

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Translation and validation of an Italian language version of the Religious Beliefs and Mental Illness Stigma Scale (I-RBMIS) / Pingani, Luca; Giberti, Sara; Coriani, Sandra; Ferrari, Silvia; Fierro, Lucia; Mattei, Giorgio; Maria Nasi, Anna; Pinelli, Giorgia; Wesselmann, Eric D.; Galeazzi, Gian Maria. - In: JOURNAL OF RELIGION AND HEALTH. - ISSN 1573-6571. - 60:5(2021), pp. 3530-3544. [10.1007/s10943-021-01195-9]

*Terms of use:*

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

13/01/2026 00:21

## **Translation and validation of an Italian language version of the Religious Beliefs and Mental Illness Stigma Scale (I-RBMIS).**

Luca Pingani<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Sara Giberti<sup>1</sup>, Sandra Coriani<sup>2</sup>, Silvia Ferrari<sup>1</sup>, Lucia Fierro<sup>4</sup>, Giorgio Mattei<sup>1,5</sup>, Anna Maria Nasi<sup>2,3</sup>, Giorgia Pinelli<sup>6</sup>, Eric D. Wesselmann<sup>7</sup>, Gian Maria Galeazzi<sup>1</sup>.

1. *Department of Biomedical, Metabolic and Neural Sciences, Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Reggio Emilia, Italy.*
2. *Department of Health Professions, Azienda USL – IRCCS di Reggio Emilia, Reggio Emilia, Italy.*
3. *Department of Mental Health, Azienda USL – IRCCS di Reggio Emilia, Reggio Emilia, Italy.*
4. *Department of Health Professions, Azienda Socio Sanitaria Territoriale degli Spedali Civili di Brescia, Brescia, Italy.*
5. *Marco Biagi Department of Economics & Marco Bigi Foundation, Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy.*
6. *Department of the Arts, Università degli Studi di Bologna, Bologna, Italy.*
7. *Department of Psychology, Illinois State University, Normal, USA.*

Luca Pingani, PhD

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3428-8308>

"De Sanctis" Pavilion - "San Lazzaro" University Campus

Via Amendola 2, 42121 – Reggio Emilia (Italy)

E-mail: [luca.pingani@unimore.it](mailto:luca.pingani@unimore.it)

Phone: +39 – 0522 – 522077

### **Brief autobiographical paragraph**

Dr Luca Pingani is Lecturer of Recovery and Psychiatric Rehabilitation at the University of Modena and Reggio Emilia and Course Program Manager of the Degree Course in Psychiatric Rehabilitation (University of Modena and Reggio Emilia - Italy). He is Research and Training Program Manager at the Department of Mental Health of the Local Health Agency of Reggio Emilia (Italy).

He discussed his doctoral dissertation in Clinical and Experimental Medicine (University of Modena and Reggio Emilia) and attended two post graduate courses in statistical analysis applied to clinical questions and systematic reviews.

The main topics of his research work are psychiatric rehabilitation, stigma and validation of psychometric questionnaires.

1    **Translation and validation of an Italian language version of the Religious**  
2    **Beliefs and Mental Illness Stigma Scale (I-RBMIS).**

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

## ***Abstract***

Introduction. The aim of this study is to validate the Italian version of the Religious Beliefs and Mental Illness Stigma Scale (I-RBMIS): a self-report measure of religious beliefs which may contribute to stigma for mental disorders, presenting original theoretical constructs, with satisfactory psychometric properties and already used in several studies.

Methods. Scale validation included: linguistic validation; pilot test for understandability; face validity; factor analysis as test of dimensionality; Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test to evaluate sample sampling adequacy; internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha; scale validity was assessed through concurrent criterion validity using as gold standard the Italian version of Attribution Questionnaire 27 and Mental Health Knowledge Schedule.

Results. 311 people agreed to participate in the study. Face validity showed that 13 items out of 16 were completely understandable while only three items (4, 9 and 13) highlighted small lexical concerns. The average compilation time was under 4 minutes. Bartlett's test for sphericity was statistically significant ( $X^2 = 1497.54$ ;  $df = 120$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). Cronbach's alpha values were acceptable for both the entire questionnaire (0.80) and for the Morality/Sin subscale (0.73), whereas it was slightly below the standard cut-off for the Spiritually-Oriented Causes/Treatments (0.68). Scale validity showed a positive correlation between I-RBMIS and AQ-27-I, and a negative correlation between I-RBMIS and MAKSI.

Discussion: I-RBMIS demonstrated good psychometric properties to assess stigmatizing religious beliefs toward mental illness in general population.

**Key words:** spiritual stigma, social stigma, surveys and questionnaires, psychometric validation.

## ***Introduction***

Gordon Allport (Allport 1954) argued that connection between religion and prejudice is paradoxical: religion “makes prejudice and it unmakes prejudice...Some people say the only cure for prejudice is more religion; some say the only cure is to abolish religion” (p. 444). One way to understand this paradox is to examine how one’s religious beliefs relate to the type of prejudice in question (e.g., racism or heterosexism), specifically how one’s religious beliefs relate to target groups (Laythe et al. 2002). Given that most modern religious groups normally condemn racism (Batson et al. 1993), religious beliefs are likely to correlate negatively with racial prejudice; heterosexism, however, may be related positively with religious beliefs given how many mainstream religions view homosexuality negatively, or at least ambivalently (Laythe et al. 2001; Rowatt and Franklin 2004). Persons with mental illness are another stigmatized group that typically experiences various forms of prejudice and discrimination from various sources, sometimes including their religious communities (Pargament 1997). Why would some religious communities, normally considered a source of social support for the various stresses of life, instead contribute to the stresses of persons with mental illness by making them feel devalued, marginalized, or otherwise excluded?

