

ONLINE SURVEY APPLICATION GUIDELINES & REPORT

Country: Slovakia



Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
<i>SURVEY APPLICATION PROCESS</i>	3
WP-Specific objectives:	3
Expected Main Results	3
Indicators	3
Quantitative indicators:	3
Quantitative Indicators	3
Tasks & Responsibilities	3
Survey Application Activities	4
Participants	4
Questions for HEI Managers	4
Questions for Students	4
DATA ANALYSIS – HEI MANAGEMENT	5
Demographics	5
University Policies on Green Sustainable Development	6
Report 1 (HEI)	9
DATA ANALYSIS STUDENTS	10
Demographics	10
Report 2 (Students)	18

SURVEY APPLICATION PROCESS

WP-Specific objectives:

O2.1 Apply an online survey to HE administration staff about the sustainability policies of higher education institutions,

O2.2 Apply an online survey to undergraduate students inquiring about their opinions and initiatives in sustainable green development,

Expected Main Results

- 5 Survey Reports (results from HEIs)
- 5 Survey Reports (results from Undergraduate Students)
- Increased awareness of sustainable green development practices
- Increased visibility of the project, EU funding and the project message

Indicators

Quantitative indicators:

- 5 online survey reports including the responses of 100 HEI administrative staff members at least (20 per partner country)
- 5 online survey reports including the responses of 500 HEI undergraduate students at least (100 per partner country)

Quantitative Indicators

- Quality and accessibility of the resources including survey results
- Satisfaction of the partners/students/local actor representatives with the obtained results

Tasks & Responsibilities

COMU will lead the WP2 process. The tasks and responsibilities (T) of the partners are as follows.

T2.1 and T2.2- Online survey results and reports

Tasks and Responsibilities:

- UNIRI, SUA, COMU, UPB and UL will collaborate to design an online survey about HEI administration staff and university students' opinions and initiatives in sustainable green development and use an existing scale developed in the "Erasmus Goes Green" project to survey the sustainability policies of higher education institutions in their respective countries.

- MELLIS will assist in designing and administering the surveys and compiling and analysing the results.

- All partners will be involved in the survey translations and preparation of reports in English.

Survey Application Activities

1- Partners will clarify the objectives of the surveys, the target audience, and the specific topics or questions to be covered.

2- A question pool will be formed, and all partners will contribute.

3- The surveys will be produced on an online platform enabling us to calculate and analyse the data.

4- Partners will copy the English version of the online surveys and translate them into national languages.

5- MELLIS will prepare the report templates in line with the survey structures.

6- Partners will write their reports by using this template and unity in reports will be ensured.

Participants

A- 100 HEI administrative staff members will be involved in the online survey application process with their responses in total (20 staff in each partner country)

The selection criteria

- Administrative Staff

- Involved in campus's environmental protection, waste management, conservation of resources, etc.

- Has knowledge about the university's environmental policies

B- 500 undergraduate students will be involved in the online survey application process with their answers in total (100 students in each partner country)

The selection criteria:

- Volunteers

- The students who attend the partner universities' economics, business, and administrative sciences departments

Questions for HEI Managers

<https://forms.gle/L4qo8RoZWjP2xND77>

Questions for Students

<https://forms.gle/mUkRTRGmMtQ2YMuE6>

DATA ANALYSIS – HEI MANAGEMENT

Demographics

Question 2.1. Gender Distribution

Gender Status	Male		Female		Prefer not to say	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number/Percentage	16	76,2	5	23,8	-	-

Question 2.2. Age Ranges

Age Range	25-30		31-35		36-40		41-45		46-50		51-55		56-60		60+	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number/Percentage			2	9,5	1	4,8	5	23,8	7	33,3	5	23,8	1	4,8		

Question 2.3. Latest Degree of Education

Latest Diploma	Bachelor's Degree		Master's Degree		Doctorate Degree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number/Percentage	-	-	1	4,8	20	95,2

Question 2.4. The Unit Represented

The Unit	Rectorate		Faculty	
	N	%	N	%
Number/Percentage	6	28,6	15	71,4

Question 2.5. Years of Experience

Experience	1-5		6-10		11-15		16-20		20+	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%

Number/ Percentage	4	19	7	33,3	4	19	2	9,5	4	19
-----------------------	---	----	---	------	---	----	---	-----	---	----

University Policies on Green Sustainable Development

Report 1 (HEI)

Demographics

Sample was made out of 21 HEI management members from Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra. The respondents were administrative staff and university management, of whom 76.2% were men and 23.8% were women. The majority of respondents (33.3%) belonged to the age category 36-40 years, with the majority (95.2%) having achieved a PhD. degree. The representation at the faculty level was 71.4% and at the rectorate level 28.6%. In terms of length of experience in the current position, 33.3% of respondents had more than 20 years of experience, followed by equal representation (19%) in the categories 1-5 years, 6-10 years and 16-20 years.

