

# Translation, Cross-cultural adaptation and Validation of the Nigerian Pidgin English version of the Rosenberg Self-esteem and Leprosy-adapted Internalized Stigma for Mental Illness Scales among Persons Affected by Leprosy in Southern Nigeria

Joseph Chukwu<sup>1</sup>, Kingsley Ukwaja<sup>2</sup>, Ngozi Murphy-Okpala<sup>1\*</sup>, Ngozi Ekeke<sup>1</sup>, Chinwe Eze<sup>1</sup>, Francis Iyama<sup>1</sup>, Anthony Meka<sup>1</sup>, Martin Njoku<sup>1</sup>, Okechukwu Ezeakile<sup>1</sup>, Tahir Dahiru<sup>3</sup>, Suleiman Abdullahi<sup>3</sup>, Chukwuma Anyaike<sup>4</sup>, Charles Nwafor<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Medical department, RedAid Nigeria, Enugu, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>Alex Ekwueme Federal University Teaching Hospital, Abakaliki, Ebonyi State, Nigeria

<sup>3</sup>Medical department, Leprosy and Tuberculosis Relief Initiative, Jos, Nigeria

<sup>4</sup>National Coordinator, National Tuberculosis and Leprosy Control Programme, Federal Ministry of Health, Abuja, Nigeria

## \*Correspondence:

Ngozi Murphy-Okpala

[ngozi.murphyokpala@redaid-nigeria.org](mailto:ngozi.murphyokpala@redaid-nigeria.org)

**Keywords:** Validity, Reliability, Psychometric equivalence, Stigma, Internalized stigma, Self-esteem, Cross-cultural adaptation

**NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** Measuring self-esteem and internalized stigma among persons affected by leprosy is important to monitor stigma-reduction interventions. While the English versions of the Rosenberg self-esteem scale (RSES) and Internalized Stigma of Mental Illness Scale (ISMI) as originally developed have been validated and widely used in many settings, to date, no cross-culturally adapted or validated Nigerian Pidgin English version exists. We describe the translation, cross-cultural validation and adaptation of the Nigerian Pidgin English versions of the RSES and ISMI in Cross River state, southern Nigeria.

**Methods:** The Nigerian Pidgin English version of the RSES and ISMI was developed systematically following the World Health Organization's (WHO) guidelines on the process of translation and adaptation of instruments. The cultural equivalence of the instruments including their conceptual, item, semantic and their operational equivalences were evaluated using qualitative methods through the process of forward and back-translation, expert panel review, pre-testing and cognitive interviewing to generate the final version. A cross-sectional study of 56 participants with leprosy (Hansen's disease) enrolled from rural and urban communities in 3 local government areas (Boki, Obubra and Calabar-South) in Cross River state, southern Nigeria was undertaken to assess the psychometric equivalence of the tools. After 2-weeks interval, one-third of them (16 participants) had a re-test.

**Results:** The conceptual, item, semantic and the operational equivalences of the Nigerian Pidgin English versions of the RSES and ISMI scale showed adequate fit with all items identified as important in the context of the Pidgin speaking population. There was a negative inverse correlation between the mean total scores of the RSES and the ISMI scale ( $r = -0.57$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ); confirming the construct validity of the two scales. The exploratory factor analysis for the scales indicated good fit as one-dimension scale. The Cronbach's alpha values representing internal consistency were 0.82 and 0.95 for the RSES and ISMI scale respectively. The test-retest reliability intra-class correlation coefficient for the RSES and the ISMI scale was 0.98 and 0.67, respectively. There were no floor or ceiling effects in the distribution of the responses to the RSES and the ISMI scale.

**Conclusion:** The Nigerian Pidgin English version of the RSES and ISMI scales were successfully developed and showed evidence to be reliable and valid instruments for the assessment of self-esteem and internalized stigma respectively among Nigerian Pidgin English speaking population of southern Nigeria.

## INTRODUCTION

Leprosy is a neglected tropical disease due to infection with *Mycobacterium leprae*. Early diagnosis and treatment of the chronic granulomatous condition using multidrug therapy (MDT) has demonstrated successful treatment outcomes [1]. However, delays in diagnosis and treatment of leprosy can cause extensive and irreversible destruction of tissues and nerves, manifesting as skin ulcers, physical impairments, and disabilities [2-4]. Therefore, as over two million people live with leprosy-related disabilities, it suggests that majority of these persons were either not diagnosed early or had substantial delays before the condition is diagnosed [3-4]. There is substantial variation in the burden of leprosy in endemic countries. In 2019, three countries consisting of Brazil, India and Indonesia each reported over 10,000 new leprosy cases, while 13 additional countries mainly in Asia and Africa including Nigeria each reported 1000–10,000 new cases [5]. In 2020, Nigeria reported 1559 incident cases of leprosy. Although some of these countries have since achieved the global target for the elimination of leprosy as a public health problem (defined as prevalence of below 1 per 10,000 population); even within such countries that have reached elimination status there are local hotspots of high endemicity [6-7].

