Supplementary Material 1

Table S1

Item-Level Descriptive Statistics in the Development Sample (n = 533)

Item	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum	Skewness	Kurtosis
X1	2.99	1.04	1	5	−0.02	−0.19
X2	3.03	1.02	1	5	−0.17	−0.15
X3	2.84	1.05	1	5	0.07	−0.24
X4	3.28	1.00	1	5	−0.30	−0.11
X5	3.22	0.93	1	5	−0.10	0.18
X6	3.26	0.96	1	5	−0.17	0.07
X7	3.22	0.92	1	5	0.07	0.05
X8	3.06	1.01	1	5	−0.06	−0.21
X9	3.04	1.00	1	5	−0.05	−0.24
X10	3.57	0.98	1	5	−0.32	−0.18
X11	3.30	0.88	1	5	−0.09	0.24
X12	3.07	0.97	1	5	−0.05	−0.01
X13	3.33	0.91	1	5	0.08	−0.06
X14	3.20	0.92	1	5	−0.06	0.19
X15	3.24	0.91	1	5	−0.05	0.22
X16	3.27	0.94	1	5	−0.13	0.15
X17	3.18	0.96	1	5	−0.17	0.08
X18	3.16	1.04	1	5	−0.08	−0.27
X19	3.28	0.96	1	5	−0.06	0.05
X20	3.60	1.06	1	5	−0.33	−0.38

Note. *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation. All items used the complete five-category response range. The reported values correspond to the development subsample.

Table S2

Empirical Verification of Reverse-Keyed Item Direction

Item	Corrected item–rest correlation	Minimum correlation with another item
X5	.512	.262
X10	.504	.206
X13	.454	.170
X20	.323	.023

Note. X5, X10, X13, and X20 were positively worded in the administered instrument and had been reverse-coded before analysis so that higher scores consistently reflected greater disability-related stigma. All item–rest correlations and the minimum observed inter-item correlations were positive after recoding.

Table S3

Empirical Comparison of Responses to Items X12 and X14

Indicator	Value
Correlation between X12 and X14	.553
Proportion of exactly identical responses	.557
Mean absolute difference |X12 − X14|	.557

Note. This diagnostic analysis was conducted because the manuscript-development documentation raised the possibility that X12 and X14 could represent duplicated items. The response patterns demonstrate that the two variables were not identical in the analytic dataset. Their correlation was moderate rather than perfect, and responses differed in 44.3% of cases.

Table S4

Assessment of Factorability of the Polychoric Correlation Matrix

Statistic	Value
Overall KMO	.938
Minimum item-level KMO	.772
Maximum item-level KMO	.968
Bartlett's χ^2	7,323.86
Bartlett's df	190

Statistic	Value
Bartlett's *p*	< .001
Correlation-matrix determinant	8.624×10^{-7}
Condition number	60.38

Note. KMO = Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy. Bartlett's test rejected the null hypothesis that the correlation matrix was an identity matrix.

Table S5

Parallel Analysis Based on Polychoric Correlations

Component/Factor	Empirical eigenvalue	95th-percentile simulated eigenvalue	Difference	Retained by parallel analysis
1	10.088	1.467	8.621	Yes
2	1.828	1.377	0.451	Yes
3	1.153	1.316	−0.163	No
4	0.953	1.267	−0.314	No
5	0.675	1.222	−0.547	No
6	0.579	1.180	−0.601	No
7	0.525	1.138	−0.612	No
8	0.504	1.100	−0.596	No
9	0.434	1.066	−0.632	No
10	0.421	1.031	−0.610	No

Note. Retention was indicated when the empirical eigenvalue exceeded the corresponding 95th-percentile eigenvalue obtained from simulated data. Parallel analysis therefore favored two factors. Factor retention in the principal analysis also considered model fit, residuals, theoretical coherence, and interpretability.

Table S6

Comparison of Two-, Three-, and Four-Factor Exploratory Solutions

Exploratory solution	Variance explained	RMSR	RMSEA	TLI	BIC
Two factors	.551	.037	.112	.822	208.33

Exploratory solution	Variance explained	RMSR	RMSEA	TLI	BIC
Three factors	.590	.028	.100	.856	14.10
Four factors	**.626**	**.018**	**.079**	**.910**	**−223.20**

Note. All exploratory solutions were estimated from the polychoric correlation matrix using MINRES extraction and oblique rotation. RMSR = root mean square residual; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index; BIC = Bayesian information criterion. Smaller RMSR, RMSEA, and BIC values and larger TLI values indicate comparatively better fit. Although parallel analysis favored two factors, the four-factor solution showed the strongest relative fit across all reported indices.

