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You talked: Salvation Army members from around the globe were asked to share their perspectives on social justice issues in their communities, their personal experiences of social justice issues, what issues they would like resources to be made available on, and the most important Sustainable Development Goals to them.

We listened: The highest level of concern was seen for issues of Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking, Domestic Violence/Abuse and Racism, whereas the most prevalent issues reported were Addiction, Racism and Climate Change. Priority Sustainable Development Goals related to basic needs – Hunger, Education, Poverty and Water. Respondents indicated they would like to engage more on issues of Marriage and relationships.

The perspectives gained, and voices heard, are invaluable in increasing understanding of Salvation Army members, their attitudes, priorities, and experiences of social justice issues, however it must be noted that there was low representation from the Africa and South Asian Zones.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In September 2021, the ISJC conducted a survey of Salvation Army members to assess Social Justice concerns at the global level. This survey received responses from nearly 1700 members of the Salvation Army, each providing their own grassroots perspective. With low representation from the Africa and South Asia zones, this survey cannot be said to be reflective of a global Salvation Army. Regardless, it offers an international picture of social justice concerns and the variability between regions.

The survey was designed around four sections each with their own purpose and findings as follows:

1 – Relative priority of Social Justice Issues
Participants were asked to rank 16 options of social justice issues in order of priority. The highest priority concerns were Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking, Domestic Violence/Abuse and Racism. Indigenous Peoples, Digital Infrastructure, and Artificial Intelligence were the lowest.

2 – Prevalence of experiences
Participants were asked to indicate the presence of different social justice issues experience in a) their community b) their local Salvation Army. Highest level of prevalence in community was reported in the experience of Addiction, followed by Racism and Climate Change. Prevalence of social justice issues within Salvation Army Corps and Centres was reported to be highest in Sexuality discrimination and Sexism. Prevalence of experiences was reported lower within The Salvation Army than in the general community.

3 – Resource Engagement
Participants indicated the issues they would engage with in Faith-based discussions. Marriage & Relationships was the issue highest rate of engagement willingness reported, with Pornography lowest.

4 – Relative priority of Sustainable Development Goals
Like section 1, participants ranked items in order of priority, this time the 17 United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. The results indicated three blocks of priorities, with Goals relating to Basic Needs (Hunger, Education, Health, Poverty, and Water) being prioritised the most.

For sections 1, 2 and 4, a regional analysis between Europe, Canada & USA, Latin America and Caribbean, and South Pacific & East Asia can be found in the relevant sections below.
Foundational to the Christian faith is the Biblical mandate to work with God to care for the poor, the outcast, and the oppressed. This mandate features heavily throughout the Old and New Testaments as a sign of God’s intention for humankind to ‘love their neighbour’, not as a requirement for Salvation but a consequence of following God’s desired action of His people. In recent years, the adoption of the phrase ‘social justice’ has provided a definition of this work at a societal level. Although social justice is a multifaceted construct with a range of different definitions and political viewpoints, the Christian perspective of social justice means to see ‘God’s Kingdom come... on earth as it is in Heaven.’ (Matthew 6:10)

Since its inception, The Salvation Army has engaged with the communities in which it has been based. It has a history of providing 1-to-1 social service, community-based social action, and initiatives we would now describe as social justice work. These three forms of social work are naturally interconnected and driven by the same motivation and towards the same purpose. However, while social service and action is to practically support those who have found themselves in need of assistance, social justice is to help prevent people from falling into these situations originally, and if so, to make it easier for them to get out.

Far from being a distraction from the Gospel, such initiatives have been conducted to be authentic in following the teachings and example of Jesus – expressions of God’s love in a world in need.

As the Salvation Army has grown it has engaged in an ever more diverse range of communities. Therefore, understanding the range of social justice concerns within these communities has never been more important. The International Social Justice Commission (ISJC) has previously done this through discussion with a network of Territorial/National Social Justice Secretaries, Social Justice Champions, and fellow advocates. It has also held discussions with Territorial Leadership and conducted secondary research to gain a broader perspective. However, relying on anecdotal and secondary evidence limits the effectiveness of the ISJC to understand the concerns at a grassroots level. Gaining this perspective would provide an evidence base from which the ISJC can respond accordingly.