Stigma is an important challenge in the management of chronic diseases particularly neglected tropical diseases (NTDs). People presenting with NTDs like Buruli ulcer, cutaneous leishmaniasis, leprosy, and lymphatic filariasis tend to encounter stigma [8-9]. Such health-related stigma can have major deleterious effects such as reduced social participation by affected persons and their family members, and it could lower their opportunities in life and affect their human rights [10-11]. In leprosy affected persons, the assessment of stigma is very important. Stigma encountered by individuals affected by leprosy has been shown to be associated with participation limitations, shame, divorce and challenges with employment [4, 12-13]. Together, these lead to a poor quality of life among the affected persons. Evaluating stigma in this group is important because it provides useful information for planning, implementing and evaluation of rehabilitation services. Moreover, such stigma data is crucial in informing interventions to address the participation rights of people with disabilities [14]. In addition, having a validated tool to assess stigma may encourage clinicians to include stigma reduction as a critical treatment goal in addition to symptom reduction. This is because interventions that could achieve symptomatic improvement and could reduce stigma are more likely to be effective and efficient [15]

To advance the study of stigma reduction strategies and interventions, validated tools to assess levels of stigma in the society are needed [13]. The Internalized Stigma of Mental Illness Scale (ISMI) scale was developed to measure the internalized stigma of people with a mental illness [15]. The leprosy-adapted version of the ISMI scale was previously validated among persons with leprosy in India [16].

The Rosenberg self-esteem stigma scale (RSES) is one of the most extensively used instruments to assess self-esteem. Within the context of a cluster-randomized controlled trial with stigma reduction outcomes in Nigeria, these two instruments have been selected for assessing stigma and self-esteem among persons affected by leprosy. The primary project aims to compare audio-delivered vs. written material health education interventions and will assess their impact on perception, knowledge of and attitudes towards leprosy including stigma. This paper describes the cross-cultural validation and adaptation of the Nigerian Pidgin versions of the RSES and the ISMI scales in Cross River state, southern Nigeria.

## METHODS

### Study design

This study uses a cross-sectional design.

### Study area

This validation study was carried out in three local government (LGAs) namely, Boki, Calabar-South, and Obubra of Cross River State Southern Nigeria with data collected between December 2022 and January 2023. The study area has a population of 797, 520 people as projected from 2006 census, and each year an average of 106 new cases (17% with Grade 2 disability) are notified. The most common language spoken in the State is the Nigerian Pidgin English. Over 90% of the people living in the selected locations speak the Nigerian Pidgin English language.

### Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The participants of the study were persons affected by leprosy (18 years and above), who have lived in the aforementioned selected areas for at least 2 years and can speak and understand the Nigerian Pidgin language. Persons affected by leprosy who declined consent for any reason were excluded from the study.

### Instruments

**Leprosy-adapted ISMI Scale.** The ISMI Scale was developed to assess internalized stigma in persons with abnormal mental wellbeing. Like the original scale, the Leprosy-adapted ISMI scale consists of 29 Likert items as well as five subscales (Alienation, Stereotype Endorsement, Discrimination Experience, Social Withdrawal, Stigma Resistance) [16]. Internalized stigma is the devaluation, shame, secrecy and withdrawal triggered by applying negative stereotypes to oneself due to the (mental) illness [17]. This may lead to stereotype agreement, self-prejudice and self-discrimination long after the precipitating illness has been treated. The items on the ISMI are rated on a four-point Likert scale (from 1—strongly disagree to 4—strongly agree) and the ISMI score is calculated by adding up the ratings of all items, after reverse coding of the five stigma resistance items. High scores indicate higher levels of internalized stigma. The internal consistency of the original version was 0.90 (N = 127) and the test–

retest reliability coefficient was  $r = 0.92$  ( $n = 16$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), after a 6 weeks interval. All subscales of the ISMI scale had high Cronbach's alpha [16].

**RSES:** The assessment of self-esteem was used as a criterion indicator of the construct validity of the ISMI scale [15]. This is because some studies in the past have demonstrated that stigma was closely related to but different from low self-esteem [18-19]. Thus, in the design of the ISMI scale it was hypothesized that ISMI scores would be moderately negatively correlated with self-esteem scores [15]. The RSES consists of 10 items rated on a four-point Likert scale (from 1— strongly disagree to 4— strongly agree) and the Rosenberg score is calculated by adding up the ratings of all items, after reverse coding of the five items (2, 5, 6 8 and 9) that were negatively worded. High scores indicate higher levels of self-esteem [20]. The original version of the RSES has good internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha= 0.87).

## Procedure

The cross-cultural validation involved many stages following the World Health Organization's (WHO) guidelines on the process of translation and adaptation of instruments [21]. The first stage involved forward translation to Nigerian Pidgin English by an experienced linguistic professional who is proficient in both languages. After which there was a bilingual expert panel review (including a person affected by leprosy) who identified and resolved any inadequate expressions/concepts of the Nigerian Pidgin English translation. Then, a back translation of the generated Nigerian Pidgin English RSES and ISMI scales was done back to English language by another independent linguistic professional. As with the first stage, emphasis was to ensure conceptual and cultural equivalence, not linguistic equivalence of the translated scales. Discrepancies were discussed and further iterations with consensus generated a satisfactory version for use. The third stage involved pre-testing of the tools among 10 leprosy-affected persons with or without disability not used for the present study and discussions were held with the participants. to clarify their conceptual, item, semantic and operational equivalence of the items. Difficult or unclear words or phrases were reviewed together with the expert translators and consensus was used to select alternatives. The expert committee met again to adopt the final version of the questionnaire for use. Lastly, the psychometric validation cross-sectional study was performed. Data collection using the final Nigerian Pidgin English translated version was performed by trained research assistants using KoboCollect mobile phone app translation-enabled feature. Persons with leprosy were interviewed at the health centres in the different LGAs.

