

Level of knowledge and information sources as predictors of sustainable development goals among students

John Mark R. Asio^{1,2*} 

¹Gordon College, Olongapo City, PHILIPPINES

²La Consolacion University Philippines, Malolos City, Bulacan, PHILIPPINES

*Corresponding Author: asio.johnmark@gmail.com

Citation: Asio, J. M. R. (2026). Level of knowledge and information sources as predictors of sustainable development goals among students. *Eurasian Journal of Science and Environmental Education*, 6(1), 73-81. <https://doi.org/10.30935/ejsee/18493>

ABSTRACT

The sustainable development goals (SDGs) have been around for quite some time already. However, there are still some college students who are still unable to appreciate their significance. This study aims to analyze the students' level of knowledge, information sources, and the impact of personal life on SDGs. Using a descriptive correlation research design, the proponent gathered essential data from 208 voluntary students who were conveniently chosen for the study. They are students enrolled in a publicly operated tertiary education in Olongapo City, Philippines, during the academic year of 2022-2023. The proponent also used an adopted and modified instrument to achieve the specific objectives of the study. Then, the gathered data underwent descriptive and inferential statistical analysis like frequency, percentage, mean, t-test, analysis of variance, Pearson-r and linear regression with the aid of a statistical software, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23. Results show that the respondents were "moderately knowledgeable" about the 17 SDGs. At the same time, they also "moderately agree" on the list of SDG information sources. Also, they believe that the SDGs "have an impact" on them. Inferential statistics also showed significant differences in terms of gender, residency, college, and GPA. In terms of relationships, both students' level of knowledge and source of information are significantly associated with the SDGs' impact on the respondents. Linear regression also confirms that the information source predicts the SDGs' impact on students. In conclusion, the study found variations and relationships that can benefit the students, the institutions, and other stakeholders to deepen their understanding of the SDGs.

Keywords: level of knowledge, information source, sustainable development goals, higher education institutions, United Nations

Received: 18 Aug. 2025 ♦ Accepted: 15 Apr. 2026

INTRODUCTION

The 17 sustainable development goals (SDGs) are a set of global targets adopted by the United Nations in 2015 as part of the 2030 agenda for sustainable development. These goals represent a shared vision for a better future, where scarcity is eradicated, the planet is protected, and all share prosperity. These goals are intended to mobilize countries around the world to end all varieties of poverty, fight inequalities, and tackle climate change, while ensuring that no one is left behind (Pallant et al., 2020).

The SDGs are designed to address the most pressing challenges facing humanity and the planet, including poverty, hunger, inequality, climate change, environmental degradation, and social injustice. They are a call to action for all countries, organizations, and individuals to work

together to achieve a more sustainable and equitable world. For instance, in the Philippines, one study reported that the country is making progress and has high potential to reach targets on poverty, maternal and early childhood mortality rates, and other related SDGs (Reyes & Arboneda, 2022). Another one also includes the Philippines as one to ensure SDGs like education are in place to attract multinational enterprises to their shores (Ike et al., 2019).

The knowledge level of students regarding the SDGs can vary widely. Some students may have a comprehensive understanding of the goals, their targets, and the interconnectedness between them. In contrast, others may have only a basic awareness or limited knowledge. Several studies in Indonesia showed that students' knowledge about the SDGs is high, with a positive attitude towards it (Afroz & Ilham, 2020; Jati et al., 2019). However, in a Chinese school, the knowledge level of students about SDGs is limited (Yuan

et al., 2021), and in universities in Spain, similar findings were reported (Leiva-Brondo et al., 2022; Zamora-Polo et al., 2019). There was also a particular study in America wherein Mexican students scored the highest in terms of knowledge on SDGs (Alvarez-Risco et al., 2021). A survey from Slovenia also revealed that only a few respondents mentioned the SDGs (Bezeliak et al., 2020). Factors such as age, educational background, exposure to global issues, and the emphasis placed on SDGs in the curriculum can influence students' knowledge levels.

In general, higher education institutions are key to implementing the sustainability principles (Zaleniene & Pereira, 2021). It is noteworthy that students in higher education who have had exposure to subjects like social studies, environmental science, global citizenship education, or specialized courses on sustainable development are more likely to have a deeper understanding of the SDGs. In a survey by García-González et al. (2020), there was a significant change in the knowledge of pre-service teachers after participating in a training process on sustainability. Higher education institutions that offer programs in fields like environmental studies, international development, or sustainability also contribute to a higher level of knowledge among students. In a particular study by Dlamini et al. (2023), it was stated that high school education in South Africa did not teach about SDGs, while Master's education claimed to be. Also, 50% of the doctorate graduates reported not being taught about SDGs.

