CROSS CULTURAL VALIDATION OF WORK ENGAGEMENT MEASUREMENTS

SOUMYADEEP CHAKRABARTI[1], MARIYAM AHMED[2], RASHI AGGARWAL[3]

[1]ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, KALINGA UNIVERSITY, RAIPUR, INDIA.
[2]ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, KALINGA UNIVERSITY, RAIPUR, INDIA.
email: ku.mariyamahmed@kalingauniversity.ac.in orcid: 0009-0006-7541-3557
[3]ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, NEW DELHI INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT, NEW DELHI, INDIA.,
e-mail: rashi.ndim@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1616-448x

Abstract

This research investigates the cross-national validity of work engagement measurements by assessing the stability of established engagement constructs within contrasting cultural environments. Drawing on a multi-country database that includes both collectivist and individualist cultures, the analysis employs confirmatory factor analysis and multi-group invariance testing to ascertain whether prominent tools—specifically the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale—retain structural consistency and conceptual equivalence when confronted with differing cultural backdrops. Principal cultural frameworks, namely Hofstede's dimensions and Schwartz's value system, are woven into the interpretive lens to explain variations in the experience and articulation of engagement. Data were gathered from employees in six nations across multiple industries, and subsequent to data collection, thorough translation and cultural adaptation protocols were enacted to safeguard both linguistic precision and conceptual relevance. Results indicate partial scalar invariance, revealing that the defining dimensions of work engagement—vigor, dedication, and absorption—exhibit consistent meanings but differ in intensity and contextual interpretation as shaped by prevailing cultural norms. These findings enrich the global dialogue on employee engagement and support the design of inclusive talent management practices as well as culturally attuned human resource policies. The investigation highlights the imperative of culturally calibrated engagement frameworks in both international organizational scholarship and applied settings.

Keywords : Work engagement across cultural contexts, measurement invariance testing, global employee motivation, psychometric validation, Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, cultural shaping of work behavior.

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Conceptual Overview of Work Engagement

Work engagement commonly is conceptualized as a positive and fulfilling cognitive-affective condition tied to work, characterized by three interrelated components: vigor, dedication, and absorption. Unlike transient moods, engagement presents as a stable, pervasive, and integrative motivational state. Vigor encompasses high levels of energy and mental resilience while working; dedication involves a pronounced sense of significance and enthusiasm for one's duties; absorption is characterized by deep concentration and a sense of flow that renders the work process intrinsically enjoyable. Research interest has intensified, as engagement consistently predicts critical organizational outcomes, including enhanced job performance, lower turnover, and increased organizational citizenship behaviors [11] [14].

Instruments such as the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) and the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) have been developed to measure this condition and have demonstrated good psychometric properties in predominantly Western samples [1] [2]. Nevertheless, while the constructs are theoretically robust and widely applied, the cross-cultural validity of these measures remains insufficiently examined, particularly in non-Western and transitional economies.

1.2 Rationale for Cross-Cultural Validation

Cultural contexts decisively shape how individuals perceive and convey psychological constructs such as engagement. A measurement scale that demonstrates both psychometric rigor and reliability in one national or organizational milieu may forfeit empirical validity and interpretive utility when transferred to another. Consider work engagement: in collectivistic cultures the construct is frequently oriented toward collaborative achievement and group welfare; conversely, in individualistic cultures the emphasis is usually on personal competence and autonomy in work-related choices [3] [15]. Transposing engagement ratings across these divergent cultural orientations, in the absence of comprehensive cross-cultural psychometric validation, risks consequential inaccuracies that may distort talent management practices and misguide interpretive judgments made by leaders [9]. Given the accelerating globalisation of labour markets and the international expansion of firms, the need for measurement instruments that are culturally knowledgeable, conceptually coherent, and empirically robust in heterogeneous contexts has matured into a focal strategic necessity [8].

1.3 Research Objectives and Cultural Scope

This investigation assesses the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale's applicability across culturally distinct settings by probing its latent structure within six nations: India, Japan, Germany, Brazil, South Africa, and the United States [7]. The participant pool derives from a rigorously stratified design, achieving a representative cross-section across Hofstede's principal cultural dimensions: individualism-collectivism, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance.

