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Abstract This study presents the development and initial psychometric evaluation of the Religious Discrimination Scale (RDS). This 11-item instrument identified three dimensions based on perceived discrimination experiences of members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS): Perceived Prejudice, Closet Symptoms, and Negative Labels. The psychometric evaluations of the RDS indicated a strong and clear factor structure as well as good internal consistency reliability. The test of measurement and structural invariance across gender also suggested that the RDS scale is equally appropriate

---

¹ Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education, McKay School of Education, 273 MCKB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602, USA
² Department of Clinical Psychology, Fuller Theological Seminary, 180 N. Oakland Ave, Pasadena, CA 91101, USA
³ Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education, McKay School of Education, 340 MCKB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602, USA
⁴ Department of Educational, School and Counseling Psychology, University of Missouri, Columbia, USA

Published online: 28 April 2018
to be used with both men and women. Implications for practice and research as well as future directions are discussed.
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Introduction

Current research on discrimination often defines it as the unjust treatment or action toward a person belonging to a different category, specifically minority groups (Woodford et al. 2014). Studies have addressed various forms of discrimination including: overt, interpersonal, subtle, and witnessing (Woodford et al. 2014; Jones et al. 2016). Overwhelmingly, the research on discrimination provides evidence that individuals who perceive discrimination or are discriminated against suffer negative psychological effects related to the discrimination (Thijs and Piscoi 2016). Some of these negative effects are: higher levels of psychological distress (Ajrouch et al. 2010), increased odds of major depressive disorder or depressive symptoms in general (Molina and James 2016; Rosenthal et al. 2015), decreased social competence (Myrick and Martorell 2011), raised daily cortisol levels (Huynh et al. 2016), increased risk of lifetime alcohol use disorders (Molina et al. 2016), and increased anxiety symptoms (Rosenthal et al. 2015). These findings have been discovered in a variety of populations.

Research on discrimination among diverse and marginalized groups seems to be prevalent, especially related to race, LGBT, and gender populations. Numerous studies have linked racial discrimination to negative mental and physical health outcomes including depression, anxiety, stress and lowered self-esteem (Ayalon and Gum 2011; Cano et al. 2016; Hudson et al. 2016; Kim and Noh 2014; McDonald et al. 2014; Otiniano Verissimo et al. 2014; Spence et al. 2016). Similarly, individuals in the LGBT community have reported several negative effects related to discrimination including: psychological distress (Lyons, 2016), PTSD symptoms (Reisner et al. 2016), depressive symptoms, suicidal ideation, and self-harm (Almeida et al. 2009). Additionally, gender discrimination has been positively associated with psychological symptoms, physical health difficulties (Greer 2011; Hahm et al. 2010; Perry et al. 2013), and depression and anxiety symptoms (Foynes et al. 2013). Some have reported that women, but not men, are affected by perceived discrimination because they are the minority group; however, there are no reported gender differences in the prevalence of discrimination (Schmitt et al. 2002; Kessler et al. 1999).

Much of the academic research in the multicultural field has been focused on race/ethnic, LGBT, and gender discrimination, but religious discrimination as a multicultural topic has been largely ignored (Sheridan 2006; Jordanova et al. 2015). For example, research on religious discrimination in the workplace has received much less attention than other workplace discrimination protections (Lund Dean et al. 2015; Ali et al. 2015). Furthermore, Hodge (2007) noticed a paucity in social work literature regarding religious discrimination. Despite the lack of research on religious discrimination, over the last decade religious discrimination claims have risen more rapidly than other categories protected under the Civil Rights Act (Ghumman et al. 2013). Sheridan (2006) noted that religious affiliation may be a more meaningful predictor of prejudice than race or ethnicity. Therefore, as the demand for more research on religious discrimination has risen, the current body of research on multicultural discrimination has failed to supply the necessary
literature and research tools to meet the demand (van der Straten Waillet and Roskam 2012).