### ***Religion and Prejudice toward Persons with Mental Illness***

Religious beliefs about mental health are diverse (H. G. Koenig 1998) and the connection between them is not well-studied. Some religious denominations may view mental health concerns within the context of taking care of one’s overall health and be open to adherents seeking treatment from mental health professionals. However, other

69 denominations may reject this idea and stigmatize mental health concerns and treatment  
70 options.

71       Specifically, regarding mental health stigma, Peteet (Peteet 2019) describes four  
72 ways in which one's religious beliefs can reinforce stigmatizing attitudes: fundamentalist  
73 thinking, tribalism, misattribution of psychopathology and traditional ways of  
74 understanding. If individuals live their religious beliefs in a *fundamentalist* way, they might  
75 consider solutions to their difficulties only from a single perspective (e.g., increased  
76 engagement with sacred scripture or religious rituals) without considering other  
77 possibilities for help or support, such as counseling or medication; at best, they may  
78 consider these latter possibilities useless, and at worst even harmful (Dowd & Nielson  
79 2006). *Tribalism* can be associated with stigma when an individual, who lives in a hermetic  
80 social context (like some forms of congregations or religious movements), is expelled  
81 because he is considered dangerous to the group itself because of his/her psychic distress  
82 (Barnes & Meyer 2012; Breland-Noble et al. 2015). Other sources of stigma are  
83 *misattribution* and association of psychopathological symptoms with elements of the  
84 religious *tradition*, such as interpreting suffering as divine punishment toward oneself or  
85 one's parents, or as demonic possession (Kovess-Masfety et al. 2018; Rosmarin et al.  
86 2018; Ventriglio et al. 2018). These four different contexts may cause serious  
87 consequences for people with mental health problems and for people who live with them:  
88 lack of trust in health services, over-reliance on non-scientific treatments or rituals, the  
89 prohibition to ask for help to health professionals or to specialized facilities, poor  
90 adherence to therapeutic recommendations and obstacles in getting in touch with self-help  
91 groups or peer-worker groups (Ayvaci 2016; Wamser et al. 2011).

92           Despite the potential for stigma, numerous studies have shown a positive  
93   association between religiosity and mental health (Dein, 2018; Hackney & Sanders 2003).  
94   For example, religious beliefs often are associated with greater hope, increased sense of  
95   meaning in life, higher self-esteem, optimism and life satisfaction (Koenig 2009; Koenig et  
96   al. 2012). Religiosity also is associated with lower rates of suicide and a lower intake of  
97   drugs and alcohol (Cook et al. 1997; Van Praag 2009). Finally, several studies also  
98   highlight how religiosity / spirituality predict lower levels of depression or faster remission  
99   of depression (Koenig 2012).

100           To address the paradoxical connection between religious beliefs and mental illness  
101   stigma, the American Psychiatric Association Foundation and the Mental Health and Faith  
102   Community Partnership Steering Committee have jointly published a book entitled "Mental  
103   Health - A Guide for Faith Leaders" (American Psychiatric Association Foundation 2016).  
104   This partnership was created to encourage a dialogue between mental health  
105   professionals and religious leaders: the former have had the chance to share and discuss  
106   concepts such as stress, psychological problems, mental disorders and their evidence  
107   based treatments while the latter have offered significant reflections on the role of religion  
108   and spirituality in the lives of believers and the possibilities that they can offer as support  
109   in a therapeutic-rehabilitation program (American Psychiatric Association Foundation  
110   2016).

111           Dialogues between mental health professionals and religious leaders are important,  
112   but it is also useful to develop psychometric tools that can quantitatively define the  
113   presence of scientifically-inaccurate or potentially stigmatizing beliefs about mental illness  
114   based on religion in the general population. In this way, it will be possible to study the

115 dynamics of stigmatization in religious contexts and to undertake further targeted actions  
116 for reducing its negative effects (Zoppei & Lasalvia 2011).

117         To the best of our knowledge, there is no psychometric questionnaire in Italian that  
118 can evaluate religious beliefs about mental illness. There is at least one published measure  
119 of these beliefs in English - the Religious Beliefs and Mental Illness Stigma Scale  
120 (Wesselman and Graziano 2010). Thus, we decided to adapt this questionnaire in an  
121 Italian version for three key reasons. First, the original measure presents interesting  
122 theoretical constructs which we consider extendable to the Italian cultural context. The  
123 questionnaire assesses two constructs of potentially stigmatizing religious beliefs about  
124 mental illness: "Morality/Sin", which measures beliefs that mental illnesses are associated  
125 with sinful behavior or moral laxity, and "Spiritually-Oriented Causes/Treatments," which  
126 measures beliefs that encourage people to focus on religious practices and rituals (e.g.,  
127 increased prayer and scripture reading, pastoral counseling, and exorcisms) for coping  
128 with mental illness and to avoid secular treatment options. Second, we decided to adapt  
129 this measure because its original psychometric properties provided satisfactory results in  
130 terms of Cronbach's alpha (Factor 1: 0.88, Factor 2: 0.72) and all the items defining the  
131 two factors have a factor loading greater than 0.40 (Wesselman & Graziano 2010).  
132 Third, the constructs assessed by the questionnaire have been studied subsequent  
133 published research (Flannelly 2017; Mannarini et al. 2018; Wesselman et al. 2015;  
134 Yelderman 2018).

