Testing the Validity of the Modified Vaccine Attitude Question Battery across 22 Languages with a Large-scale International Survey Dataset

Hyemin Han [a]*

[a]*Educational Psychology Program, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, United States of America*

*Corresponding: Educational Psychology Program, University of Alabama, Box 870213, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487, United States of America. Email: hyemin.han@ua.edu

Testing the Validity of the Modified Vaccine Attitude Question Battery across 22 Languages with a Large-scale International Survey Dataset

In this study, we tested the validity of the modified version of the Vaccine Attitude Question Battery (VAQB) across 22 different languages. Validity test was conducted with a large-scale international survey dataset, COVIDiSTRESSII Global Survey, collected from 20,601 participants from 62 countries. We employed exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, measurement invariance test, and measurement alignment for internal validity test. Moreover, we examined correlation between the VAQB score, vaccination intent, compliance with preventive measures, and trust in public health-related agents. The results reported that the modified VAQB, which included five items, showed good validity across 22 languages with measurement alignment. Furthermore, the VAQB score showed negative association with vaccination intent, compliance, and trust as expected. The findings from this study provide additional evidence supporting the validity of the modified VAQB in 22 languages for future large-scale international research on COVID-19 and vaccination.

Keywords: COVID-19; Vaccine Attitude; Psychometrics; Validation; International Survey; Measurement alignment

Introduction

COVID-19 vaccines have been reported as an effective and reliable mean to prevent COVID-19 caused hospitalization and death across the globe (Tregoning et al. 2021). Although scientific research has consistently supported their safety and effectiveness, negative attitudes toward vaccines have become a serious issue (Guess et al. 2020). Because how to deal with such negative attitudes is one of the most fundamental problems that shall be addressed to promote wide distribution of the COVID-19 vaccines, and eventually, to end the COVID-19 pandemic, it is necessary to have a reliable and valid way to examine vaccination attitude. For example, (Shapiro et al. 2018) developed and tested the Vaccination Hesitancy Scale (VHS) consisting of ten items; in the study, the VHS was validated in two languages, English and French,

among Canadian populations. Since its development, the VHS has been widely employed in studies focusing on people's attitude on vaccination (Oduwole et al. 2019).

Although the VHS has been tested in validated in prior research, whether it can be applicable across different languages in a consistent way has not been fully examined. Given the COVID-19 pandemic is a global issue, international and cross-cultural research is strongly required. The majority of the previous studies employing the VHS tested the scale within a single-language study context, so they would not sufficiently support cross-language validity of the scale, which requires for international and cross-cultural comparisons or investigations (Fischer and Karl 2019). Similarly, other scales that have been less employed than the VHS have not been well tested for their validity in multi-lingual settings (e.g., Guess et al. 2020).

In this study, we aimed at testing the validity of the Vaccination Attitude Question Battery (VAQB), which was modified from the original VAQB employed in a large-scale survey regarding vaccination attitude conducted in 2020 (Guess et al. 2020), across different languages by examining a large-scale dataset, COVIDiSTRESSII Global Survey (COVIDiSTRESSII), collected 20,601 participants from 62 countries (Lieberoth, Mauritsen, et al. 2021). First, we performed exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis (EFA and CFA) with the English version of the modified VAQB. Second, we conducted measurement invariance (MI) test across 22 languages to examine whether the measurement structure of the modified VAQB was valid across different languages. Third, we performed measurement alignment to address the existing measurement non-invariance. Finally, we examined correlation between the calculated VAQB score and other variables that are expected to be positively associated with positive vaccine attitude, i.e., vaccination intent, compliance with preventive measures, trust in public health-related agents (Latkin et al. 2021; Soveri et al. 2021).

Methods

Analyzed Dataset

COVIDiSTRESSII dataset was collected from 20,601 participants using 48 different languages across the globe (Lieberoth, Mauritsen, et al. 2021). For MI test and measurement alignment, which involve CFA, only the language versions with $N \geq 200$ were analyzed. As a result, responses from 14,271 participants using 22 different languages were used in the present study (see Table S1 for the list of languages and demographics). Further details about the original dataset collection and preprocessing procedures are available in COVIDiSTRESSII project page, https://osf.io/36tsd. COVIDiSTRESSII project was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at University of Salford.

Measures

All measures were translated into different languages by COVIDiSTRESSII Consortium members. Further details about the employed measures are available in Supplementary Methods.

