

Türkiye's Position in the Global Sustainable Development Goals: A Comparison on Quality Education

Sinan ERTEN

Hacettepe University

Pelin KOSEOGLU

Süleyman Demirel University

Zubeyde GUNES

Hacettepe University

Muge OZKANBAS

Hacettepe University

To Cite This Chapter:

Erten, S., Koseoglu, P., Gunes, Z., & Ozkanbas, M. (2023). Türkiye's position in the global sustainable development goals: A comparison on quality education. In O. Cardak & S. A. Kiray (Eds.), *Current Studies in Educational Disciplines 2023* (pp. 15-37). ISRES Publishing

Sustainability and Sustainable Development

Since its existence, humanity has benefited from the environment in order to meet its endless needs. All the developments that exist for the progress of humanity have emerged as a result of the unconscious use of natural resources. However, natural resources are not unlimited, which causes damage to the basic elements of the environment. Currently, the whole world is faced with environmental problems resulting from the deterioration of the ecological balance. The main reason for the rapidly growing environmental problems that lead to the deterioration of human-environment interaction is the industrialization phenomenon that started in the 19th century and continues to develop (Deniz, 2009). Industrialization is a turning point for human history, as it enables large-scale production and developments in industrialization offer numerous benefits to the world. However, alongside these benefits, industrialization is also known to create challenges in economic, social, and cultural domains because it has also increased the consumption desire of humanity. The world has undergone significant and rapid changes, encompassing a wide range of issues. Presently, change and development have made international competition crucial. Nevertheless, addressing the global challenges that societies face requires nations to collaborate towards common goals rather than engaging in competition. Development can be defined as the process of improving a country's economic and social structure to align it with modern nations. Although the concept of development is primarily associated with the economy, it is evolving to include new dimensions. Nowadays, development is often referred to as "sustainable development," which entails meeting the present generation's needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (Ada, 2015). In other words, sustainable development involves repairing past resource destruction, preserving the environment's carrying capacity, safeguarding the renewable characteristics of existing resources, and ensuring their continuity into the

future (Aydın, 2016; Ertan, 2018; The World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987).

The transition to an industrial society has brought many benefits on a global scale. In addition, it has created many social, environmental and economic problems. These are global problems that every society, not just a single society, must solve. However, the intensity of these problems differs depending on the structure of the society. In addition to environmental problems, inequality, terrorism, violence, gender discrimination, unhealthy living conditions, population growth, poverty, inequality of opportunity in education have become the common problem of the whole world. The search for solutions to these problems has increased the importance of the concept of sustainable development on an international scale (Korkmaz, 2020).

It was seen that the use of the concept of sustainable development has increased in the 1980s and this concept has been discussed in the context of solving environmental problems (Ralph & Stubbs, 2014; Spindler, 2013). In these years, the conscious use of natural resources and the prevention of damage to nature constitute the framework of sustainable development. Later, the concept of economy was included in the basis of sustainable development. In this context, the concept of sustainable development; It has begun to be explained as providing economic developments by protecting environmental values and taking into account the rights and benefits of future generations (Bozdoğan, 2010). International meetings such as the Stockholm Conference and the Rio Summit, which were held after 1970, revealed the sociological and social aspects of sustainable development as well as the environment and economy. One of the most important steps regarding sustainable development is the determination of the global targets to be achieved by 2030 at the United Nations Sustainable Development Summit.

The Global Sustainable Development Goals

All societies worldwide exhibit the characteristics of a consumer society. With the population projected to reach eight billion in the near future, determining the extent to which resources can sustain the needs and desires of constantly consuming individuals is not as simple as forecasting population growth. Hence, it is crucial to consider the sustainability of limited resources. Efficient resource utilization and future planning become imperative at this juncture. In 2015, the United Nations General Assembly established 17 goals aimed at protecting the planet, eradicating poverty, combating inequality and injustice, among others. These goals, known as the Sustainable Development Goals, are expected to be achieved by 2030. They have been designed to be inclusive of all nations. However, attaining these goals necessitates the cooperation and collaboration of various stakeholders such as technology, business world, innovations, and new approaches to conducting business. The member states of the United Nations adopted the Sustainable Development Goals at the United Nations General Assembly in September 2015, and they came into effect on January 1, 2016. The goals involve 193 countries and are presented through descriptive phrases and illustrations, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. *Sustainable Development Goals*

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

Türkiye's Position in the Global Sustainable Development Goals

By the end of 2030, the member countries of the United Nations are expected to find solutions to both social, cultural and environmental problems gathered under 17 headings such as food insecurity and hunger, climate crisis, poverty, gender equality, providing quality education. These issues are grouped under the sustainable development goals. These goals are a universal call to action that includes the targets that UN member states are expected to achieve by the end of 2030. The 17 sub-headings and the number and names of countries that have achieved these goals are given in the table below.