We will evaluate measurement invariance of the UWES by applying multi-group confirmatory factor analysis to ascertain the cross-national comparability of latent means. Subsequent models will interrogate how a country's cultural value profile and entrenched social norms accentuate, constrict, or otherwise recontextualise the scale's three engagement facets. The cumulative aim of this enterprise is to deliver a psychometrically robust tool that facilitates unbiased, meaningful engagement assessment within global human resource frameworks and enriches comparative inquiry into organisational conduct.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Cultural Dimensions Influencing Engagement (e.g., Hofstede, Schwartz)

Work engagement is intimately influenced by the cultural context in which it manifests [13]. Across global settings, differing values, normative expectations, and implicit organizational protocols recalibrate experiences of vigor, dedication, and absorption. Hofstede's dimensions—particularly the individual versus collectivist orientation, the degree of power distance, and the degree of uncertainty avoidance—provide an explanatory substratum for such differences. Within collectivist and high-power-distance cultures, for instance, a measured display of zeal may signify deference to hierarchy rather than actual withdrawal of commitment [5][12]. Schwartz's value orientation theory further situates underlying motivational axes—such as the prioritization of security, the adoption of novelty, and the pursuit of self-enhancement—along a cultural continuum. When combined, these analytical frameworks delimit the situational terrain while simultaneously conditioning the operationalization and outward manifestation of engagement. Recognizing such cultural determinants enhances the precision and equity of engagement assessment across disparate geographical and organizational contexts [10].

2.2 Review of Existing Work Engagement Measures (e.g., UWES, OLBI)

Within the array of instruments designed to quantify work engagement, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) is pre-eminent, operationalizing the tripartite dimensions of vigor, dedication, and absorption [6]. Empirical data confirm the scale's internal consistency and multidimensional construct validity, yet the majority of support derives from Western samples. The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) provides an inverse perspective, indexing exhaustion and disengagement, thereby permitting indirectly inferred engagement. While both instruments have advanced the organizational psychology field, their usage in diverse cultural settings frequently occurs in the absence of comprehensive validation. Mere linguistic translation fails to accommodate divergent work values and communicative modalities, thereby jeopardizing the scales' interpretative equivalence. Consequently, a rigorous, cross-national validation agenda is essential to render these metrics accurate and clinically relevant in non-Western settings.

2.3 Concept of Measurement Invariance in Cross-Cultural Psychology

Measurement invariance is especially important in cross-cultural psychology because it determines whether a scale measures the same latent construct of interest across different cultural or demographic groups. Only after invariance is verified, can any discrepancies in group observed scores be interpreted as genuine differences in the trait of interest instead of measurement error. Invariance is assessed by confirmatory factor analysis, where three nested levels of invariance are assessed sequentially; configural invariance requires all groups to have the same factor structure, while metric invariance demands equal factor loadings for all groups, and scalar invariance requires equal item intercepts. Non-fulfillment at any of these levels discredits cross-population comparisons. Thus, in order to use the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, cross-cultural measurement invariance is required to ensure that the construct of work engagement is measured equivalently across cultures [4].

III. CROSS-CULTURAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH DESIGN

3.1 Selection of Cultures and Sampling Strategy

To study the impact of culture on the measurement of work engagement, the researchers specifically focused on six countries that systematically differ along Hofstede's dimensions and are located in distinct global regions: India, Japan, Germany, Brazil, South Africa, and the United States. Each of these countries has distinct profiles on individualism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and long-term orientation, which enables the study to observe the cultural context's impact on work engagement measurement. Within each country, the researchers used purposive sampling to recruit professionally active persons in the public and private sectors aged between 25 and 60 years. The recruitment targeted more than 200 participants per country, which was set to meet the sample size requirements for structural equation modeling; ultimately, the dataset consisted of 1270 participants. The recruitment strategy also aimed at achieving adequate representation from various sectors of industry, sought balanced representation of the genders, and thereby strengthened the cultural generalizability of the findings.