The purpose of this survey was to achieve this perspective. Free from filtering, a survey open to all members of The Salvation Army allows for each person to have a unique voice and feed into the data directly. It aims to provide an understanding of social justice topics of most concern both globally and, where possible, by Zone and Territory.

**the Christian perspective of social justice means to see ‘God’s Kingdom come... on earth as it is in Heaven.’**
DESIGN

To obtain the widest range of perspectives, the survey was predominantly constructed of quantitative questions. While limiting the quality of data each individual participant can provide, this approach made it possible for more respondents to directly input into the dataset. Likewise, to be able to process a large number of responses on a global scale, an online survey format was chosen. The survey was created on Survey Monkey and advertised in both English and Spanish.

To incorporate as many social justice topics as possible while remaining short enough for participants to complete within a reasonable time frame (~10 minutes), there was a compromise needed between scientific rigor and ease of use. Therefore, some control features, such as negatively worded questions to avoid agreement bias, were not included. However, features which did not make the survey more complex for participants were included, such as questions and items within sections appearing in a random order for each participant so that no order was implied overall. A full list of questions can be found in appendix 1.

The survey was designed around four sections to each explore a different topic of interest:

1) Relative priority of social justice issues

Participants were asked to rank 16 different social justice concerns in order of their priority in terms of how important each concern was to them. Participants were able to rank any number of items from 1-16 (1 being highest priority) but were asked for at least the top 5. If participants did not want to rank any further items, they ticked them as N/A. Participants were free to prioritise the concern based on either their perceived prevalence, perceived severity, or both. The concerns listed were chosen from previous ISJC topics of advocacy, topics discussed at the International Moral and Social Issues Council (IMASIC), and discussion with the Territorial Social Justice network.

The concerns included were:

- Addiction
- Artificial Intelligence
- Corruption
- Digital Infrastructure
- Disability Discrimination
- Domestic Violence/Abuse,
- The Environment
- Forced Migration
- Indigenous Peoples
- Marriage & Sexual Ethics
- Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking
- Racism
- Sanctity of life (inc. Abortion, Death Penalty, Euthanasia)
- Sexism
- Sexual Identity (including Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity)
- War/Conflict

The initial order of items was randomised for each participant.
2) Prevalence of experiences

Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with various statements using a 5-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree). The statements were broken into two groups, within which the participants received the questions in a randomised order. The first group of statements considered experience with the participant’s community - “[ITEM] affects me and/or the people around me.”

Items in this group were:

- Addiction
- Corruption
- Climate Change
- difficulty accessing Digital Infrastructure
- difficulty accessing Education
- difficulty accessing Healthcare
- Disability Discrimination
- Pornography
- Racism
- Sexism
- Sexuality discrimination.

A second group of statements considered experience with the participant’s Salvation Army at local, national and regional levels – “I/those around me experience [ITEM] within The Salvation Army.” Less items were included in this group as only interpersonal concepts (interactions between people) were included, and not community level issues such as being able to access services.

Items within this group were:

- Corruption
- Disability Discrimination
- Racism
- Sexism
- Sexuality Discrimination

3) Resource Engagement

Participants were asked to indicate which topics they would be willing to engage with in faith-based discussions at their local Salvation Army Corps/Centre. Items were generated through identifying the main social justice concerns which have disagreement over theology, Christian ethics and/or Christian practice. The list was not exhaustive, therefore there was availability for participants to indicate other topics of discussion for qualitative analysis and potential inclusion in future surveys. Participants were able to tick any number of discussions, or to tick ‘None’ to indicate as such.

