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**A B S T R A C T**

The novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) continues to plague the world. Hence, there has been an effort to mitigate this virus and its effects with several means including vaccination which is one of the most effective ways of controlling the virus. However, efforts at getting people to vaccinate have met several challenges. To help with understanding the reasons underlying an individual's willingness to take COVID-19 vaccine or not, a scale called Motors of COVID-19 Vaccination Acceptance Scale (MoVac-COVID19S) was developed. To expand its usability worldwide (as it has currently been limited to only China and Taiwan), data were collected in other countries (regions) too. Therefore, this
MoVac-COVID19S data is from five countries (that is, India, Ghana, Afghanistan, Taiwan, and mainland China) which cut across five regions. A total of 6053 participants across the stated countries completed the survey between January and March 2021 using a cross-sectional survey design. The different sections of the survey solicited sociodemographic information (e.g., country, age, gender, educational level, and profession) and the MoVac-COVID19S data from the participants. The data collected from this survey were analyzed using descriptive statistics, which were carried out using the IBM SPSS version 22.0.
© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

**Specifications Table**

| Subject | Health and medical sciences |
|---------|-----------------------------|
| Specific subject area | Public Health and Health Policy |
| Type of data | Table |
| How the data were acquired | Data were collected using survey (paper-and-pencil or online) method where participants completed the form. A copy of the survey is included as a Supplementary File. |
| Data format | Raw, Analyzed |
| Description of data collection | A total of 6053 adult participants across five countries (India, Ghana, Afghanistan, Taiwan, and mainland China) completed the survey between January and March 2021 using a cross-sectional survey design. The sections of the survey solicited sociodemographic information (e.g., country, age, gender, educational level, and profession) and the MoVac-COVID19S (also named as DrVac-COVID19S) data from the participants. |
| Data source location | • Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Hospital, Srinagar, India  
  • Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana  
  • Jamhuriat hospital, Kabul, Afghanistan  
  • National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan  
  • Qufu Normal University, Qufu City, Shandong, China |
| Data accessibility | Repository name: Harvard Dataverse  
  Data identification number: https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/U8ZYDF  
  Direct URL to data: https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/U8ZYDF  
  Questionnaire: https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/U8ZYDF  
  Related research article: Y.-C. Yeh, I.H. Chen, D.K. Ahorsu, N.-Y. Ko, K.-L. Chen, P.-C. Li, C.-F. Yen, C.-Y. Lin, M.D. Griffiths, A.H. Pakpour, Measurement Invariance of the Drivers of COVID-19 Vaccination Acceptance Scale: Comparison between Taiwanese and Mainland Chinese-Speaking Populations, Vaccines 9(3) (2021) 297. https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9030297 |

**Value of the Data**

• This data is useful as it comprises data from a largescale survey across five regions/countries worldwide on COVID-19 vaccination acceptance. Hence, the data can always be used to verify the psychometric properties of the MoVac-COVID19S (COVID-19 vaccination acceptance scale; also named as DrVac-COVID19S) and its suitability for use worldwide.
• The data can be beneficial to the following group of persons: Researchers who are interested in communicable disease, psychometrics, health promotion, health psychology, public health, epidemiology, and health behavior as the findings from this dataset will serve as the basis for assessing citizens' willingness to take COVID-19 vaccination.
• The data may be useful for researchers who want to replicate or extend the psychometric properties (especially, measurement invariance) of the MoVac-COVID19S by adding their country's data to this data.

