b> |
| <b>Cronbach's alpha</b>  | 0.857        | 0.536        |

**Source:** Authors

### 2.3 Validation / Confirmatory Phase

The Confirmatory phase continues to reduce the random error by realizing tests of the internal consistency reliability and the construct validity and finishes by reducing the systematic error to ensure a good quality of measurement scale (Roussel and Wacheux, 2005). A second data collection was done using an online survey with 400 respondents. This step aims to refine

items that hamper the quality of the internal consistency reliability and the validity of the construct (Roussel and Wacheux, 2005). In this step, the scale measurement of humanitarianism after the first iteration is studied. A second Exploratory Factor Analysis was included to test humanitarianism reliability and its internal consistency.

### 2.3.1 Data collection

For the confirmatory analysis, we collected 400 responses using a non-probabilistic sampling method. The sample consisted of 59.5% females and 40.5% males, with ages ranging from 18 to over 60. Of the respondents, 77.5% were professionals, 14% were students, and 8.5% belonged to other professional categories. Table 7 summarizes our samples' characteristics.

**Table N°7: Sample Size and Characteristics**

| Characteristics | Modality      | Number | Percentage |
|-----------------|---------------|--------|------------|
| <b>Gender</b>   | Female        | 238    | 59.5%      |
|                 | Male          | 162    | 40.5%      |
| <b>Age</b>      | 18-34         | 277    | 69.3%      |
|                 | 35-46         | 84     | 21%        |
|                 | 47-60         | 24     | 6%         |
|                 | over 60 years | 15     | 3.8%       |
| <b>SPC</b>      | Professionals | 310    | 77.5%      |
|                 | Students      | 56     | 14%        |
|                 | Others        | 34     | 8.5%       |

**Source:** Authors

### 2.3.2 Reliability and validity assessment

Based on the data presented in table 8, the results of the PCA are valid since the KMO test is above the recommended value of 0.50, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is significant at the 5% risk, which means that the correlation matrix is different from the identity matrix. As such, the relationship between the observed variables and the factor model is validated. Regarding the quality representation of humanitarianism items, all items are retained because they have a higher value than (0.5) and are grouped under the humanitarianism variable with an Eigenvalue (>1) and a total explained variance of 86.685% (87% of total information). Moreover, Cronbach's alpha is higher than the recommended value of 0.70, which indicates the acceptable reliability at the exploratory level.



**Table N°8: Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Humanitarianism scale**

| Items  | KMO and Bartlett's Test                           | Loading | Eigen value | Variance | $\alpha^*$ |
|--|---|---------|-------------|----------|------------|
| <b>HUM1:</b> I believe that supporting disadvantaged people is an everyday responsibility.                       | KMO= 0.900<br>Bartlett<br>Significance<br>= 0,000 | 0.874   | 4.334       | 86.685%  | 0.961      |
| <b>HUM2:</b> For me, helping to fulfill the vital needs of poor people is a daily way to preserve their dignity. |   | 0.824   |             |          |            |
| <b>HUM3:</b> I am committed to improving the living conditions of marginalized people in my everyday actions.    |   | 0.894   |             |          |            |
| <b>HUM4:</b> I believe it is everyone's daily responsibility to assist those in need.                            |   | 0.895   |             |          |            |
| <b>HUM5:</b> I feel a daily obligation to address the difficult living conditions of marginalized people.        |   | 0.847   |             |          |            |

\*: Cronbach's alpha

**Source:** Authors

After the second iteration, a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) is conducted using AMOS 18.0 to confirm the factor structure and validity of the scale. The results displayed in table 9, show that the ratio of the minimum discrepancy to its degree of freedom, CMIN/df is above the recommended threshold (>5) according to Marsh and Hocevar (1985). The GFI, CFI and NFI were well above the recommended threshold (>0.9), and AGFI is above the recommended threshold (>0.8) according to Marsh and Hocevar (1985). As such, the standard deemed important for model fit. However, the root mean square of approximation, RMSEA and RMR tends to 0 as recommended. Those indices indicated a good fit of the hypothesized model.

**Table N°9: Model Fit and Adjustment Quality for the Humanitarianism Scale**

| Indices | Parsimony     | Absolute |       |       |       | Incremental |       |
|---------|---------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|
|         | Chi-deux/ ddl | GFI      | AGFI  | RMR   | RMSEA | NFI         | CFI   |
| Values  | 13.641        | 0.930    | 0.800 | 0.027 | 0.178 | 0.971       | 0.973 |

Source: Authors

Moreover, we tested the reliability and validity of the scale measurement of humanitarianism through Rho of Joreskog and Convergent Validity. We found that the Rho of Joreskog is well above the recommended ( $>0.7$ ), and the Convergent Validity is also well above the recommended value ( $>0.5$ ) according to Fornell and Larcker (1981). Those results show that humanitarianism's scale meets the standards for validity and reliability at the confirmatory level. Results of reliability and validity are shown in table 10.