Items were:

- Environment
- Gender Identity
- Marriage & Relationships
- Pornography
- Racism
- Sexism
- Sexual Orientation
4) Relative priority of Sustainable Development Goals

Participants were asked to rank the 17 United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in order of priority in terms of how important each concern was to them personally. Participants were able to rank any number of items from 1-17 (1 being highest priority) but were asked for at least the top 5. If participants did not want to rank any further items, they ticked them as N/A. They were free to prioritise the concern based on either their perceived prevalence, perceived severity or both.

The initial order for all participants was the SDGs in the original numerical order:

- GOAL 1: No Poverty
- GOAL 2: Zero Hunger
- GOAL 3: Good Health and Well-being
- GOAL 4: Quality Education
- GOAL 5: Gender Equality
- GOAL 6: Clean Water and Sanitation
- GOAL 7: Affordable and Clean Energy
- GOAL 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth
- GOAL 9: Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure
- GOAL 10: Reduced Inequality
- GOAL 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities
- GOAL 12: Responsible Consumption and Production
- GOAL 13: Climate Action
- GOAL 14: Life Below Water
- GOAL 15: Life on Land
- GOAL 16: Peace and Justice Strong Institutions
- GOAL 17: Partnerships to achieve the Goals.

Before release, a pilot study was conducted where participants from all Salvation Army zones were approached to ‘test run’ the survey and provide feedback.
DATA COLLECTION

The survey was released on 29th September 2021 and closed on 28th November 2021. It was advertised on ISJC social media channels and at virtual events regularly during this period. Social media posts were shared by other Salvation Army pages and individuals. To extend reach, Territorial Social Justice Secretaries, IMASIC members and ISJC alumni were contacted and requested to distribute within their personal and professional networks. Additionally, all English- and Spanish-speaking Territorial Leadership boxes received an email requesting distribution within the Territory. Several Salvation Army publications were contacted, of which one featured the survey in their ‘International Briefs’ column.

DATA CLEANING

The survey received a total of 2,200 responses. The first step of data cleaning was to remove responses which participants did not complete past the demographic questions. Following this, participants who were not currently members of The Salvation Army community were removed, such as former members, donors, or friends of members. Finally, suspected duplicated responses were removed, identified by IP address, demographics, and similarity in answers. If there was any doubt, both contributions were included (this was the apparent where several responses came from one IP address with a large range of demographics, suggesting the survey was completed by staff in an office or similar). Following this process 1,692 responses were included in the analysis, of which 128 were completed in Spanish.

Participants were able to indicate their relationship with the Salvation Army if it did not fit into the pre-existing options. For the purposes of clarity, similar or former roles were changed to match one of the options. For example, ‘Corps leader’, ‘Cadet’, ‘Retired Officer’ and ‘Former Officer (above retirement age)’ were changed to ‘Officer’, ‘Intern’ was changed to ‘Employee’, and ‘Board Member’ was changed to ‘Volunteer’. Dual roles were given priority based on the primacy. For example, ‘Church Member and Volunteer’ was changed to ‘Church Member’.

For the ‘Relative priority of social justice issues’ question, the rankings (1-16) were reversed so that a higher value indicated a higher priority. To do this, ‘N/A’ responses were given a value of 17. A formula was then applied to subtract the ranking from 17. This meant an original ranking of 1st now has a value of 16, an original 16th priority has a value of 1, and an original N/A has a value of 0. This process was repeated for the ‘Relative priority of Sustainable Development Goals’ question, with a value to 18 instead, due to 17 items on the scale. For both sections, participants were asked to indicate at least their top 5 priorities in order. To account this, the percentage of occasions each item featured within the top 3 and top 5 was also calculated.
RESULTS

Demographics

The 1,692 participants had an average age of 48.1, with a standard deviation of 14.6, meaning approximately 70% of respondents were aged between 34 and 63 years of age. Female participants (959) made up most responses with 717 male participants, 10 Other, and 6 Unknown.