## Cultural and measurement equivalence assessment

This cross-cultural validation study utilized the framework for cultural validity assessment by Stevelink et al., who integrated Herdman's model with metric standards assessment of Terwee et al [9, 22-23]. In this study the conceptual, item, semantic and operational equivalences were evaluated as described

above. The measurement equivalence was assessed by testing the psychometric properties, exploratory factor analysis, test-retest reliability analysis and construct validity highlighting the relationship between the scales. Mean and standard deviation (SD) were used to describe each item of the scale. For this study, we used SPSS version 26 to carry out all statistical analysis including inferential statistics. A two-sided test  $p < 0.05$  was considered statistically significant.

### **Ethical considerations**

The study was approved by the by the Heath Research and Ethics Committee of the University of Nigeria Teaching Hospital (UNTH), Ituku-Ozalla, Enugu, Nigeria. Approval was also obtained from the Ethics Committee of Cross Rivers State Ministry of Health. Informed consent was obtained from all participants. The study guarantees the confidentiality of the content of the data provided by the participants.

## **RESULTS**

### **Cultural Equivalence**

**Conceptual equivalence:** Several approaches such as expert opinion, discussion with frontline health care workers, in-depth interviews with persons affected by leprosy (Hansen's disease) and pre-testing of the tools were utilized to evaluate the correspondence of the conceptual meanings between cultures in relation and equivalence of the Pidgin versions of the RSES and ISMI scale. The instruments were found to be relevant and useful in the target Nigerian Pidgin English-speaking persons-affected by leprosy in southern Nigeria.

**Item equivalence:** Review by experts who undertook forward- and back-translation of the tools to the Nigerian Pidgin English version as well as observations obtained during pre-testing indicated that there was no basis to change any of the items in the Nigerian Pidgin English versions of RSES and ISMI scale. All the items found in the English version of the tools were found to be relevant and useful in the Nigerian Pidgin English version.

**Semantic equivalence:** Although the target population speaks several local languages and dialects, the Nigerian Pidgin English versions of the RSES and ISMI scales were used because Nigerian Pidgin English is the most common language spoken and understood by over 90% of the target population. Adjustments were made in the questionnaires of confusing words, and differences were resolved by consensus by the experts involved in the translation.

**Operational equivalence:** The Nigerian Pidgin English versions of the RSES and ISMI scale used for the survey were delivered as interviewer-administered tools. Also, the format of the Nigerian Pidgin English version of RSES and ISMI scales as well as the scoring system corresponded with those of the English version of the tools.

## **Measurement Equivalence**

### **Characteristics of study participants**

A total of 56 patients with complete data were included in the analysis. Most of the patients 41 (73.2%) were over 40 years with a mean age of  $47.43 \pm 14.65$  years, and 29 (51.8%) of them were females. Also, 40 (71.4%) of the participants were married, 52 (92.9%) had some formal education. The study participants characteristics are as summarized in Table 1. Most of the patients 37 (66.1%) resided in the rural area, and 44 (78.6%) of them belonged to households earning less than ₦30,000; with the mean monthly household income of the participants being ₦27,626.79  $\pm$  43,385.

Most of the patients 55 (98.2%) had multibacillary leprosy with 20 (35.7%) and 23 (41.1%) presenting with grade 1 and grade 2 disability, respectively.

### **Item characteristics**

The mean total scores for the items in the RSES was 27.86 ( $\pm$  5.91) with scores ranging from 14 as the minimum score to 40 representing the maximum total self-esteem score by the patients. Table 2 summarizes the mean score per item in the scale. The individual items in the Rosenberg scale had means ranging from 1.70 to 3.45, and standard deviations ranging from 0.75 to 1.09. The mean total score of the items of the ISMI scale was 65.75 ( $\pm$  19.67) and the total scores ranged from 30 representing the minimum internalized stigma score to 113 representing the maximum total score obtained by the patients. Table 3 summarizes the mean score per item in the ISMI scale. The individual items in the ISMI scale had mean values ranging from 1.57 to 2.71 and standard deviations ranging from 0.78 to 1.16.

### **Construct validity**

The total scores of the RSES and ISMI scale were correlated to test the construct validity and assess the relationship between the two scales. ISMI was inversely associated with self-esteem as assessed using the RSES ( $r = -0.57$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) indicating that that internalized stigma construct was different from the self-esteem construct. The construct validity of the two scales was therefore confirmed.

### **Exploratory factor analysis**

For the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of the RSES, the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.73, which indicated that the sample was adequate for EFA for the overall scale. Using principal axis factoring and varimax rotation, two factors were extracted with eigenvalues greater than 1, and the absolute values of factor loadings less than 0.40 were suppressed. EFA for the RSES suggested a good fit as a one-dimensional scale, with a first factor accounting for 39.8% of the variance. Although, the EFA suggested that there are two potential factors explaining 52.3% of the

variance, parallel analysis indicated that the overall instrument should have one overriding factor. The EFA of the RSES in relation to the two-factor structure is as shown in Table 4. The analysis revealed that the first factor had six (6) items, and the second factor had four (4) items. Overall, the inter-item correlations were high supporting the existence of one overriding factor. Cronbach's alphas for the overall Rosenberg scale and the identified subscales are as shown in Table 4.