135

136

137

## ***Methods***

### ***Questionnaire Description***

RBMIS is a self-administered psychometric questionnaire for assessing participants religious beliefs about mental illness (Wesselmann et al. 2015; Wesselmann & Graziano 2010). The original 16 items of the RBMIS were on a 9-point rating scale, asking participants to indicate the degree to which they agreed with each statement (from 1: "Strongly Disagree" to 9: "Strongly Agree"). Two belief factors emerged: Morality/Sin (sum of items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9) and Spiritually-Oriented Causes/Treatments (sum of items 4, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16). The measure is scored such that higher scores indicate a person's greater endorsement of potentially stigmatizing religious beliefs towards mental illness.

### ***Measure translation***

The translation of the original version of RBMI was a three-step process. Three native Italian speakers, bilingual in English, independently translated the original questionnaire into Italian: based on the three translations, a unique Italian version was created with the approval of all translators. In the second step, the pooled version was back translated into English by a professional translator not involved in the previous step. From the comparison between the back-translation and the first Italian translation, an initial draft of the Italian questionnaire, for pilot testing, was produced. To evaluate understandability, the draft version was administered to 20 undergraduate students who were in their third year of training for a bachelor's degree in Psychiatric Rehabilitation at

161 the University of Modena and Reggio Emilia. During the administration, each item was  
162 read aloud and each student answered the following questions: "Is the statement clearly  
163 stated?", "Could the statement be worded more clearly?" and "Is it difficult to identify the  
164 right answer for that statement?". The authors (LP, SF, and GM) discussed participants'  
165 responses and subsequently revised the items for the beta version to be used in the  
166 general population. The beta version is available upon request to the corresponding  
167 author.

168

#### 169 Sample recruitment

170 The beta version of the I-RBMIS was administered by one of the authors (SG) to  
171 individuals in the general population, specifically in the capital cities of the Modena and  
172 Reggio Emilia provinces. The author recruited participants in public places, such as  
173 shopping centers, squares, markets, recreational clubs, stadiums, post offices, cinema,  
174 etc. No stratification was applied in the recruitment. The inclusion criteria were: (a) being  
175 18 years of age or more; (b) to provide an informed consent to take part to the study.  
176 Clark and Watson (1995) suggested that an adequate sample size for questionnaire  
177 validation should be no less than 300 respondents while Comrey and Lee (1992) proposed  
178 a graded scale of sample size: 100 respondents = poor; 200 = fair; 300 = good; 500 =  
179 very good;  $\geq 1000$  = excellent. We administered the Italian version of RBMIS to 400  
180 people expecting a response rate around 75%: 311 (77.75% - largely satisfying the  
181 minimum sample size required) agreed to participate in the study. **All the research**  
182 **participants were informed about the objectives and procedure of the study**  
183 **and signed the informed consent prior to data collection.**

184

## 185 Statistical Analysis

186 Descriptive statistics were computed for each I-RBMIS item and for all collected  
187 socio-demographic variables. Questionnaire feasibility was evaluated by calculating the  
188 average completion time by the first 20 people who completed the questionnaire. As a test  
189 of dimensionality, exploratory factor analysis was used (Principle Axis Factoring) with  
190 Promax rotation, indicating a predefined number of factors equal to that identified in the  
191 original version (morality/sin and spiritually-oriented causes/treatments belief factors) to  
192 verify the exact correspondence of factors in two different cultural context: items with a  
193 factor loading of 0.40 or greater were retained in the composite scores (Comrey & Lee,  
194 1992). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was used to test sampling adequacy: <0.49 is  
195 considered unacceptable, from 0.50 to 0.59 miserable, from 0.60 to 0.69 mediocre, from  
196 0.70 to 0.79 middling, from 0.80 to 0.89 meritorious and from 0.90 to 1.00 marvelous  
197 (Kaiser 1974). Bartlett's test for sphericity was used to check redundancy between items  
198 considering  $p < 0.05$  as a significant value (Snedecor & Cochran 1989).

199 Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha (an alpha coefficient of  
200 0.70 or greater was considered acceptable; Nunnally 1978). Scale validity was assessed  
201 through concurrent criterion validity using Italian versions of two questionnaires that are  
202 considered gold standard stigma measures: the Attribution Questionnaire 27 (AQ-27-I;  
203 Corrigan et al. 2002; Corrigan 2000; Pingani et al. 2012; Pingani et al. 2016) and the  
204 Mental Health Knowledge Schedule (MAKS-I; Evans-Lacko et al. 2010; Pingani et al.  
205 2019). AQ-27-I, a 27-brief statement questionnaire, evaluates in the presence of  
206 stigmatizing stereotypes, attitudes, and behaviors toward mental illness among the  
207 general population: higher scores indicate higher levels of stigma toward mental illness.  
208 MAKS-I is a self-administered 12-item questionnaire assessing participants' knowledge

209 about mental health: a higher score indicates a greater knowledge of scientifically-  
210 accurate information concerning mental health and illness. To verify the I-RBMIS's validity,  
211 one would expect a negative correlation between the I-RBMIS total score and the MAKS-I,  
212 as well as a positive correlation with the AQ-27-I.