The Americas Zone had the most responses (939), followed by Europe (415), South Pacific and East Asia (SPEA; 226), Africa (63) and South Asia (49). To differentiate within the Americas Zone, responses from that Zone were split into two groups: Canada and Bermuda Territory and the four USA Territories in one (labelled Can-USA; 796 responses) and all other Territories within the Americas Zone in another (labelled for brevity as ‘Latin America’; 143 responses). It is important to note that Can-USA was predominantly USA (695/796), Europe was predominantly UK & Ireland (312/415), and SPEA predominantly Australia (103/226) and New Zealand (53/226).

The survey saw responses primarily from Officers (749), followed by Church Members (487), Employees (217), Church Members who are also Employees (133), Volunteers (84) and Service Users (20) – two participants were not clear in their relationship to the Salvation Army.
Of the 1,692 respondents, 1,663 provided an answer to this section. Overall, Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking (MSHT) was the highest concern, followed by Domestic Violence/Abuse and Racism. At the other end, Artificial Intelligence was of least concern, followed by Digital Infrastructure and Indigenous Peoples (see Figure 2).

As participants were asked to indicate at least their top 5 priorities, there may be variation in the pattern of priorities and order of issues when considering the percentage of participants who selected the issues within the top 5. However, as seen in Figure 3, the order is similar (only Forced Migration is less of a concern) and the pattern is similar to when average rankings are used.

However, variation was seen when considering only the top 3 priorities, indicating a different pattern among respondents for how they viewed each social justice issue.
Results - Relative Priority of Social Justice Issues

As MSHT was the highest priority for each method, the three methods can be overlaid, with each issue as a % of MSHT (Figure 4). Doing so highlights that Sanctity of Life and Sexual Identity were higher in the top 3 method than average ranking, suggesting large variation in how participants prioritise these issues. Similarly, Addiction, Forced Migration and Disabilities appear in the top 3 relatively less, suggesting that they are a mid-range but consistent priority. For Forced Migration, this extends to underrepresentation in the top 5.

![Figure 4. Comparing methods of assessing relative priority, in Average Ranking Order](image)

Note: this line graph is a visual representation of categorical data. The original Bar chart can be found in Appendix 2.

Further analysis reveals variation within regions. Due to a low response rate, Africa (63) and South Asia (49) zones were not included in this analysis, but the Americas Zone was split as discussed in the Demographics section above. Figure 5 shows Europe to prioritise Forced Migration and Sexual Identity more so than others, but indigenous Peoples less. Analysis of the top 3 by region (see appendix 2) shows relative overrepresentation of Sexual Identity in the top 3 to be driven primary by Europe. In Can-USA, Addiction is a particularly high priority, with the Environment being ranked lower. Although Sanctity of Life is similar to Latin America, this issue is relatively overrepresented in the top 3 (appendix 2) in Can-USA, suggesting increased variation in how high the issue is prioritised in this region. Latin America is high in concern for Marriage & Sexual Ethics, Corruption and Digital Infrastructure, and low in Racism and Sexism concern. Digital Infrastructure is of particular interest here as this region is the only one to not be dominated by a western culture, suggesting that this topic would be of greater priority if the survey was more representative of a truly global Salvation Army population. Finally, SPEA showed high relative priority for Indigenous Peoples compared to other regions. SPEA was also the only region to have significantly higher priority on Domestic Violence/Abuse as greatest importance rather than MSHT (Latin America also had Domestic Violence/Abuse as highest priority but MSHT closely followed).
Prevalence of Experience

As expected, there was an overall tendency towards agreement with the statements and therefore interpretation of results should occur with this in mind. Regardless, as shown in Figure 6, Addiction was the topic receiving most agreement with more respondents seeing this issue affecting themselves and/or those around them the most. (Note however that this is an indication of prevalence rather than severity). Climate Change, unlike Environment in the previous section, features highly in this section, with the highest number of ‘Strongly Agree’ responses. However, it also has a relatively high ‘Strongly Disagree’ responses, which may be why it’s sister issue was not a high priority in the previous section.
Results - Prevalence of Experience

Regarding prevalence of experiences within Salvation Army Corps and Centres, Figure 7 shows that Sexuality discrimination and Sexism were the most agreed upon items, the first time these items have been prominent. Sexuality also received the greatest number of ‘Strongly Agree’ responses by a significant margin (almost 100 participants). Although questions such as these tend to invoke general agreement, this was not the case in this section. This, alongside the consideration that it usually takes lived experience to ‘Strongly agree rather than ‘Agree’, points to the need for Sexuality discrimination being a point in need of address.