For the ISMI scale, the value of the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.80 suggesting sample adequacy for the overall scale. Using principal axis factoring and varimax rotation, with the absolute values of factor loadings less than 0.40 being suppressed; EFA for the ISMI scale indicated a moderate fit as a one-dimension scale with one factor explaining 45.5% of the variance observed. It should be noted that the subscales generated from the EFA of the ISMI scale did not load as per the design of the English version of the scale probably due to low sample size of the study population which is inadequate for analyzing the subscales. The analysis revealed that the scale had up to five subscales (Table 5). Overall, the inter-item correlations were high supporting the existence of one overriding factor. Cronbach's alpha for the overall ISMI scale was 0.95 as seen in Table 5.

### **Reliability**

The Cronbach's alpha values representing internal consistency were 0.82 and 0.95 for the RSES and ISMI scale, respectively. If an item was deleted, the value of Cronbach's alpha for all items in the RSES was higher than 0.78; and higher than 0.94 in the ISMI scale. These values confirm the internal consistency of the RSES and ISMI scale in the population. However, the corrected item-total correlations for items 3 and 7 of the RSES; and items 7 and 24 of the ISMI scale were less than 0.3, meaning that they were weakly correlated with the respective total scores.

Test-retest reliability was assessed using 16 participants who were administered the Pidgin versions of the tools at least two weeks apart. The mean Rosenberg score at the first and second visit were  $29.67 \pm 6.07$  and  $29.47 \pm 6.36$ , respectively. Test-retest reliability analysis gave an excellent positive correlation ( $r = 0.97$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ); and the intraclass correlation coefficient was 0.98 (95% CI 0.95 – 0.99;  $p < 0.001$ ) indicating excellent reliability of the RSES. The mean ISMI scores at the first and second visits were  $59.07 \pm 20.70$  and  $67.00 \pm 21.02$ , respectively. For the ISMI scale, test-retest reliability analysis gave a moderate positive correlation ( $r = 0.51$ ;  $p = 0.05$ ); and the intraclass correlation coefficient was 0.67 (95% CI 0.03 – 0.89;  $p = 0.02$ ) indicating moderate reliability of the ISMI scale. The SEM for the Rosenberg and ISMI scores were 1.56 and 20.71, respectively.

### **Floor and ceiling effects**

No floor or ceiling effects were identified for the RSES and the ISMI scale. None (0%) of the respondents scored the lowest possible score of 0 and only 3 (5.4%) scored the highest possible score



of 40 points on the RSES. Similarly, for the ISMI scale, none (0%) of the respondents had the lowest possible score of 29 and none (0%) had the highest possible score of 116. Therefore, no evidence exists for the occurrence of floor and ceiling effect in the two scales.

### **Interpretability**

The means and SD of the total scores of the tools for the different subgroups in relation to the baseline data of the participants are as shown in Table 6. The mean total score of RSES significantly differed according to area of residence ( $p = 0.04$ ). However, it did not differ according to the other sub-groups assessed (Table 6). The mean total score on the ISMI scale significantly differed according to age categories ( $p = 0.01$ ), marital status ( $p = 0.02$ ) or whether the participants had a close relationship with an individual affected by leprosy ( $p = 0.003$ ). However, the mean ISMI scores did not differ according to the other sub-groups assessed (Table 6).

A summary of the key psychometric properties of the Nigerian Pidgin English versions of the RSES and ISMI scales can be found in Table 7.

## **DISCUSSION**

The aim of this study was to undertake the translation, cross-cultural validation and adaptation of the Nigerian Pidgin English version of the RSES and Leprosy-adapted ISMI scales among persons affected by leprosy in Cross River, Southern Nigeria. The findings of the study revealed that both the RSES and ISMI scale were culturally valid in the Nigerian Pidgin English-speaking population of Cross River State as they had very good internal consistency and reproducibility, as well as moderate construct and content validity. Also, there was no evidence of floor and ceiling effect in the two scales. However, there are some areas in the scales requiring either some improvement or modifications based on the findings of this validation process.

### **Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale (RSES)**

The study findings revealed the cross-cultural nature of self-esteem among persons affected by leprosy suggesting that the Nigerian Pidgin English version of the RSES has adequate cultural and measurement equivalence. Therefore, the results of the study suggest that the Nigerian Pidgin English version of the RSES has adequate utility for the assessment of self-esteem among persons affected by leprosy in Cross River, Southern Nigeria. The RSES assessed the perception of self-esteem among persons-affected by leprosy (R1 to R10). The finding of the present study indicates that all items in the scale were important and for the assessment of self-esteem among the study population. The three most important items in the context of the target population with the highest total means scores were: 'R10: I take a positive attitude toward myself' with a mean score of 3.45 (highest), 'R4: I am able to do things as well as most other people.' with a mean score of 3.27 (second highest), and 'R7: I feel

that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others' with a mean score of 3.27 (third highest). Overall, items R2 and R8 of the scale had the lowest mean total scores.