University Policies on Green Sustainable Development

The questionnaire, based on a scale from 1 - 5, with 1 being very seldom, 2 being seldom, 3 being on average 4 being often and 5 being very often, **provides insight into various aspects of environmental and sustainable behavior in the university environment. Based on the answers provided, we can identify several trends and levels of engagement:**

Strengths:

In questions such as "reducing water consumption" and "producing and consuming our own energy", most respondents rated these activities with higher marks (4-5), indicating their relatively frequent practice.

Supporting students and staff using public transport also received high marks, indicating an active policy in this area.

Medium-frequent activities:

Activities such as "organizing eco-events" and "implementing mobility strategies" are rated with more distributed answers (e.g. 2-4), indicating an average level of implementation.

Topics such as "electronic document policy" or "rainwater management" show mixed ratings, which may reflect the diversity of implementation across faculties.

Weaknesses:

Areas such as "places to share things" (e.g. clothes, books) or "meatless days" have lower ratings, indicating that these activities are not frequent.

Activities related to directly linking travel funding to carbon footprint or implementing sustainability standards appear to be less of a priority.

Evaluation of individual questions 3.1 – 3.36

3.1 Regular recycling system

Most respondents (71.5%) rated this activity at level 4-5, indicating that recycling systems are well established.

3.2 Energy monitoring

Answers are divided between levels 2-5, with 71.4% of responses at level 3-5. Energy monitoring is a common but not universal practice.

3.3 Replacement of used items

Answers are mostly at level 3 and 4 (66.7%), indicating a medium level of implementation of this activity.

3.4 Environmental awareness workshops

52.3% of respondents rated them at level 4-5, indicating a decent but not complete implementation.

3.5 Environmental management training

61.9% of respondents rated the activity at level 4-5, indicating that these trainings are relatively frequent.

3.6 Meatless days

47.6% of the ratings are at level 4-5, but the rest remain at medium or low levels.

3.7 Food sharing places

66.7% of respondents rated them at level 1, indicating a very low level of implementation.

3.8 Sharing knowledge about sustainability

Responses are evenly distributed between levels 3-5, indicating a medium level of activity.

3.9 Places to share things (e.g. clothes, books)

47.6% of respondents rated them at level 1-2, indicating poor implementation.

3.10 Reducing plastic use

52.4% of the ratings are at level 4-5, but it is not a universal practice.

3.11 Using recycled paper

Ratings are spread across all levels, with higher ratings dominating.

3.12 Electronic document policy

More than 50% of respondents rate it at level 4-5, indicating advanced implementation.

3.13 Unplugging electronics after working hours

Responses are spread, with only 33% at level 4-5, indicating low levels of practice.

3.14 Green public procurement

Most responses (66.7%) are at level 3-4, indicating medium levels of implementation.

3.15 Sustainable building projects

66.7% of the ratings at level 4-5 indicate that these activities are well implemented.

3.16 Bike rental system

90.5% of the ratings at level 1 indicate that this activity is almost non-existent.

3.17-3.20 Public transport support

High ratings (4-5) dominate all questions, indicating significant support for public transport for both students and staff.

3.21 Road financing based on carbon footprint

Most of the ratings are at level 1-2, indicating that this practice is not common.

3.22 Stormwater management

38.1% of the responses are at level 4-5, indicating a medium level of implementation.

3.23 Increasing green space at the university

57.1% of respondents rated the activity at level 4-5, indicating a high level of implementation.

3.24 Organizing eco-events

57% of respondents rated the activity at level 3-4, indicating an average level of implementation.

3.25 Implementing mobility strategies

Most of the responses are at level 3-4, indicating an average level of implementation.

3.26 Implementing sustainability standards

52.4% of ratings at level 4-5 indicate a decent implementation of these standards.

3.27 Reducing water consumption

52.4% of ratings at level 4-5 indicate that this activity is relatively common.