Comparing the discrimination items within the community and the Salvation Army (appendix 3), as percentages of responses due to slightly different number of responses, it is apparent that prevalence is reported to be less within Salvation Army Corps and Centres than in general community. However, this is at least the case for Sexism and Sexuality discrimination, with Strong Agreement regarding Sexuality being the closest between the different contexts (23.5% within Community, 19.5% within Salvation Army).

Resource Engagement

Participants were asked to indicate which resources they would be willing to engage with within a faith-based discussion at their local Salvation Army Corps/Centre. Of the 1692 respondents, 1590 responded to this section of the survey. As seen in Figure 8, Marriage & Relationship was desired most frequently followed by Racism and Sexism, with Pornography discussions the least desired of the options. The most frequent ‘Other’ suggestions included Sanctity of Life, MSHT, Corruption and Indigenous Peoples. It should be noted that this could be due to some form of order effect, whereby participants responded with suggestions of topics which have previously featured in the survey. Also note that, while there is high percentage of respondents willing to hold discussions in some form (only 12% said they would not engage with any topic), this is among members of the Salvation Army who have demonstrated their willingness to engage in surveys and so may not be representative of the whole Salvation Army population. It is likely that true percentages of resource engagement willingness will be lower than reported. That notwithstanding, the comparative interpretation of issues to one another remains valuable.
Additionally, the willingness to engage in different resources can be analysed by region (see Demographics section). As seen in Figure 9, Europe is highest in desire to discuss Sexism, Environment, Sexual Orientation and Gender, but is lowest in Marriage & Relationships and joint lowest in Pornography. Canada-USA is particularly low in willingness to discuss the Environment, and is highest in not wanting to engage in any issue. Latin America is leading in willingness to discuss Marriage & Relationships and Pornography, and shows more willingness to discuss in general with the lowest number of participants responding that they would not engage in any issue. SPEA is often comparative with other regions, but joins Can-USA and Europe in being least willing to discuss Sexual Orientation and Pornography respectively.
Relative priority of Sustainable Development Goals

A total of 1325 participants indicated their relative priorities of the SDGs. As seen in Figure 10, the results show three blocks of priorities. In the first block, of highest priority, are the Basic Needs for survival, alongside the recognition of the importance of education. The second block appears to be Quality of Life related, particularly those which prove issues within the western world. The final block are the non-human related goals of SDG 14 (Life on Land) and SDG 15 (Life under Water), the unique goal of SDG 17 (Partnerships to achieve the SDGs), and SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure) which perhaps is perceived as greatly developing within Western societies already, and so lacks the priority of others.

Like the ‘Relative priority of Social Justice Concerns’ section, attention must be paid to analysis of the top 3 and top 5 issues (see appendix 4). Within these methods of measurement, the three separate blocks of priorities remain the same. There are subtle differences however between the methods which suggest that SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) and SDG 4 (Quality Education) are prioritised highly but relatively outside of the top 3, compared to others within their block.

Assessing the relative priorities of SDGs by region, there appears to be general agreement across many of the goals, and the 3 blocks pattern in evident consistently (Figure 11). Latin America deviates from other regions to the greatest extent, with SDG 1 (No Poverty) and SDG 6 (Clean Water and Sanitation) ranked similarly to SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) and SDG 16 (Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions). The greatest deviation within regions is seen in SDG 13 (Climate Action), in which Europe and SPEA rank highly, but Latin America and Can-USA rank lower.
Limitations

In reading and interpreting the results, it is important to recognise a number of limitations with the survey.