Table S7

Sensitivity of the Four-Factor Exploratory Solution to Items With Factorial Complexity

Exploratory model	Variance explained	RMSR	RMSEA	TLI	BIC
Four factors, 20 items	.626	.018	.079	.910	−223.20
Four factors, excluding X11	.625	.017	.073	.925	**−244.76**
Four factors, excluding X11 and X14	.626	.017	.070	.933	−230.08

Note. X11 and X14 were examined because the exploratory pattern matrix indicated comparatively greater factorial complexity. Removal reduced RMSEA and increased TLI, but did not materially increase explained variance. Consequently, these analyses were treated as sensitivity analyses rather than as an automatic basis for item deletion.

Table S8

Sensitivity Analysis Comparing the Four-Factor and Three-Factor Empirical CFA Models

Model	χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
Four empirical factors (M5)	**902.79**	164	**.935**	**.924**	**.092**	**.051**
Three empirical factors: EF1 and EF2 combined (M7)	988.61	167	.927	.917	.096	.053

Note. Models were estimated in the independent confirmatory subsample (n = 532) using WLSMV. The nested-model comparison favored M5, $\Delta\chi^2(3)=76.71$, $p<.001$. The three-factor model combined the two empirical dimensions that exhibited the strongest latent association.

Table S9

Sensitivity Analysis for Removal of Item X20

Model	χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
M5, 20 items	902.79	164	.935	.924	.092	.051
M5 without X20, 19 items	809.90	146	.941	.931	.093	.048

Note. X20 displayed the smallest standardized loading in the selected empirical model. Removing X20 produced modest increases in CFI and TLI and a modest reduction in SRMR, while RMSEA was essentially unchanged. Because the overall structural interpretation did not materially change, X20 was retained in the primary model pending replication in an independent sample.

Table S10

Fit of the Selected Empirical Four-Factor Model Re-Estimated in the Full Sample (N = 1,065)

Fit statistic	Value
Scaled χ^2	1,783.25
df	164
CFI	.930
TLI	.918
RMSEA	.096
SRMR	.047

Note. The selected model was derived in the development subsample and evaluated in the independent confirmatory subsample before re-estimation in the total sample. Full-sample estimation was performed to obtain more precise final parameter estimates and was not interpreted as an additional independent confirmation.

Table S11

Latent Factor Correlations for the Empirical Four-Factor Model Re-Estimated in the Full Sample (N = 1,065)

Factor	EF1	EF2	EF3	EF4
EF1	1.000			
EF2	.894	1.000		

Factor	EF1	EF2	EF3	EF4
EF3	.811	.815	1.000	
EF4	.597	.562	.545	1.000

Note. EF1=MR1, EF2=MR4, EF3=MR3, and EF4=MR2 in the original R output. The EF1–EF2 correlation was notably high, consistent with the corresponding HTMT result and indicating incomplete empirical differentiation between these dimensions.

Table S12

Heterotrait–Monotrait Ratios Among the Empirical Factors in the Confirmatory Sample (n = 532)

Factor	EF1	EF2	EF3	EF4
EF1	—			
EF2	**.924**	—		
EF3	.832	.836	—	
EF4	.578	.554	.529	—

Note. HTMT = heterotrait–monotrait ratio of correlations. EF1=MR1, EF2=MR4, EF3=MR3, and EF4=MR2 in the R output. The EF1–EF2 coefficient exceeded .90, whereas all remaining coefficients were below .90. Therefore, evidence of empirical differentiation was satisfactory for most factor pairs but not for EF1 and EF2.

Table S13

Internal Consistency, Composite Reliability, and Average Variance Extracted in the Confirmatory Sample (n = 532)

Factor	No. of items	Cronbach's α	Ordinal α	AVE	CR
EF1	7	.881	.901	.573	.904
EF2	5	.873	.894	.652	.904
EF3	4	.808	.836	.571	.842
EF4	4	.739	.777	.469	.776

Note. EF1=MR1, EF2=MR4, EF3=MR3, and EF4=MR2 in the original output. AVE = average variance extracted; CR = composite reliability. AVE exceeded .50 for EF1–EF3 but was .469 for EF4.