Students can access information about the SDGs from various sources. Schools and universities often incorporate SDGs into their curriculum, providing students with information and resources. In a related article, the best-ranked universities in the world are more committed to transferring knowledge about SDGs to different stakeholders (De la Poza et al., 2021). As Arruda-Filho et al. (2019) mentioned, education impacts the new mindset for the students on SDGs. However, in a study by Yuan et al. (2021), they stated that students had limited information sources. Teachers play a crucial role in disseminating knowledge about the goals and their significance. Students can access information about the SDGs through dedicated websites, online courses, educational videos, and interactive tools. Platforms like the United Nations' SDG website, academic journals, and reputable non-governmental organizations (NGOs) also provide valuable resources. Students may come across information about the SDGs through news articles, documentaries, and social media. Media coverage of global issues and sustainability-related events can raise awareness among students. Various NGOs and non-profit organizations work towards promoting the SDGs and offer educational materials, workshops, and campaigns aimed at raising awareness among students. Students can learn about the SDGs through community initiatives, volunteering opportunities, and participation in sustainable development projects. Local organizations and community leaders often organize

events and workshops to educate and engage young people in SDG-related activities.

Individual actions and lifestyles can have a significant impact on achieving the SDGs. Students, like any other individuals, can contribute to the goals through their personal choices and behaviors. A study by Alimehmeti et al. (2024) found that students with courses related to SDG content had higher and better employment outcomes. Students can adopt sustainable consumption habits by reducing waste, choosing environmentally friendly products, and supporting fair trade. Thus, designing and implementing teaching-learning activities focused on SDGs are necessary for a better future profession (Oltra-Badenes et al., 2023). Responsible consumption helps address goals related to sustainable production and climate action. Students can conserve energy, use renewable energy sources, and practice water conservation. Such actions contribute to the goals of affordable and clean energy, responsible consumption and production, and sustainable cities and communities. Although some students value SDG education, they still lack knowledge behind it (Cachero et al., 2023). To address this concern, Espino-Díaz et al. (2025) explored the impact of project-based learning on university students' growth and found significant improvements in students' knowledge.

Students can engage in activism, advocacy, or community service activities related to the SDGs. By raising awareness, influencing policies, or supporting local initiatives, they can contribute to various goals, such as quality education, gender equality, and reduced inequalities. A related study also noted that higher and tertiary education institutions must work hand in hand with policymakers and societies to implement the SDGs (Togo & Gandidzanwa, 2021). Students can pursue educational paths and careers that align with the SDGs. They can choose fields related to sustainability, environmental sciences, social work, or international development and contribute directly to the goals through their professional endeavors. A related study by Ribeiro et al. (2023) showed that educating students about the SDGs through service learning can impact academic learning as well as personal and professional domains. Students can volunteer their time, skills, or resources to organizations working towards the SDGs. However, Novieastari et al. (2022) also pointed out that although the majority of students from different disciplines have good knowledge and perceptions of the SDGs, some were still unaware of them. By supporting initiatives focused on poverty eradication, environmental conservation, or social justice, they can advance multiple goals.

Although research is abundant on the assessment of the SDGs and their perspectives on students, no investigation has yet examined the influence of knowledge and information sources on the SDGs' impact on students' personal lives. This idea motivated this study. Thus, the study's objective is first to analyze students' knowledge and information sources regarding the SDGs. And second, to

determine whether the level of knowledge and information has an impact on a student's personal life.

It is important to note that while personal actions are valuable, systemic changes, policy reforms, and collective efforts are essential for achieving the SDGs on a global scale. Students can also advocate for such changes, raise awareness, and demand action from policymakers and institutions.

This study primarily contributes to the growing literature on SDG awareness and promotion. Also, it can provide educators and school administrators with an avenue to engage students in the different contexts of the SDGs and how they will affect them in the future. Hence, the results can serve as a baseline for developing effective policies and guidelines for the institution and students.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

In the study, the researcher used a descriptive correlation research design. Stangor and Walinga (2019) explained that descriptive research is designed to provide a snapshot of the current state of a phenomenon, while a correlational design is designed to discover relationships among variables. Since the study's objective is to analyze students' levels of knowledge and information sources and determine their impact on students' personal lives, the research design fits. It also used an online survey as the primary data gathering tool for the study. This study aimed to analyze knowledge levels, information sources, and the impact of personal life on SDGs. Since a descriptive study investigates the characteristics of a particular phenomenon or event, this type of research is well-suited to the study. In addition, the study seeks to identify any underlying relationship among the three variables and determine which variable influences the others. Thus, a correlation design is also appropriate.