**Table N°10: Reliability and Validity of the Humanitarianism Scale**

|                 | Reliability (Rho of Joreskog) | Convergent Validity |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Humanitarianism | 0.836                         | 0.962               |

Source: Authors

### 3. Discussion, conclusion and recommendations

This study aims to develop and validate a new scale measurement of the construct humanitarianism. To achieve this, we employed a reflexive measurement model, which is well-suited for our research objectives. Although humanitarianism is not a new concept and has existed for centuries, we build upon existing definitions and measurement scales. We used Churchill's paradigm (1979) based on the guidelines proposed by Evrard et al. (2009) consisting of three phases: the specification of the construct's domain, the exploratory phase, and the confirmatory phase. As a result, we developed a new definition and a valid, unidimensional scale consisting of five Likert-type items, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, to measure humanitarianism.

In the first phase of Churchill's (1979) paradigm, exploratory research was conducted to gather a comprehensive review of the humanitarianism literature. Based on this literature review, we proposed a new definition of humanitarianism (presented in the methodology and results sections). The core idea of this definition is that humanitarianism is not just a fleeting emotion or occasional act of kindness toward those in need; it is an ongoing responsibility for everyone, every day. Helping destitute people and alleviating their suffering is a duty we all

share, not something to be left to the government or reserved for times of crisis and immediate danger as mentioned by Barnett (2005); Bornstein and Redfield (2011) and Ticktin (2014). Instead, it should be a daily habit, integrated into our lives, demonstrating that even small acts of help can make a difference at little cost to ourselves.

The second and the third step of the Churchill's (1979) paradigm led to develop a new measurement scale consisting of five items, assessed using a Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree as recommended by Steenbergen (1996). The scale items are presented in table 8, located in the methodology and results section. The developed scale measurement offers some novelties and some common points compared to existing scales. We developed the scale in a crisis-stricken context, unlike other scales created for different settings, such as war and rebellion (Ferguson, 1944), social welfare policy (Steenbergen, 1996), and American racial attitudes (Katz and Hass, 1988). Context plays a crucial role in shaping the orientation and meaning of the items, as the needs in a poverty context differ from those in war. While humanitarianism is traditionally viewed as essential during times of crisis and immediate danger, our scale emphasizes it as a daily responsibility for everyone. In a crisis-stricken context, where poor living conditions have become an ongoing reality for many, integrating humanitarianism into everyday life can have a profound impact. Small, consistent acts of kindness, when performed by many, can lead to meaningful change in the lives of destitute people who endure continual hardship. Our scale reflects the current need for humanitarianism as an everyday practice, adapting to the reality of today's world, where older scales may no longer be as relevant. This five-item scale, aligning closely with Steenbergen's six-item version, adopting Churchill's (1979) paradigm, as Steenbergen (1966) did, to ensure a rigorous approach.

Our study contributes to the literature by providing a new and a valid scale measurement for empirical validation, and proposing a new definition. These novelties aim to enrich the literature and provide a recent scale meeting the crisis-stricken context that we are living in. The concept of humanitarianism is widely studied in research and academia, yet it remains a complex variable that is challenging to define and measure. Our new scale addresses the evolving nature of humanitarianism, considering the shift from modern to post-modern society and the need to align with contemporary contexts. It highlights the growing importance of everyday humanitarianism as an integral part of daily life, emphasizing the practice of humanitarianism in various daily situations, not just during times of crisis and immediate danger.

Our study provides valuable insights for researchers by offering a recent relevant scale to measure humanitarianism that aligns with the crisis-stricken context we are experiencing. It enables researchers to distinguish humanitarian and non-humanitarian people and help them to effectively target people in humanitarian actions. In addition, this research could help academicians to measure peoples' levels of humanitarianism which can serve as a moderating variable in future research to better understand its impact on various aspects related to engagement and involvement in humanitarian actions. Our study can also assist advertisers in developing impactful humanitarian commercials. The items from this scale can guide advertisers in creating effective content by highlighting key elements that resonate with audiences, helping to capture attention and evoke empathetic emotions in their advertisements. Based on these items, helping others is portrayed as an everyday responsibility, a shared concern, and a duty that preserves dignity and makes a meaningful impact. The orientation of our items can shape the design and content of fundraising campaigns, enabling advertisers to create compelling messages that motivate people to contribute. Additionally, brands may be drawn to incorporate humanitarianism into their strategies, highlighting their commitment to humanitarian actions to better resonate with humanitarian consumers. This approach can encourage greater participation in cause-related marketing initiatives and increase the purchase of products developed to raise funds for social causes and support those less fortunate.

