MEASUREMENT INVARIANCE OF DIGITAL PARTICIPATION ATTITUDES ACROSS CULTURES

"DR.JAINISH ROY[1], DR. NIDHI MISHRA[2], MANIKA GUPTA[3]

[1]ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, KALINGA UNIVERSITY, NAYA RAIPUR, CHHATTISGARH, INDIA.
e-mail: ku.jainishroy@kalingauniversity.ac.in ORCID: 0009-0003-7116-9137"

[2]ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, KALINGA UNIVERSITY, RAIPUR, INDIA.
e-mail: ku.nidhimishra@kalingauniversity.ac.in, 0009-0001-9755-7950

[3]ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, NEW DELHI INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT, NEW DELHI, INDIA.,
e-mail: manika.gupta@ndimdelhi.org, https://orcid.org/0009-0003-4709-0429

Abstract:
This research investigates whether individuals harboring differing cultural backgrounds exhibit equivalent attitudes toward digital participation, using multi-group confirmatory factor analysis (MG-CFA) as the analytical cornerstone. Since digital participation progressively determines the ways citizens engage in civic duties, access educational opportunities, and attain social inclusion, clarifying whether the underlying attitudinal constructs possess consistent conceptual and metric properties across varied cultural contexts becomes a critical step in understanding both the fairness and comparability of empirical findings in the expanding literature on digital engagement. We apply an advanced psychometric approach to investigate configural, metric, and scalar invariance within three culturally distinct populations: East Asian, Western European, and Sub-Saharan African. Data were gathered using the validated Digital Participation Attitude Scale (DPAS) from 1,200 respondents, evenly distributed among the three regions. The findings advance theories of digital inclusion by underscoring the necessity of cultural awareness in research on digital participation. We propose practical adaptations of digital engagement strategies to accommodate localized attitudes. By rigorously establishing measurement equivalence, the research guards against the misinterpretation of cross-cultural findings stemming from latent construct divergence. The work underscores that equity in digital participation extends beyond access, necessitating sensitivity to varying cultural scripts that inform users' attitudes. This study expands the field of digital psychology and cross-cultural methods by presenting a robust, replicable framework for psychometric validation that holds true across a range of sociocultural contexts.

Keywords:
Digital Participation, Measurement Invariance, Cross-Cultural Comparison, MG-CFA, Attitudinal Equivalence, Digital Engagement, Psychometric Validation, Digital Inclusion, Civic Technology, Cultural Psychology

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background on Digital Participation and Its Global Importance

Digital participation refers to the ways individuals intentionally and interactively immerse themselves in online environments, whether through messaging one another, casting ballots remotely, deliberating over policies, or acquiring new competencies[1]. Affordable bandwidth and mobile devices have placed these channels at everyone's fingertips, and now they influence nearly every civic sector, from health campaigns to participatory city design. These channels have therefore evolved into influential sites where inclusive development is either realized or denied. The degree to which particular communities are able to engage on the supply and demand sidesilluminates the more complex trunks of social justice, opportunity, and the long-term health of participatory governance. Consequently, governments, academic institutions, and civic organizations are now concentrating on digital literacy and fair infrastructure, sometimes under the sole slogans of closing the digital divide and bolstering democracies in which every opinion possesses weight[2].

1.2 Role of Psychometric Tools in Measuring Attitudes Across Cultures

Psychometric tools supply a disciplined approach for translating subjective beliefs and sentiments into quantifiable data. Nevertheless, for these metrics to retain meaning in a diffuse global landscape, investigators must demonstrate that the dimensions they seek to measure are interpreted consistently, and equivalently, by diverse cultural cohorts[3]. This requirement is especially salient in studies of digital participation, since local social norms and distinct digital environments can shape how respondents interpret questions and choose their answers.

1.3 Research Gap in Invariance Testing for Digital Attitude Measures

Although research increasingly maps worldwide differences in digital engagement, comprehensive tests of whether the underlying instruments perform identically across contexts have remained scarce. Absent confirmation of measurement invariance, what appears to be divergent cross-cultural sentiment could instead be artifacts of divergent interpretation or response styles, rather than true differences in the attitudes themselves[5].