Modified Vaccine Attitude Scale

The modified VAQB with six item was employed to assess participants' attitude to get COVID-19 vaccines. The six items were extracted and modified from the original VAQB (Guess et al. 2020) for a feasibility within the context of the large-scale international survey project based on discussions between COVIDiSTRESSII Consortium members. Responses were anchored to a seven-point Likert scale (1—strongly disagree to 7—strongly agree). Four items, Items 4 and 5 were reverse coded.

Vaccination Intent

Intent to get COVID-19 vaccines was assessed one item. Responses were anchored to a five-point Likert scale (1—not willing at all to 5—very willing).

Items for Compliance with Preventive Measures

We surveyed participants' compliance with non-pharmaceutical measures to prevent spread of COVID-19. These items were adapted from the previous round of COVIDiSTRESS Global Survey (Lieberoth, Lin, et al. 2021; Yamada et al. 2021). We examined compliance in three different behavioral domains, i.e., indoor and outdoor mask use, social distancing. Each type of compliance was measured with one item. Responses were anchored to a seven-point Likert scale (1—strongly disagree to 7—strongly agree).

Items for Trust

Participants' trust in four different agents, i.e., health system, the World Health Organisation (WHO), governmental effort to handle the pandemic, science research, related to vaccination was also assessed. Similar to the items for compliance, the trust items were also adapted from COVIDiSTRESS Global Survey (Lieberoth, Lin, et al. 2021; Yamada et al. 2021). Trust in each agent was surveyed with one item. Responses were anchored to a 11-point Likert scale (0—no trust to 10—complete trust).

Analysis Plan

All R source code and data files are available to the public via the Open Science Framework, https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/QCPZX.

Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The whole English version dataset was randomly separated into two subsets, one for EFA (50%) and one for CFA (50%), to prevent overfitting. Then, we performed EFA of the modified VAQB with the first subset with R packages, *EFA.dimensions* and *EFAtools*. First, we tested whether EFA can be adequately performed with Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's test. Second, we employed diverse measures, i.e., parallel analysis (PA), minimum average partial (MAP) test, hull method, Kaiser-Guttman criterion (KGC), to determine the number of factors to be explored (McGrath et al. 2021). Third, we performed EFA with the determined factor number.

Then, we conducted CFA with the second subset. CFA was performed with the measurement model identified by EFA with *lavaan* package. Because responses were anchored to a Likert scale, we employed *WLSMV* estimator, which is suitable for CFA with ordinal responses. CFA was conducted again with the whole data with the model. We examined whether RMSEA and SRMR < .08 and CFI and TLI ≥ .90 at the least (Hu and Bentler 1999).

Additionally, we examined the internal consistency of the modified VAQB across different languages in term of Cronbach α.

Measurement Invariance Test

MI test was performed to examine whether the measurement model of the modified VAQB validated in the English version can also be validated across different language versions. It was performed by setting the group variable and equal parameter conditions in *lavaan*.

There are different levels of MI depending on the different equal parameter assumption. First, configural invariance only assumes the equal measurement structure across different groups. Second, metric invariance additionally assumes that factor loadings are

equal. Third, scalar invariance additionally requires equal intercepts. Finally, the strictest invariance, scalar invariance, is achieved when the equal residual assumption is additionally satisfied (Putnick and Bornstein 2016).

Whether a specific level of invariance was achieved was examined by comparing fit indicators, i.e., RMSEA, SRMR, CFI, TLI, between two different levels of invariance. In the case of metric invariance, indicator changes should be smaller than -.01 CFI, +.015 RMSEA, and +.30 SRMR. For scalar invariance, changes should be less than -.01 CFI, +.015 RMSEA, and +.15 SRMR (Rachev et al. 2021). For between-group comparison, scalar invariance must be satisfied at the least [3].

Measurement Alignment

If scalar invariance was not supported in the MI test, we performed measurement alignment to address the existing non-invariance. We employed *sirt* package to implement measurement alignment in R [3]. Measurement alignment is a procedure to adjust factor loadings, intercepts, and group means to address non-invariance (Fischer and Karl 2019; Robitzsh 2021). To examine whether non-invariance was successfully addressed, we checked whether the resultant R^2_{loadings} and $R^2_{\text{intercepts}}$, which indicate to what extent the non-invariance was absorbed via measurement alignment, approached 100% (Asparouhov and Muthén 2014; Robitzsh 2021). If both R^2 values exceeded 95% as shown in the prior research using measurement alignment (Han 2021), we assumed achievement of scalar invariance through measurement alignment (Asparouhov and Muthén 2014; Robitzsh 2021).