1. Data Description

The challenges posed by COVID-19 continues unabated [1–9]. One of the most efficient ways of controlling this pandemic is by vaccination. However, the vaccination drive has met lots of challenges. The Motors of COVID-19 Vaccination Acceptance Scale (MoVac-COVID19S; also named as Drivers of COVID-19 Vaccination Acceptance Scale [DrVac-COVID19S]) was, therefore, developed to help with understanding the reasons underlying an individual's willingness to take COVID-19 vaccine or not. To expand its usability worldwide (as it has currently been limited to only China and Taiwan), data were collected in other countries (regions) too. Therefore, the MoVac-COVID19S data is from five countries (that is, India, Ghana, Afghanistan, Taiwan, and mainland China) which cut across five regions. A total of 6053 participants across the above-stated countries completed the survey between January and March 2021 using a cross-sectional survey design. The sections of the survey solicited sociodemographic information (e.g., country, age, gender, educational level, and profession) and the MoVac-COVID19S data from the participants (please find the questionnaire in the supplementary material). Table 1 shows the sociodemographic characteristics of the participants while Table 2 shows the distributions of responses related to the items of the MoVac-COVID19S. For the demographic characteristics, the codes used were 0 and 1 for gender (females and males respectively), 1, 2, and 3 for educational levels (others, undergraduate, and postgraduate respectively), and 0 and 1 for profession (not health related and health related respectively). For the MoVac-COVID19S, the codes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 were used to represent Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Slightly Disagree, Neither Disagree nor Agree, Slightly Agree, Agree, and Strongly Agree respectively. For group (countries), 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were used as codes for Taiwan, mainland China, India, Ghana, and Afghanistan respectively.

Table 1
Distribution of responses in relation to sociodemographic variables.

| Socio-demographics | Taiwan (n=932; 15.4%) | China (n=3145; 52%) | India (n=508; 8.4%) | Ghana (n=1244; 20.6%) | Afghanistan (n=224; 3.7%) | Total (n=6053; 100%) |
|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Age: Mean±SD       |                        |                      |                     |                        |                           |                      |
| <30 years          | 25.39±6.46             | 20.84±2.67           | 24.46±7.34          | 20.34±1.75             | 26.82±4.76                | 22.00±4.56            |
| ≥30 years          | 805 (14.1%)            | 2935 (51.3%)         | 385 (6.7%)          | 1132 (19.8%)           | 168 (2.9%)                | 5425 (94.7%)         |
| Gender             |                        |                      |                     |                        |                           |                      |
| Male               | 354 (5.9%)             | 1567 (26.2%)         | 176 (2.9%)          | 789 (13.2%)            | 144 (2.4%)                | 3030 (50.6%)         |
| Female             | 578 (9.7%)             | 1578 (26.4%)         | 328 (5.5%)          | 393 (6.6%)             | 80 (1.3%)                 | 2957 (49.4%)         |
| Educational Level  |                        |                      |                     |                        |                           |                      |
| Others             | 0 (0%)                 | 31 (0.5%)            | 67 (1.2%)           | 147 (2.6%)             | NA                        | 245 (4.3%)           |
| Undergraduate      | 595 (10.3%)            | 3026 (52.6%)         | 215 (3.7%)          | 988 (17.2%)            | NA                        | 4824 (83.9%)         |
| Postgraduate       | 337 (5.9%)             | 88 (1.5%)            | 226 (3.9%)          | 32 (0.6%)              | NA                        | 683 (11.9%)          |
| Profession         |                        |                      |                     |                        |                           |                      |
| Not Health related | 468 (7.9%)             | 2904 (49.1%)         | 432 (7.3%)          | 1043 (17.6%)           | 0 (0%)                    | 4847 (82.0%)         |
| Health related     | 403 (6.8%)             | 241 (4.1%)           | 76 (1.3%)           | 121 (2.0%)             | 224 (3.8%)                | 1065 (18.0%)         |
### Table 2
Distribution of responses related to MoVac-COVID19S.