There was a significant western bias to the results, with significant overrepresentation from the USA. While steps were taken to promote the survey globally, these were not particularly successful, and the survey completion is broadly similar to the ISJC Social Media audience. This should be kept in mind when viewing the overall data and raises issues of applicability to the Africa and South Asia zones particularly. Similarly, within the Europe zone, there was overrepresentation from UKI Territory, and within SPEA there was overrepresentation from Australia and New Zealand. This Western bias has been noted through interpretation of the results and adjustment to regional analysis, but while this remains a global survey, it primarily represents the views of a Western Salvation Army and not all Salvation Army members.

To keep the survey short enough and manageable for participants, several issues needed to be grouped together under an umbrella term. While this was done sparingly, it meant the survey was less sensitive to detecting different attitudes towards issues within the collective group, particularly relating to the ‘Relative priority of Social Justice Issue’s section. Therefore, difference between Marriage Ethics and Sexual Ethics was not detected, items within Sanctity of Life (Abortion, Euthanasia, Death Penalty) and within Sexual Identity (Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity).
The survey will also assist the ISJC in assisting its partners such as providing guidance to Territorial Social Justice Secretaries on the most pressing issues in their area from a grassroots perspective. The ISJC also works closely with IMASIC and the results of this survey can help fuel and guide their agenda of discussions to identify where The Salvation Army needs to become vocal.

The perspectives gained, and voices heard, are invaluable in increasing understanding of Salvation Army members, their attitudes, priorities and experiences. A final word of thanks must go to all participants and to those whose efforts to advertise the survey brought it to the attention of participants who would not have seen it otherwise.

Results - Limitations

Along similar lines, the quantitative nature of the survey meant items had to be chosen on participants behalf. Although there were no common topics raised when participants were given the opportunity to suggest items which were not included in the survey, and a pilot study with people from each Salvation Army zone was conducted before the survey was released, the issues themselves were set by researcher. Therefore, there was some ethnocentrism present within the design, as issues such as Child Marriage or Teen Pregnancy were not included despite being major issues within the Africa zone.

Outcomes

The results of the survey and the findings from it can be used to direct Salvation Army priorities of advocacy and topics covered on social media and other communications. It also provides an evidence base of topics around which to base events and education resources. The indication of resource engagement willingness will help direct the creation of its Faith-Based Facilitation resources – a collection of programmes designed to lead and guide Godly discussions on difficult social topics to increase understanding, discern biblical direction, and inspire redemptive action.

The survey will also assist the ISJC in assisting its partners such as providing guidance to Territorial Social Justice Secretaries on the most pressing issues in their area from a grassroots perspective. The ISJC also works closely with IMASIC and the results of this survey can help fuel and guide their agenda of discussions to identify where The Salvation Army needs to become vocal.

The perspectives gained, and voices heard, are invaluable in increasing understanding of Salvation Army members, their attitudes, priorities and experiences. A final word of thanks must go to all participants and to those whose efforts to advertise the survey brought it to the attention of participants who would not have seen it otherwise.
Appendix 1
Survey Questions (English, Español)

Demographics

1. What is your age?
1. ¿Cuál es su edad?

2. What is your gender? Male, Female, Other (Please Specify)
2. ¿Cuál es su género? Masculino, Femenino, Otro (Por favor especifique)

3. What is your Salvation Army zone? Africa, Americas and Caribbean, Europe, South Asia, South Pacific and East Asia
3. ¿A qué zona del Ejército de Salvación pertenece? África, Américas y el Caribe, Europa, Asia del Sur, Pacífico Sur y Asia Oriental

4. What is your country of residence? (Option of all countries)
4. ¿Cuál es su país de residencia?

5. What is your primary relationship to The Salvation Army? Officer, Employee, Church Member (Soldier, Adherent, regular attender), Employee AND Church Member, Service User
5. ¿Cuál es su relación principal con el Ejército de Salvación? Oficial, Empleado, Miembro de la Iglesia (Soldado, Adherente, Asistente regular), Empleado Y Miembro de la Iglesia, Beneficiario.

Relative priority of Social Justice Concerns

6. Please rank the social justice issues that are of greatest importance to you from the following list (with 1 being the most important).