213

214

## ***Results***

215

### ***Face validity and understandability***

217 The students in the pilot sample were on average 24.93 years old ( $SD = 3.54$ ),  
218 mainly female ( $N = 13$ ; 65%). All but three items were considered clear and  
219 understandable by the entire sample. Item 4 ("People suffering from mental illness are not  
220 going to their places of worship enough") was found to be not clear by 3 respondents  
221 (15%) because the Italian translation of "places of worship" may not be understandable by  
222 everyone. Four respondents (20%) asked the researcher to better specify the meaning of  
223 "demons" of item 9 ("Demons are not responsible for causing the symptoms of mental  
224 illness") and 1 respondent (5%) was not aware of the meaning of "original sin" described  
225 in item 13 ("Mental illnesses are a result of Original Sin").

226

### ***Sample characteristics and rating scale scores***

228 The mean age of the validation sample was 33.01 years (minimum = 18; maximum  
229 = 82;  $SD = \pm 15.14$ ). Of the 311 respondents 38.59% ( $N = 120$ ) were male. The socio-  
230 demographic characteristics of the sample and the mean total score obtained at the three

231 questionnaires (I-RBMIS, MAKS-I and AQ-27-I) are described in Table 1 while the  
232 descriptive statistics for each item are described in Table 2.

233

234 *Insert tables 1 and 2 about here*

235

### 236 Psychometric properties

237 The average completion time was 239 seconds (just under 4 minutes) with a  
238 standard deviation of  $\pm 47$  seconds.

239 The exploratory factor analysis results are described in Table 3: all the items  
240 defining the two factors (Morality/Sin and Spiritually-Oriented Causes/Treatments belief  
241 factors) had a factor loading  $\geq 0.40$ , replicating the original loadings for the English  
242 version.

243 *Insert table 3 about here*

244

245 The sampling adequacy can be considered "meritorious" (0.82) and the Bartlett's  
246 test for sphericity is statistically significant ( $\chi^2 = 1497.54$ ;  $df = 120$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ).  
247 Cronbach's alpha values are acceptable for the entire questionnaire (0.80) and for the  
248 Morality/Sin subscale (0.73) while it is slightly below the cut-off for the Spiritually-Oriented  
249 Causes/Treatments (0.68).

250 Regarding the scale concurrent validity (Table 4), a statistically significant positive  
251 correlation emerged between AQ-27-I and I-RBMIS Total score ( $r = 0.26$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), I-  
252 RBMIS Morality/Sin ( $r = 0.32$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) and I-RBMIS Spiritually - Oriented

253 Causes/Treatments ( $r = 0.14$ ;  $p = 0.02$ ). Specifically, higher endorsement of the two  
254 religious belief factors (whether separately or combined together) relate to higher  
255 endorsements of common secular stigmatizing beliefs about persons with mental illness  
256 (as indexed by an established measure that has already been validated in its Italian  
257 version). Additionally, the MAKS-I negatively correlates with I-RBMIS Total score ( $r = -$   
258  $0.11$ ;  $p = 0.04$ ) and I-RBMIS Morality/Sin ( $r = -0.12$ ;  $p = 0.03$ ). These statistically  
259 significant correlations indicate that a greater knowledge of scientifically-accurate  
260 information about mental health and illness is related to lower endorsements of beliefs  
261 about mental illness as a result of sin or moral laxity, as well as lower endorsements of  
262 beliefs focused on spiritually-oriented causes/treatments for mental illness.

263

264 *Insert table 4 about here*

265

266

## Discussion

267

268 The aim of the study was to translate and validate in Italian language the Religious  
269 Beliefs and Mental Illness Stigma Scale (I-RBMIS) through face validity analysis,  
270 dimensionality factorial analysis, internal consistency analysis and scale validity analysis.  
271 Face validity showed that 13 items out of 16 were completely understandable while only  
272 three items (4, 9 and 13) highlighted small lexical problems without questioning the  
273 meaning of the statements. The average compilation time was less than 4 minutes  
274 (238.75 seconds) indicating a quick understanding of the items and a good adaptation to  
275 use the evaluation system (9-point likert scale).

276           The original English questionnaire consists of two different factors (Wesselmann et  
277 al. 2015; Wesselmann & Graziano 2010): Morality/Sin and Spiritually-Oriented  
278 Causes/Treatments. The factorial analysis conducted on the Italian questionnaire  
279 replicated the patterns of item loadings found in published studies using the English  
280 version (Wesselmann et al. 2015; Wesselmann & Graziano 2010). We believe that these  
281 results are important as they demonstrate that future researchers could conduct cross-  
282 cultural studies on these beliefs and how they relate to other measures of mental illness  
283 stigma (Evans-Lacko et al. 2012; Mascayano et al. 2015). Further, the Cronbach alpha  
284 values suggest generally acceptable internal consistency, both for the two subscales and  
285 for an overall composite. These consistency levels are similar to those found in the English  
286 version.