The psychometric properties of the Nigerian Pidgin English version of the RSES suggest that the scale had an excellent internal consistency, with an excellent reliability and the distribution of the scale was acceptable with no evidence of a floor or ceiling effect. The Cronbach's alpha observed in the present study for the Nigerian Pidgin English version of the RSES (0.82) is consistent with the values reported by other studies [20, 24]. Our finding indicate that the Cronbach's alpha indicates that all items loaded well. The EFA of the Nigerian Pidgin English version of the RSES indicated a moderate fit as a one-dimensional scale, with the first factor explaining 39.8% of the variation observed. This finding is consistent with those of an earlier report from Brazil indicating that the RSES is an overall one-dimensional scale [20, 25]. The distribution of the Nigerian Pidgin English version of the RSES is acceptable with no floor or ceiling effects. This indicates that the respondents had clear understanding of the items contained in the scale which ensured they were not giving extreme responses or responses that suggest social desirability bias.

### **The Leprosy-adapted ISMI Scale**

The findings of this study suggest that the Nigerian Pidgin English version of the Leprosy-adapted ISMI scale has good cross-cultural reliability and validity. The reliability was assessed by evaluating the internal consistency of the items, and by the test-retest reliability of the scale. The construct validity of the scale was assessed by evaluating the correlation of the mean total scores of the Leprosy-adapted ISMI and the Rosenberg self-esteem scores. Overall, our findings were consistent with those of the original (English) scales for internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and construct validity [15-16]. The psychometric properties of the Nigerian Pidgin English version of the ISMI scale indicate a Cronbach's alpha of 0.95 which is excellent; and consistent with the findings of the original English version of the scale as well as other studies in patients with leprosy and mental illness [15-16, 26-27]. Furthermore, the test-retest reliability coefficient was similar to the value obtained using the original English version of the scale. Therefore, the Nigerian Pidgin English version of the Leprosy-adapted ISMI scale demonstrated a similar level of reliability to the original version of the scale [15]. Although the EFA showed that there are five potential sub-scales of the Pidgin version of the ISMI scale, the items did not align in accordance with the original version of the ISMI scale [15-16]. This may be due to the low sample size of the study which did not have sufficient power to detect and classify the items in accordance with the original English version of the sub-scales.

Furthermore, in our examination of construct validity, we also obtained the same result as for the original English version [15, 26-27]. The Leprosy-adapted ISMI total mean scores was inversely associated with self-esteem as assessed using the RSES ( $r = -0.57$ ) indicating that that internalized

stigma construct was different from the self-esteem construct. Therefore, the construct validity of the two scales was therefore confirmed.

Overall, the findings of this study advance previous studies on internalized stigma in two main aspects. First, the findings strengthen the cross-cultural nature of internalized stigma, indicating that the Nigerian Pidgin English version of the Leprosy-adapted ISMI has adequate psychometric properties, and is therefore suitable for assessing the level of internalized stigma across very distinctive linguistic and cultural settings [28]. The present study found no floor or ceiling effects in the overall ISMI scale based on the detailed criteria by Terwee et al [22]. This indicate that the scale is sensitive enough at the high ends of the scale and further highlights its good content validity.

This study has some limitations. First, the sample size of the study is small which does not have adequate power to allow for detailed sub-scale analysis of the leprosy-adapted ISMI scale. The assessment of measurement equivalence utilized a descriptive cross-sectional design. Therefore, any associations found should not imply causation. Third, the questionnaire was presented and delivered as an interviewer-administered questionnaire where the research assistants read questions and answer selections aloud, and waited for patients to respond. Therefore, the reliability and validity of the Nigerian Pidgin English version of the ISMI scale may give different findings if the scales were self-administered; though this was mitigated by ensuring the selected research assistants were bi-lingual and were thoroughly trained before commencing data collection.

## CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study revealed that the Nigerian Pidgin English version of the RSES and Leprosy-adapted ISMI scale had good levels of reliability and validity compared to the original English versions of the scales. Therefore, the Nigerian Pidgin English versions of the RSES and leprosy-adapted ISMI scales may be used as a valid tool to reliably assess self-esteem and internalized stigma in persons-affected by leprosy in Nigeria. It is expected that these Nigerian Pidgin English versions of both scales will be of use to researchers and policymakers in advancing our understanding of self-esteem and internalized stigma experienced by people-affected by leprosy in Nigeria. However, assessment of the Leprosy-adapted ISMI sub-scales will require further validation using a larger sample size in the study setting.