| Items | Frequency | Percentages |
|-------|-----------|-------------|
| 1. Vaccination is a very effective way to protect me against the COVID-19. |   |   |
| Strongly Disagree | 143 | 2.4 |
| Disagree | 88 | 1.5 |
| Slightly disagree | 249 | 4.1 |
| Neither disagree nor agree | 826 | 13.6 |
| Slightly agree | 1291 | 21.3 |
| Agree | 1753 | 29.0 |
| Strongly Agree | 1703 | 28.1 |
| 2. I know very well how vaccination protects me from the COVID-19. |   |   |
| Strongly Disagree | 182 | 3.0 |
| Disagree | 132 | 2.2 |
| Slightly disagree | 303 | 5.0 |
| Neither disagree nor agree | 890 | 14.7 |
| Slightly agree | 1313 | 21.7 |
| Agree | 1538 | 25.4 |
| Strongly Agree | 1695 | 28.0 |
| 3. It is important that I get the COVID-19 jab. |   |   |
| Strongly Disagree | 190 | 3.1 |
| Disagree | 110 | 1.8 |
| Slightly disagree | 210 | 3.5 |
| Neither disagree nor agree | 899 | 14.9 |
| Slightly agree | 1018 | 16.8 |
| Agree | 1613 | 26.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 2013 | 33.3 |
| 4. Vaccination greatly reduces my risk of catching COVID-19. |   |   |
| Strongly Disagree | 186 | 3.1 |
| Disagree | 93 | 1.5 |
| Slightly disagree | 216 | 3.6 |
| Neither disagree nor agree | 769 | 12.7 |
| Slightly agree | 1117 | 18.5 |
| Agree | 1742 | 28.8 |
| Strongly Agree | 1930 | 31.9 |
| 5. I understand how the COVID-19 jab helps my body fight the COVID-19 virus. |   |   |
| Strongly Disagree | 190 | 3.1 |
| Disagree | 154 | 2.5 |
| Slightly disagree | 303 | 5.0 |
| Neither disagree nor agree | 940 | 15.5 |
| Slightly agree | 1273 | 21.0 |
| Agree | 1557 | 25.7 |
| Strongly Agree | 1636 | 27.0 |
| 6. The COVID-19 jab plays an important role in protecting my life and that of others. |   |   |
| Strongly Disagree | 157 | 2.6 |
| Disagree | 98 | 1.6 |
| Slightly disagree | 188 | 3.1 |
| Neither disagree nor agree | 773 | 12.8 |
| Slightly agree | 1016 | 16.8 |
| Agree | 1820 | 30.1 |
| Strongly Agree | 2001 | 33.1 |
| 7. I feel under pressure to get the COVID-19 jab. |   |   |
| Strongly Disagree | 526 | 8.7 |
| Disagree | 333 | 5.5 |
| Slightly disagree | 506 | 8.4 |
| Neither disagree nor agree | 1331 | 22.0 |
| Slightly agree | 1322 | 21.8 |
| Agree | 1048 | 17.3 |
| Strongly Agree | 987 | 16.3 |
| 8. The contribution of the COVID-19 jab to my health and well-being is very important. |   |   |
| Strongly Disagree | 165 | 2.7 |
| Disagree | 88 | 1.5 |
| Slightly disagree | 175 | 2.9 |
| Neither disagree nor agree | 898 | 14.8 |
| Slightly agree | 1110 | 18.3 |
| Agree | 1761 | 29.1 |
| Strongly Agree | 1856 | 30.7 |

(continued on next page)
Table 2 (continued)