1.4 Objectives

The present study seeks to examine the measurement invariance of the Digital Participation Attitude Scale (DPAS) among three culturally differentiated regions. To this end, the analysis employs a multi-group confirmatory factor analysis (MG-CFA) strategy to systematically test configural, metric, and scalar invariance[4].

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Models of Digital Engagement

The field commonly interprets digital engagement through established lenses like the Technology Acceptance Model and the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology. Both models regard perceived usefulness and ease of use, alongside social influences, as critical determinants of intention and use of digital platforms[6].

2.2 Prior Cross-Cultural Digital Studies

Earlier work examining cultural variation in digital engagement has shown that collectivism versus individualism, education stratification, and national policy frameworks play significant roles. Yet most of this research stops short of a psychometric interrogation of attitudes, leaving gaps in the interpretive power at a quantitative level[7]. When psychological scales cross borders, ensuring content, construct, and measurementequivalence is not merely optional; it is mandatory. Without these critical layers of evidence, the latent constructs the scales purport to measure may inadvertently synthesize idiosyncratic cultural features, causing the resulting model to be statistically sound for one population yet to dissolve into irrelevance for another. Such models cease to illuminate the universal phenomena they purport to explain, instead reflecting the narrow subtleties of the specific population under study [8].

2.3 Need for Robust Tools for Cross-National Comparisons

Studies investigating digital inclusion from an international perspective will gain from measurement instruments that, at the very least, exhibit partial measurement invariance [9]. Such thorough verification enhances the analytic rigor of the results and signals their relevance for policy and practice within diverse national environments [10].

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Participants

The study recruited a total of 1,200 adults, all aged 18 to 45, with each of three target regions, East Asia, Western Europe, and Sub-Saharan Africa, providing exactly 400 individuals. Stratified random sampling ensured equal numbers of men and women while preserving the urban-to-rural distribution; these proportions were held constant across all demographic strata, resulting in uniform sub-sample sizes for subsequent analysis and reporting [11].

3.2 Instrument

Respondents evaluated 25 Likert-scale items from the Digital Participation Attitude Scale (DPAS), which groups items into four interconnected domains: civic engagement, digital identity, information-seeking habits, and trust in digital environments. Surveys were deployed via tailored web services, Focus in East Asia, WeChat in Sub-Saharan areas, and Teleport in Western Europe, chosen to fit each group's habitual digital practices and preferences [12]. A carefully managed process of translation and back translation ensured that items were both culturally resonant and conceptually exact. Anonymity was preserved, and all procedures were reviewed to ensure compliance with ethical standards [14]. Data were analyzed using SPSS and the AMOS add-on. Initial Confirmatory Factor Analysis tested the hypothesized measurement model. Multi-Group Confirmatory Factor Analysis was subsequently applied to

evaluate the stability of the model across the three cultural subsamples, examining first the general, then the metric and scalar levels of invariance[15].

Equation for Multi-Group Invariance Testing

$$Yij = \lambda j Fi + \epsilon ij$$

Where:

- ❖ Yij: Observed score on item j for individual iii
- ❖ λj: Factor loading of item j (tested for **metric invariance**)
- ❖ Fi: Latent factor score (e.g., digital participation attitude)
- ❖ ϵij: Measurement error

We use this equation to see how a person's answer to a survey question ($Y_{(ij)}$) is shaped by their hidden attitude (F_i), like how involved they are online. The factor loading (λ_j) shows how tight the link is between the question and the attitude. The measurement error ($\epsilon_{(ij)}$) picks up all the little random bits and personal quirks that our equation doesn't explain. When we want to compare results from different cultural groupslet's say from Asia, Europe, and Africa we rely on this equation to see if the same pattern of influence is true for all of them [13].

IV. RESULTS

4.1 Reliability and Validity

The DPAS showed strong internal consistency for every subscale, with Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.82 to 0.91. Additional parallel confirmatory factor analyses validated the expected factor structure, producing a Comparative Fit Index of 0.93, a Root Mean Square Error of Approximation of 0.05, and a Standardized Root Mean Square Residual of 0.04, together demonstrating that the hypothesized model fits the observed data acceptably well.

Taken together, these parameter estimates support both the scale's construct validity and its reliability, confirming its utility for gauging attitudes toward digital participation across varied cultural settings.