Table 2. *Countries achieving the sustainable development goals*

Objective Number	Objective Name	Number of Countries Reached	Reachable Country Names
1	No Poverty	31	Dominica, Czechia, Denmark, Sweden, Kazakhstan, Germany, France, Poland, Russia, Finland, China, Malaysia, Thailand, Iceland, Austria, United Arab Emirates, Jordan, Azerbaijan, Malaysia, Norway, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ukraine, Croatia, Hungary, Slovenia, Belarus, Ireland, Belgium, Netherlands, Bulgaria, Moldova, Germany, Hungary, Hungary, Hungary, Hungary, Slovenia, Norway, Moldova, Ireland, Ireland, Jordan, United Arab Emirates, Ukraine, Ukraine, Slovenia, Poland, Russia, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Netherlands, Moldova
2	Zero Hunger	0	-
3	Good Health and Well-being	0	-
4	Quality Education	16	Argentina, Peru, Uruguay, Russia , Canada , Canada, Serbia , Croatia, China, Cyprus, Serilanka, Moldova, Finland , Belarus, Japan, Japan, Mongolia, Serbia, United Arab Emirates, Vietnam
5	Gender Equality	5	Argentina, Norway, Nabimya, New Zealand, Sweden
6	Clean Water and Sanitation	0	-
7	Affordable and Clean Energy	11	Brazil, Costa Rica, Austria, Denmark, Georgia, Iceland, New Zealand, Portugal, Switzerland, Switzerland, Andorra
8	Decent Work and Economic Growth	2	Cuba, Slovenia
9	Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure	1	Japan
10	Reducing Inequality	9	Denmark, Algeria, Iceland, Norway, Belarus, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Mali, Ukraine, Ukraine
11	Sustainable Cities and Communities	0	-
12	Responsible Consumption and Production	26	Guatemala, Hunduras, Haiti, Morocco, Senegal, Guinea, Congo, Congo, Zambia, Madagascar, Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Yemen, Nigeria, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Somalia, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Afghanistan, India, Kombocia, Miyemmar, Philippines, Papua New Guinea,

			Korea
13	Climate Action	20	Nicaragua, Cuba, Bolivia, Morocco, Mauritania, Mauritania, Senegal, Mali, Mali, Guinea, Guinea, Burkinafaso, Madagascar, Sudan, Chad, Syria, Yemen, Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Papua New Guinea, Kombocia, Korea
14	Life Below Water	0	-
15	Life on Land	4	Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia
16	Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions	2	Iceland, Japan
17	Partnerships for Goals	1	Norway

When the data for 2023 in the table above are analyzed, it is seen that the Poverty Reduction goal has been achieved the most. The number of countries achieving this goal is 31. The second goal is Responsible Consumption and Production. This goal was achieved by 26 countries. The third goal is Climate Action. The number of countries achieving this goal is 20. Zero Hunger, Good Health and Well-being, Clean Water and Sanitation, Sustainable Cities and Communities, and Life Below Water were not achieved by any country. Another striking data in the relevant table is that Türkiye is not mentioned in all 17 goals. Therefore, Türkiye's level of achievement of these goals is analyzed in detail.

There are some codes according to the level of realization of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Thanks to these codes, the level of realization of the 17 goals can be easily understood on a country basis. There are five codes: blue, green, yellow, orange and red. The blue code indicates that the information has not been achieved, the green code indicates that the information has been achieved, the yellow code indicates that challenges remain, the orange code indicates that significant challenges remain, and the red code indicates that major challenges remain. Türkiye's current situation as of 2023 is summarized in the table below.

Table 3. *Türkiye's position on Sustainable Development Goals*

Objective Number	Objective Name	Türkiye's Situation	Description
1	No Poverty	Code Yellow	The challenges continue.
2	Zero Hunger	Code Orange	Significant challenges remain.
3	Good Health and Well-being	Code Red	Great challenges remain.
4	Quality Education	Code Orange	Significant challenges remain.
5	Gender Equality	Code Red	Great challenges remain.
6	Clean Water and Sanitation	Code Orange	Significant challenges remain.
7	Affordable and Clean Energy	Code Yellow	The challenges continue.

8	Decent Work and Economic Growth	Code Red	Great challenges remain.
9	Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure	Code Red	Great challenges remain.
10	Reducing Inequality	Code Red	Great challenges remain.
11	Sustainable Cities and Communities	Code Orange	Significant challenges remain.
12	Responsible Consumption and Production	Code Yellow	The challenges continue.
13	Climate Action	Code Red	Great challenges remain.
14	Life Below Water	Code Red	Great challenges remain.
15	Life on Land	Code Red	Great challenges remain.
16	Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions	Code Red	Great challenges remain.
17	Partnerships for Goals	Code Orange	Significant challenges remain.

When the relevant table is analyzed, it is seen that Türkiye has not achieved the green code in any of the 17 goals by 2023. Again, none of the 17 goals is marked with a blue code. This is an indication that the data is open for all 17 goals. When the relevant table is analyzed, it is seen that Türkiye is marked with a yellow code in three goals. This shows that there are still significant challenges in poverty reduction, Affordable and Clean Energy and responsible consumption and production. There are five goals where Türkiye is struggling with great difficulties to achieve the goal. These goals are zero hunger, quality education, clean water and sanitation, sustainable cities and communities, and partnerships for the goals. These goals are marked with an orange code. Current data shows that Türkiye is still struggling with major challenges in 9 of the 17 goals. All these goals are marked with code red. Gender equality, decent work and economic growth, industry, innovation and infrastructure, reducing inequality, climate action, Life Below Water, life on land, peace, justice and strong institutions are the goals marked with code red.