Respondents

The population of the study came from a public tertiary institution located in Olongapo City, Philippines. There was a total of 208 voluntary student-respondents who participated and became the representative sample for the study. These students were chosen because they were from a reputable higher education institution in the city where the SDGs are being inculcated in their courses; hence, they already have prior ideas for the survey. According to Brysbaert (2019), in a correlation study, the minimum number of participants required is 195; hence, the current number of participants in the study is more than enough. The study also used an online survey as a primary data-gathering tool. The researcher then used a convenience sampling technique in order to gather enough respondents for the study. Data gathering commenced in April 2023 until June 2023. In order for the respondents to participate in the

survey, they have to qualify under the following inclusion criteria:

- (a) bona fide student of the tertiary institution,
- (b) enrolled in the institution during the time of data gathering,
- (c) must be willing to participate in the online survey, and
- (d) must have gadget(s) and internet connection.

As for the exclusion criteria,

- (a) any participants outside the institution are not excluded,
- (b) not yet enrolled in the institution,
- (c) not interested in the survey, and
- (d) no gadgets or internet connection.

Instrument

To gather the most essential information, the researcher adopted and revised an instrument created by Yuan et al. (2021). The instrument has four parts: the demographic characteristics, the knowledge level, the information source, and the impact of personal life on SDGs. The instrument also underwent validity and reliability tests to ensure its consistency. The overall result of the Cronbach alpha analysis was 0.936 with a range of 0.90-0.96 for each variable. The coefficients show a reliable set of questionnaires for the study. Lastly, the participants used a five point Likert scale to respond to the survey's statements ranging from (1) not knowledgeable to (5) very knowledgeable for the level of knowledge; (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree for the information sources of SDGs; and (1) no impact at all to (5) have a strong impact for the impact of SDGs on personal life.

Data Analysis

There were two sets of data analysis done in the study. First was the descriptive statistics, which included the frequency count, percentage, and mean computation for the demographic characteristics and the three variables in the study. The second was the inferential analysis for the significant difference and relationships among the variables. The statistical tools involved were t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the test of difference, and Pearson-r and linear regression for the test of relationships. The study also used software like MS Excel for data tabulation and statistical package for social sciences version 23 for statistical computation.

RESULTS

The study aims to analyze the knowledge level, information sources, and impact of personal life on SDGs. The following tables show the results of the study.

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents in a study. **Table 1** provides information on various demographic variables such as age, sex at birth,

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the respondents

Demographics	F	P (%)
Age		
Less than 20 years old	57	27.4
21-25 years old	451	72.6
Gender		
Male	42	20.2
Female	166	79.8
Residence/locality		
City	131	63.0
Province	77	37.0
Year level		
First level	15	7.2
Second level	6	2.9
Third level	180	86.4
Fourth level	7	3.4
College		
Business and accountancy	125	60.1
Education, arts, and science	23	11.1
Hospitality and tourism	60	28.8
GPA/GWA		
81-85%	61	29.3
86-90%	94	45.2
91+%	53	25.5
Total	208	100

Note. F: Frequency & P: Percentage

residence/locality, year level, and college. In terms of age, 58 individuals (27.1%) fall into the 18-20 age group, while 156 individuals (72.9%) fall into the 21-25 age group. This distribution suggests that the majority of the respondents are in the older age bracket, indicating a relatively higher representation of young adults in the study. In terms of sex at birth, out of the total respondents, 45 individuals (21%) were classified as male, while 169 individuals (79%) were classified as female. These figures indicate a higher representation of females in the study sample. In the case of residency/locality, 136 individuals (63.6%) reside in cities, while 78 individuals (36.4%) reside in provinces. This distribution suggests that the majority of the respondents are urban dwellers or live in urban areas. As for the year level, the distribution shows that the most significant

proportion of respondents is in the third year, with 185 individuals (86.4%).

The remaining respondents are distributed across the other year levels, with the lowest representation in the second year (6 individuals or 2.8%). These findings suggest that the study sample is predominantly composed of third-year students. Moreover, for the college, the largest group is from the Business and Accountancy college, with 129 individuals (60.3%). The education, arts, and science college has 24 individuals (11.2%), while the hospitality and tourism college has 61 individuals (28.5%). These figures indicate that the majority of the respondents in the study are from the Business and Accountancy college. Overall, the demographic characteristics of the respondents provide valuable insights into the composition of the study sample.