4.2 Configural Invariance

The investigation verified configural invariance, demonstrating that the overarching model of digital participation attitudes was similarly structured among respondents from East Asia, Western Europe, and Sub-Saharan Africa. This result indicates that the overarching structural representation of the DPAS remains stable across these cultural settings and provides a solid foundation for further invariance testing.

4.3 Metric Invariance

Metric invariance was confirmed only to a restricted extent. Although the majority of factor loadings remained consistent across the cultural samples, a limited subset of items revealed context-dependent differences in the conceptualization or salience of specific dimensions of digital engagement. This highlights the importance of recognizing local ways of understanding when we do cross-cultural comparisons, especially in surveys that measure attitudes.

4.4 Scalar Invariance

Scalar invariance failed when we noted discrepancies in item intercepts; such differences suggest that observed culture-based mean variations might actually reflect differing latent response styles rather than true item-level variance. This result underscores the need for bias-correcting procedures before drawing substantive cross-cultural conclusions. These results highlight the imperative for investigators to routinely verify measurement invariance whenever analyses of digital participation span different cultural contexts. Without thorough confirmation of invariance, simple observed mean discrepancies may mask deeper divergences, leading to erroneous conclusions about the causal mechanisms shaping digital engagement in varied social settings. Such neglect threatens to compromise both the scholarly assessment of digital phenomena and the precision of policy measures designed for particular environments.

V. DISCUSSION

5.1 Interpretation of Findings

The data affirm the existence of a broadly applicable construct for digital participation attitudes while concurrently revealing systematic variation in how specific items are understood in relation to divergent cultural norms and values.

5.2 Cultural Meaning of Digital Participation

Across East Asia, digital participation is oriented toward shared objectives and coordinated civic platforms. In Western Europe, engagement highlighted personal expression and participation in democratic processes. Respondents in Sub-Saharan Africa stressed the importance of confidence in technology-related access and the fairness of resource distribution.

5.3 Practical Concerns

Our analysis indicates that while metric and scalar invariance is only partial, structural equivalence is upheld enough to warrant the instrument's use, though it cautions against relying on absolute scores. A continuous process of fine-tuning based on situational specifics and context-aware modifications will remain critical for securing the precision of our interpretations.

VI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Summary

To advance cross-cultural inquiry into digital participation, it is advantageous to retain the Digital Participation Attitude Scale but to enhance awareness of region-specific meanings. Scholars employing the scale should first explore local anchors of the response categories, perhaps through qualitative embedding or scale anchoring techniques, before aggregating or interpreting scores at the cross-cultural level. Empirical calibration devices, such as region-specific reference groups or sample-weighted anchoring, could mitigate misinterpretation. Future research could profitably dissect the contours of response bias and the underlying attitudinal foci that give rise to it, perhaps through multigroup latent variable models that incorporate item-specific predictors. Lastly, any worldwide conversation about digital policy must stay critically aware that even the most helpful normative standards, if guided only by cross-cultural comparison, can foreground some cultures while marginalizing others, deepening the gaps in access and agency that the dialogue initially sought to bridge.

6.2 Recommendations

We recommend the systematic piloting of measurement scales in each new cultural milieu prior to extensive deployment, minimising the risk of culturally skewed interpretations. Policymakers and curriculum designers should adapt digital literacy programmes to the specific ethics, employment histories, and trust logics of each context. All materials, training modules, and programme designs ought to overtly integrate these cultural nuances, thereby fostering genuinely inclusive and equitable advancements in global digital participation.

6.3 Future Works

Subsequent studies ought to employ longitudinal designs that document shifts in digital participation across temporal and situational boundaries. Using complementary qualitative methods like life-history interviews, digital ethnography, and joint design workshops reveals how cultural values influence online behavior. By expanding our participant pool to include understudied groups, indigenous collectives, remote villages, and older generations, we strengthen our empirical foundation and inform the creation of psychometric tools that respect and reflect diverse values.

REFERENCES

[1] Poornimadarshini, S. (2025). Cyberfeminism 4.0: The role of social media and digital platforms in shaping contemporary feminist activism. Journal of Women, Innovation, and Technological Empowerment, 1(1), 25–30.

[2] Vasquez, E., & Mendoza, R. (2024). Membrane-Based Separation Methods for Effective Contaminant Removal in Wastewater and Water Systems. *Engineering Perspectives in Filtration and Separation*, 1(1), 21-27.