Goal 4: Quality Education

Countries must act together to achieve the goals set out in the Sustainable Development Goals. The current goals emphasize making the planet more habitable, using resources efficiently and carefully, and leaving future generations a world they can live in. Undoubtedly, environmental education has its place and importance in this context. Ultimately, it is through education that individuals recognize, understand and take action to protect the environment. The fourth Sustainable Development Goal is Quality Education. Quality Education requires countries to develop and change their education systems, policies and curricula with an awareness of sustainable development. At this point, inclusive and equitable quality education is explained in the context of lifelong learning and equal opportunity in education for all. The sub-goals expected to be achieved in order to realize the goal of Quality Education are determined as follows:

Table 4. *Goal 4 Quality Education 2030 targets*

No.	Targets
1	By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education, leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes
2	By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys have access to quality pre-primary education that prepares them for primary education
3	By 2030, ensure that all women and men have equal access to accessible and quality technical education, vocational training and higher education, including university
4	By 2030, significantly increase the number of youth and adults with relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills for employment, decent work and entrepreneurship
5	By 2030, eliminate gender inequalities in education and ensure that vulnerable people, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations, have equal access to education and vocational training at all levels
6	Ensure that all young people and a large proportion of adults, both women and men, are literate and acquire numeracy skills by 2030
7	By 2030, ensure that all students acquire the knowledge and skills needed to advance sustainable development through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, world citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and the contribution of culture to sustainable development
8	Creating and improving education opportunities that are sensitive to children, persons with disabilities and gender equality, and creating safe, non-violent, inclusive and effective learning environments for all
9	By 2020, significantly increase the number of scholarships globally that offer developing countries, in particular least developed countries, small island developing states and African countries, the opportunity to enrol in higher education programs in developed and other developing countries, including vocational training programs and information and communication technology programs, technical programs, engineering programs and scientific programs
10	By 2030, significantly increase the supply of qualified teachers through international cooperation for teacher training in developing countries, in particular least developed countries and small island developing States

In order to better understand the purpose of Quality Education, it is necessary to explain the concept of education for sustainable development. Education for sustainable development is an approach that enables individuals to acquire the

awareness of sustainable development and transform this awareness into action, develop their critical thinking and decision-making skills. Sustainable education and sustainable development are two concepts that support each other (Öztürk, 2017). Sustainable development education, which aims to raise generations with environmental awareness and sustainable behaviors, is seen as a very important tool to provide the necessary knowledge, skills, values, attitudes and behaviors to protect the environment (Erten, 2002; 2004). Another important feature of sustainable development education is that it is a transdisciplinary process that includes all disciplines. Therefore, it addresses both cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains (Erten, 2004; 2020). In a study explaining education and competencies for sustainable development from the perspective of science teachers; teachers stated that it is important to raise awareness of sustainable development in formal and informal environments and to include it in the curriculum and to articulate it in the curriculum in an integrated manner from pre-school to higher education (Şeker & Aydın, 2021). At the same time, when education is considered as a general concept, it is known that the concepts of freedom, human rights, law and justice are highly emphasized. It is possible for all these elements to meet with individuals through quality education (Aksoy, 2016). Another emphasis in quality education is the right to education. The Constitution of the Republic of Türkiye states that "No one shall be deprived of the right to education and learning. The scope of the right to education is determined and regulated by law. Education and training shall be carried out in line with Atatürk's principles and reforms, according to the principles of modern science and education, under the supervision and control of the State." Individuals cannot be prevented from benefiting from basic education regardless of their religion, language, sect, race, ethnic origin, political opinion or gender. In other words, education is a phenomenon that cannot be prevented, cannot be stopped and cannot be compensated for its absence.

Comparison of Countries in the Context of Quality Education

In the context of Quality Education, there are a total of 16 countries (Argentina, Peru, Uruguay, Russia, Canada, Serbia, Croatia, United Arab Emirates, Serilanka, Moldava, Finland, Belarus, Japan, Vietnam, Mongolia, China, Cyprus). Since making a comparison by examining the data of all countries within the scope of the research would increase the data density, the comparison was limited to three countries (Finland, Canada and Serbia). Another reason for selecting these countries is the difficulty in accessing the original documents. Except for Finland, Canada and Serbia, the original documents on the education systems of the other countries are in their own languages. The documents analyzed for the education systems of Finland, Canada and Serbia are both original and in English. The sources selected for Türkiye were the 2018 Science Curriculum and the Turkish National Education Law of 1971. In the 2018 Science Curriculum, since the Turkish National Education Law of 1971 was given as a source in the explanations about the structure of the curriculum, this law was also included.

In this chapter, the Sustainable Development Report for 2022 prepared by the University of Cambridge was accessed from the official web address specially prepared for this report (<https://dashboards.sdgindex.org/>). Türkiye 2018 Science Curriculum and 1971 Turkish National Education Law were accessed from the official website of the Board of Education (<https://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/>). For Canada 2022 Science and Technology Curriculum, the official website of the Ministry of

National Education of Canada (Ontario) (<https://www.dcp.edu.gov.on.ca/en/curriculum/science-technology>) was used.

Documents related to the Finnish Education System were accessed from the official websites of the national education agency and the Ministry of National Education (<https://www.oph.fi/en/education-system>, <https://www.oph.fi/en/statistics-and-publications/publications/finnish-education-nutshell>). The 2020 Russian curricula were accessed from the original documents on the official web pages of the National Education Departments of the relevant country (https://prosv.ru/_data/umk/7427/toc_09-0041-01.pdf). Information on the Serbian education system was obtained from the official website of the Serbian Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development (<https://prosveta.gov.rs/>).