Rank the issues based on either those that affect you the most or those you care about the most. You can do this either by clicking and dragging, or by selecting a number from the drop-down box. (Note - you are unable to drag an item if the N/A box is ticked)
After ranking 5 issues, you are free to continue ranking or tick ‘N/A’ for the remaining choices. Ensure each item has an entry of some sort before continuing.

6. Por favor clasifique los siguientes temas de justicia social de la siguiente lista en orden de mayor importancia para usted (siendo 1 el más importante)
Clasifique los temas en función de los que más le afecten o los que más le importen. Puede hacer esto haciendo clic y arrastrando, o seleccionando un número del cuadro desplegable. (Nota: no puede arrastrar un elemento si la casilla N / A está marcada)
Después de clasificar 5 temas, puede continuar clasificando o bien marcar ‘N / A’ para las opciones restantes. Asegúrese de que cada elemento tenga una entrada de algún tipo antes de continuar.
Relative priority of Social Justice Concerns

ITEMS:

Racism/Racial Equity, Sexism/Gender Equity, Disability Discrimination, Corruption, Environment/Climate Change, Digital Infrastructure, Marriage/Sexual ethics (e.g. Divorce, Pre-marital sex, Pornography), Sexual identity (e.g. Same sex attraction, Gender identity), Forced Migration (Refugees, Asylum Seekers, Internally displaced persons), Sanctity of life (Abortion, Euthanasia, Death Penalty), Addiction, Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking, Artificial Intelligence, War/ Conflict, Domestic Violence/Abuse, Indigenous persons

Prevalence of experiences – Selection 1, in Community

Tell us about your local community and the prevalence of the following issues around you. We want to know about both your experiences and the experiences of those around you (family, friends, co-workers, other Corps members: this includes people you are emotionally close to, not just geographically).

7. Racism affects me and/or the people around me. (For all questions, options were: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree)
7. El racismo me afecta a mí y/o a las personas que me rodean. (Totalmente de acuerdo, de acuerdo, ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo, en desacuerdo, totalmente en desacuerdo)

8. Sexism affects me and/or the people around me.
8. El sexismo me afecta a mí y/o a las personas que me rodean.

9. Corruption affects me and/or the people around me.
9. La corrupción me afecta a mí y/o a las personas que me rodean.

10. Pornography affects me and/or the people around me.
10. La pornografía me afecta a mí y/o a las personas que me rodean.

11. Addiction affects me and/or the people around me.
11. Las adicciones me afectan a mí y/o a las personas que me rodean.
12. Difficulty accessing healthcare affects me and/or the people around me.
12. La dificultad para acceder a la atención médica me afecta a mí y/o a las personas que me rodean.

13. Lack of education services affects me and/or the people around me.
13. La falta de servicios educativos me afecta a mí y/o a las personas que me rodean.

14. Climate Change affects me and/or the people around me.
14. El cambio climático me afecta a mí y/o a las personas que me rodean.

15. Sexuality discrimination (based on, for example, sexual orientation, traentity) affects me and/or the people around me
15. La discriminación por sexualidad (basada, por ejemplo, en la orientación sexual, la identidad de género) me afecta a mí y a las personas que me rodean

16. Difficulty accessing infrastructure (electricity, computer, internet) affects me and/or the people around me
16. La dificultad para acceder a la infraestructura (electricidad, computadora, internet) me afecta a mí y/o a las personas que me rodean

17. Disability discrimination affects me and/or the people around me.
17. La discriminación por discapacidad me afecta a mí y/o a las personas que me rodean.

Prevalence of experiences – Selection 2, within The Salvation Army

Although our centres and places of worship should be free from injustice, unfortunately this is not always the case.

Please tell us of your experience, including consideration within Salvation Army locations and with Salvation Army personnel, and including at local, national and regional levels.

Aunque nuestros centros y lugares de culto deberían estar libres de injusticias, lamentablemente esto no siempre es así.