Then, we calculated an adjusted VAQB factor score for each language group with adjusted factor loadings and intercepts. The factor score was calculated with the pseudo inverse matrix of factor loadings with *MASS* package (DiStefano et al. 2009).

Correlation Analysis

We conducted correlation analysis to acquire additional evidence supporting the validity of the modified VAQB. Correlation between the VAQB score and other surveyed variables, vaccination intent, compliance, and trust, which were supposed to be negatively associated with vaccination hesitancy (Latkin et al. 2021; Soveri et al. 2021), was examined.

Results

Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Both KMO, .82, and Bartlett's test, $\chi^2(15) = 1{,}545.28$, $p < .001$, indicated that EFA was able to be adequately performed with the current scale and first English-version subset. All factor number determination methods, i.e., PA, MAP test, hull method, KGC, unequivocally suggested that only one factor was sufficient in the measurement model. The result of EFA with the one-factor model is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Standardized factor loading resulting from EFA and CFA

	6-item VAQB		5-item VAQB	
	EFA (English)	CFA (English)	CFA (English)	CFA (whole)
Item 1	.78	.79	.84	.89
Item 2	.70	.76	.79	.81
Item 3	.58	.60	.63	.60
Item 4	.44	.42	-	-
Item 5	.61	.59	.51	.58
Item 6	.78	.64	.66	.84

When CFA was performed with the second English-version subset, the original measurement model including all six items did not report good model fit indicators, RMSEA = .15, SRMR = .06, CFI = .75, TLI = .58. Thus, we excluded the fourth item that showed the lowest standardized factor loading (.42). The modified five-item scale well fitted the data, RMSEA = .04, SRMR = .02, CFI = .99, TLI = .98. When CFA was performed with the whole dataset with the five-item model, good model fit indicators

were reported as well, RMSEA = .07, SRMR = .02, CFI = .98, TLI = .96. All resulting standardized factors loadings are presented in Table 1. In addition, brief descriptive statistics and internal consistency of the modified VAQB in α for each language version are presented in Table S1.

Measurement Invariance Test

When configural invariance was tested, the resultant model fit indicators suggested mediocre fit, RMSEA = .09, SRMR = .03, CFI = .93, TLI = .87. With the equal loading assumption, metric invariance was tested. However, the model did not fit data well, RMSEA = .11, SRMR = .09, CFI = .81, TLI = .78. Additionally, the large changes in RMSEA (+.02), SRMR (+.06), CFI (-.12), and TLI (-.08), suggested metric invariance could not be achieved. Given scalar invariance, which is minimally required for between-group comparison, could not be supported by data, we performed measurement alignment to address the non-invariance across different languages.

Measurement Alignment

The results from measurement alignment demonstrated that measurement non-invariance across different languages was successfully resolved by adjusting factor loadings and intercepts. The resultant $R^2_{\text{loadings}} = .97$ and $R^2_{\text{intercepts}} = .98$. They indicate that approximately 100% of existing non-invariance was absorbed by latent factor means and variances varying across languages, and thus, scalar invariance can be achieved via measurement alignment.

Correlation Analysis

Correlation between surveyed variables, the VAQB factor score, general vaccination intent, compliance, and trust, is presented in Table 2. As expected, vaccination hesitancy was positively associated with all other variables.

Table 2. Result from correlation analysis

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. VAQB		-							
2. Vaccination intent		.78	-						
Trust	2. Health system	.39	.37	-					
	3. WHO	.40	.38	.51	-				
	4. Governmental effort	.31	.28	.57	.46	-			
	5. Scientific research	.58	.52	.55	.61	.47	-		
Compliance	6. indoor mask use	.45	.42	.23	.26	.19	.34	-	
	7. outdoor mask use	.26	.30	.08	.09	.04	.13	.50	-
	8. social distancing	.29	.28	.13	.18	.14	.21	.44	.44

Note. All correlation reported $p < .05$ after false discovery rate correction.

Discussion

In this study, we tested the validity of the modified VAQB across 22 different languages. We found that the original measurement model should be modified to achieve good model fit, so one item was excluded from the original six-items scale. The five-item scale reported acceptable model fit. However, measurement non-invariance was reported from the MI test. When measurement alignment was performed, the existing non-invariance was successfully absorbed; the large resultant R^2 values suggest achievement of scalar invariance through measurement alignment (Han 2021). The correlation analysis demonstrated that the calculated factor score of vaccine hesitancy after alignment was positively associated with general vaccination intent, compliance with non-pharmaceutical preventive measures, and trust in health organizations, governmental efforts, and science research, in line with previous research (Latkin et al. 2021; Soveri et al. 2021).