Comparison of Türkiye and Finland in the Context of Quality Education

Goal 4, Quality Education, advocates an inclusive and equitable education process for all humanity. Another emphasis in this goal is lifelong education. Hunger, poverty, war and other unexpected and urgent crises, especially in developing countries, have undermined equality of opportunity in education. The decline in the number of children attending school, particularly in Africa, has reaffirmed the belief that achieving inclusive and quality education for all in United Nations member states is one of the most powerful and proven tools for sustainable development. Central to this goal is to ensure that all girls and boys complete free primary and secondary education by 2030. It also aims to ensure equal access to affordable vocational training, eliminate gender and wealth inequalities, and ensure access to quality higher education for all. The education systems of Canada, Russia, Finland and Serbia, which are among the leading countries in meeting these goals, and the Turkish education system were compared in order to reach recommendations that will further improve Turkish National Education with a sustainable development awareness. The similarities and differences in the education systems of the two countries are summarized in the tables below.

Table 5. *Comparison of the education systems of Türkiye and Finland*

	TÜRKİYE	FINLAND
FEATURES OF TEACHING PROGRAMS	-a monolingual country with a centralized education system	-education system linked to local government (<i>different</i>)
	-to be based on developments in science and technology	-based on equality of opportunity in education (<i>different</i>)
	-based on individual and community needs	-ensuring the relationship between school and community (<i>different</i>)
	-producing knowledge	school-specific teaching programs (<i>different</i>)
	-problem solving	-based on individual differences (<i>similar</i>)
	-critical thinking	-gain values and skills (<i>similar</i>)
	-gain values and skills	
	-based on individual differences	
	-based on metacognitive features	
	-ensure meaningful and lasting learning	

AIMS OF TEACHING PROGRAMS	-the right to education regardless of religion, language, race or ethnic origin -the right to lifelong general and vocational education and training -centralized curriculum Non-formal education -to provide literacy training -to raise individuals suitable for the age -to provide education on recognizing and protecting national culture	-the right to education without distinction of religion, language, race or ethnic origin (similar) -providing the right to lifelong general and vocational education and training, in particular for adults (similar) -equal opportunities in education (similar) -lifelong learning (similar) -accountability in education (different) -to raise individuals with human values and ethical understanding (different)
THE PERSPECTIVE OF TEACHING PROGRAMS	-To raise individuals on the basis of values and competencies	-provide education for everyone, everywhere (different) -raising individuals who are lifelong learners (different)
VALUES	-moral decision making -moral behavior	-preserving cultural values (different)
COMPETENCIES	-communication in the mother tongue -communication in a foreign language -core competencies in science/technology -digital competence -learning to learn -competencies related to citizenship -entrepreneurship -cultural awareness and expression	- learning to think and learn - cultural competence and interaction (different) -observing the rights of self and others (different) -building a sustainable future (different)
INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHING PROGRAMS	-based on developmental stages -based on individual differences -based on lifelong learning	-based on the needs of schools (different) - create school-specific targets (different) -achieving the main objectives of national education (different) - based on developmental stages (similar) -based on individual differences (similar)

One of the most fundamental features of national education in Türkiye and Finland is equal opportunity for all. In Finland, individual support is also provided to enable each student to achieve self-realization and reach their full potential. In both

countries, there is teaching that is based on individual differences and provides value and skill development. The main difference between Türkiye and Finland is that in Türkiye there is a central curriculum prepared by the Ministry of National Education and the Board of Education, whereas in Finland schools are municipal institutions. In fact, the school management is directly appointed by the municipalities and the school's teaching staff is formed by the principal. This ensures a strong link between the school and the community. Each school in Finland has its own curriculum, management style and rules. Again, the achievement level of all schools in Finland is close to each other and therefore the quality of education is known to be high in every region of the country.

When the curricula of Türkiye and Finland are compared, the right to education without discrimination and equal opportunity in education draw attention. The emphasis on general and vocational education on the basis of lifelong learning is common. However, as a small difference, Finland also emphasizes lifelong learning on the basis of adult education. In the Finnish education system, it is considered important for students to have human values and ethical responsibility. In addition, students are expected to be individuals who can take responsibility for the welfare of society. Finland has also set a goal to create an accountable education system. To this end, all stakeholders are informed about the quality of the education system as a whole and are supported in the development of education policies.

When the two countries are compared in terms of the perspective of curricula, Turkish National Education aims to raise individuals on the basis of values and competencies, while Finnish National Education aims to provide education for everyone, everywhere. In Turkish National Education, values are included in the form of morality-based behavior and decision-making. In Finland, on the other hand, culture-based values are mentioned rather than morality. When a comparison is made in terms of competencies, it is seen that in Turkish National Education, there are competencies for communication, science and technology, citizenship and cultural differences. In Finland, on the other hand, learning to think and learn in order to ensure metacognition, respecting the rights of self and others, cultural competencies and intercultural interaction are mentioned. The existence of the Quality Education Goal is included in the competencies with the concept of building a sustainable future.

Finland has a school-based education system. The main purpose of the school is to ensure the personality development of the students, to support them in skill development, to provide them with the valid knowledge they will need in their professional life and to support their future education. Just like in Türkiye, schools in Finland do all this on the basis of developmental stages and individual differences.