287           In particular, thanks to the initial validation of this questionnaire, it will be possible  
288 to investigate how potentially stigmatizing religious beliefs about mental illness can be  
289 grafted onto stigmatization processes already present in literature (L. Pingani et al. 2016;  
290 Luca Pingani et al. 2012, 2016, 2019), such as the "Responsibility model" and  
291 "Dangerousness model" concerning public stigma for mental disorders. These two models  
292 are composed of cognitive (stereotypes), emotional (attitude) and behavioral parts. Future  
293 research can assess how these religious beliefs influence on these three established  
294 components.

295           Finally, the construct validity of the instrument was demonstrated by correlations  
296 between the I-RBMIS and two other stigma-related measures that have already been  
297 translated into Italian and validated: the AQ-27-I and the MAK-S-I. Specifically, potentially  
298 stigmatizing religious beliefs were related positively to secular stigmatizing beliefs In this  
299 case, therefore, as the knowledge of mental illness increases, there is a reduction of

300 stigmatizing religious beliefs toward mental illness (Evans-Lacko et al. 2010; Evans-Lacko  
301 et al. 2013). Despite the limitations illustrated, we believe that the current psychometric  
302 evidence provides support for using the Italian version of the RBMIS in research.

303         Of course, measurement validation is an ongoing process and there can always be  
304 future measurement development to address limitations. The present study has the  
305 several limitations. First, we used a convenience sample which is unlikely to be  
306 representative of the whole Italian general population. Second, we administered the  
307 questionnaires within two provinces and therefore our data cannot fully represent the  
308 cultural diversity (in particular traditions) that characterizes the Italian population. Third,  
309 the mean age of the sample is decidedly lower than that of Italian population (33.01 vs  
310 44.40) (Istituto Nazionale di Statistica 2019). Fourth, the percentage of males of the  
311 sample (38.59%) is decidedly lower than in the general Italian population (48.37%)  
312 (Istituto Nazionale di Statistica 2019). Fifth, our pilot sample used to check face validity  
313 and understandability was a convenience sample composed by of university students: due  
314 to their educational level their comprehension of the questionnaire may not fully  
315 correspond to that of the general population. Sixth, since this study protocol did not have  
316 a test-retest analysis we are unable to determine the temporal stability of responses.  
317 Seventh, the correlation between MAKS-I and the two subscales of I-RBMIS albeit  
318 statistically significant, are weak. Lastly, this study used exploratory factor analysis on the  
319 data, which is a descriptive approach rather than a confirmatory/inferential approach.  
320 However, given this study focused on translating a questionnaire into a different cultural  
321 and linguistic context, we therefore decided to use the exploratory factor analysis to check  
322 the possibility of maintaining the original two factors construct using a predefined number  
323 of factors. Future validation studies can use these data to conduct a priori power analyses

324 best suited for confirmatory approaches and further investigate the factor structure.  
325 Regardless of these limitations, we believe the I-RBMIS provides an exciting research tool  
326 for future exploration on understanding the complex connection between religious beliefs  
327 and mental health issues.

328

### 329 ***Compliance with Ethical Standards***

330

#### 331 *Conflict of interest*

332 The authors have no financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this  
333 manuscript. The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the  
334 publication of this article. The permission to translate and validate the Religious Beliefs  
335 and Mental Illness Stigma Scale was received from EDW.

336

#### 337 ***Compliance with Ethical Standards***

338 **According to the Internal Review Board, the ethical approval for this study was**  
339 **not necessary because it did not involve cases nor patients: the questionnaires**  
340 **used were administered to general population and do not produce diagnosis**  
341 **nor allow the definition of psychopathological conditions. Detailed information**  
342 **on the study was given to each participant and consent was asked also for**  
343 **processing of personal data. The authors assert that all procedures contributing**  
344 **to this work comply with the ethical standards of the relevant national and**

**institutional committees on human experimentation and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008.**

### ***Data Availability***

All data used for this study are available upon request by the corresponding author.

### ***References***

- Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- American Psychiatric Association Foundation. (2016). *Mental Health: A Guide for Faith Leaders*. Arlington: American Psychiatric Association Foundation.
- Ayvaci, E. R. (2016). Religious Barriers to Mental Healthcare. *American Journal of Psychiatry Residents' Journal*, 11(7), 11–13. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp-rj.2016.110706>
- Barnes, D. M., & Meyer, I. H. (2012). Religious affiliation, internalized homophobia, and mental health in lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals. *The American journal of orthopsychiatry*, 82(4), 505–515. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.2012.01185.x>
- Batson, C. D., Schoenrade, P., Ventis, W. L., & Batson, C. D. (1993). *Religion and the individual: a social-psychological perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Breland-Noble, A. M., Wong, M. J., Childers, T., Hankerson, S., & Sotomayor, J. (2015). Spirituality and religious coping in African American youth with depressive illness.

369       *Mental health, religion & culture*, 18(5), 330–341.  
 370       <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2015.1056120>

371   Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale  
 372       development. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 309–319.  
 373       <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.309>

374   Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A First Course in Factor Analysis*. New Jersey: Lawrence  
 375       Erlbaum Associates.