## REFERENCES

1. Britton WJ. Leprosy. In: Cohen J, Powderly WG, Opal SM, editors. *Infectious Diseases* (Fourth Edition). Elsevier; 2017. pp. 954–960.e12.
2. Bennett BH, Parker DL, Robson M. Leprosy: Steps Along the Journey of Eradication. *Public Health Rep.* 2008; 123: 198–205.
3. Saunderson P, Bizuneh E, Leekassa R. Neuropathic pain in people treated for multibacillary leprosy more than ten years previously. *Lepr Rev.* 2008; 79: 270–276.
4. van Brakel WH, Sihombing B, Djarir H, Beise K, Kusumawardhani L, Yulihane R, et al. Disability in people affected by leprosy: the role of impairment, activity, social participation, stigma and discrimination. *Glob Health Action* 2012; 5.
5. World Health Organization. Leprosy Fact sheet 2023. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/leprosy> [Accessed 5th April 2023]
6. World Health Organization. Towards zero leprosy: Global Leprosy (Hansen’s disease) Strategy 2021–2030. World Health Organization, Regional Office for South-East Asia; 2021.
7. Ogunsumi DO, Lal V, Puchner KP, Brakel W, Schwienhorst-Stich E-M, Kasang C, et al. Measuring endemicity and burden of leprosy across countries and regions: A systematic review and Delphi survey. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2021; 15: e0009769.
8. Weiss MG. Stigma and the social burden of neglected tropical diseases. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2008; 2: e237
9. Stevelink SA, Terwee CB, Banstola N, van Brakel WH. Testing the psychometric properties of the Participation Scale in Eastern Nepal. *Qual Life Res.* 2013 Feb;22(1):137-44. doi: 10.1007/s11136-012-0116-8. Epub 2012 Jan 22. PMID: 22331513; PMCID: PMC3548091.
10. Bayer R. Stigma and the ethics of public health: not can we but should we. *Soc Sci Med* 2008; 67: 463–472.
11. Maluwa M, Aggleton P, Parker R. HIV- and AIDS-Related Stigma, Discrimination and Human Rights: A Critical Overview. *Health Hum Rights* 2002; 6: 1–19.
12. Dahiru T, Iliyasu Z, Aliyu MH. Social participation restriction among persons with leprosy discharged from a multidrug therapy clinic in northern Nigeria. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg* 2022;116(8):694-703.
13. van Brakel WH. Measuring health-related stigma – a literature review. *Psychol Health Med* 2006; 11: 307–334
14. Chung EY, Lam G. Validation of two scales for measuring participation and perceived stigma in Chinese community-based rehabilitation programs. *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 2018;16(1):105.

15. Ritsher JB, Otilingam PG, Grajales M. Internalized stigma of mental illness: psychometric properties of a new measure. *Psychiatry Res.* 2003;121(1):31-49.
16. Rensen C, Bandyopadhyay S, Gopal PK, Van Brakel WH. Measuring leprosy-related stigma - a pilot study to validate a toolkit of instruments. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2011;33(9):711-9.
17. Corrigan PW. The impact of stigma on severe mental illness. *Cogn Behav Pract* 1998;5:201–222.
18. Link BG, Struening EL, Rahav M, Phelan JC, Nuttbrock L. On stigma and its consequences: evidence from a longitudinal study of men with dual diagnoses of mental illness and substance abuse. *J Health Soc Behav.* 1997;38(2):177-90.
19. Link BG, Struening EL, Neese-Todd S, Asmussen S, Phelan JC. Stigma as a barrier to recovery: The consequences of stigma for the self-esteem of people with mental illnesses. *Psychiatr Serv.* 2001;52(12):1621-6.
20. Rosenberg, M. *Conceiving the self.* New York: Basic Books, 1979.
21. World Health Organization (WHO). Process of translation and adaptation of instruments. Available: [http://www.who.int/substance\\_abuse/research\\_tools/translation/en/](http://www.who.int/substance_abuse/research_tools/translation/en/) [Accessed 19<sup>th</sup> August 2022].
22. Terwee CB, Bot SDM, de Boer MR et al. Quality criteria were proposed for measurement properties of health status questionnaires. *J Clin Epidemiol.*, 2007; 60: 34–42.
23. Herdman MJF-RXB. Herdman 1998 A model of equivalence in the cultural adaption of HRQoL instruments.pdf. *Qual Life Res.*, 1998; 7: 323–335.
24. Umunnah JO, Madieke OC, Amaech IA, Alom GO. Disability level, physical activity limitations, self-esteem and self-efficacy of persons living with leprosy in selected states in Nigeria. *Sierra Leone J Biomed Res* 2021; 13: 1 – 8
25. Hutz CS, Zanon C. Revisão da adaptação, validação e normatização da Escala de Autoestima de Rosenberg [Revision of the adaptation, validation, and normatization of the Rosenberg self-esteem scale]. *Revista Avaliação Psicológica* 2011; 10: 41-49
26. Tanabe Y, Hayashi K, Ideno Y. The Internalized Stigma of Mental Illness (ISMI) scale: validation of the Japanese version. *BMC Psychiatry* 2016; 16: 116
27. Oliveira SE, Esteves FG, Pereira EG, Carvalho M, Boyd JE. The Internalized Stigma of Mental Illness: cross-cultural adaptation and psychometric properties of the Portuguese version of the ISMI scale. *Community Ment Health J.* 2015; 51(5): 606-612.
28. Boyd JE, Adler EP, Otilingam PG, Peters T. Internalized Stigma of Mental Illness (ISMI) scale: a multinational review. *Compr Psychiatry.* 2014;55(1):221-31.

**Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of the patients, Cross River (N = 56)**

Variables	N (%)
Age group (years)	
<40	15 (26.8)
≥40	41 (73.2)
Mean ± SD	47.43 ± 14.65
Sex	
Female	29 (51.8)
Male	27 (48.2)
Marital status	
Married	40 (71.4)
Never married	10 (17.9)
Widowed	6 (10.7)
Education	
None	4 (7.1)
Primary	9 (16.1)
Secondary	23 (41.1)
Post-secondary	20 (35.7)
Occupation	
Paid work	4 (7.1)
Retired	2 (3.6)
Self-employed	44 (78.6)
Unemployed	6 (10.7)
Residence	
Rural	37 (66.1)
Urban	19 (33.9)
Income (Naira)	
<30,000	44 (78.6)
≥30,000	12 (21.4)
Mean ± SD	27626.79 ± 43385.97
Leprosy type	
Multibacillary	55 (98.2)
Paucibacillary	1 (1.8)
Disability grade	
Grade 0	13 (23.2)
Grade 1	20 (35.7)
Grade 2	23 (41.1)
Know an individual affected by leprosy	
No	40 (71.4)
Yes	16 (28.6)

SD = Standard Deviation

**Table 2. Descriptive statistics of items on the Rosenberg self-esteem scale (N = 56)**

No	Items	Mean	SD
R1	On the whole, I am satisfied with myself	2.80	1.09
R2	At times, I think I am no good at all	2.29	1.04
R3	I feel that I have a number of good qualities	2.36	0.75
R4	I am able to do things as well as most other people.	3.27	0.88
R5	I feel I do not have much to be proud of	2.46	1.03
R6	I certainly feel useless at times	2.48	1.08
R7	I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others	3.27	0.82
R8	I wish I could have more respect for myself	1.70	0.89
R9	All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure	2.79	1.06
R10	I take a positive attitude toward myself	3.45	0.78

**Table 3 Descriptive statistics of items on statistics items of Leprosy-adapted ISMI scale (N = 56)**

No	Items	Mean	SD
S1	I feel out of place in the world because I have (had) leprosy	2.57	1.02
S2	Persons affected by leprosy tend to be violent.	1.84	1.11
S3	People discriminate against me because I have (had) leprosy	2.54	1.06
S4	I avoid getting close to people who don't have (had) leprosy to avoid rejection.	2.43	1.11
S5	I am embarrassed or ashamed that I have (had) leprosy	2.57	1.16
S6	Persons affected by leprosy shouldn't get married.	1.73	1.05
S7	Persons affected by leprosy make important contributions to society.	1.98	1.07
S8	I feel inferior to others who don't have (had) leprosy.	2.55	1.09
S9	I don't socialize as much as I used to because the condition might make me look or behave "weird."	2.55	1.16
S10	Persons affected by leprosy cannot live a good, rewarding life.	2.05	1.07
S11	I don't talk about myself much because I don't want to burden others with my condition.	2.64	1.07
S12	Negative stereotypes about leprosy keep me isolated from the "normal" world.	2.61	1.12
S13	Being around people who don't have (had) leprosy makes me feel out of place or inadequate.	2.39	1.06
S14	I feel comfortable being seen in public with someone who has visible signs of leprosy.	2.09	0.96
S15	People often patronize me, or treat me like a child, just because I have (had) leprosy.	2.30	1.06
S16	I am disappointed in myself for having (had) leprosy	2.39	1.12
S17	Having (had) leprosy has spoiled my life.	2.55	1.14
S18	People can tell that I have (had) leprosy by the way I look.	2.71	1.12
S19	Because I have (had) leprosy, I need others to make most decisions for me.	1.57	0.78
S20	I stay away from social situations in order to protect my family or friends from embarrassment.	2.43	1.14
S21	People without leprosy could not possibly understand me.	2.36	1.05
S22	People ignore me or take me less seriously just because I have (had) leprosy	2.21	1.11
S23	I can't contribute anything to society because I have (had) leprosy	1.87	0.97
S24	Living with leprosy has made me a tough survivor.	1.59	0.85
S25	Nobody would be interested in getting close to me because I have (had) leprosy.	2.27	1.05
S26	In general, I am able to live my life the way I want to.	2.02	0.98
S27	I can have a good, fulfilling life, despite my condition.	1.68	0.92
S28	Others think that I can't achieve much in life because I have (had) leprosy	2.54	1.06
S29	Stereotypes about persons affected by leprosy apply to me.	2.70	1.03



**Table 4. Internal consistency of the RSES and ISMI scale and their sub-scales**

Items	Cronbach's alpha
<b>Rosenberg scale</b>	
R1 – R10	0.82
R1 – R2, R5 – R6, R8 – R9	0.86
R3 – R4, R7, R10	0.68
<b>Leprosy-adapted ISMI Scale</b>	
S1– S29	0.95
S1, S3– S4, S10–S16, S20–S22, S25, S29	0.95
S1, S8–S9, S11–S12, S16–S18, S20, S23, S28–S29	0.95
S1, S4–S5, S8, S16–S17, S26	0.92
S2, S6–S7, S23	0.62
S19, S24, S26–S27	0.66