Comparison of Türkiye and Canada in the Context of Quality Education

After Finland, another country compared to Türkiye is Canada. Information on these two countries is summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. *Comparison of the education systems of Türkiye and Canada*

	TÜRKİYE	CANADA
FEATURES OF TEACHING PROGRAMS	-a monolingual country with a centralized education system -to be based on developments in science and technology -based on the needs of the individual and society -producing knowledge -problem solving -critical thinking -gain values and skills -based on individual differences -based on metacognitive features -ensure meaningful and lasting learning	-a decentralized education system (<i>different</i>) - special state-specific curricula (<i>different</i>) -based on developments in science and technology (<i>similar</i>) -generate knowledge (<i>similar</i>) -problem solving (<i>similar</i>) -critical thinking (<i>similar</i>) -gain skills (<i>similar</i>)
AIMS OF TEACHING PROGRAMS	-the right to education regardless of religion, language, race or ethnic origin -the right to lifelong general and vocational education and training -centralized curriculum <i>Non-formal education</i> -to provide literacy training -to raise individuals suitable for the age -to provide education on recognizing and protecting national culture	-decentralized curriculum (<i>different</i>) -offer the right to lifelong learning based on technology and science (<i>different</i>) -developing critical skills through scientific and technological research (<i>different</i>) -thinking about the bigger picture by making connections between science and technology and the changing world, including society, economy and environment (<i>different</i>)
COMPETENCIES	-communication in the mother tongue -communication in a foreign language -core competencies in science/technology -digital competence -learning to learn -competencies related to citizenship -entrepreneurship -cultural awareness and expression	-critical thinking and problem solving (<i>similar</i>) -innovation, creativity and entrepreneurship (<i>similar</i>) -self-directed learning (<i>similar</i>) -cooperation (<i>similar</i>) -communication (<i>similar</i>) -global citizenship and sustainability (<i>similar</i>) -digital literacy (<i>similar</i>)
INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHING PROGRAMS	-based on developmental stages -based on individual differences -based on lifelong learning	-based on problem solving (<i>different</i>) -based on family, student, teacher and community needs (<i>different</i>) -based on developmental stages -based on the collaboration of

The Canadian education system has no centralized ministry or department of education. According to the Canadian constitution, provincial governments are responsible for all levels of education. Therefore, it is different from the Turkish National Education System. In each province, the ministry of education has the authority to develop curricula and set the standard of assessment exams. Although there is no national ministry of education in Canada, there are departments in charge of determining and implementing the country's education policy. In Türkiye, there is a central curriculum prepared by the Ministry of National Education and the Board of Education.

When the two countries are compared in terms of the objectives of the curricula, it is seen that Canada has more science and technology based objectives. The concepts of non-formal education and lifelong learning, which are also emphasized in Turkish National Education, are addressed in terms of technology and science in Canada. While the Turkish Education System emphasizes equality in education, vocational education, literacy education, and raising individuals in accordance with the requirements of the age, Canada's aim is more specifically to raise individuals who think about the bigger picture by making connections between science and technology and the changing world, including society, economy and environment.

When the two countries are compared under the competencies heading, communication, science and technology, citizenship and cultural differences are mentioned in Turkish National Education. In Canada, on the other hand, higher order thinking skills, communication, individual learning and cooperation are mentioned. Sustainability is also included under this heading in Canada. Global citizenship and sustainability are other existing competencies. While in Türkiye there is a curriculum based on developmental stages, individual differences and lifelong learning, in Canada there is a curriculum based on solving daily life problems and developmental stages. Unlike in Türkiye, there is a program based on the needs of families, students, teachers and society. Again, the curricula are based on the cooperation of educational partners, government and public resources.

Comparison of Türkiye and Russia in the Context of Quality Education

The other two countries whose education systems were compared in this research are Türkiye and Russia. Information on these countries is given in the table below.

Table 7. *Comparison of the education systems of Türkiye and Russia*

	TÜRKİYE	RUSSIA
FEATURES OF TEACHING PROGRAMS	-a monolingual country with a centralized education system -to be based on developments in science and technology -based on the needs of the individual and society -producing knowledge -problem solving -critical thinking -gain values and skills -based on individual differences -based on metacognitive features -ensure meaningful and lasting learning	-an education system based on the Federal State Education Standard and the Estimated Core Curriculum for Basic General Education (different) -(different) curricula aimed at forming moral ideals -(different) curricula aimed at building humanist ideals
AIMS OF TEACHING PROGRAMS	-the right to education regardless of religion, language, race or ethnic origin -the right to lifelong general and vocational education and training -centralized curriculum Non-formal education -to provide literacy training -to raise individuals suitable for the age -to provide education on recognizing and protecting national culture	-education on the basis of morality and ethics (different) -education based on technology and science (different) -awareness of the value of a safe way of life in the modern technological world (different) -education based on environmental awareness (different) -education based on tolerance (different) -education based on the integration of arts and sciences (different)
THE PERSPECTIVE OF TEACHING PROGRAMS	-To raise individuals on the basis of values and competencies	- to raise individuals on the basis of values, competencies and levels of development (similar)
VALUES	-moral decision making -moral behavior	- In order to raise physiologically and psychologically Good Health and Well-being; (different) -contributing to the happiness of the family -to help them gain an optimistic perspective on the world -maintaining a good mood -to create a healthy social environment to get away from the feeling of loneliness -encouraging them to pursue the

		arts so that they can become intellectuals -to create awareness that they are dependent on the environment and nature they live in -to create curiosity about scientific knowledge so that they can become knowledgeable -to gain responsibility for working to ensure well-being in his/her life
COMPETENCIES	-communication in the mother tongue -communication in a foreign language -core competencies in science/technology -digital competence -learning to learn -competencies related to citizenship -entrepreneurship -cultural awareness and expression	free and independent decision-making (different) -making moral choices (different) -expressing oneself and one's thoughts (similar) -caring for nature (different) -communicate and interact effectively (similar) -explain the events around them scientifically (different)
INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHING PROGRAMS	-based on developmental stages -based on individual differences -based on lifelong learning	-based on developmental stages (similar)