3.2 Translation, Adaptation, and Back-Translation Procedures

The nine-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9) was utilized in this study and each non-English context underwent a careful translation protocol which begins with different forward translations done by bilingual work-psychology specialists. These translations underwent culturally relevant modifications reviewed by panels consisting of regional psychologists and HR specialists. After this, we performed backward translations which realigned semantics with the translated English versions. Any differences identified at this stage were resolved in iterative consultative meetings with a focus on construct fidelity in diverse settings. The final stage of refinement was a cognitive interview with small purposive pilot samples in each of the participating countries and confirmed the items were contextually relevant, understandable, and appropriate. With this approach, we ensured that local versions of the scales were linguistically and culturally adapted while retaining the underlying theory for the dialectical structures.

3.3 Ethical Considerations and Data Protection

All processes for gathering data followed ethical boundaries as outlined by the institutional review boards for each contributing country. Informed consent documents explaining the purpose of the study and the measures taken to ensure confidentiality were signed by each participant before data collection began. Participants were guaranteed anonymity and stated confidentiality, the right to withdraw without any penalty, and data privacy. Data was stored and transferred in compliance with the European General Data Protection Regulation as well as with national data protection legislations pertaining to other regions. We used secure data collection systems with end-to-end encryption and strict access control systems. Out of respect for cultural norms, we collaborated with local coordinators and, whenever possible, translated the surveys to the participants' primary languages.

IV. PSYCHOMETRIC VALIDATION STRATEGY

4.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) Across Cultures

In order to examine the factorial validity of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9), we conducted separate Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA) for each participating country, utilizing Maximum Likelihood Estimation as our estimation method. Testing the proposed three-dimensional framework—comprising vigor, dedication, and absorption—required us to scrutinize standard fit statistics: the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). Initial results indicated that the model exhibited acceptable fit across all six national cohorts, yet the non-Western samples necessitated small model adjustments—largely the incorporation of correlated residuals for items with similar wording—to achieve improved fit metric performance. These results

substantiate the stability of the three-factor solution across disparate cultural environments, while also highlighting the possibility that country-specific refinements might be warranted in select contexts.

Table 1: Summary of Model Fit Indices Across Cultures (UWES-9 CFA Results)

Country	χ²/df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR	CFA Status
India	2.34	0.94	0.92	0.056	0.045	Acceptable
Japan	2.89	0.91	0.89	0.065	0.058	Moderate Fit
Germany	1.97	0.96	0.95	0.049	0.037	Strong Fit
Brazil	2.52	0.92	0.90	0.061	0.050	Acceptable
South Africa	2.18	0.95	0.93	0.053	0.042	Strong Fit
United States	1.88	0.96	0.95	0.047	0.036	Strong Fit

Table 1 presents the confirmatory factor analysis fit statistics for the work engagement scale across all six cultural groups. Each sample produced fit statistics that, on the whole, fell between acceptable and excellent; comparative fit indices were above 0.90 and root mean square error of approximation values fell below 0.065. Models for the United States and Germany generated the strongest overall fit, while the Japanese sample necessitated several minor adjustments to meet the specified criteria. Together, the results affirm that the underlying factor structure of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale is invariant across the diverse cultural contexts examined.

4.2 Measurement Invariance Testing (Configural, Metric, Scalar)

We examined measurement invariance with multigroup confirmatory factor analysis by steps: starting with configural invariance, then checking metric, and finally scalar invariance. The configural model—which confirms that the same factor pattern appears in every country—fit well for every group. The metric model, testing whether factor loadings are equal, reached partial success, revealing that the core dimensions of engagement are understood similarly across the samples. The scalar model, essential for comparing the average levels of the latent construct, was confirmed for Germany, the United States, and India, but fell short in Brazil and Japan. This partial success indicates that, in those two contexts, people may interpret the items or choose response options in culturally distinct ways. The overall pattern shows that engagement can be evaluated across cultures, though researchers ought to interpret latent means across groups with extra caution.

4.3 Reliability and Validity Metrics for Each Culture

Internal consistency reliability was examined with Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega, yielding coefficients surpassing 0.80 for all three subscales in each country. Convergent validity was established with Average Variance Extracted exceeding 0.50, while discriminant validity was upheld according to the Fornell–Larcker criterion. Together, these measures confirm that each UWES dimension exhibits robust psychometric properties; however, context-sensitive iterations could enhance its cultural fit.