Even possibly more concerning and non-existent is the lack of discrimination instruments to measure religious discrimination. There are virtually no adequate scales that reliably and validly assess perceived religious discrimination. The scales and instruments that do exist are few and lacking. Rippy and Newman (2007) developed the Perceived Religious Discrimination Scale (PRDS), which assesses one’s discriminatory experiences because of one’s religion. However, this measure includes items specifically designed for a Muslim population, thereby limiting the generalizability and making it difficult for other religious populations to be studied using the scale. Some example items include: “Have you been called a terrorist, foreigner, Osama Bin Laden?” “Has a wounded Iraqi or Afghani woman or child reminded you of a relative or friend?” “Do you have a stronger association with other Muslims/Arabs?” Rippy and Newman’s (2007) PRDS examines three factors: Racial Prejudice and Discrimination, Bicultural Identification, and Racist Environment. The confounding relationship between religion and race among these factors is also a limitation for the use of this measure with diverse intersections between one’s religious orientation and race. The PRDS possesses adequate internal consistency reliability estimates: PRDS Total (α = .91), Racial Prejudice and Discrimination (α = .91), Bicultural Identification (α = .82), and Racist Environment (α = .85). However, further psychometric properties of the PRDS have not been thoroughly tested beyond these initial alpha values. Since the PRDS has not been tested for more psychometric estimates, it is difficult to rely on the PRDS as a trustworthy and generalizable religious discrimination measure.

Non-religious discrimination-focused scales which include specific items regarding religious discrimination have also been developed such as the Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire (PEDQ; Brondolo et al. 2005), and the Spiritual Competence Scale (SCS; Hodge 2005). The PEDQ, like the PRDS above, combine some aspects of ethnicity and religion, which make it difficult to focus on RD alone. The SCS contains items that specifically ask about the environment within a social work program. Some sample items are: “To what degree does your social work program (or educational program, department, agency, etc.) foster respect for religious and spiritual cultures?” and “How acceptable is it in your social work program to share religious or spiritual views?” Thus, these scales are inadequate because they are not entirely focused on the construct of perceived religious discrimination or are specific to a social work environment and therefore lack important details and generalizability/use.

Given the paucity of religious discrimination instruments, there is a need to develop an instrument that is able to reliably and adequately measure one’s experiences of religious discrimination, and identify the different dimensions/aspect of this construct. Such an instrument must solely assess perceived religious discrimination, be adaptable across diverse religious groups, and contain sound psychometric properties. The research is abundant related to the negative psychological effects of religious discrimination among multiple populations (Ajrouch et al. 2010; Molina and James 2016; Rosenthal et al. 2015; Thijs and Piscoi 2016), but to what extent have we really assessed religious discrimination in detail regarding specific factors and experiences? The stakes are high when it comes to the negative effects of perceived discrimination; therefore, a religious discrimination measure is needed to better assess religious discrimination among various religious groups. The aim of this study was to develop and initially provide psychometric properties for the Religious Discrimination Scale (RDS).
Methods

Participants

Sample 1 consisted of 270 (96 men, 174 women) participants. The majority of participants were White (87%) and from suburban settings (71%). The mean age of participants was 20.89 (S.D. = 3.94). The household income of these participants was mostly in the $100,000–$200,000 (36%) and $75,000–$100,000 (27%) ranges. Sample 2 consisted of 274 (100 men, 174 women) participants. The majority of participants were White (89%) and from suburban settings (66%). Participants’ mean age was 20.68 (S.D. = 2.78). The household income of the sample 2 participants was mostly in the $100,000–$200,000 (30%) and $75,000–$100,000 (24%) ranges. Participants across two samples were almost exclusively Latter-day Saints (99%).

Data for this study were collected as part of a larger multiple-measure research project conducted through Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah, in collaboration with Columbia University in New York. BYU’s SONA online research participation system was utilized to gather participants and directed them to the study on a Qualtrics survey. Research participants were recruited from among a convenience sample of students attending Brigham Young University. Students in various classes (both undergraduate and graduate) at BYU were offered extra credit as an incentive for participating in the study. Students were sent a link by their instructors which directed them to the SONA website. The survey took approximately 30 min to complete.