The first striking difference between the education systems of Türkiye and Russia is the basic characteristic of the curriculum. In Türkiye, there is a central curriculum prepared by the Ministry of National Education and the Board of Education. In Russia, the existing curriculum is developed taking into account the requirements of the updated Federal State Educational Standard for Basic General Education and the Estimated Core Curriculum for Basic General Education. The program aims to form moral and humanistic ideals as a foundation. Comparing the objectives of the curricula, the Turkish National Education emphasizes equal right to education, lifelong learning, non-formal education, recognition and preservation of national culture, while in Russia the situation is different. The curriculum is based on morality and ethics, technology and science, environmental awareness, a safe way of life, and tolerance. The perspective of the curricula in both countries is similar. The emphasis on values, competencies and developmental level constitute the perspective of the curricula. Turkish National Education has a morality-based understanding of values. In Russia, on the other hand, values exist to create a healthy individual in every respect. For this, family happiness, having an optimistic outlook, building psychological resilience, being a social person, coping with feelings of loneliness, having intellectual knowledge, and taking responsibility for work are seen as necessities. Another value that gives an important clue in terms of Quality Education and sustainable development is the awareness of students that they are dependent on the nature they live in. The same emphasis is also seen in the competencies. Being attentive to nature and protecting the environment, having environmental knowledge is included as a competency. Other competencies emphasized in Russian National Education are making free and independent

decisions, making moral choices, and effective communication. Turkish National Education lacks competencies in environmental knowledge and environmental awareness. In Türkiye, competencies related to communication, science and technology, citizenship, and cultural diversity are mentioned. Again, it seems important for both countries to create a curriculum based on individual differences, developmental stages and lifelong learning.

Comparison of Türkiye and Serbia in the Context of Quality Education

Another country compared with Turkish National Education is Serbia. Information on the two countries is summarized in Table 8.

Table 8. Comparison of the education systems of Türkiye and Serbia

	TÜRKİYE	SERBIA
FEATURES OF TEACHING PROGRAMS	-a monolingual country with a centralized education system -to be based on developments in science and technology -based on individual and community needs -producing knowledge -problem solving -critical thinking -gain values and skills -based on individual differences -based on metacognitive features -ensure meaningful and lasting learning	-centralized educational objectives under ministerial control (different) -special teaching programs for schools (different) -curricula based on inclusive education (different) -gain values and skills (similar) -based on individual differences (similar) - develop self-awareness (different) -critical thinking (similar) -creative thinking (similar) - based on metacognitive features (similar) -ensure meaningful and lasting collaborative learning (similar)
AIMS OF TEACHING PROGRAMS	-the right to education regardless of religion, language, race or ethnic origin -the right to lifelong general and vocational education and training -centralized curriculum Non-formal education -to provide literacy training -to raise individuals suitable for the age -to provide education on recognizing and protecting national culture	-providing equal right to education -providing interaction between family, society, economy, student (different) -creating an education system that meets the needs of the society (different) -inclusive education (different) -decentralized curriculum (different) Non-formal education -creating special education programs for adult education (similar)

		-lifelong learning (<i>similar</i>) -offer vocational training -training to develop personal and national identity (<i>similar</i>) -provide education that supports full intellectual, emotional, social, moral and physical development according to developmental needs and interests (<i>differentiated</i>)
THE PERSPECTIVE OF TEACHING PROGRAMS	-To raise individuals on the basis of values and competencies	to raise individuals whose well-being is ensured and whose development is supported (<i>different</i>)
VALUES	-moral decision making -moral behavior	creating a safe non-violent environment (<i>different</i>) -adopting a healthy lifestyle and becoming a physiologically and psychologically healthy individual (<i>different</i>) -being aware of the importance of sustainable development, having awareness about the protection of nature, environment and environmental ethics (<i>different</i>) -having a positive humanitarian attitude -have and respect children's rights, human rights, civil liberties and the ability to live in a democratically organized society (<i>different</i>) -respect for racial, national, cultural, linguistic, religious, gender and age equality and equity, tolerance and diversity (<i>different</i>)
COMPETENCIES	-communication in the mother tongue -communication in a foreign language -core competencies in science/technology -digital competence -learning to learn -competencies related to citizenship -entrepreneurship	-effective communication (<i>similar</i>) -cultural awareness and expression (<i>similar</i>) -learning to learn (<i>similar</i>) -civic competencies (<i>similar</i>) -contemporary technological competencies (<i>similar</i>)

-cultural awareness and expression		
INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHING PROGRAMS	-based on developmental stages	-based on developmental stages (<i>similar</i>)
	-based on individual differences	-based on individual differences (<i>similar</i>)
	-based on lifelong learning	-based on lifelong learning (<i>similar</i>)

The first difference that draws attention when comparing the education systems of Türkiye and Serbia is the basic characteristic of the curriculum. In Türkiye, there is a central curriculum prepared by the Ministry of National Education and the Board of Education. In Serbia, on the other hand, there are basic educational objectives set by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development. Within the framework of these objectives, each school has its own autonomous curriculum. In both Türkiye and Serbia, it is fundamental to provide equal right to education without any discrimination. The Serbian education system also has a clear emphasis on providing a quality, balanced, democratic, social and student-centered education that meets the needs of society. Both countries have curricula based on values and skills development. The Serbian education system also clearly emphasizes inclusive and individualized education.