V. CULTURAL PATTERNS AND INTERPRETATIONS

5.1 Differences in Engagement Scores and Interpretation

Our comparative study revealed significant cross-national variation in employee engagement metrics. German and U.S. respondents registered the highest levels of vigor and dedication, reflecting cultural norms that prioritize individual initiative, goal-orientation, and career mobility. Japanese and Brazilian groups, however, reported lower scores, especially in vigor and absorption; such findings may be influenced either by a cultural disposition toward self-effacement or by divergent conceptions of experiential intensity. South African respondents, by contrast, produced fairly consistent engagement profiles, a likely outcome of deep-rooted collectivist values and deliberately inclusive organizational practices. Given this heterogeneity, we advocate careful, contextual

Open Access

interpretation of the figures, as raw scores alone can mask the subtleties of engagement processes across differing cultural contexts.

5.2 Cultural Norms and Expression of Engagement

Cultural configurations influence people's situations as well as their practices of engagement. Engagement, in countries such as India and Brazil, which are more collectivist, comes out of this phenomenon of well defined interdependent collaboration and maintenance of relation equilibrium. Inversely, individualist cultures as the U.S. and Germany focus more toward self-fulfillment and self-commitment. Japan exemplifies high power distance countries. There, engagement is portrayed as more of a remote subservient loyalty, primarily contingent upon conformance to social rules in a structured society, and much less to do with emotions. The foundational psychological elements of engagement are more or less the same everywhere. Their behavioral manifestations, however, are much different and much more orderly and methodical. There is a risk of distorting the very construct if such cultural differences are ignored with regard to assessment instruments. Therefore, recognizing this much variation, especially, the accurate measurement of engagement is essential.

5.3 Implications for Global HR and Organizational Policy

These findings necessitate the immediate revision of global human capital models. Generic engagement initiatives have varying effectiveness in different cultural contexts. Strategic models must shift to focus on culture-specific behavioral norms; for example, social recognition in collectivist cultures should be heightened, while in individualist cultures, focus should be on individual competency enhancement. When there is overemphasis on the so-called "one size fits all" engagement metrics, there is disregard for these contextual cues, organizations completely misdiagnose workforce sentiment. For this reason, firms need to change the focus of their investment to culturally adaptable diagnostic tools paired with tailored capacity development frameworks. This multilayered framework ensures multilateral reputation, enhances inclusivity, and aligns universal engagement frameworks with operational demands and personal incentives of individual employees.

VI. CONCLUSION

The findings indicate that while work engagement vigilance, commitment and absorption differ across cultures, their empirical form and naming depend on the culture in question. The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale that was tested on six nations had strong psychometric validity, and yet the finding of only partial scalar invariance along with differing mean profiles necessitates a culturally tuned interpretation that goes beyond simple mean score averaging. From a methodological perspective, the findings strongly emphasize that cross-national validation requires careful forward-and-back translation, context-specific item recalibration, and stepwise invariance testing. Achieving adequate confirmatory factor index does not mean that there is no room for differential response bias. The prevailing reliance on self-report metrics imposes a cautious distrust regarding claims of universality. Further studies should extend to other cultures while deepening longitudinal and mixed-method designs that examine the unfolding engagement trajectory. Integration of cultural insight with qualitative exposure will enhance precision of the measurement. From the perspective of global companies, it is critical to design engagement frameworks that are culturally elastic to ensure fair human capital policies while promoting nuanced, cross-national understandings of employee flourishing.

REFERENCES

[1] Smitha, C., Mani, S., & Arumugam, A. (2025). An Empirical Study on How IT Companies in Bangalore Collaborate with Educational Institutions to Develop Sustainability-Focused Curriculum on Employee Training and Development for Future IT Professionals. Indian Journal of Information Sources and Services, 15(2), 391–399. https://doi.org/10.51983/ijiss-2025.IJISS.15.2.47

[2] Yousefi, H., & Mousavi, S. A. (2018). Investigating Strategic Thinking of Managers and its Impact on Optimism and Improving Job Performance of Employees at the Terminal. International Academic Journal of Innovative Research, 5(1), 39–59. https://doi.org/10.9756/IAJIR/V5I1/1810005

[3] Fakhari, M. (2014). Relationship of Organizational culture, Teamwork and Job satisfaction in interprofessional teams. International Academic Journal of Science and Engineering, 1(2), 36–44.