RDS Item Development

Other discrimination scales were analyzed to gather possible items for the RDS regarding content and meaning of experiences, feelings, and perceptions related to discrimination. The authors examined items from the Everyday Discrimination Scale (Williams et al. 1997) and the Daily Life Experience (DLE) subscale of the Racism and Life Experience Scale (Harrell 1994). After the initial development of the RDS item pool, the initial items were evaluated thoroughly and rigorously to check for technical and semantic accuracy, correctness, and sound language structure. Any item that did not fit the criteria of religious discrimination and prejudice accurately was either edited or eliminated. The RDS items were revised four times between three authors to capture the essence of religious discrimination initially beginning with a pool of 22 items. The final RDS 11 items were selected among the 22-item pool through factor analyses while maintaining the core subjective meaning of religious discrimination. There were three subscales in the final RDS scale; five items were designed for Perceived Prejudice, three for Closet Symptoms, and three for Negative Labels. Example items included: “I sense hostility from others because of my religious affiliation” (Perceived Prejudice), “I felt inclined to keep my religious affiliation private” (Closet Symptoms), and “Others hold negative stereotypes of people with my religion” (Negative Labels). Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = frequently, 5 = always). The instructions to participants were: “Please rate how often during your life you have had the following experiences.”
Results

We used the first sample ($N = 270$) for exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to select the scale items. The second sample ($N = 274$) was used for confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) to cross-validate the factor structure results from the EFA. The reliability and validity analyses were conducted with both sample 1 and sample 2, separately.

Preliminary Analyses

The normality of the RDS items were examined to determine whether using robust maximum likelihood (MLR) as the estimator for CFA analyses was appropriate. Among the 22 items in the initial RDS pool used for EFA in sample 1, only three items had an absolute skew value over 1.0 and two items had absolute kurtosis values over 1.0, but all under 1.30, which indicated that the items did not significantly deviate from normal distributions. Of the 11 RDS items used for CFA in sample 2, two of the items had an absolute skew value over 1.0 and one item had absolute kurtosis values over 1.0, but all under 1.30, which also indicated that the item distributions approximated normality. Thus, MLR estimation procedure was used in the CFA analyses of this study.

Sample 1

We first conducted exploratory factor analyses (EFA) for item selection with sample 1 ($N = 270$). The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy for the initial EFA was .94, and Bartlett’s test of sphericity [$\chi^2(231) = 4589.42, p < .001$] indicated that the correlation matrix was appropriate for factor analysis. To determine the number of factors, we conducted a parallel analysis and scree plot. Parallel analysis was conducted by comparing initial eigenvalues of this sample with those generated through random data and suggested a two-factor solution. Scree plot suggested a two- or three-factor solution. We thus conducted principal axis factor analyses on the 22 items with two- to three-factor solutions using an oblique (Promax) rotation. The most interpretable solution was a three-factor solution, which had at least three clean items (i.e., one factor loading greater than .40 and no cross-loading over .30) on all the factors. Compared to the three-factor solution, there were much more cross-loaded items in the two-factor solution. The three factors included items that generally described discrimination in the forms of: Perceived Prejudice, Closet Symptoms, and Negative Labels. Among the 22 items from the initial pool, 11 were selected based on the following criteria: (a) factor loadings > .40 (Netemeyer et al., 2003), (b) cross-loading < .30, (c) item content within each factor consistent but not redundant, and (d) no more than five items representing each factor given the goal to develop a brief measure (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007). Another EFA using principal factor was conducted with the 11 selected items. The three-factor solution accounted for 65.17% of the total variance explained before rotation. After the oblique rotation all factor loadings exceeded .40 on the respective factor, and no item had a cross-loading over .30 on another factor. The five Perceived Prejudice items had loadings ranging from .62 to .83 and accounted for 47.3% of the total variance before rotation. The three Closet Symptoms items had loadings ranging from .62 to .89 and accounted for 17.0% of the total variance before rotation. The three Negative Labels items had loadings ranging from .64 to .94 and accounted for 9.9% of the total variance before rotation. Each of the items representing the three factors and
their factor loadings, communality estimate, mean, and standard deviation are presented in Table 1.