| Items                                                                 | Frequency | Percentages |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|
| 9. I can choose whether to get a COVID-19 jab or not.                 |           |             |
| Strongly Disagree                                                    | 201       | 3.3         |
| Disagree                                                             | 101       | 1.7         |
| Slightly disagree                                                    | 158       | 2.6         |
| Neither disagree nor agree                                           | 891       | 14.7        |
| Slightly agree                                                       | 973       | 16.1        |
| Agree                                                                | 1662      | 27.5        |
| Strongly Agree                                                       | 2067      | 34.1        |
| 10. How the COVID-19 jab works to protect my health is a mystery to me. |           |             |
| Strongly Disagree                                                    | 503       | 8.3         |
| Disagree                                                             | 414       | 6.8         |
| Slightly disagree                                                    | 482       | 8.0         |
| Neither disagree nor agree                                           | 1204      | 19.9        |
| Slightly agree                                                       | 1306      | 21.6        |
| Agree                                                                | 1041      | 17.2        |
| Strongly Agree                                                       | 1103      | 18.2        |
| 11. I get the COVID-19 jab only because I am required to do so.       |           |             |
| Strongly Disagree                                                    | 590       | 9.7         |
| Disagree                                                             | 481       | 7.9         |
| Slightly disagree                                                    | 657       | 10.9        |
| Neither disagree nor agree                                           | 1389      | 22.9        |
| Slightly agree                                                       | 1117      | 18.5        |
| Agree                                                                | 847       | 14.0        |
| Strongly Agree                                                       | 972       | 16.1        |
| 12. Getting the COVID-19 jab has a positive influence on my health.   |           |             |
| Strongly Disagree                                                    | 222       | 3.7         |
| Disagree                                                             | 130       | 2.1         |
| Slightly disagree                                                    | 254       | 4.2         |
| Neither disagree nor agree                                           | 1336      | 22.1        |
| Slightly agree                                                       | 1289      | 21.3        |
| Agree                                                                | 1415      | 23.4        |
| Strongly Agree                                                       | 1407      | 23.2        |

2. Experimental Design, Materials and Methods

The data was collected using a survey with a cross-sectional design. The Taiwanese participants were recruited using snowballing method via the posts on social media pages and social networking apps. A total of 932 questionnaires were collected between January 5 and February 5, 2021. The MoVac-COVID19S for the Taiwanese was written in traditional Chinese, Taiwan’s official language. Similarly, snowballing method (posts on social media pages and social networking apps (e.g., WeChat)) were used to recruit Mainland Chinese participants. A total of 3145 questionnaires were collected between January 5 and January 16, 2021. The MoVac-COVID19S for mainland Chinese was written in simplified Chinese, mainland China’s official language. Also, snowballing method (posts on social media pages and social networking apps (e.g., Facebook and Whatsapp)) were used to recruit Indian participants. A total of 508 questionnaires were collected between July 25 and October 5, 2021. The MoVac-COVID19S for the Indians was written in English, the official language of Indian universities. The snowballing method (sharing the survey link in various Afghanistan healthcare workers’ groups (e.g., Fan page in the Facebook)) was also used to recruit Afghan participants. A total of 224 questionnaires were collected between April 1 and July 31, 2021. The MoVac-COVID19S used for the Afghans was written in English. Among the Ghanaians participants, a convenient sampling strategy was used to recruit the participants. A total of 1,244 questionnaires between January 25 and March 12, 2021. The MoVac-COVID19S for Ghanaians was written in English, the official language of Ghanaians. All the recruited participants are natives of their respective countries [10]. All the participants consented to participate by providing a written Informed consent (signing or ticking). The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (specifically, Mean and Standard Deviation, and frequency with percentage) using the IBM SPSS 22.0.
The MoVac-COVID19S was developed from an original MoVac-Flu Scale by changing the word from “flu” to “COVID-19” to derive the current form of MoVac-COVID19S with the kind permission of MoVac-Flu Scale’s developer, Professor Vallée-Tourangeau [11,12]. Hence, the cognitive model of empowerment (CME) that formed the basis of the MoVac-Flu Scale remains unchanged under the MoVac-COVID19S [13]. The MoVac-COVID19S, therefore, is made up of 12 items; nine positively worded items and three negatively worded items. It must be noted that previous evidence indicated that the MoVac-COVID19S has wording effects that should be taken into account when testing its factor structure [11,14]. The items of MoVac-COVID19S are rated on a 7-point Likert scale response format (from Strongly disagree =1 to Strongly agree =7). The participant’s responses are summed together to get a total score after aligning the directions of the positively and negatively worded items. Hence, the higher the total score (including the entire instrument and the four domains), the higher the levels of acceptance to get COVID-19 vaccinated. Both the 9-item version (ω = 0.921) and the 12-item version (ω = 0.898) have high internal consistency.
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