3.28 Self-generated energy production and consumption

47.6% of respondents rated 4-5, indicating a medium level of implementation.

3.29 Grass paving/permeable surfaces

38.1% of respondents rated 4, indicating a more advanced level of implementation.

3.30 Urban sustainability projects

47.6% rated 3-4, indicating a medium level of engagement.

3.31 Financial incentives for sustainability

61.9% of respondents rated 4-5, indicating a high level of support.

3.32 Comprehensive sustainability curricula

Ratings are distributed between 3-5, with higher ratings being more common.

3.33 Compulsory sustainability subjects

33.3% of respondents rated it at level 4, indicating a medium level of implementation.

3.34 Additional sustainability qualifications

38.1% of respondents rated it at level 4-5, indicating a good level of activity.

3.35 Environmental management certificates

38.1% rated it at level 4-5, indicating a decent level of implementation.

3.36 Use of eco-labels

38.1% rated it at level 4-5, indicating a more advanced level of implementation.

Recommendations

Improve low-performing activities: Introduce systematic support for low-performing activities such as meatless days, food/item sharing and bike sharing.

Support best-performing activities: Continue to support recycling, water reduction and public transport, where implementation rates are already high.

Comprehensive measures: Focus on systematic implementation of rainwater management, electronic documents and green procurement.

Greater emphasis on education and motivation: Expand the availability of training, workshops and study programmes focused on sustainability.

Expand environmental standards: Strengthen the implementation of environmental standards and certificates to foster a culture of responsibility at all levels of the university.

Other activities for climate, biodiversity and natural resources

Summary of answers to question 3.37: What else is your institution doing to protect the climate/biodiversity/natural resources?

Positive initiatives :

1. Practical measures :

- Operation of a biogas station.
- Composting and waste separation, beyond the scope of mandatory separation.
- Restoration and maintenance of greenery.
- Implementation of green infrastructure elements in the reconstruction of university buildings.
- Introduction of charging stations for electric cars.
- Gradual increase in the use of green energy.

2. Research and project activities :

- Implementation of research in the field of renewable energy sources.
- Implementation of projects, methodologies and assessments in the field of environmental management.
- Projects in accordance with the 2030 Agenda.

3. Energy efficiency :

- Reduction of energy consumption.

Critical remarks and shortcomings :

- Some respondents state that their institution does not do enough for climate protection (“very little” or “nothing”).
- Some respondents are not familiar with the activities (“don’t know”, “n/a”).

The answers show that the institution has established practical and research activities for climate, biodiversity and natural resource protection, but these activities are not universally known to all respondents. This may signal the need for better communication and involvement of the entire university community.

Importance of stakeholder in collaborative work for SGD

Respondents rated the importance of different partners on a 5-point scale:

- Scientists/researchers : The most important partners, with over 60% of respondents rating their importance at level 4-5.
- Businesses/entrepreneurs : 33% at level 4 and 28% at level 5, ranking them second in importance.
- Consumers : Medium level of importance, with 19% of respondents rating their importance at 4 or 5.
- Media : The lowest ratings, mostly at level 2-3, indicate a weaker perceived role.

Section 4 Evaluation: Effectiveness of cooperation with local partners

4.1 Joint campaigns to promote awareness of sustainability

Most of the responses (66.7%) are at level 4-5, which shows that these campaigns are considered effective.

4.2 Joint organization of competitions

71.4% of the ratings at level 4-5 indicate that this way of cooperation is well received.

4.3 Cooperation on environmental events

57% of respondents rated the effectiveness of these events with ratings of 4-5, while 33% gave a rating of 3.

4.4 Training activities

57.1% of the ratings at level 4-5 indicate their perception as an effective way of cooperation.

4.5 Conferences/lectures for students with the support of local partners

More than 70% of the responses are at level 4-5, indicating a very positive assessment.

Recommendations

1. Scientists and researchers : Use their position as the most important partners to strengthen cooperation in the design and implementation of sustainability projects.

2. Businesses/entrepreneurs : Deepen cooperation in practical areas such as green procurement and support for public transport.
3. Media : Improve the communication strategy and media engagement to promote sustainability activities.
4. Forms of cooperation : Maintain and expand the most effective forms such as campaigns and lectures, and increase the attractiveness of environmental events for the wider community.
5. Training activities : Establish regularity and expand the focus on different areas of sustainability.