**Sample 2**

**Cross-Validation—Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted with sample 2 (\(N = 274\)) using Mplus 7 to cross-validate the measurement qualities of the CCLS with MLR as the estimator and Geomin as the rotation method. The CFA model constrained the 11 RDS items to load onto their corresponding factors based on the EFA results. The three factors were permitted to correlate with one another. The range of standardized factor loadings for the factors was: .59 to .80 for Perceived Prejudice, .57 to .96 for Closet Symptoms, and .63 to .86 for Negative Labels. The fit statistics for this three-factor oblique model [CFI = .948, SRMR = .059, RMSEA = .068 (90% C.I. .049–.086)] were adequate. We also examined three competing models: a three-factor orthogonal model, a bifactor model (i.e., each item loads on a general Religious Discrimination factor and one of the three orthogonal factors), and a one-factor model. The fit indices for all four models are presented in Table 2. Based
on the general guidelines, the CFI, SRMR, and RMSEA all indicated adequate data to model fit for both the three-factor oblique and the bifactor models, but not the three-factor orthogonal model or one-factor model. To compare between the three-factor oblique and the bifactor model, we examined the Akaike information criteria (AIC). Although the bifactor model was marginally better, the three-factor model is reasonably close and significantly easier to use in research and practice.

### Table 2  Goodness-of-fit indicators for the competing models of the 11-item RDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>MLRχ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA [CI]</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-factor oblique</td>
<td>92.31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.068 [.049–.086]</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>6942.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-factor orthogonal</td>
<td>196.09</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.112 [.097–.129]</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>7051.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bifactor</td>
<td>66.22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.061 [.039–.082]</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>6918.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-factor</td>
<td>373.09</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.165 [.150–.181]</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>7264.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 274. RDS religious discrimination scale, CFI comparative fit index, RMSEA root-mean-square error of approximation, CI confidence interval for RMSEA, SRMR standardized root-mean-square residual, AIC Akaike information criteria

### Table 3  Testing for measurement and structural invariance across gender groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>MLRχ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M comp</th>
<th>MLRAχ²</th>
<th>Δdf</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.92</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74.27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[M0] Unconstrained</td>
<td>120.60</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[M1] Loadings</td>
<td>128.69</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>M1-M0</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[M2] Loadings, Intercepts</td>
<td>141.41</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>M2-M1</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[M4] Loadings, Intercepts, Factor Var/Cov</td>
<td>148.64</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>M4-M2</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 274 (174 women, 100 men)

[M0], The Baseline Model (i.e., all parameters freely estimated); [M1], The Invariant Factor Loadings Model (i.e., constraining all factor loadings to be equal across the two groups); [M2], The Invariant Factor Loadings and Intercepts Model (i.e., constraining all factor loadings and intercepts to be equal across the two groups); [M3], The Invariant Factor Loadings, Intercepts and Residual Variances Model (i.e., constraining all factor loadings, intercepts, and residual variances to be equal across the two groups); [M4] The Invariant Factor Loadings, Intercepts and Factor Variances/Covariances Model (i.e., constraining all factor loadings, intercepts, and factor variances and covariances to be equal across the two groups)

MLR robust maximum likelihood, CFI comparative fit index, RMSEA root-mean-square error of approximation, SRMR standardized root-mean-square residual
Measurement Invariance Across Genders