376   Cook, C. C. H., Goddard, D., & Westall, R. (1997). Knowledge and experience of drug use  
 377       amongst church affiliated young people. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 46(1–2),  
 378       9–17. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-8716\(97\)00036-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-8716(97)00036-7)

379   Corrigan, P., Rowan, D., Green, A., Lundin, R., River, P., Uphoff-Wasowski, K., et al.  
 380       (2002). Challenging two mental illness stigmas: personal responsibility and  
 381       dangerousness. *Schizophr Bull*, 28(2), 293–309.  
 382       [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12693435)  
 383       [Citation&list\\_uids=12693435](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12693435)

384   Corrigan, P. W. (2000). Mental Health Stigma as Social Attribution: Implications for  
 385       Research Methods and Attitude Change. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*,  
 386       7(1), 48–67. <https://doi.org/10.1093/clipsy.7.1.48>

387   Dowd, T., & Nielson, S. (2006). *The psychologies in religion: Working with the religious*  
 388       *client*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

389   Evans-Lacko, S., Brohan, E., Mojtabai, R., & Thornicroft, G. (2012). Association between  
 390       public views of mental illness and self-stigma among individuals with mental illness  
 391       in 14 European countries. *Psychol Med*, 42(8), 1741–52.  
 392       <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291711002558>

393 Evans-Lacko, S., Little, K., Meltzer, H., Rose, D., Rhydderch, D., Henderson, C., &  
 394 Thornicroft, G. (2010). Development and psychometric properties of the Mental  
 395 Health Knowledge Schedule. *Can J Psychiatry*, 55(7), 440–8.  
 396 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20704771>  
 397 Evans-Lacko, Sara, Henderson, C., & Thornicroft, G. (2013). Public knowledge, attitudes  
 398 and behaviour regarding people with mental illness in England 2009-2012. *The*  
 399 *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 202(s55), s51.  
 400 <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.112.112979>  
 401 Flannelly, K. J. (2017). *Belief in Divine Forgiveness, Evil, and Biblical Literalism and Mental*  
 402 *Health. Religious Beliefs, Evolutionary Psychiatry, and Mental Health in America.*  
 403 New York: Springer Publishing Company.  
 404 Hackney, C. H., & Sanders, G. S. (2003). Religiosity and Mental Health: A Meta-Analysis of  
 405 Recent Studies. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 42(1), 43–56.  
 406 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1387984>  
 407 Istituto Nazionale di Statistica. (2019, October 30). Indicatori demografici al 01/01/2019.  
 408 [http://dati.istat.it/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=DCIS\\_INDDEMOG1](http://dati.istat.it/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=DCIS_INDDEMOG1)  
 409 Kaiser, H. (1974). An index of factor simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 31–36.  
 410 Koenig, H. G. (Ed.). (1998). *Handbook of religion and mental health*. San Diego: Academic  
 411 Press.  
 412 Koenig, H. G. (2009). Research on religion, spirituality, and mental health: a review.  
 413 *Canadian journal of psychiatry. Revue canadienne de psychiatrie*, 54(5), 283–291.  
 414 <https://doi.org/10.1177/070674370905400502>  
 415 Koenig, H. G. (2012). Religion, spirituality, and health: the research and clinical  
 416 implications. *ISRN psychiatry*, 2012, 278730. <https://doi.org/10.5402/2012/278730>

- 417 Koenig, H., King, D., & Carson, V. (2012). *Handbook of Religion and Health*. Oxford:  
418 Oxford University Press.
- 419 Kovess-Masfety, V., Saha, S., Lim, C. C. W., Aguilar-Gaxiola, S., Al-Hamzawi, A., Alonso,  
420 J., et al. (2018). Psychotic experiences and religiosity: data from the WHO World  
421 Mental Health Surveys. *Acta psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 137(4), 306–315.  
422 <https://doi.org/10.1111/acps.12859>
- 423 Laythe, B., Finkel, D. G., Bringle, R. G., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2002). Religious  
424 Fundamentalism as a Predictor of Prejudice: A Two-Component Model. *Journal for*  
425 *the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41(4), 623–635. [https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-](https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5906.00142)  
426 5906.00142
- 427 Laythe, B., Finkel, D., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2001). Predicting Prejudice from Religious  
428 Fundamentalism and Right-Wing Authoritarianism: A Multiple-Regression Approach.  
429 *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 40(1), 1–10.  
430 <https://doi.org/10.1111/0021-8294.00033>
- 431 Mannarini, S., Boffo, M., Rossi, A., & Balottin, L. (2018). Etiological beliefs, treatments,  
432 stigmatizing attitudes toward schizophrenia. What do Italians and Israelis think?  
433 *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(JAN). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02289>
- 434 Mascayano, F., Armijo, J. E., & Yang, L. H. (2015). Addressing Stigma Relating to Mental  
435 Illness in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 6.  
436 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00038>
- 437 Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 438 Pargament, K. I. (1997). *The psychology of religion and coping: theory, research, practice*  
439 (3. [Dr.]). New York: Guilford Press.