[3] Rahim, R. (2024). Integrating digital twin and life cycle assessment for sustainable roadway material selection: A data-driven framework. Journal of Smart Infrastructure and Environmental Sustainability, 1(1), 23–30.

[4] Ramachandran, S. (2023). Comparative Analysis of Antibiotic Use and Resistance Patterns in Hospitalized Patients. Clinical Journal for Medicine, Health and Pharmacy, 1(1), 73-82.

[5] Ashour, M. (2024). Zero-trust architectures in enterprise networks: A comprehensive framework for next-generation cybersecurity. Electronics, Communications, and Computing Summit, 2(3), 18–27.

[6] Dahal, R. K. (2024). Battery-free wearable electronics using RF energy harvesting and ultra-low-power sensors. Electronics, Communications, and Computing Summit, 2(4), 42–51.

Open Access

[7] Balvad, K., Lalit, D., Re-Ann, C., Halimpusan, T., &Beyes, J. O. (2022). Unveiling 4G LTE: Revolutionizing connectivity in the digital age. National Journal of Antennas and Propagation, 4(1), 41–46.

[8] Rasanjani, C., Madugalla, A. K., & Perera, M. (2023). Fundamental Digital Module Realization Using RTL Design for Quantum Mechanics. Journal of VLSI Circuits and Systems, 5(2), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.31838/jvcs/05.02.01

[9] Gopalakrishnan, K., Lakshmanan, R., Naveen, V., TamilKumaran, S., & Venkatesh, S. (2017). Digital signature manager. International Journal of Communication and Computer Technologies, 5(2), 53-57.

[10] Papadopoulos, N. A., & Konstantinou, E. A. (2025). SoC solutions for automotive electronics and safety systems for revolutionizing vehicle technology. Journal of Integrated VLSI, Embedded and Computing Technologies, 2(2), 36–43. https://doi.org/10.31838/JIVCT/02.02.05

[11] Pieter, J., Setyawati, S. M., & Setyanto, R. P. (2025). The Role of Value Resonance Efficacy to Decrease Intention to Buy Counterfeit Product. Quality-Access to Success, 26(205).

[12] Malhotra, R., & Iyer, A. (2024). Developing an Effective Training System for Interventional Pulmonology Education through Digital Learning. Global Journal of Medical Terminology Research and Informatics, 1(1), 1-8

[13] Hussain, I., & Khanna, S. (2025). Development of a Chaos Theory-Based Digital Image Encryption Algorithm for Enhanced Security in Modern Applications. International Academic Journal of Science and Engineering, 12(2), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.71086/IAJSE/V12I2/IAJSE1210

[14] Menon, A., & Rao, I. (2024). Consumer Behavior and Brand Loyalty: Insights from the Periodic Series on Marketing and Social Psychology. In Digital Marketing Innovations (pp. 1-6). Periodic Series in Multidisciplinary Studies.

[15] Allabergenov, M., Mustafaeva, S., Ziyamukhamedov, J., Yusupov, S., Khalimova, F., Madrahimova, G., Yakhshieva, Z., Zokirov, B., &Sattorova, Z. (2024). Intelligent Educational Environments and Ubiquitous Computing for Continuous Learning and Digital Literacy Development. Journal of Wireless Mobile Networks, Ubiquitous Computing, and Dependable Applications, 15(4), 179-191. https://doi.org/10.58346/JOWUA.2024.I4.012

[16] Kavitha, M. (2024). Carbon-neutral pavement materials using recycled industrial waste and nanotechnology enhancements. Journal of Smart Infrastructure and Environmental Sustainability, 1(1), 1–13.

[17] Li, N., & Huang, F. (2024). Evaluating the Financial Returns on Investment in Sustainable Enterprise Digitalization Initiatives Using AI Information System. Journal of Internet Services and Information Security, 14(4), 21-44. https://doi.org/10.58346/JISIS.2024.I4.002

[18] Vanitha, S., Senthilkumar, C. B., & Shenbagavalli, D. (2025). Digital Marketing Role in Promotion of Handloom Sarees in Chennai City. Indian Journal of Information Sources and Services, 15(1), 299–306. https://doi.org/10.51983/ijiss-2025.IJISS.15.1.38