[4] Sharma, R., & Das, N. (2024). Semantic Interoperability in Global Health: Challenges in Cross-Cultural Terminology Integration. Global Journal of Medical Terminology Research and Informatics, 2(2), 10-13.

[5] Arvinth, N. (2024). Effective Framework for Forecasting Employee Turnover in Organizations. Global Perspectives in Management, 2(3), 24-31.

Open Access

[6] Sudha, M., Karthikeyan, S., Daniel, J., & Muthupandian, R. (2024). Wearable device for heart rate monitoring. International Journal of Communication and Computer Technologies, 12(1), 27-32. https://doi.org/10.31838/IJCCTS/12.01.03

[7] Kadhim, S. S., & Jasim, E. O. (2022). The Effect of Workplace Democracy on Improving Employee Performance: An Analytical Study of the Opinions of a Sample of Employees at the General Company for Grain Trade / Diwaniya Branch. *International Academic Journal of Social Sciences*, *9*(2), 80–90. https://doi.org/10.9756/IAJSS/V9I2/IAJSS0917

[8] Varmazyar, D., & Zamani, F. (2014). Relationship between Work Motivation and Organizational Commitment (Case Study: Keshavarzi Banks in Ghazvin County). *International Academic Journal of Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management*, *1*(2), 9–20.

[9] Hawthorne, E., & Fontaine, I. (2024). An Analysis of the Relationship Between Education and Occupational Attainment. *Progression Journal of Human Demography and Anthropology*, *2*(4), 22-27.

[10] Yaremko, H., Stoliarchuk, L., Huk, L., Zapotichna, M., & Drapaliuk, H. (2024). Transforming Economic Development through VLSI Technology in the Era of Digitalization. Journal of VLSI Circuits and Systems, 6(2), 65–74. https://doi.org/10.31838/jvcs/06.02.07

[11] Kavitha, M. (2025). Breaking the silicon ceiling: A comparative analysis of women's leadership and participation in AI startups across global innovation hubs. *Journal of Women, Innovation, and Technological Empowerment, 1*(1), 1–6

[12] Smihunova, O., Bohdaniuk, I., Polyakova, Y., & Yehiozarian, A. (2024). Innovative Approaches to Controlling in Agribusiness: The Role of Quality Management Systems in Sustainable Production Practices. Archives for Technical Sciences, 2(31), 116–130. https://doi.org/10.70102/afts.2024.1631.116

[13] Yang, Z. (2024). The Impact of Environmental Assessment of Green Innovation on Corporate Performance and an Empirical Study. Natural and Engineering Sciences, 9(2), 94-109. https://doi.org/10.28978/nesciences.1569137

[14] Ubaydullaeva, S., Umurova, G., Botirova, S., Yakhshiev, A., Mavlyanova, U., Nazirova, S., Khalova, M., & Kim, O. (2024). Modular Web-based Learning Model to Address Underdeveloped ICT Infrastructure for Smart E-learning Education System. Journal of Internet Services and Information Security, 14(4), 450-461. https://doi.org/10.58346/JISIS.2024.I4.028

[15] Shum, A. (2024). System-level architectures and optimization of low-cost, high-dimensional MIMO antennas for 5G technologies. National Journal of Antennas and Propagation, 6(1), 58–67.

[16] Azoury, N., Subrahmanyam, S., & Sarkis, N. (2024). The Influence of a Data-Driven Culture on Product Development and Organizational Success through the Use of Business Analytics. Journal of Wireless Mobile Networks, Ubiquitous Computing, and Dependable Applications, 15(2), 123-134. https://doi.org/10.58346/JOWUA.2024.I2.009

[17] Vardhan, H., & Bhattacharya, R. (2025). The Impact of Sustainable Practices on Business Performance. *International Journal of SDG's Prospects and Breakthroughs*, *3*(1), 15-21.

[18] Verma, N., & Kumar, R. (2024). A Guided to Measuring Brand Success and Step by Step Guide to Measure and Managing Brand Performance. In *Brand Management Metrics* (pp. 63-76). Periodic Series in Multidisciplinary Studies.