**Table 5. Exploratory Factor analysis for the ISMI scale (N = 56)**

No	Items	Factor Loading				
		1	2	3	4	5
S1	I feel out of place in the world because I have (had) leprosy	0.42	0.54	0.54		
S2	Persons affected by leprosy tend to be violent.				0.58	
S3	People discriminate against me because I have (had) leprosy	0.65				
S4	I avoid getting close to people who don't have (had) leprosy to avoid rejection.	0.66		0.46		
S5	I am embarrassed or ashamed that I have (had) leprosy			0.72		
S6	Persons affected by leprosy shouldn't get married.				0.64	
S7	Persons affected by leprosy make important contributions to society.				0.76	
S8	I feel inferior to others who don't have (had) leprosy.		0.48	0.60		
S9	I don't socialize as much as I used to because the condition might make me look or behave "weird."		0.69			
S10	Persons affected by leprosy cannot live a good, rewarding life.	0.49				
S11	I don't talk about myself much because I don't want to burden others with my condition.	0.46	0.55			
S12	Negative stereotypes about leprosy keep me isolated from the "normal" world.	0.51	0.61			
S13	Being around people who don't have (had) leprosy makes me feel out of place or inadequate.	0.58				
S14	I feel comfortable being seen in public with someone who has visible signs of leprosy.	0.63				
S15	People often patronize me, or treat me like a child, just because I have (had) leprosy.	0.78				
S16	I am disappointed in myself for having (had) leprosy	0.52	0.47	0.56		
S17	Having (had) leprosy has spoiled my life.		0.72	0.49		
S18	People can tell that I have (had) leprosy by the way I look.		0.84			
S19	Because I have (had) leprosy, I need others to make most decisions for me.					0.54
S20	I stay away from social situations in order to protect my family or friends from embarrassment.	0.73	0.54			
S21	People without leprosy could not possibly understand me.	0.80				
S22	People ignore me or take me less seriously just because I have (had) leprosy	0.79				
S23	I can't contribute anything to society because I have (had) leprosy		0.54		0.52	
S24	Living with leprosy has made me a tough survivor.					0.68

S25	Nobody would be interested in getting close to me because I have (had) leprosy.	0.79		
S26	In general, I am able to live my life the way I want to.		0.52	0.56
S27	I can have a good, fulfilling life, despite my condition.			0.78
S28	Others think that I can't achieve much in life because I have (had) leprosy	0.75		
S29	Stereotypes about persons affected by leprosy apply to me.	0.41	0.66	

---

**Table 6. Relation between total mean of the Nigerian Pidgin English versions of Rosenberg and Leprosy-adapted ISMI scores by patient subgroups**

Variables	Rosenberg total score mean (SD)	p-value	Leprosy-adapted ISMI total score mean (SD)	p-value
Age group (years)		0.17		0.01
<40	26.07 (4.89)		76.40 (18.48)	
≥40	28.51 (6.16)		61.85 (18.83)	
Sex		0.13		0.25
Female	26.69 (6.00)		68.69 (19.52)	
Male	29.11 (5.66)		62.59 (19.71)	
Marital status		0.06		0.02
Married	28.77 (6.02)		61.63 (18.29)	
Never married	27.20 (5.18)		80.30 (22.98)	
Widowed	22.83 (3.92)		69.00 (11.17)	
Education		0.23		0.69
None	22.75 (5.12)		73.50 (12.66)	
Primary	29.78 (6.91)		63.22 (26.04)	
Secondary	27.39 (6.05)		63.17 (15.28)	
Post-secondary	28.55 (5.14)		68.30 (22.55)	
Occupation		0.78		0.34
Paid work	28.25 (4.99)		61.50 (18.41)	
Retired	32.00 (11.31)		45.50 (14.85)	
Self-employed	27.57 (5.79)		67.89 (20.31)	
Unemployed	28.33 (6.83)		59.67 (14.12)	
Residence		0.004		0.59
Rural	26.27 (5.47)		66.78 (18.70)	
Urban	30.95 (6.62)		63.74 (21.83)	
Income (Naira)		0.49		0.86
<30,000	27.57 (6.00)		66.00 (18.64)	
≥30,000	28.92 (5.66)		64.83 (23.99)	
Leprosy type		0.98		0.97
Multibacillary	27.85 (5.96)		65.76 (19.85)	
Paucibacillary	28.00 (0.00)		65.00 (0.00)	
Disability grade		0.44		0.31
Grade 0	29.54 (4.63)		62.92 (21.07)	
Grade 1	27.90 (7.15)		62.00 (20.31)	
Grade 2	26.87 (5.35)		70.61 (18.08)	
Know a leprosy affected person		0.28		0.003
No	28.40 (6.13)		61.00 (17.15)	
Yes	26.50 (5.23)		77.63 (21.06)	

SD = Standard Deviation

**Table 7. Summary of key psychometric properties of the Nigerian Pidgin English versions of the RSES and Leprosy-adapted ISMI scale**

Properties		Rosenberg scale	ISMI scale
Total participants		56	56
Internal consistency	Cronbach's alpha	0.82	0.95
Content validity	Exploratory factor analysis	39.8%	45.5%
	K-M-O test	0.73	0.80
	Bartlett's test	228.21 (p < 0.001)	1419.84 (p < 0.001)
Construct validity		r = -0.57 (p < 0.001)	
Agreement	SEM	1.56	20.71
Reliability (N = 15)	ICC (CI)	0.98 (95% CI 0.95 – 0.99)	0.67 (95% CI 0.03 – 0.89)
Floor and ceiling effects		(10) = 0%	(29) = 0%
		(40) = 5.4%	(116) = 0%

SEM = Standard error of measurement; Intraclass correlation coefficient; CI (95% confidence interval)