440 Peteet, J. R. (2019). Approaching Religiously Reinforced Mental Health Stigma: A  
 441 Conceptual Framework. *Psychiatric Services*, 70(9), 846–848.  
 442 <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201900005>

443 Pingani, L., Evans-Lacko, S., Luciano, M., Del Vecchio, V., Ferrari, S., Sampogna, G., et al.  
 444 (2016). Psychometric validation of the Italian version of the Reported and Intended  
 445 Behaviour Scale (RIBS). *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci*, 25(5), 485–492.  
 446 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2045796015000633>

447 Pingani, Luca, Catellani, S., Del Vecchio, V., Sampogna, G., Ellefson, S. E., Rigatelli, M., et  
 448 al. (2016). Stigma in the context of schools: Analysis of the phenomenon of stigma  
 449 in a population of university students. *BMC Psychiatry*, 16.  
 450 [http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psych&AN=2016-07410-](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psych&AN=2016-07410-001&site=ehost-live&scope=site)  
 451 [001&site=ehost-live&scope=site](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psych&AN=2016-07410-001&site=ehost-live&scope=site)

452 Pingani, Luca, Forghieri, M., Ferrari, S., Ben-Zeev, D., Artoni, P., Mazzi, F., et al. (2012).  
 453 Stigma and discrimination toward mental illness: translation and validation of the  
 454 Italian version of the Attribution Questionnaire-27 (AQ-27-I). *Social psychiatry and*  
 455 *psychiatric epidemiology*, 47(6), 993–999. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-011-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-011-0407-3)  
 456 [0407-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-011-0407-3)

457 Pingani, Luca, Sampogna, G., Evans.Lacko, S., Gozzi, B., Giallonardo, V., Luciano, M., et  
 458 al. (2019). How to Measure Knowledge About Mental Disorders? Validation of the  
 459 Italian Version of the MAKs. *Community Mental Health Journal*.  
 460 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-019-00416-6>

461 Rosmarin, D. H., Moreira-Almeida, A., & Koenig, H. (2018). Religion and psychotic  
 462 experiences. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 138(2), 173–173.  
 463 <https://doi.org/10.1111/acps.12917>

- Rowatt, W. C., & Franklin, L. M. (2004). Christian Orthodoxy, Religious Fundamentalism, and Right-Wing Authoritarianism as Predictors of Implicit Racial Prejudice. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 14(2), 125–138. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327582ijpr1402\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327582ijpr1402_4)
- Snedecor, G. W., & Cochran, W. G. (1989). *Statistical Methods*. Iowa City: Iowa State University Press.
- Van Praag, H. (n.d.). The role of religion in suicide prevention. In *Oxford Textbook of Suicidology and Suicide Prevention*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ventriglio, A., Bonfitto, I., Ricci, F., Cuoco, F., & Bhavsar, V. (2018). Delusion, possession and religion(dagger). *Nordic journal of psychiatry*, 72(sup1), S13–S15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08039488.2018.1525639>
- Wamser, R., Vandenberg, B., & Hibberd, R. (2011). Religious Fundamentalism, Religious Coping, and Preference for Psychological and Religious Treatment. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 21(3), 228–236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508619.2011.581582>
- Wesselmann, E. D., Day, M., Graziano, W. G., & Doherty, E. F. (2015). Religious beliefs about mental illness influence social support preferences. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 43(3), 165–174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10852352.2014.973275>
- Wesselmann, E. D., & Graziano, W. G. (2010). Sinful and/or possessed? Religious beliefs and mental illness stigma. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 29(4), 402–437. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2010.29.4.402>

- 486 Yelderman, L. A. (2018). Cognitive rigidity explains the relationship between religious  
487 fundamentalism and insanity defence attitudes. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*,  
488 *21*(7), 686–697. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2018.1551340>
- 489 Zoppei, S., & Lasalvia, A. (2011). Anti stigma campaigns: really useful and effective? A  
490 critical review of the anti-stigma initiatives conducted in Italy. *Rivista Di Psichiatria*,  
491 *46*(4), 242–249.
- 492

**Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of the sample and rating scales scores.**

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
<i>Age</i>	33.01	±15.14	18	82
<i>I-RBMIS Total score</i>	27.66	±12.55	16	101
<i>I-RBMIS Morality/Sin</i>	14.17	±7.21	9	58
<i>I-RBMIS Spiritually - Oriented Causes/Treatments</i>	13.49	±7.33	7	43
<i>MAKS-I Total score</i>	20.78	±2.43	10	29
<i>AQ-27-I</i>	102.08	±25.40	49	172

  

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Sex</i>		
Male	120	38.59
Female	191	61.41
<i>Civil status</i>		
Unmarried	208	66.88
Married	89	28.61
Separated / Divorced	10	3.22
Widow / Widower	4	1.29
<i>Citizenship</i>		
EU	303	97.43
non-EU	8	2.57
<i>Highest level of education</i>		
Primary school diploma	2	0.65
Middle school diploma	24	7.72
High school graduation	191	61.41
Bachelor's degree	91	29.26
<i>Religious affiliation</i>		
Christian	216	69.45%
Agnostic	39	12.54%
Atheist	56	18.01%

*I-RBMIS: Italian version of the Religious Beliefs and Mental Illness Stigma Scale*