Cuéntenos su experiencia dentro de las ubicaciones del Ejército de Salvación y con el personal del Ejército de Salvación a nivel local, nacional y regional.

18. I/those around me experience racism within The Salvation Army.
18. Yo / los que me rodean experimentamos racismo dentro del Ejército de Salvación.
Prevalence of experiences – Selection 2, within The Salvation Army

19. I/those around me experience sexism within The Salvation Army.
19. Yo / los que me rodean experimentamos sexismo dentro del Ejército de Salvación.

20. I/those around me experience disability discrimination within The Salvation Army.
20. Yo / las personas que me rodean experimentamos discriminación por discapacidad dentro del Ejército de Salvación.

21. I/those around me experience sexuality discrimination (e.g. sexual orientation, gender identity) within The Salvation Army.
21. Yo / las personas que me rodean experimentamos discriminación sexual (por ejemplo, orientación sexual, identidad de género dentro) del Ejército de Salvación.

22. I/those around me experience corruption within The Salvation Army.
22. Yo / los que me rodean experimentamos corrupción dentro del Ejército de Salvación.

Resource Engagement

23. I would engage in faith-based discussions at my local Salvation Army Centre/Corps regarding (Tick all applicable):
23. Participaría en discusiones sobre Fe en mi Centro / Cuerpo local del Ejército de Salvación con respecto a (Marque todas las que apliquen):

ITEMS:
Racism / Racial Equity, Sexism / Gender Equity, The Environment / Climate Change, Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, Marriage and Relationships, Pornography, Other(s) (please specify), None of the above

Racismo / Equidad racial, Sexo / Equidad de género, Medio ambiente / Cambio climático, Orientación sexual, Identidad de género, Matrimonio y relaciones, Pornografía, Otro(s) (Por favor especifique), Ninguno de los anteriores

Relative priority of Sustainable Development Goals

In addition to the social justice issues mentioned previously, The Salvation Army works with the United Nations towards achieving the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals – globally shared targets for the world of the future.

This final set of questions regard those goals.

Además de las problemáticas de justicia social mencionados anteriormente, el Ejército de Salvación trabaja con las Naciones Unidas con el fin de alcanzar los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible para el año 2030 – objetivos compartidos globalmente para el mundo del futuro.

Este último conjunto de preguntas se refieren a esos objetivos.
24. Are you familiar with the Sustainable Development Goals? (1-10 scale)
   1 - This is my first time hearing of them
   10 - I am highly familiar with the goals and how they relate to me.

24. ¿Conoce los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible? (En una escala del 1-10)
   1 - Esta es la primera vez que escucho sobre ellos.
   10 - Estoy muy familiarizado con los objetivos y cómo se relacionan conmigo.

25. Do you integrate the Sustainable Development Goals into your life decisions? (1-10 scale)
   1 – I give them no consideration
   10 - I always consider implications towards the SDGs when making decisions

25. ¿Considera los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible a la hora de tomar decisiones en su vida? (En una escala del 1-10)
   1 - No les doy consideración
   10 - Siempre considero las implicaciones de los ODS a la hora de tomar decisiones

26. The following options are the Sustainable Development Goals. Even if you are relatively unfamiliar with them, please rank in order of personal concern.

After ranking AT LEAST 5 issues, you are free to continue ranking or select ‘N/A’ for the remaining choices.

ITEMS:

26. Las siguientes opciones son los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible. Clasifiquelos en orden de interés personal Incluso si no está familiarizado con ellos.

Después de clasificar AL MENOS 5 de ellos, puede continuar clasificando o seleccionar ‘N/A’ para las opciones restantes.

ITEMS:
27. What is your understanding of The Salvation Army’s relationship with the United Nations?
1 – I didn’t know there was any link
10 – I fully understand why The Salvation Army works with the United Nations and reports on progress towards the SDGs. No, Yes (Please state), Please enter a comment

28. Are there any social justice issues which have not been included in this survey which you would like to raise?

¿Hay algún problema de justicia social que no se haya incluido en esta encuesta que le gustaría plantear?
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