We conducted a multiple-group CFA to examine measurement invariance between men and women using a forward (sequential constraint imposition) approach based on Dimitrov’s (2010) guidelines (see Table 3). The first step involved establishing configural invariance by examining models for each gender group separately. Results indicated adequate fit for both groups [men: MLR$\chi^2$(41, $n = 100$) = 46.92, $p = .24$, CFI = .986, RMSEA = .038, SRMR = .055; women: MLR$\chi^2$(41, $n = 174$) = 74.27, $p = .001$, CFI = .944, RMSEA = .068, SRMR = .066]. Measurement invariance was examined next, which involved establishing a baseline model (Model 0: Unconstrained Model), and then testing for equal factor loading across groups (Model 1: Invariant Factor Loadings Model), equal item intercepts across groups (Model 2: Invariant Factor Loadings and Intercepts Model), and equal item error variances/covariances across groups (Model 3: Invariant Factor Loadings, Intercepts, and Residual Variances Model). Nested models were compared using MLR scaled Chi-square difference tests. In Model 0 (M0), no parameters were constrained to be equal across the two gender groups. Factor loadings were constrained to be equal across groups in Model 1 (M1). A nonsignificant MLR$\Delta\chi^2$ difference between M1 and M0 [MLR$\Delta\chi^2$(8) = 8.08, $p = .43$] indicated metric invariance (i.e., invariant factor loadings). Both factor loadings and item intercepts were constrained to be equal across two gender groups in Model 2 (M2). The MLR$\Delta\chi^2$ between M2 and M1 was nonsignificant [MLR$\Delta\chi^2$(8) = 12.87, $p = .12$], indicating that the intercepts were also invariant across the two gender groups. Model 3 (M3) added constraints for residual item variances/covariances to be equal across genders. The nonsignificant MLR$\Delta\chi^2$ difference between M3 and M2 [MLR$\Delta\chi^2$(11) = 16.13, $p = .14$] indicated that item error variances/covariances were also invariant across genders. Testing structural invariance was the last step where constraints were added to factor variances and covariances across genders in Model 4 (M4). The MLR$\Delta\chi^2$ difference between M4 and M2 was nonsignificant [MLR$\Delta\chi^2$(6) = 7.26, $p = .30$], supporting structural invariance between genders. In sum, multiple-group CFA results indicate that the RDS demonstrated the strictest level of measurement and structural invariance between men and women in this sample (Figs 1, 2).

Reliability

The reliability for the RDS total and subscale scores were overall adequate, based on the Generalizability Theory Study (G-study) results. G-study has been highly utilized for its strength to distinguish multiple sources of error, which provides reliability of the measurement collected in a given study that could be generalized to other situations (Raykov and Marcoulides 2009). The Perceived Prejudice subscale score had generalizability coefficient of .89 in sample 1 and .85 in sample 2. The Closet Symptoms subscale score had a generalizability coefficient of .85 in sample 1 and .78 in sample 2. The Negative Labels subscale score had generalizability coefficient of .82 in sample 1 and .79 in sample 2. The coefficient estimates were near .80, which is often used as a rule-of-thumb for acceptable score in GT studies (Mushquash and O’Connor 2006).
Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to develop a reliable and valid measure of perceived religious discrimination across two samples. The majority of research on multicultural topics related to discrimination has focused heavily on race, LGBT, and gender issues to the exclusion of religious issues. Accordingly, there are virtually no psychometrically sound measures of perceived religious discrimination that are generalizable across a variety of religious groups. However, religion and religious discrimination are important factors to consider in the growing realm of multiculturalism given highly religious individuals who may experience discrimination based on their faith and religious beliefs. Thus,
the RDS scale and subscales were constructed in order to address this gap in the current psychological and multicultural measurement regarding religious discrimination.