*MAKS-I: Italian version of Mental Health Knowledge Schedule*

*AQ-27-I: Italian version of Attribution Questionnaire 27*

*EU: European Union*

**Table 2. Frequencies and percentage related to the answers given to each item**

	1 Strongly Disagree		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9 Strongly Agree	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
<i>Item 1 Compared to a minister / pastor, a counselor / therapist would be much better at helping a person suffering from a mental illness. *Δ</i>	164	52.73	52	16.72	43	13.83	22	7.07	19	6.11	2	0.64	2	0.64	4	1.29	3	0.96
<i>Item 2 God's healing is all a person suffering from a mental illness needs—nothing else should be relied on.</i>	224	72.03	37	11.90	23	7.40	11	3.54	12	3.86	1	0.32	2	0.64	0	0.00	1	0.32
<i>Item 3 Persons suffering from mental illness are being tormented by the Devil.</i>	244	78.46	35	11.25	9	2.89	5	1.61	8	2.57	3	0.96	3	0.96	2	0.64	2	0.64
<i>Item 4 People suffering from mental illness are not going to their place of worship enough.</i>	238	76.53	35	11.25	12	3.86	7	2.25	10	3.22	5	1.61	1	0.32	0	0.00	3	0.96
<i>Item 5 It is superstitious to believe a person suffering from mental illness is possessed by demons. *Δ</i>	193	62.06	32	10.29	21	6.75	7	2.25	8	2.57	5	1.61	7	2.25	4	1.29	34	10.93
<i>Item 6 Mental illnesses should be healed by having people pray over the afflicted person.</i>	176	56.59	62	19.94	23	7.40	14	4.50	20	6.43	7	2.25	4	1.29	1	0.32	4	1.29
<i>Item 7 A person's relationship with God has nothing to do with their suffering from a mental illness. Δ</i>	275	88.42	23	7.40	4	1.29	2	0.64	5	1.61	1	0.32	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.32
<i>Item 8 Prayer is not the only way to fix a mental illness. Δ</i>	256	82.32	28	9.00	11	3.54	4	1.29	7	2.25	1	0.32	2	0.64	0	0.00	2	0.64
<i>Item 9 Demons are not responsible for causing the symptoms of mental illness. * Δ</i>	214	68.81	36	11.58	13	4.18	2	0.64	9	2.89	8	2.57	1	0.32	6	1.93	22	7.07
<i>Item 10 Mental illnesses result from an immoral or sinful lifestyle.</i>	231	74.28	38	12.22	12	3.86	9	2.89	10	3.22	7	2.25	3	0.96	1	0.32	0	0.00
<i>Item 11 A person suffering from a mental illness is not praying enough.</i>	267	85.85	31	9.97	4	1.29	3	0.96	3	0.96	2	0.64	1	0.32	0	0.00	0	0.00
<i>Item 12 People suffer from mental illnesses because they are not sorry for their sins.</i>	263	84.57	28	9.00	9	2.89	2	0.64	3	0.96	4	1.29	2	0.64	0	0.00	0	0.00
<i>Item 13 Mental illnesses are a result of Original Sin.</i>	269	86.50	26	8.36	4	1.29	4	1.29	3	0.96	0	0.00	1	0.32	0	0.00	4	1.29
<i>Item 14 Moral weakness is the main cause of mental illness.</i>	178	57.23	37	11.90	14	4.50	8	2.57	25	8.04	24	7.72	17	5.47	6	1.93	2	0.64
<i>Item 15 A person suffering from mental illness is not relying on their faith like they should.</i>	221	71.06	38	12.22	22	7.07	10	3.22	6	1.93	10	3.22	3	0.96	0	0.00	1	0.32
<i>Item 16 People have mental illnesses because someone else sinned against them.</i>	242	77.81	17	5.47	13	4.18	7	2.25	15	4.82	4	1.29	11	3.54	1	0.32	1	0.32

\* Reverse score in the Italian version

Δ Reverse score in English version

**Table 3. Factor loading of the two factors: Morality/Sin and Spiritually-Oriented Causes/Treatments**

	Morality/Sin	Spiritually-Oriented Causes/Treatments
Item 1 *	-0.37	0.48
Item 2	-0.27	0.55
Item 3	-0.16	0.61
Item 4	0.53	0.08
Item 5 *	-0.40	0.42
Item 6	-0.14	0.63
Item 7	0.46	0.25
Item 8	-0.23	0.66
Item 9 *	-0.20	0.42
Item 10	0.76	0.53
Item 11	0.63	0.27
Item 12	0.67	0.54
Item 13	0.40	-0.10
Item 14	0.49	0.38
Item 15	0.56	0.23
Item 16	0.48	0.25

\* Reverse score in Italian version

**Table 4. Correlations between the Italian versions of the Religious Beliefs and Mental Illness Stigma Scale, the Attribution Questionnaire 27 and the Mental Health Knowledge Schedule's score**

	<i>I-RBMIS Morality/Sin</i>	<i>I-RBMIS Spiritually - Oriented Causes/ Treatments</i>	<i>MAKS-I Total score</i>	<i>AQ-27-I</i>
<i>I-RBMIS Total score</i>	$r = 0.86$ $p < 0.001$	$r = 0.87$ $p < 0.001$	$r = -0.11$ $p = 0.04$	$r = 0.26$ $p < 0.001$
<i>I-RBMIS Morality/Sin</i>		$r = 0.50$ $p < 0.001$	$r = -0.12$ $p = 0.03$	$r = 0.32$ $p < 0.001$
<i>I-RBMIS Spiritually - Oriented Causes/ Treatments</i>			$r = -0.07$ $p = 0.22$	$r = 0.26$ $p < 0.001$
<i>MAKS-I Total score</i>				$r = -0.16$ $p = 0.004$
<i>AQ-27-I</i>				

*I-RBMIS: Italian version of the Religious Beliefs and Mental Illness Stigma Scale*

*MAKS-I: Italian version of Mental Health Knowledge Schedule*

*AQ-27-I: Italian version of Attribution Questionnaire 27*