A comparison of the objectives of the curricula reveals that both countries share the same right to education. Providing lifelong general and vocational education, planning activities on the basis of non-formal education, and training individuals for all the requirements of the age are other common points for both countries. It is clear that Turkish education aims to recognize and preserve national culture. Serbian education, on the other hand, emphasizes the development of national and personal identity. When Table 8 is analyzed, it is seen that there are features that distinguish Serbian education from Turkish education. This is seen as the aim to create an educational system that is oriented towards ensuring the interaction between family-community-economy-student and supporting full intellectual, emotional, social, moral and physical development according to developmental needs and interests. While Turkish education aims to raise individuals who have achieved values and competencies, in the other country the main goal is to raise individuals who have achieved prosperity.

In Turkish National Education, decision-making and behavior based on morality seem to be important. In Serbia, on the other hand, one of the main values is to raise individuals who are completely free from all forms of violence and who can create a safe environment. It is also important to raise individuals who have adopted a healthy lifestyle and are responsible for ensuring and protecting both their physical and psychological health. Another value that bears traces of the goal of Quality Education is to be aware of the importance of sustainable development, to protect nature and the environment, and to be conscious of environmental ethics. The value of living in a democratic society with awareness of all rights and freedoms and respect for diversity is also seen in this goal. It is clear that Serbia aims to raise individuals who are tolerant of all kinds of diversity, regardless of religion, language and race.

When the two countries are compared in terms of competencies, it is seen that there is no difference between them. Both countries mention competencies for communication, science and technology, citizenship and cultural diversity. Again, it seems important for both countries to create a curriculum based on individual differences, developmental stages and lifelong learning. Finally, for the goal of Quality Education, it is known that Serbia has launched a strategic action plan for all levels of education, implemented in 2021-2023, to improve all levels of education towards the relevant goals.

Conclusion

When the situation of Türkiye is analyzed in terms of the United Nations Global Sustainable Development Goals, it is an important result that Türkiye has not achieved the green code in any of the 17 goals. Türkiye continues to face significant challenges related to zero hunger, quality education, clean water and sanitation, sustainable cities and communities, and partnerships for the goals. At the same time, major challenges remain for Good Health and Well-being, gender equality, decent work and economic growth, industry, innovation and infrastructure, reducing inequality, climate action, life below water, life on land, peace, justice and strong institutions. It is said that Türkiye's failure to achieve the sustainable development goals may lead to a loss of balance in many environmental, economic and social issues (Demir and Atasoy, 2021). In addition, when all countries are analyzed in terms of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, it is seen that there is no country that has managed to achieve 17 goals simultaneously. Doğan and Yılmaz (2020) found that the D-8 countries are behind the goals and concluded that the wealth of the countries or the political leaders of the countries are not effective in achieving the goals.

In terms of the characteristics of the curricula of Türkiye and other countries, it is seen that the centralization feature of the Turkish curriculum is similar to that of Serbia, but differs from Finland, Canada and Russia. In three countries, decentralized education system is emphasized. At the same time, it is seen that these countries differ from Türkiye in terms of the unit preparing the curriculum. While the curriculum in Türkiye is prepared by the Ministry of National Education and the Board of Education, in Finland it is prepared by municipalities, in Canada by special units, and in Serbia by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development. Er and Atıcı (2015) reported that curricula in Finland are determined locally and that parents, students, teachers and support staff play a role in the curriculum process. The flexible nature of the programs enables solutions to be produced with urgent intervention during any disruption (Demirkan, 2018).

When the objectives of Türkiye's and other countries' curricula are examined, it is seen that emphasis is placed on the objectives of equality in education, lifelong learning, raising individuals in accordance with the requirements of the age, and protecting national culture. It was determined that similar objectives were set with Serbia. In Finland, adult education, developing individuals who can take responsibility for ensuring the welfare of society, and accountability in education are emphasized. Demirkan (2018) in his study comparing the education systems of Finland and Türkiye, it is seen that, unlike Türkiye, in Finland, special team studies are carried out in the preparation of lifelong education programs for individuals and draw attention to lifelong learning where adults can receive education according to their different competencies and needs. It can be said that lifelong activities should

be developed and increased in Türkiye. In Canada, the emphasis on science and technology in the curriculum objectives is particularly noteworthy. When İnce and Yıldırım evaluated the 5th grade science curriculum in the context of Canada and Türkiye, they found that it supports the Canadian science and technology findings. Due to the rapid advancement of technology and the increase in digitalization, emphasizing technology in curriculum objectives can provide the opportunity to raise more people in accordance with the needs of the age (Gök & Sayıcı, 2022). In Russia, awareness of the value of a safe way of life on the basis of morality and ethics, education on the basis of environmental awareness, education on the basis of tolerance, education on the basis of integration of art and science are different. The inclusion of environmental education may lead to an increase in the rate of raising environmentally conscious individuals (Erten, Köseoğlu, & Gök, 2022). In terms of our country, the fact that environmental education is not specified in the objectives of the curriculum may have a negative impact on our access to quality education.

When the perspective of the curricula of Türkiye and other countries is examined, it is seen that raising individuals on the basis of values and competencies is at the center in Türkiye. In terms of curriculum perspective, Türkiye is similar to Russia and differs from other countries in a few points. In Finland, the perspective of curricula is to provide education for everyone everywhere and to raise individuals who are lifelong learners. The fact that the state provides education services for individuals at all age levels and eliminates discrimination between individuals can be said to be on the way to creating a knowledge society (Genç, 2022). In Serbia, it is seen that raising individuals whose welfare is ensured and whose development is supported is at the center. In this respect, it can be said that Serbia attaches importance to social development and supports individual development in parallel with Türkiye.