DATA ANALYSIS STUDENTS

Demographics

Question 2.1. Gender Distribution

Gender Status	Male		Female		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number/Percentage	31	22,5	107	77,5		

Question 2.2. Level of study

Latest Diploma	Bachelor's Degree		Master's Degree		Doctorate Degree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number/Percentage	119	86,2	19	13,8		

Question 2.3. Year of study

Year of Study	1		2		3		4		5	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number/Percentage	7	5,1	112	81,2	1	0,7	10	7,2	8	5,8

Question 2.4. The field of study

Field of Study	Economics		Non-Economics	
	N	%	N	%

Number/Percentage	134	97,1	4	2,9

Question 2.5. The title of the study programme

Most frequently indicated study programs were Economics and Management: 29% of responses, Accounting (Accounting): 15.2% of responses, Business Economics (BE): 12.3% of responses. Several other programs received low individual representation (mostly 1-3% of each program), such as agribusiness, business management, and others.

Question 2.6. The home located

The largest number of respondents (48.6%) reported living in a city with a population of 100,000 to 499,999. The next largest group were students from cities with a population of 50,000 to 99,999 (22.5%), while 18.8% lived in large cities with more than 500,000 inhabitants. Smaller cities with a population of 10,000 to 49,999 were home to 8% of respondents, and rural areas/villages accounted for 2.1% of responses.

Question 2.7. Number of people live in the household

Most respondents (42.8%) reported living in a household with three members. The second most common response was four people (25.4%), with two people reported by 21% of students. Households with five or more members were less common (8%), and only a small percentage of students (2.9%) lived alone.

Question 2.8. Parent's/guardian's educational background

The most common educational background of parents/guardians was university (47.8%), followed by secondary school (33.3%). 18.8% of guardians had a vocational education, and none of the respondents reported primary school.

Question 2.9. Family financial situation

The majority of respondents (68.1%) reported their financial situation as average. 25.4% of students declared their financial situation to be above average and none declared it to be significantly above average. Conversely, 6.5% of respondents described their financial situation as below average.

Report 2 (Students)

World Risks

The students rated the 14 global risks offered on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being a very low risk and 5 being a very high risk. The students indicated very high risk in case of wars, environmental pollution and climate change. Aging of population, migration, fake news, terrorism and cybercrime were rated as moderate risks.

Climate Change

The students' perception of climate change was examined based on four propositions that express valid attitudes towards the significance of climate change. The students expressed their views on a scale of agreement ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". In general, it can be concluded that students are aware of the importance of climate change as a fundamental threat to humanity and the importance of proactive measures to tackle climate change for current generations.

4.1 Climate change is a scientifically proven fact.

The majority of respondents (51.4%) strongly agreed with this statement (score 5), with a further 36.2% giving a score of 4. Only 11.6% of respondents were neutral (3) and less than 1% disagreed (score 1 or 2). The results show that the vast majority of respondents accept the scientific evidence of climate change.

4.2 Climate change does not concern my generation, it is a problem for future generations.

The largest proportion of respondents (47.8%) strongly disagreed with this statement (score 1), with a further 31.9% giving a score of 2. Only 11.6% of respondents were neutral (3) and the remaining 8.7% agreed (4 or 5). The results indicate that the majority of respondents consider climate change to be a current problem that also affects their generation.

4.3 Climate change is a problem, but certainly not as serious as it is said to be.

The largest proportion of respondents (39.1%) disagreed (score 2) and the same percentage gave a score of 1, indicating that they consider climate change to be a serious problem. Only 15.2% of respondents took a neutral position (3) and less than 7% agreed that climate change is not that serious.

4.4 We must take immediate action to stop climate change.

The largest proportion of respondents (42%) strongly agreed (score 5) and a further 34.1% gave a score of 4. Only 19.6% of respondents took a neutral position (3) and less than 5% gave low scores (1 or 2). These results show that most respondents are aware of the urgency of climate action.

Importance of the Climate Change Effects

A set of six measures addressing climate change effects was used to examine students' attitudes about the levels of importance of the effects that climate change produces. Overall, students rated as very important and important effects of "loss of food availability", "lower yields in agriculture",

“extreme weather” and “increased temperatures”. Slightly lower importance was addressed to loss of biodiversity and displacement of the population as one of the consequences of climate change.