The modified VAQB can be reliably and validly administrated in 22 different languages with assistance of measurement alignment addressing measurement non-invariance. The correlational analysis also provides additional evidence supporting the validity of the scale. In conclusion, the five-item version of the VAQB will be able to be widely utilized in future large-scale international studies regarding COVID-19 vaccination,

particularly those involving cross-cultural or cross-national comparisons, with measurement alignment.

Acknowledgements: The author thanks Sara Vestergren and COVIDiSTRESSII Global Survey Consortium members for their help regarding data collection and preprocessing.

Disclosure statement: No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

References

Asparouhov T, Muthén B. 2014. Multiple-Group Factor Analysis Alignment. Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal. 21(4):495–508. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2014.919210

DiStefano C, Zhu M, Mîndrilă D. 2009. Understanding and Using Factor Scores: Considerations for the Applied Researcher. Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation. 14:20.

Fischer R, Karl JA. 2019. A Primer to (Cross-Cultural) Multi-Group Invariance Testing Possibilities in R. Frontiers in Psychology. 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01507

Guess AM, Nyhan B, O'Keeffe Z, Reifler J. 2020. The sources and correlates of exposure to vaccine-related (mis)information online. Vaccine. 38(49). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.10.018

Han H. 2021. Exploring the association between compliance with measures to prevent the spread of COVID-19 and big five traits with Bayesian generalized linear model. Personality and Individual Differences. 176:110787. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110787

Hu L, Bentler PM. 1999. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal. 6(1):1–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Latkin CA, Dayton L, Yi G, Colon B, Kong X. 2021. Mask usage, social distancing, racial, and gender correlates of COVID-19 vaccine intentions among adults in the US. PLOS ONE. 16(2). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0246970

Lieberoth A, Lin S-Y, Stöckli S, Han H, Kowal M, Chrona S, Gelpi R, Tran TP, Jeftić A, Rasmussen J, et al. 2021. Stress and worry in the 2020 coronavirus pandemic: Relationships to trust and compliance with preventive measures across 48 countries. Royal Society Open Science. 8(2):200589. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.200589

Lieberoth A, Mauritsen AL, Mandillah S, Amin R, Sandbakken EM, Ntontis E, Ćepulić D-B, Tran TP, Carballo M, Onyutha C, et al. 2021. COVIDiSTRESSII Global Survey [Internet]. [accessed 2021 Sep 26]. https://osf.io/36tsd/

McGrath RE, Brown M, Westrich B, Han H. 2021. Representative Sampling of the Via Assessment Suite for Adults. Journal of Personality Assessment.:1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2021.1955692

Oduwole EO, Pienaar ED, Mahomed H, Wiysonge CS. 2019. Current tools available for investigating vaccine hesitancy: a scoping review protocol. BMJ Open. 9(12). https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033245

Putnick DL, Bornstein MH. 2016. Measurement invariance conventions and reporting: The state of the art and future directions for psychological research. Developmental Review. 41:71–90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2016.06.004

Rachev NR, Han H, Lacko D, Gelpí R, Yamada Y, Lieberoth A. 2021. Replicating the Disease framing problem during the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic: A study of stress, worry, trust, and choice under risk. PLOS ONE. 16(9). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0257151

Robitzsh A. 2021. Package “sirt” [Internet]. [accessed 2021 Sep 26]. https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/sirt/sirt.pdf

Shapiro GK, Tatar O, Dube E, Amsel R, Knauper B, Naz A, Perez S, Rosberger Z. 2018. The vaccine hesitancy scale: Psychometric properties and validation. Vaccine. 36(5). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2017.12.043

Soveri A, Karlsson LC, Antfolk J, Lindfelt M, Lewandowsky S. 2021. Unwillingness to engage in behaviors that protect against COVID-19: the role of conspiracy beliefs, trust, and endorsement of complementary and alternative medicine. BMC Public Health. 21(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10643-w

Tregoning JS, Flight KE, Higham SL, Wang Z, Pierce BF. 2021. Progress of the COVID-19 vaccine effort: viruses, vaccines and variants versus efficacy, effectiveness and escape. Nature Reviews Immunology. 21(10). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41577-021-00592-1

Yamada Y, Ćepulić D-B, Coll-Martín T, Debove S, Gautreau G, Han H, Rasmussen J, Tran TP, Travaglino GA, Lieberoth A. 2021. COVIDiSTRESS Global Survey dataset on psychological and behavioural consequences of the COVID-19 outbreak. Scientific Data. 8(1):3. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-020-00784-9