## **EVENT DESCRIPTION SHEET**

(To be filled in and uploaded as deliverable in the Portal Grant Management System, at the due date foreseen in the system.

Please provide one sheet per event (one event = one workpackage = one lump sum).)

PROJECT	
Participant:	Bratislava Policy Institute (BPI)
PIC number:	911230417
Project name and acronym:	RevivEU

.EVENT DESCRIPTION			
Event number:	8.1		
Event name:	Citizens' consultation on Migration and Climate in Slovakia		
Туре:	Public citizens' consultations		
In situ/online:	in-situ		
Location:	Regions of Slovakia (specified by NUTS 2 division)		
Date(s):	5. – 16.2.2023		
Website(s) (if any):	http://reviveu.net/activities/research/citizens-attitudes-towards- migration-and-climate/		
Participants			
Female:	187		
Male:	180		
Non-binary:	0		
From country 1 [Slovakia]:	367		
From country 2 [name]:			
From country 3 [name]:			
Total number of participants:	367	From total number of countries:	1
Description (			

## Description

Provide a short description of the event and its activities.

First phase of the series of citizens' consultations brought intriguing answers that confirmed findings of previous research confirming widespread dissatisfaction, frustration, and anger of the Slovak population. Unlike in the past when Slovak society was polarised and divided into two camps, RevivEU survey, conducted in the form of public consultations of citizens, showed dissatisfaction of

most people in Slovakia with their national government, EU, and life in general.

The consultations were conducted in the form of guided in-person interviews with professional facilitators based on the previously prepared and agreed set of sociological questions. They were carried out in the one-on-one format, following the agreed methodology of the project and striving to create an efficient and comfortable method for the citizens to provide their inputs and opinions. An average interview lasted 22 minutes, with up to 18 of those being dedicated to the scripted questions and the rest used by the participants to either ask questions or provide feedback on top of that. The consultations took place in all the Slovak regions: almost 8% of them in the capital Bratislava, almost 38% of them in the Western Slovakia region, approximately 24% in the Central Slovakia region and 28% in the Eastern Slovakia region, based on the NUTS 2 specification.

The consultations bring a picture of a country that is deeply dissatisfied, frustrated, and derailed from the standards they have been used to. As many as 87 percent of people declare that the country's economic situation is bad, and 82 percent of people believe that the country is going in the wrong direction. The country displays features of fear of the future and expects only the worst about the future. At the same time, the results of the consultations suggest that as many as 72 percent of people in Slovakia believe that their children will be worse off in comparison with their life.

The participants' feedback also brought disturbing findings about the extremely high level of distrust toward institutions and also toward other people. As many as 75 percent of people in Slovakia do not trust other people. Trust, as an important component of social capital, has its specifics in Slovakia. People see it as trusting people I know and authorities I respect, not trusting institutions. Trust is based on personal relationships, not formal relationships. This type of trust makes social networks and the informational and attitudinal "bubbles" they create extremely effective.

The consultations show, at the same time, lacking solidarity with those who are different and confirms the findings of various previous surveys. With the exceptions of Czechs, Poles, and Hungarians (neighbours) Slovak citizens show a high level of social distance toward migrants and people from other cultural contexts. Lack of solidarity can also be seen in the assessment of Ukrainian refugees, who are rejected by the majority of Slovaks. As many as 70 percent of Slovaks display a lack of solidarity with Ukrainian refugees, more than 60 percent believe that Ukrainian will not be an asset for Slovakia in the future, and 70 percent of Slovaks believe that the government of Slovakia does more for Ukrainians then for Slovaks.

The consultations, however, also show positive findings - knowledge about the EU, European Parliament, representatives of the EU, and division of competencies within EU institutions is rather high and widespread. At the same time, as far as the climate crisis is concerned, people in Slovakia are concerned about it. The majority does not question the existence of the climate crisis, and generally speaking, they are aware of the solutions of the crisis.

However, in evaluations of policies of the EU and its handling of various crises, Slovak citizens are extremely critical, even in cases when the European Commission visibly handled crises well and with positive results for people. For instance, as few as 7 percent of people in Slovakia evaluate the way EU handled recent energy crisis as positive.

To conclude, the citizens' consultations confirm theses about widespread anomie and unbalanced cultural and social capital in Slovakia. It has been caused by the disintegration of previous values that have not been fully replaced by the values of a pluralistic modern country. The system of values was replaced after 1989 by a system of post-communist values of "profit" and "success," which sanctify the use of any means. The plebeian rural culture in Slovakia, which was guided by the moral values of the traditional local community and the conviction of its purity and innocence as opposed to the values of Western civilization, after the collision with the moral perversion of fascism and communism and after the collision with the cultural pluralism and modern civilization of the West, disintegrated, lost its anchored in tradition and has not gained anchoring in the modern world. It did not get it also because the offer was a mistaken and primitive image of the freedoms of liberal democracy, as interpreted by political representatives who were not political elites in the normative sense of the word.

HISTORY OF CHANGES				
VERSION	PUBLICATION DATE	CHANGE		
1.0	01.04.2022	Initial version (new MFF).		