Table S14

Measurement Invariance Across Sex for the Empirical Four-Factor Model

Model	χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR	ΔCFI	ΔRMSEA
Configural	1,115.28	368	.937	.935	.088	.058	—	—
Metric	1,084.15	384	.941	.941	.083	.058	+.004	−.005
Scalar specification[a]	1,084.15	384	.941	.941	.083	.058	.000	.000

Note. Models were estimated for women and men using the ordinal empirical four-factor structure. CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual. Changes in CFI and RMSEA are relative to the immediately preceding model. The robust scaled χ^2 difference test comparing the configural and metric models was not statistically significant, $\Delta\chi^2(16)=18.25$, $p=.310$, and the changes in approximate fit were small (ΔCFI=+.004; ΔRMSEA=−.005), supporting **metric invariance across sex**.

[a]The nominal scalar specification produced exactly the same degrees of freedom and fit indices as the metric model and therefore did not impose a distinguishable additional set of restrictions. Consequently, **scalar invariance was not considered independently established**, and no inference regarding latent mean comparability was based on this model.

Table S15

Alternative Exploratory Factor Solutions in the Development Sample (n = 533)

Panel A. Two-factor exploratory solution

Item	EF1	EF2	h^2	Complexity
X1	**.661**	−.018	.423	1.002
X2	**.602**	.031	.385	1.005
X3	**.852**	−.156	.595	1.067
X4	**.479**	.289	.474	1.644
X5	.116	**.609**	.466	1.072
X6	**.679**	.122	.572	1.064
X7	**.701**	.097	.580	1.038
X8	**.889**	−.152	.657	1.058
X9	**.850**	−.098	.635	1.026
X10	.005	**.770**	.597	1.000
X11	**.682**	.184	.646	1.145

Item	EF1	EF2	h²	Complexity
X12	**.838**	−.095	.618	1.026
X13	.061	**.609**	.418	1.020
X14	**.777**	−.007	.598	1.000
X15	**.764**	.044	.624	1.007
X16	**.662**	.090	.516	1.037
X17	**.784**	−.021	.595	1.001
X18	**.730**	−.022	.515	1.002
X19	**.638**	.173	.565	1.146
X20	−.242	**.843**	.532	1.164

Note. Values are pattern coefficients obtained using minimum residual extraction and oblique rotation based on the polychoric correlation matrix. Boldface identifies the largest absolute loading for each item. h^2 = communality.

Panel B. Three-factor exploratory solution

Item	EF1	EF2	EF3	h²	Complexity
X1	.159	**.609**	−.057	.501	1.155
X2	−.040	**.782**	−.020	.554	1.007
X3	.374	**.571**	−.184	.646	1.966
X4	−.125	**.741**	.254	.635	1.294
X5	.029	.167	**.572**	.467	1.174
X6	.318	**.447**	.098	.592	1.921
X7	.387	**.389**	.079	.588	2.082
X8	**.643**	.285	−.147	.651	1.495
X9	**.666**	.219	−.094	.633	1.258
X10	−.083	.183	**.723**	.601	1.155
X11	**.502**	.244	.168	.643	1.702
X12	**.731**	.131	−.087	.625	1.093

Item	EF1	EF2	EF3	h²	Complexity
X13	.301	−.227	**.617**	.482	1.753
X14	**.759**	.039	.001	.622	1.005
X15	**.763**	.025	.048	.652	1.010
X16	**.622**	.073	.087	.528	1.067
X17	**.852**	−.055	−.013	.649	1.009
X18	**.849**	−.112	−.012	.583	1.036
X19	**.771**	−.118	.181	.629	1.158
X20	−.138	−.031	**.792**	.519	1.064

Note. Values are pattern coefficients obtained using minimum residual extraction and oblique rotation based on the polychoric correlation matrix. Boldface identifies the largest absolute loading for each item. X7 showed nearly equivalent loadings on EF1 (.387) and EF2 (.389), indicating marked factorial ambiguity in the three-factor solution.