Knowledge Level on Climate Change, Biodiversity and The Protection of Natural Resources

The level of knowledge about climate change, biodiversity and the protection of natural resources was tested using a knowledge level scale ranging from "very bad (1)" to "very good (5)". Student answers indicate that they tried to be objective and critical in evaluating the knowledge they possess. In all three areas, the students assessed that their knowledge was at an intermediate level, i.e. "Neither Good nor Bad".

6.1 How do you rate your knowledge of climate change?

Most respondents (57.2%) rated their knowledge of climate change as 3 (medium level). Another 17.4% rated it as 4, and only 0.7% rated it as 5 (very high). Conversely, 18.1% of respondents rated it as low (2), and 6.5% rated their knowledge as very low (1). The results indicate that most respondents have basic to moderately advanced knowledge of climate change.

6.2 How do you rate your knowledge of biodiversity?

The most common rating was 3 (medium level), which was given by 37.7% of respondents. This was followed by rating 2 (24.6%) and rating 4 (30.4%). Level 5 (very high) was not given by anyone, and 7.2% of respondents chose rating 1 (very low). These responses show that respondents perceive their knowledge of biodiversity to be somewhat lower compared to climate change.

6.3 How do you rate your knowledge of natural resource protection (water, air, soil)?

The most common rating was 3 (47.1%), followed by 2 (16.7%) and 4 (34.8%). Only 0.7% of respondents rated level 5 (very high) and less than 3% rated level 1 (very low). The results indicate that respondents perceive their knowledge of natural resource protection as adequate, but with room for improvement.

Eco-friendly behaviour

Eco-friendly behavior was examined with a set of 9 statements measured on an intensity scale: never, rarely, sometimes, often and always.

7.1 I use disposable products (e.g. straws, bags, plates, etc.).

The most frequent rating was 3 (sometimes), which was given by 47.1% of the respondents. Another 29.7% answered with a rating of 4 (often), while only 3.6% gave a rating of 5 (always). Less frequent responses were ratings of 1 and 2, together less than 20%. These results show that the use of disposable products is common, but not dominant.

7.2 I buy less to reduce/reduce the amount of waste.

Most respondents gave a rating of 3 (sometimes) – 46.4%, and 27.5% chose a rating of 4 (often). Only 3.6% of the students gave a rating of 5 (always). Less frequent responses were ratings 1 (2.2%) and 2 (20.3%), indicating that most respondents try to limit excessive consumption at least occasionally.

7.3 I reduce my water consumption.

The most frequent responses were ratings 3 (34.1%) and 4 (34.8%), indicating a medium to high frequency of this behavior. Rating 5 (always) was reported by 10.1% of respondents, while ratings 1 and 2 together accounted for 21%.

7.4 I limit my consumption of meat and other animal products.

Most respondents indicated rating 1 (never) – 41.3%. Another 32.6% indicated rating 2 (rarely). Ratings 3, 4 and 5 together accounted for less than 30%, indicating that most respondents do not limit their meat consumption.

7.5 I buy drinks in refillable bottles and return them to the store.

As many as 77.5% of respondents rated this as 5 (always), and another 15.2% rated this as 4 (often). Less than 7% rated it lower (1–3), indicating that returning refillable bottles is very common among respondents.

7.6 I prefer e-books and audiobooks over traditional books.

The most common responses were ratings 1 (31.9%) and 2 (26.1%), indicating a low frequency of this behavior. Ratings 4 and 5 together accounted for less than 16% of responses, indicating that most students prefer traditional books.

7.7 I expand my knowledge of environmental issues from independent sources.

The most common responses were 3 (37.7%) and 4 (19.6%). Rating 5 (always) was given by 4.3% of respondents, while ratings 1 and 2 together accounted for 38.4%. The results show that students expand their knowledge about the environment only occasionally.

7.8 I expand my knowledge about environmental issues as part of my regular studies.

The most common answers were 3 (37.7%) and 4 (19.6%). Rating 5 was given by only 4.3% of respondents. Lower ratings (1 and 2) together accounted for approximately 38.4%. The results indicate that students acquire information about the environment as part of their regular studies only occasionally.

7.9 I expand my knowledge about environmental issues in postgraduate studies.

Most respondents (41.3%) gave rating 1 (never) and 34.8% chose rating 2 (rarely). Ratings of 3, 4 and 5 were less common, totalling approximately 24%. This shows that expanding environmental knowledge through postgraduate study is not common.