Table 2 presents the knowledge level of the respondents regarding the SDGs. As seen in **Table 2**, statement 1 generated the highest mean score of 2.75, which translates to an interpretation of “moderately knowledgeable.” However, it was statement 3 that obtained the lowest mean with a score of 2.53, which corresponds to an interpretation of “partially knowledgeable” in the scale. These results indicate that the respondents have some awareness of the time aspect of the SDGs. However, their understanding may be incomplete or lacking in specific details. Overall, the average mean for the knowledge level of respondents on SDGs was 2.66, which falls under the interpretation of “moderately knowledgeable.” The findings from **Table 2** suggest that the respondents have a moderate level of knowledge about the SDGs. While they are familiar with the 17 goals, the countries they are addressed to, and the number of goals, their knowledge may not be comprehensive or in-depth. It is important to consider these knowledge levels when interpreting the respondents’ perspectives or designing interventions or educational programs to enhance their understanding of the SDGs.

Table 3 depicts the information sources of the respondents regarding the SDGs. Based on **Table 3**, the

Table 2. Knowledge level of respondents on SDGs

Statements	M	SD	Interpretation
1. I know what the 17 SDGs are.	2.75	1.080	Moderately knowledgeable
2. I know the countries to which the SDGs are addressed.	2.62	1.100	Moderately knowledgeable
3. I know the time horizon for which the SDGs are designed.	2.53	1.100	Partially knowledgeable
4. I know the number of SDGs and could indicate one of the goals.	2.74	1.144	Moderately knowledgeable
Overall M	2.66	0.991	Moderately informed

Note. 1.00-1.80: Not knowledgeable; 1.81-2.60: Partially knowledgeable; 2.61-3.40: Moderately knowledgeable; 3.41-4.20: Knowledgeable; & 4.21-5.00: Very knowledgeable

Table 3. Information source of the respondents on SDGs

Statements	M	SD	Interpretation
1. I have received information about the SDGs by email and/or social networks.	2.58	1.161	Disagree
2. I have received information about the SDGs from the traditional media (press, radio, and/or television).	2.73	1.130	Moderately agree
3. I have received information about SDGs in formal education (kindergarten, primary school, junior high school, senior high school, etc.).	3.06	1.167	Moderately agree
4. I have received information about the SDGs in informal training (e.g., workshops of NGOs, extracurricular activities, etc.).	2.63	1.174	Moderately agree
Overall M	2.75	0.962	Moderately agree

Note. 1.00-1.80: Strongly disagree; 1.81-2.60: Disagree; 2.61-3.40: Moderately agree; 3.41-4.20: Agree; & 4.21-5.00: Strongly agree

Table 4. SDGs impact on respondents

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. No poverty	3.60	0.882	Have an impact
2. Zero hunger	3.46	0.909	Have an impact
3. Good health and well-being	3.70	0.913	Have an impact
4. Quality education	3.82	0.921	Have an impact
5. Gender equality	3.80	0.960	Have an impact
6. Clean water and sanitation	3.71	0.978	Have an impact
7. Affordable and clean energy	3.56	0.969	Have an impact
8. Decent work and economic growth	3.53	0.965	Have an impact
9. Industry, innovation, and infrastructure	3.57	0.943	Have an impact
10. Reduced inequalities	3.49	0.925	Have an impact
11. Sustainable cities and communities	3.51	0.946	Have an impact
12. Responsible consumption and production	3.50	0.966	Have an impact
13. Climate action	3.67	0.981	Have an impact
14. Life below water	3.39	1.051	Moderate impact
15. Life on land	3.60	1.005	Have an impact
16. Peace, justice and strong institutions	3.62	0.943	Have an impact
17. Partnerships for the goals	3.50	0.985	Have an impact
Overall M	3.59	0.831	Have an impact

Note. 1.00-1.80: No impact at all; 1.81-2.60: Have a little impact; 2.61-3.40: Have a moderate impact; 3.41-4.20: Have an impact; & 4.21-5.00: Have a strong impact

Table 5. Differences in the responses on SDGs among the student-respondents

Demographic profile	Knowledge level	Sources of information	SDGs impact
Age	t = -0.106 & p = .915	t = 0.223 & p = .824	t = 2.053* & p = .042
Gender	t = -1.436 & p = .152	t = 0.242 & p = .809	t = 0.595 & p = .553
Residency	t = -1.428 & p = .155	t = -2.751* & p = .006	t = -1.885 & p = .061
Year level	F = 1.653 & p = .178	F = 0.161 & p = .922	F = 0.344 & p = .794
College	F = 8.478* & p = .000	F = 5.659* & p = .004	F = 6.993* & p = .001
GPA	F = 2.691 & p = .070	F = 3.364* & p = .037	F = 3.542* & p = .031

Note. *p < .05

statement with the highest mean was “I have received information about SDGs in formal education (kindergarten, primary school, junior high school, senior high school, etc.)” with a score of 3.06. This result translates to an interpretation of “moderately agree.”