Panel C. Comparative fit of the two-, three-, and four-factor exploratory solutions

Solution	Variance explained	RMSR	RMSEA	TLI	BIC
Two factors	.551	.037	.112	.822	208.33
Three factors	.590	.028	.100	.856	14.10
Four factors	**.626**	**.018**	**.079**	**.910**	**−223.20**

Note. RMSR = root mean square residual; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index; BIC = Bayesian information criterion. Smaller RMSR, RMSEA, and BIC and larger TLI indicate comparatively better fit. Parallel analysis favored two factors; however, the four-factor solution provided substantially better relative fit and greater explained variance. The four-factor solution was therefore evaluated further, while the discrepancy among retention criteria was retained explicitly in interpretation.

Table S16

Item Content, Original Theoretical Domain, Scoring Direction, and Empirical Factor Allocation

Item	Original theoretical dimensión	Scoring	Empirical factor
X1	Economic incapacity stigma	Direct	EF3

Item	Original theoretical dimensión	Scoring	Empirical factor
X2	Economic incapacity stigma	Direct	EF3
X3	Economic incapacity stigma	Direct	EF3
X4	Economic incapacity stigma	Direct	EF3
X5	Economic incapacity stigma	**Reverse**	EF4
X6	Dependence and weakness stigma	Direct	EF2
X7	Dependence and weakness stigma	Direct	EF2
X8	Dependence and weakness stigma	Direct	EF2
X9	Dependence and weakness stigma	Direct	EF2
X10	Dependence and weakness stigma	**Reverse**	EF4
X11	Family and personal incapacity stigma	Direct	EF1
X12	Family and personal incapacity stigma	Direct	EF2
X13	Family and personal incapacity stigma	**Reverse**	EF4
X14	Family and personal incapacity stigma	Direct	EF1
X15	Family and personal incapacity stigma	Direct	EF1
X16	Work and educational incapacity stigma	Direct	EF1
X17	Work and educational incapacity stigma	Direct	EF1
X18	Work and educational incapacity stigma	Direct	EF1
X19	Work and educational incapacity stigma	Direct	EF1
X20	Work and educational incapacity stigma	**Reverse**	EF4

Note. EF1–EF4 refer to the empirically derived four-factor solution. Reverse-keyed items were X5, X10, X13, and X20. Responses to these items were recoded before psychometric analysis so that higher scores consistently indicated greater endorsement of disability-related stigma. The empirical allocation differs from the original theoretically proposed domains; therefore, the theoretical and empirical classifications should not be treated as interchangeable.

Supplementary Appendix A

Spanish-Language Instrument as Administered

Escala de Estigma hacia Personas con Discapacidad en la Población Adulta

Instrucciones

A continuación, encontrarás una serie de afirmaciones relacionadas con las personas con discapacidad. Lee cada afirmación y señala con qué frecuencia estás de acuerdo con ella.

Escala de respuesta

1 = Nunca
2 = Casi nunca
3 = A veces
4 = Casi siempre
5 = Siempre

Dimensión teórica 1. Estigma de incapacidad económica

Productividad económica percibida

X1. Considero que las personas con discapacidad presentan mayores dificultades para alcanzar niveles altos de productividad laboral.

X2. Percibo que el desempeño económico de las personas con discapacidad suele ser inferior al de otros trabajadores.

Generación de ingresos

X3. Creo que la contratación de personas con discapacidad puede implicar mayores costos para las empresas.

X4. Considero que, debido a su condición, muchas personas con discapacidad enfrentan dificultades para sostenerse económicamente de manera independiente.

Aporte organizacional

X5. Las personas con discapacidad pueden aportar valor económico significativo a una organización. **[Reverse-keyed]**

Dimensión teórica 2. Estigma de dependencia y debilidad

Dependencia percibida

X6. Considero que las personas con discapacidad requieren apoyo frecuente para desenvolverse en su vida diaria.

X7. Percibo que muchas personas con discapacidad dependen en mayor medida de otras personas para su funcionamiento cotidiano.

Autonomía en la toma de decisiones

X8. Creo que las personas con discapacidad enfrentan dificultades para tomar decisiones importantes por sí mismas.

X9. Considero que administrar recursos económicos puede resultar más complejo para una persona con discapacidad.

X10. Con apoyos adecuados, las personas con discapacidad pueden desenvolverse de forma autónoma. **[Reverse-keyed]**

Dimensión teórica 3. Estigma de incapacidad familiar y personal

Roles parentales

X11. Considero que ejercer la crianza puede representar mayores desafíos para una persona con discapacidad.

X12. Creo que la discapacidad puede dificultar el establecimiento de vínculos parentales adecuados.