In their answers students showed varying degrees of engagement in environmental activities. Most students (47.1%) occasionally use disposable products, but 47.8% buy less to reduce waste. Water consumption is limited for 34.1% of respondents, but most do not limit meat consumption (41.3%). Most students regularly return bottles (77.5%), but only 16% prefer e-books to traditional books. Resources for expanding environmental knowledge are drawn mainly from independent sources (37.7%), but only some students focus on this content as part of their regular or postgraduate studies.

The way of travel within the city

Students rated their attitudes about traveling within the city within the five options offered on a scale: "yes, always", "yes, occasionally" and "I don't travel that way". The answers to the question about the ways of travelling within the city were dominated by the use of public transport, which was reported by 47.8% of respondents as an occasional way of travelling. Walking was the most common way for 41.3% of respondents who travelled on foot daily. Own bicycle/scooter was the preferred way for 32.6%, and public bicycle/scooter for 23.9% of students, mostly as an occasional choice. Driving was the least common way, with only 15.2% of respondents, indicating that most students prefer more environmentally friendly modes of transport.

Decisions on Buying Clothes

By the intensity of the frequencies expressed on the scale: never, rarely, sometimes, often and always, students evaluated the way of making decisions about buying clothes with regard to motivational factors based on 11 offered statements.

What motivates you to decide to buy new clothes?

Respondents identified appearance (43.5% rating 4-5) and price (41.3% rating 4-5) as the most common motivating factors. Comfort was important for 37.7% of respondents (rating 4-5), while the naturalness of the material received a lower rating, with only 27.5% of respondents rating 4-5. These results indicate that aesthetic and financial factors dominate clothing choices, while environmental and comfort aspects are less of a priority.

When buying a product, what motivates you is its ability to

When buying a product, the most important motivation was its ability to be recycled (47.1% rating 4-5), followed by the possibility of reuse (43.5% rating 4-5). Product repair was the least motivating factor, with only 31.9% of respondents rating 4-5. The results show that sustainable aspects, such as recycling and reuse, are of increasing importance among students, although they still do not predominate in all aspects of decision-making.

Students' Views

Participation in Educational Programmes

43.5% of respondents indicated that they participated in non-formal education programmes related to the topic of sustainable environmental development frequently (three or more times in the last five years). 40.6% indicated that they participated occasionally (twice in the last five years). 13.8% of respondents indicated that they have never participated in these programmes.

These results show that the majority of respondents have at least some experience with non-formal education programmes in the field of sustainable development, with regular participants representing a significant proportion. Complete non-participation was recorded only for a smaller group of respondents.

Students' Views on SGD Activities

Students' views regarding the SGD activities were evaluated on a scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" based on 12 statements. Respondents in most questions showed a positive interest in topics related to sustainability, with the share of affirmative answers (4 or 5) being dominant in all questions.

Satisfaction with the faculty's content on sustainable development: 58% of respondents expressed satisfaction (10.9% strongly agree, 47.1% agree), while 35.5% remained neutral.

Interest in learning more about sustainable green development: 84% of respondents agreed (56.5% agree, 27.5% strongly agree), while only 12.3% disagreed.

The role of NGOs in green development: 81.1% of respondents expressed interest (47.8% agree, 33.3% strongly agree), with minimal disagreement.

Gaining knowledge through interaction with NGOs: 78.2% of respondents agreed (42% agree, 36.2% strongly agree), with 10.9% being neutral.

Interest in contributing to sustainable green development of society: 81.1% of respondents expressed positive interest (57.2% agree, 23.9% strongly agree).

Willingness to engage in NGO activities: 76.1% of respondents expressed willingness (47.1% agree, 29% strongly agree).

Studying at a sustainable and green university: 77.6% of respondents indicated interest (42.8% agree, 34.8% strongly agree), with only 12.3% being neutral.

Impact of sustainability education on environmental awareness: 76.8% of respondents acknowledged the importance of education (59.4% agree, 17.4% strongly agree).

Awareness of sustainable development influences the choice of green products: 63.8% of respondents agreed (49.3% agree, 14.5% strongly agree), while 31.9% remained neutral.

Interest in more sustainability seminars at university: 80.5% of respondents expressed interest (43.5% agree, 37% strongly agree).

Cooperation of NGOs with university students: 87% of respondents expressed interest (46.4% agree, 40.6% strongly agree).

The proportion of respondents interested in expanding education and collaboration on sustainability ranged between 63% and 87% across all questions, with minimal neutrality or disagreement. Students showed high motivation to engage in activities to support sustainable green development.



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