On the other hand, statement 1 garnered the lowest mean with a score of 2.58, which corresponds to an interpretation of “disagree.” To sum, the overall mean for the information source of the respondents on SDGs was 2.75, which falls under the interpretation of “moderately agree” in the scale. The results from **Table 3** suggest that respondents primarily receive information about the SDGs through formal education, followed by traditional media sources. Informal training and digital platforms, such as email and social networks, have a relatively lower influence as information sources. These findings highlight the importance of educational institutions and traditional media in disseminating information about the SDGs, while also indicating the potential for utilizing informal training and digital platforms to enhance further awareness and understanding of the SDGs among the respondents.

Depicted in **Table 4** is the SDGs' impact on respondents. Based on the result of mean calculations, indicator 4 garnered the highest mean with a score of 3.82, which corresponds to a descriptive interpretation of “has an impact.” However, indicator 14 got the lowest mean score with 3.39, and it falls under the interpretation of “moderate impact” from the Likert scale. The overall mean for the SDGs' impact on respondents' lives was 3.59, which also corresponds to an interpretation of “has an impact” in the

scale. **Table 4** suggests that the respondents recognize the importance of their actions in contributing to the achievement of the SDGs, and they believe that their efforts can make a difference.

Table 5 presents the results of a statistical analysis of differences in responses to SDGs among student respondents based on different variables, including age, sex at birth, residency, year level, and college. For the variable age, the t-test result for the two variables involved shows no significant differences in mean scores among respondents of different age groups. Following the study, the obtained values for knowledge level were $t(212) = 0.086$, $p = .932$, and for information source, $t(212) = 0.273$, $p = .785$. However, for the SDGs impact, the study found a significant difference wherein $t(212) = 2.053$, $p = .042$. This result means that respondents who were less than 20 years old (mean [M] = 3.78, standard deviation [SD] = 0.821) have a higher score as compared to 21-25 years old respondents (M = 3.52, SD = 0.828). On the other hand, for gender, there are no significant differences in knowledge level since $t(212) = -1.436$, $p = .155$, information source since $t(212) = 0.242$, $p = .809$, and SDGs impact with $t(212) = 0.595$, $p = .553$. Their probability values were higher than the .05 alpha significance level.

In the case of residency, there was a significant difference for the information source since $t(212) = -2.751$, $p = .006$. This result means that respondents from the city (M = 2.61; SD = 0.956) got a lower mean score than those in the province (M = 2.98; SD = 0.937). On the other hand, no significant difference was found for the knowledge level and

Table 6. Correlation between knowledge level, information source, and impact of personal life

Variable	Impact on personal life	
	Pearson correlation	
Knowledge level	Pearson correlation	.304*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	208
Information source	Pearson correlation	.350*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	208

Note. *p < .05

the SDGs impact, with $t(212) = -1.428$, $p = .155$ for knowledge level and $t(212) = -1.885$, $p = .061$ for the SDGs impact among respondents. Their p -values were higher than the alpha significance level of 5%.

In terms of the year level, the study did not particularly get a significant finding based on the computation. **Table 5** revealed the following F -values: for knowledge level, $F(3, 204) = 1.653$, $p = .178$; for information source, $F(3, 204) = 0.161$, $p = .922$; and for SDGs impact to respondents, $F(3, 204) = 0.344$, $p = .794$. The probability values mentioned were all higher than the alpha level of significance of .05.

As for the college, the study obtained significant differences in all three variables. The following were the results generated by the ANOVA: $F(2, 205) = 8.478$, $p = .000$ for the knowledge level; $F(2, 205) = 5.659$, $p = .004$ for the information source; and $F(2, 205) = 6.993$, $p = .001$ for the SDGs impact to respondents. All of the p -values were significant at the .05 alpha level of significance. Therefore, it is safe to assume that there was a variance in the perspectives of the respondents when grouped according to their college.

Lastly, in terms of GPA, there were also significant differences found in terms of information source ($F[2, 205] = 3.364$, $p = .037$) and the impact of SDGs on respondents ($F[2, 205] = 3.542$, $p = .031$). The obtained probability values were significant at 5% alpha level of significance. On the other hand, only the knowledge level ($F[2, 205] = 2.691$, $p = .070$) did not yield a significant finding to endorse a variance in the perspectives of the respondents in the study.

To determine if there is an underlying relationship between knowledge level and information, as well as the impact of personal life on SDGs, the researcher performed a correlation computation. It can be gleaned from **Table 6** that there was a weak positive relationship between the mentioned variables since the study obtained the following values: for knowledge level, $r = .304$, $p = .000$; and for information source, $r = .350$, $p = .041$. The p -values were all lower than the alpha significance level set at .05. Therefore, it is safe to assume that there is a significant association

between the knowledge level and information source with the impact of personal life on SDGs. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis of the study.