Vida personal y afectiva

X13. Las personas con discapacidad pueden mantener relaciones de pareja estables y satisfactorias. **[Reverse-keyed]**

Participación y autoridad familiar

X14. Considero que la administración de la economía del hogar puede resultar más compleja para una persona con discapacidad.

X15. Percibo que asumir responsabilidades familiares exigentes puede representar mayores dificultades para una persona con discapacidad.

Dimensión teórica 4. Estigma de incapacidad laboral y educativa

Competencia laboral percibida

X16. Considero que las personas con discapacidad enfrentan mayores obstáculos para desarrollarse profesionalmente al mismo nivel que otras personas.

X17. Percibo que asumir roles de liderazgo puede resultar más desafiante para una persona con discapacidad.

X18. Creo que, en promedio, las personas con discapacidad presentan menor competencia laboral que otras personas.

Capacidad académica percibida

X19. Considero que los estudiantes con discapacidad pueden enfrentar mayores dificultades para responder a exigencias académicas altas.

Autonomía educativa y profesional

X20. Las personas con discapacidad tienen la misma capacidad para decidir sobre su educación y carrera profesional que cualquier otra persona. **[Reverse-keyed]**

Supplementary Appendix B

English Reporting Translation of the Spanish-Language Instrument

Stigma Toward People With Disabilities Scale for the Adult Population

Instructions

The following statements concern people with disabilities. Please read each statement and indicate how often you agree with it.

Response options

1 = Never
2 = Almost never
3 = Sometimes
4 = Almost always
5 = Always

Theoretical Dimension 1. Economic Incapacity Stigma

Perceived economic productivity

X1. I consider that people with disabilities experience greater difficulty achieving high levels of work productivity.

X2. I perceive that the economic performance of people with disabilities tends to be lower than that of other workers.

Income generation

X3. I believe that employing people with disabilities may involve greater costs for organizations.

X4. I consider that, because of their disability, many people with disabilities experience difficulty supporting themselves financially and independently.

Organizational contribution

X5. People with disabilities can make a significant economic contribution to an organization. **[Reverse-keyed]**

Theoretical Dimension 2. Dependence and Weakness Stigma

Perceived dependence

X6. I consider that people with disabilities require frequent support to manage their daily lives.

X7. I perceive that many people with disabilities depend more heavily on other people in their everyday functioning.

Autonomy in decision-making

X8. I believe that people with disabilities experience difficulty making important decisions on their own.

X9. I consider that managing financial resources may be more difficult for a person with a disability.

X10. With appropriate support, people with disabilities can function autonomously. **[Reverse-keyed]**

Theoretical Dimension 3. Family and Personal Incapacity Stigma

Parenting roles

X11. I consider that parenting may present greater challenges for a person with a disability.

X12. I believe that disability may make it more difficult to establish appropriate parent–child relationships.

Personal and intimate relationships

X13. People with disabilities can maintain stable and satisfying romantic relationships. **[Reverse-keyed]**

Family participation and responsibility

X14. I consider that managing household finances may be more difficult for a person with a disability.

X15. I perceive that assuming demanding family responsibilities may present greater difficulties for a person with a disability.

Theoretical Dimension 4. Work and Educational Incapacity Stigma

Perceived occupational competence

X16. I consider that people with disabilities face greater barriers to developing professionally at the same level as other people.

X17. I perceive that assuming leadership roles may be more challenging for a person with a disability.

X18. I believe that, on average, people with disabilities show lower occupational competence than other people.

Perceived academic capacity

X19. I consider that students with disabilities may experience greater difficulty meeting high academic demands.

Educational and occupational autonomy

X20. People with disabilities have the same capacity as anyone else to make decisions about their education and professional career. **[Reverse-keyed]**

Note. This English wording is provided solely to facilitate international reporting and interpretation of the instrument. The scale was developed, reviewed, administered, and psychometrically evaluated in Spanish. The English translation has **not** undergone independent linguistic adaptation or psychometric validation and should therefore not be treated as a validated English-language version.

Supplementary Appendix C

Scoring Key

Directly scored items

X1, X2, X3, X4, X6, X7, X8, X9, X11, X12, X14, X15, X16, X17, X18, and X19.

Reverse-keyed items

X5, X10, X13, and X20.

Original response	Recoded score
1	5
2	4
3	3
4	2
5	1

After recoding, **higher scores consistently indicate greater endorsement of disability-related stigma**.