Despite its contribution to both theory and practice, this research has obviously some limitations that could be addressed in future research. First, our sample was limited to a single country. Future research could include international samples to enhance the cross-cultural generalizability of the scale and enable a comparative analysis across different cultural settings. Second, qualitative research may not reveal all hidden insights. In future studies, it would be beneficial to combine both direct and indirect qualitative methods to ensure that all relevant information is captured from respondents.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, E., Kevany, S., & Sitaraman, S. (2022). Everything everywhere all at once: Wars, climate change, natural disasters, coups, and economic collapse. *Security Nexus Perspective, DKI-APCSS*, 1-13.
- Aloudat, T., & Khan, T. (2022). Decolonising humanitarianism or humanitarian aid? *PLOS Global Public Health*, 2(4), 1-4.
- Aullon de Haro, P., & Mombelli, D. (2020). Introduction to the Spanish Universalist School: Enlightened culture and education versus politics. *History of Early Modern Educational Thought, Brill*.
- Bardhan, P. (2006). Does globalization help or hurt the world's poor? *Scientific American*, 294(4), 84–91.
- Barnett, M. (2005). Humanitarianism transformed. *Perspectives on Politics*, 30(4), 723-740.
- Berger, S., & Scalme, S. (2020). Towards a history of global humanitarianism. *The Historical Journal*, 63(5), 1378-1389.
- Bornstein, E., & Redfield, P. (2007). Genealogies of suffering and the gift of care. *Working paper*, Social Science Research Council, United States.
- Bornstein, E., & Redfield, P. (2011). Forces of compassion: Humanitarianism between ethics and politics. *School for Advanced Research Press*.
- Brewer, G.A. (2003). Building social capital: Civic attitudes and behavior of public servants. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13(1), 5-25.
- Cheung, C.M., Lee, M.K., & Jin, X.L. (2011). Customer engagement in an online social platform: A conceptual model and scale development [Paper presentation]. *Association for Information Systems, Shanghai, China*.
- Churchill, G.A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(1), 64-73.
- Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Evrard, Y., Pars, B., & Roux, E. (2009). *Market: Fondements et méthodes des recherches en marketing*. Dunod.
- Fassin, D. (2012). *Humanitarian reason: A moral history of the present*. University of California Press.

- Fassin, D. (2010). Inequality of lives, hierarchies of humanity: Moral commitments and ethical dilemmas of humanitarianism. In I. Feldman & M. Ticktin (Eds.), *In the name of humanity: The government of threat and care* (pp. 238-255). Durham Press.
- Feldman, S. (1988). Structure and consistency in public opinion: The role of core beliefs and values. *American Journal of Political Science*, 32, 416-440.
- Feldman, S., & Steenbergen, M.R. (2001). The humanitarian foundation of public support for social welfare. *American Journal of Political Science*, 45(3), 658-677.
- Ferguson, L.W. (1944). A revision of the primary social attitude scales. *Journal of Psychology*, 17, 229-241.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variable and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50.
- Goh, J.X., Schlegel, K., Tignor, S.M., & Hall, J.A. (2016). Who is interested in personality? The interest in personality scale and its correlates. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 101, 185-191.
- Han, H., Nguyen, H.N., Song, H., Lee, S., & Chua, B.L. (2018). Impact of functional/cognitive and emotional advertisements on image and repurchase intention. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 29(8), 1-19.
- Hassas, M., El Basri, M., & Bentahar, A. (2022). La Pauvreté : Concepts, approches et mesures. *Revue Internationale du Chercheur*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 746-756.
- Hilton, M., Baughan, E., Davey, E., Everill, B., O'Sullivan, K., & Sasson, T. (2018). History and humanitarianism: A conversation. *Past & Present*, 241(1), e1-e38.
- Holland, J.H., Holyoak, K.J., Nisbett, R.E., & Thagard, P.R. (1989). Induction: Processes of inference, learning, and discovery. *IEEE Expert*, 2(3), 92-93.
- Hoonakker, P.L.T., & Carayon, P. (2009). Questionnaire survey nonresponse: A comparison of postal mail and Internet surveys. *International Journal of Human Computer Interaction*, 25(5), 348-373.
- Jolibert, A., & Jourdan, P. (2006). Marketing research: Méthodes de recherche et d'études en marketing. *Dunod*.
- Katz, I., & Hass, R.G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(6), 893-905.
- Luborsky, M.R., & Rubinstein, R.L. (1995). Sampling in qualitative research rationale. *Research on Aging*, 17(1), 89-113.

- MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M., Nathan, P., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2011). Construct measurement and validation procedures in MIS and behavioral research: Integrating new and existing techniques. *Validation Procedures in MIS and Behavioral Research*, 35(2), 293-334.
- Marsh, H.W., & Hocevar, D. (1985). Application of confirmatory factor analysis to the study of self-concept: First- and higher order factor models and their invariance across groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97(3), 562-582.
- Fraser, N. A., & Murakami, G. (2022). The role of humanitarianism in shaping public attitudes toward refugees. *Political Psychology*, 43(2), 255-275.
- Nisbet, E.K., Zelenski, J.M., & Murphy, S.A. (2008). The nature relatedness scale. *Environment and Behavior*, 41(5), 715-740.
- Norris, L. (2012). Economies of moral fibre? Recycling charity clothing into emergency aid blankets. *Journal of Material Culture*, 17(4), 389-404.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). Psychometric theory. *McGraw-Hill*.
- Oyamot, C.M., Fisher, E.L., Deason, G., & Borgida, E. (2012). Attitudes toward immigrants: The interactive role of the authoritarian predisposition, social norms, and humanitarian values. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(1), 97-105.
- Radice, H. (2019). Saving ourselves? On rescue and humanitarian action. *Review of International Studies*, 45(3), 1-18.
- Redfield, P. (2012). Humanitarianism. In D. Fassin (Ed.), *A companion to moral anthropology* (1st ed., pp. 464-478). *John Wiley & Sons, Inc.*
- Richey, L.A. (2018). Conceptualizing “everyday humanitarianism”: Ethics, affects, and practices of contemporary global helping. *New Political Science*, 40(4), 625-639.
- Richey, L.A. (2019). Eclipsed by the halo: “Helping” brands through dissociation. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 9(1), 78-82.
- Roborgh, S.E. (2018). Beyond medical humanitarianism: Politics and humanitarianism in the figure of the Midani physician. *Social Science & Medicine*, 211, 321-329.
- Rose, J., O’Keefe, P., Jayawickrama, J., & O’Brien, G. (2013). The challenge of humanitarian aid: An overview. *Environmental Hazards*, 2(1), 74-92.
- Roussel, P., Durrieu, F., Campoy, E., & El Akremi, A. (2002). Méthode d’équation structurelles: Recherche et application en gestion. *Edition Economica*.
- Roussel, P., & Wacheux, F. (2005). Management des ressources humaines: Méthodes de recherche en sciences humaines et sociales. *De Boeck Supérieur*.



Sellami, L., Bel Faquir, N., & Rouggani, K. (2023). Vers un développement durable, citoyens et conscience : quel lien ? 'Le capital humain est la source de toute richesse'," *Revue Internationale du Chercheur*, 4(1), 160–186.

Schwittay, A. (2015). New media and international development: Representation and affect in microfinance. *Routledge*.

Selltiz, C., Wrightsman, L.S., & Cook, S.W. (1976). Research methods in social relations (3rd ed.). *Holt, Rinehart, and Winston*.

Sheikh, S.U.R., & Beise-Zee, R. (2011). Corporate social responsibility or cause-related marketing? The role of cause specificity of CSR. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 28(1), 27-39.

Shen, F., & Edwards, H.H. (2005). Economic individualism, humanitarianism, and welfare reform: A value-based account of framing effects. *Journal of Communication*, 55(4), 795-809.

Stamatov, P. (2013). The origins of global humanitarianism: Religion, empires, and advocacy. *Cambridge University Press*.

Steenbergen, M.R. (1996). Compassion and American public opinion: An analysis of the NES humanitarianism scale. *NES Pilot Study Report*. University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill.

Strauss, A.L., & Corbin, J. (1998). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory. *Sage Publications Ltd*.

Taibi, H., & Benabdelhadi, A. (2022). Social responsibility in the Moroccan public sector: Towards a sustainable development. *Revue Internationale des Sciences de Gestion*, 5(2), 172-187.

Tamburini, R. (2024). <https://socialincome.org/en/int/world-poverty-statistics-2024>.

Ticktin, M. (2011). Casualties of care: Immigration and the politics of humanitarianism. *University of California Press*.

Ticktin, M. (2014). Transnational humanitarianism. *Department of Anthropology, The New School for Social Research, Annual Review of Anthropology*, 43(1), 273-289.

Zhang, Q., Lan Oo, B., & Heng Lim, B.T. (2018). Drivers, motivations, and barriers to the implementation of corporate social responsibility practices by construction enterprises: A review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 210(3), 563-584.