In **Table 7**, the study presents the linear regression result between the knowledge level, information source, and the impact of personal life on SDGs. As seen from the presentation, one can determine that the information source yielded a substantial result. The study obtained a β coefficient of .227, which has an equivalent t -value of 15.857 and a p -value of .000. This result is significant at a .05 alpha significance level, which means that the information source is a significant predictor of the SDGs' impact on students. On the other hand, the knowledge level also correlated with the SDGs' impact on students, but not to a significant extent. This idea means that the knowledge level remains a predictor for the SDGs' impact, but not significantly. The results of this linear regression analysis suggest that the information source has a relatively moderate positive effect on the impact on respondents. In contrast, knowledge level has a weak positive effect that is not statistically significant.

DISCUSSION

The objective of this study is to determine the students' knowledge level, information source, and the impact of SDGs on their personal lives from a tertiary school in Olongapo City, Philippines. As seen from the results of the study, the researcher found some interesting discoveries that may be achieved through various means. The result may significantly contribute to organizations, the academic communities, and even to the policy makers who intend to promote and advocate sustainability.

For the basic characteristics of the respondents, the study found the following vital information. A good majority of the respondents were aged between 21 and 25 years old, female, living within the city, currently in their third year, and most of them came from the College of Business and Accounting.

In the case of students' knowledge level of SDGs, the study obtained a general level of "moderately informed" from respondents. The current result has some resemblance to the findings of Novieastari et al. (2022), wherein 42 percent of their respondents were unaware of the SDGs. The said result only means that their information regarding SDGs is not that high. Nevertheless, sustainability-based curricula and culture change are the key to the mindset of transformation (Zaleniene & Pereira, 2021)

Table 7. Linear regression between knowledge level, information source, and impact of personal life on SDGs

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Standard error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.662	.174		15.298	.000
Knowledge level	.115	.070	.137	1.633	.104
Information source	.227	.073	.262	3.122	.002

Note. $F(2, 206) = 15.857$; $p = .000$; $R^2 = .133$

This result is fascinating, as the SDGs have been around for quite some time, yet most of them still have little information on this matter. This finding is also supported by the past study of Novieastari et al. (2022), which found that the majority of their participants from different disciplines have good knowledge and perceptions of the SDGs; however, some were unaware of them. It is also essential to note that they are already at a tertiary level of learning, and this level is not emphasized in their curricula. Nevertheless, Ribeiro et al. (2023) emphasized that educating students about the SDGs through service learning can impact academic learning as well as personal and professional domains. This finding is significant for the institution to know.

In the case of the students' information source about the SDGs, it is also noteworthy to reveal that the primary source of SDG information comes from formal education. According to the study by Mawonde and Togo (2019), several practices align with the SDGs, especially in teaching, research, community engagement, and campus operations management. This discovery might contradict or support the previous finding that the students are moderately knowledgeable regarding the SDGs. This result may strengthen the context that the knowledge is dependent on the school's exploration of incorporating the SDGs in their curricula. Again, this result is significant to be discussed in the institution.

For the last variable of the study, the impact of personal life on the SDGs, it is quite a relief to know that the respondents try to impact the SDGs with their lives unconsciously. Although they have a moderate level of knowledge of the SDGs, as the basic concepts of the SDGs are related to people's lives, the respondents somehow identified them with their experiences. Thus, they have an impact on the SDGs. For instance, an Ecological Project implemented by some students in an engineering department resulted in a rise in the awareness of the SDGs among the participants of the project (Manolis & Manoli, 2021). Also, in the paper of ElMassah and Mohieldin (2020), localization allows the government to effectively create sustainable development strategies at the local level, which can boost digital transformation in society.

The study also has another story for the inferential statistics done in order to determine the differences and relationships among the responses and the variables. For the test of difference, there were variations found in sex at birth (impact of personal life on SDGs), residency (information source), and college (all three variables). In a related study by Dlamini et al. (2023), it was claimed that there were more females than males who were aware of SDGs. Another study also found differences in the SDG contexts in terms of geographical location and the universities involved in the study (De la Poza et al., 2021). These interesting findings are essential for the institution to consider how to approach and incorporate the SDGs into its curricula. In terms of relationship, both the knowledge level and source of information showed a weak positive