This study identified three dimensions based on the experiences of LDS individuals. An 11-item Religious Discrimination Scale with three different subscales—Perceived Prejudice, Closet Symptoms, and Negative Labels—was developed. The Perceived Prejudice dimension included discrimination through both overt hostility and subtle avoidance. This is similar to many prejudice scales that have split prejudice into both overt and implicit types (Huntsinger et al. 2016; Cascio and Plant 2015). The Closet Symptoms dimension focused on believers’ hesitancies or fears around identifying publicly and openly about their religious faith. This subscale is similar to scales and ideas surrounding coming out with mental illness (COMIS; Corrigan, et al. 2010) and LGBT “coming out of the closet”; however, the RDS items are specifically religious in nature. The Negative Labels dimension addressed the negative stereotypes and assumptions that others have toward the believer’s religious orientation. Other scales have measured Negative Labels, but in the context of mental health symptom stigmas (Rockett et al. 2007; Yang et al. 2015). The

Fig. 2 Diagram for RDS bifactor model
correlations between these subscale scores were of medium to strong strength. The correlations along with the bifactor model fit results indicate that these three factors have shared commonalities but represent distinct experiences of religious discrimination. However, due to the inadequate model fit indices of the single-factor model, we do not suggest using a composite RDS total score.

The mean scores on the three RDS dimensions in this sample were relatively low, especially for Perceived Prejudice ($M = 1.97$) and Closet Symptoms ($M = 1.94$). An endorsed response of 2 on the Likert scale was “rarely.” These low averages could be due to the fact that this LDS sample in Utah Valley, UT, lived in a Mormon-friendly environment and community. In other words, they did not feel the need to hide their Mormon faith (Closet Symptoms) because a majority of others were also LDS. Moreover, they may not feel like a minority living in Utah and thus would perceive less prejudice from others around them. However, these are all speculation because the sample may not be completely based on this heavily dense LDS community given that the population of students is drawn widely from all fifty US states and international countries. Their experiences with religious discrimination may have emerged from their home communities which may not be so LDS-friendly. Interestingly, for this sample, the Negative Labels subscale had a mean ($M = 3.36$) indicating the frequency of experiencing this type of discrimination between “sometimes” and “frequently.” It could be that these participants were aware of the negative labels associated with their religious faith by outsiders or conveyed through the media. In other words, although the participants might not feel as strong of a perceived prejudice in their everyday life, or the need to hide their faith, they may be aware of negative perceptions and stereotypes of the LDS community through various forms of media such as the Internet, television, movies.

Overall, the psychometric evaluations of the RDS indicated a strong and clear factor structure as well as good internal consistency reliability. The test of measurement and structural invariance across gender also suggested that this newly developed RDS scale is equally appropriate to be used with both men and women. With the gender invariance established for the RDS, future studies can better use this scale to examine and compare religious discrimination experiences between genders. This could be particularly useful when studying religious populations that have more specific gender roles, which may lead to different experiences based on one’s gender. In sum, the RDS has potential to be a useful measure for research related to religion in the field of psychology.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

Although the results of this study indicate that the RDS could be a promising measure in the study of religious discrimination, there are some limitations of this study as well as future directions for research that should be noted. First, this initial psychometric evaluation was conducted with a sample of LDS participants. It would be important and helpful to validate the psychometric properties of the RDS in other religious populations in future research. For example, it would be important to see if the psychometric properties hold for believers of other religions in diverse international contexts, such as Muslims in the USA, Christians in China, or Buddhists in India. Although this sample may have resided in an LDS-friendly environment, LDS individuals may have very different experiences regarding religious discrimination depending on whether they are living in an LDS majority community such as Utah or a community where they are a religious minority.
Future studies may use this scale to measure and compare perceived religious discrimination of believers across environments with varying degrees of friendliness/hostility toward their particular religious belief.

**Implications**

The Religious Discrimination Scale (RDS) makes it possible to assess aspects of religious discrimination, which has not been reliably and validly available across religious groups for interested researchers, social scientists, and other instrument developers previously. Previous RD scales have focused almost exclusively on Islamic religious discrimination, but the RDS can certainly be applicable and generalizable to other religious affiliations. Additionally, some preceding scales have contained only limited items or focus on religious discrimination, but the RDS is a sole measurement of perceived religious discrimination which can add important information and knowledge about this type of discrimination. Our hope is that the RDS can be utilized in a variety of future research studies that will further assess elements of religious discrimination across the globe. Furthermore, the RDS could be used to raise awareness about religious discrimination in the social, political, and mental health communities, and in the general population.
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