correlation with the impact of personal life on SDGs. A related study by Alvarez-Risco et al. (2021) also shared that the availability of training programs in universities promotes SDGs among students. It is also important to note that higher education institutions can play a significant role in the implementation of SDGs in the community (Togo & Gandidzanwa, 2021). This result is vital to strengthening the connotation of incorporating the sustainable developmental goals into the different curricula of every school, even in the earlier stages of learning (e.g., high school or senior high school). Furthermore, the linear regression also predicted that the information source significantly influences the impact of personal life on SDGs among the students. Based on a special issue article by Chankseliani and McCowan (2020), the current SDGs are intended to broaden their focus beyond primary and secondary education to the tertiary level of education, since this is the missing piece from the previous international agenda.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussions presented in the previous sections of the study, the researcher concludes that the demographic profile of the respondents predominantly consisted of individuals aged 21-25 years old, with a higher representation of females residing in urban areas, enrolled in the third-year level, and studying within the College of Business and Accountancy. Regarding SDGs, respondents exhibited a "moderate" level of understanding, with a similar degree of agreement about their education as a source of SDG information. They also acknowledged a personal impact on the SDGs. Noteworthy differences were observed by sex at birth (influence of personal life), residency (source of information), and college affiliation (knowledge level, information source, and personal impact on the SDGs). A significant relationship was identified between knowledge levels and information sources, particularly regarding the influence of personal life on the SDGs. Additionally, the study highlighted the substantial influence of information sources on individuals' personal impact on the SDGs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results and conclusion of the study, the researcher recommends the following:

1. Raise student awareness and knowledge regarding the 17 SDGs, especially in the institution, by posting information, education, and communication materials around the school.
2. Some courses at the tertiary level should incorporate aspects of the SDGs in their discussions and emphasize their importance to students and how they can participate accordingly.

3. The institution or the school should also integrate some principles of the SDGs into their planning and decision-making to achieve their vision, mission, and goals.
4. Proactive participation and commitment of faculty and non-teaching personnel in observing and taking into action the main agenda of the SDGs.
5. Training and workshop for the different SDGs for faculty, non-teaching personnel, and student to strengthen their commitment to attaining the SDGs.

Funding: The author received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

Ethics declaration: The author conducted this research in accordance with recognized ethical standards for research involving human participants. All efforts were made to ensure ethical integrity. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study, their participation was purely voluntary, and informed consent was secured. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained throughout the research process. The study also adheres to the principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki.

AI statement: This manuscript involved the use of an AI tool like Grammarly for linguistic refinement. All conceptual, methodological, and analytical content is the sole responsibility of the author.

Declaration of interest: The author declares no competing interest.

Data availability: The data generated or analyzed during this study are available from the author upon request.

REFERENCES

- Afroz, N., & Ilham, Z. (2020). Assessment of knowledge, attitude and practice of university students towards sustainable development goals (SDGs). *The Journal of Indonesia Sustainable Development Planning*, 1(1), 31-44. <https://doi.org/10.46456/jisdep.v1i1.12>
- Alimehmeti, G., Fia, M., & Paletta, A. (2024). The sustainability-to-employment pipeline: The impact of SDG-related curricula on graduates' employability. *Studies in Higher Education*, 49(12), 2328-2342. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2299328>
- Alvarez-Risco, A., Del-Aguila-Arcentales, S., Rosen, M. A., García-Ibarra, V., Maycotte-Felkel, S., & Martínez-Toro, G. M. (2021). Expectations and interests of university students in COVID-19 times about sustainable development goals: Evidence from Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, and Peru. *Sustainability*, 13(6), Article 3306. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063306>
- Arruda-Filho, N. P., Hino, M. C., & Przybylowicz-Beuter, B. S. (2019). Including SDGs in the education of globally responsible leaders. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 20(5), 856-870. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-01-2019-0032>
- Bezeljak, P., Scheuch, M., & Torkar, G. (2020). Understanding of sustainability and education for sustainable development among pre-service biology teachers. *Sustainability*, 12(17), Article 6892. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12176892>
- Brysbaert, M. (2019). How many participants do we have to include in properly powered experiments? A tutorial of power analysis with reference tables. *Journal of Cognition*, 2(1), Article 16. <https://doi.org/10.5334/joc.72>
- Cachero, C., Grao-Gil, O., Pérez-delHoyo, R., Ordóñez-García, M. C., Andújar-Montoya, M. D., Lillo-Ródenas, M. Á., & Torres, R. (2023). Perception of the sustainable development goals among university students: A multidisciplinary perspective. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 429, Article 139682. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.139682>
- Chankseliani, M., & McCowan, T. (2021). Higher education and the sustainable development goals. *Higher Education*, 81, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00652-w>
- De la Poza, E., Merello, P., Barberá, A., & Celani, A. (2021). Universities' reporting on SDGs: Using THE impact rankings to model and measure their contribution to sustainability. *Sustainability*, 13(4), Article 2038. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042038>
- Dlamini, S., Block, E. K., & Mathibela, N. (2023). Knowledge of and attitudes towards sustainable development goals among adults in South Africa. *South African Geographical Journal*, 105(3), 384-401. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03736245.2022.2148723>
- ElMassah, S., & Mohieldin, M. (2020). Digital transformation and localizing the sustainable development goals (SDGs). *Ecological Economics*, 169, Article 106490. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106490>
- Espino-Díaz, L., Luque-González, R., Fernández-Caminero, G., & Álvarez-Castillo, J. (2025). Exploring the impact of project-based learning on sustainable development goals awareness and university students' growth. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 14(1), 283-296. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.14.1.283>
- García-González, E., Jiménez-Fontana, R., & Azcárate, P. (2020). Education for sustainability and the sustainable development goals: Pre-service teachers' perceptions and knowledge. *Sustainability*, 12(18), Article 7741. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12187741>
- Ike, M., Donovan, J. D., Topple, C., & Masli, E. K. (2019). The process of selecting and prioritizing corporate sustainability issues: Insights for achieving the sustainable development goals. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 236, Article 117661. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.117661>

- Jati, H. F., Darsono, S. N. A. C., Hermawan, T., Yudhi, W. A. S., & Rahman, F. F. (2019). Awareness and knowledge assessment of sustainable development goals among university students. *Jurnal Ekonomi & Studi Pembangunan*, 20(2), 163-175. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jesp.20.2.5022>
- Leiva-Brondo, M., Lajara-Camilleri, N., Vidal-Meló, A., Atarés, A., & Lull, C. (2022). Spanish university students' awareness and perception of sustainable development goals and sustainability literacy. *Sustainability*, 14(8), Article 4552. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14084552>
- Manolis, E. N., & Manoli, E. N. (2021). Raising awareness of the sustainable development goals through ecological projects in higher education. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 279, Article 123614. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.123614>
- Mawonde, A., & Togo, M. (2019). Implementation of SDGs at the University of South Africa. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 20(5), 932-950. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-04-2019-0156>
- Novieastari, E., Pujasari, H., Abdul Rahman, L. O., Ganefianty, A., & Rerung, M. P. (2022). Knowledge, perception, and awareness about sustainable development goals (SDGs) among students of a public university in Indonesia. *International Journal of Health Promotion and Education*, 60(4), 195-203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14635240.2022.2066557>
- Oltra-Badenes, R., Guerola-Navarro, V., Gil-Gómez, J.-A., & Botella-Carrubi, D. (2023). Design and implementation of teaching-learning activities focused on improving the knowledge, the awareness and the perception of the relationship between the SDGs and the future profession of university students. *Sustainability*, 15(6), Article 5324. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15065324>
- Pallant, E., Choate, B., & Haywood, B. (2020). How do you teach undergraduate university students to contribute to the UN SDGs 2030? In W. Leal Filho (Ed.), *Universities as living labs for sustainable development. World sustainability series* (pp. 69-85). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15604-6_5
- Reyes, C., & Arboneda, A. (2022). Measuring the distance to 2030 targets: Can the Philippines achieve the SDGs? In V. Anbumozhi, K. Kalirajan, & F. Kimura (Eds.), *Sustainable development goals and pandemic planning* (pp. 373-411). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-6734-3_8
- Ribeiro, L. M., Miranda, F., Themudo, C., Gonçalves, H., Bringle, R. G., Rosário, P., & Aramburuzabala, P. (2023). Educating for the sustainable development goals through service-learning: University students' perspectives about the competences developed. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, Article 1144134. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1144134>
- Stangor, C., & Walinga, J. (2019). *Introduction to psychology*. BC Open Textbooks. <https://www.saskoer.ca/introductiontopsychology/chapter/psychologists-use-descriptive-correlational-and-experimental-research-designs-to-understand-behavior/>
- Togo, M., & Gandidzanwa, C.P. (2021). The role of Education 5.0 in accelerating the implementation of SDGs and challenges encountered at the University of Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 22(7), 1520-1535. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-05-2020-0158>
- Yuan, X., Yu, L., & Wu, H. (2021). Awareness of sustainable development goals among students from a Chinese senior high school. *Education Sciences*, 11(9), Article 458. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11090458>
- Zaleniene, I., & Pereira, P. (2021). Higher education for sustainability: A global perspective. *Geography and Sustainability*, 2(2), 99-106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geosus.2021.05.001>
- Zamora-Polo, F., Sánchez-Martín, J., Corrales-Serrano, M., & Espejo-Antúnez, L. (2019). What do university students know about sustainable development goals? A realistic approach to the reception of this UN program amongst the youth population. *Sustainability*, 11(13), Article 3533. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11133533>