When Türkiye and other countries are examined in terms of the values in the curriculum, it is seen that moral decision-making and moral behavior are the values aimed in Türkiye, while in Finland these values are to protect cultural values. In Russia, it is aimed to raise individuals who are healthy in every sense, who are happy in their families, who have a positive view of the world, who have a healthy social environment to get away from the feeling of loneliness, who are encouraged to be intellectual, who are encouraged to art branches to encourage them to be intellectual, who have gained responsibility for work, and who have curious values towards scientific knowledge. It can be said that Russia attaches importance to developing students as a whole and integrating them into society. In Serbia, it is seen that the values to be acquired are providing safe environments free from violence, creating Good Health and Well-being in every sense, having the importance of sustainable development, being individuals with positive attitudes, respecting children's rights, human rights, civil liberties and the ability to live in a democratically organized society, respecting racial, national, cultural, linguistic, religious, gender and age equality and equality, tolerance and diversity. In Serbia and Russia, unlike in Türkiye, there are statements that environmental protection and sustainable development are important and targeted. The formation of values related to environmental protection requires individuals to be interested in the environment. In this way, individuals can develop awareness towards protecting the environment (Erten, 2015). At the same time, students can gain environmental awareness through targeted environmental education (Erten, Köseoğlu, & Gök, 2022). It can be said that awareness of sustainable development goals, which our country lacks in this respect, should be increased and emphasized in the goals.

When the competencies in the curricula of Türkiye and other countries are examined, it can be said that there are some differences between Türkiye and other countries in terms of communication in mother tongue, communication in a foreign language, science and technology competencies, digital competencies, learning to learn, competencies related to citizenship, entrepreneurship, cultural awareness and expression. The values targeted in Finland are individuals' learning to think and learn, cultural competence and interaction, respecting the rights of self and others, and building a sustainable future. Based on our research findings, it can be said that both countries want to provide scientific process skills. Scientific thinking skills are the thinking skills we use in defining the problem and evaluating the results (Can Aran & Derman, 2020). In Canada, the desired competencies are critical thinking and problem solving, innovation, creativity and entrepreneurship, self-directed learning, collaboration, communication, global citizenship and sustainability, and digital literacy. It can be said that the concept of digital literacy attracted particular attention in Canada. Considering that digital literacy provides technological environments that facilitate the learning process and that these environments include skills such as problem solving and critical thinking, its importance should not be ignored (Şarlakkaya & Sülün, 2022). In Russia, it is seen that the targeted competencies are making free and independent decisions, making moral choices, expressing oneself and one's thoughts, being attentive to nature, communicating and interacting effectively, and explaining the events around them scientifically. In Russia, it is seen that the most prominent concept is individuals' caring attitude towards nature. This is possible with individuals with positive environmental attitudes (Erten, Köseoğlu, & Gök, 2022). It can be said that all these steps can contribute to the realization of quality education on behalf of the country. In Serbia, effective communication, cultural awareness and expression can be listed as learning to learn, competencies related to citizenship, and technological competencies for the age. In general, considering that 21st century skills consist of learning and innovation skills, life and career skills, information media and technology skills, it is seen that the programs of the countries cover these skill competencies (Şan & İlhan, 2022).

When individual development and curricula of Türkiye and other countries are compared, it is seen that Türkiye is based on developmental stages, individual differences and lifelong learning. While Türkiye has similarities with Russia and Serbia in terms of individual development, there are some differences with other countries. In Finland, it is seen that schools are based on the needs of schools, creating school-specific goals, reaching the basic goals of national education, taking developmental periods as the basis and individual differences as the center. It can be said that Finland takes regional needs into consideration, especially by targeting education according to schools (Er & Atıcı, 2016). Meeting the needs according to the region can enable the country to realize its sustainable development goals by providing regional development. Canada, on the other hand, draws attention to problem solving, family, student, teacher and community needs, and developmental periods. In Canada, it can be said that the welfare of the society is especially important.

References

- Ada, A. (2015). Kümeleme analizi ile AB ülkeleri ve Türkiye'nin sürdürülebilir kalkınma açısından değerlendirilmesi . *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (29).
- Aksoy, B. (2016), *Nitelikli eğitim hakkı temelinde öğrencilerin, velilerin, yöneticilerin ve öğretmenlerin temel lise uygulamasına ilişkin görüşleri*. Akdeniz Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Aydın, M. (2016). Enerji verimliliğinin sürdürülebilir kalkınmadaki rolü: Türkiye değerlendirmesi. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 14 (28) , 409-441.
- Bulut, B. & Çakmak, Z. (2018). Sürdürülebilir kalkınma eğitimi ve öğretim programlarına yansımaları, *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 7(4), 2680-2697.
- Birleşmiş Milletler Türkiye, Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma Amaçları (2023). <https://turkiye.un.org/tr>
- Can-Aran, Ö., & Derman, İ.(2020). Fen bilgisi öğretmenliği lisans programının farklı ülkelerin fen bilimleri yeterlikleri açısından incelenmesi. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 22(3), 723-749. <https://doi.org/10.17556/erziefd.661722>.
- Demir, Y., & Atasoy, E. (2021). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin sürdürülebilir kalkınmaya yönelik algılarının incelenmesi. *Trakya Eğitim Dergisi*, 11(3), 1688-1702. <https://doi.org/10.24315/tred.878404>.
- Demirkan, S. (2018). Finlandiya eğitim sisteminden Türkiye'ye mesajlar. *Alinteri Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(4), 171-195. <https://doi.org/10.30913/alinterisosbil.360454>.
- Deniz, M. (2009). Sanayileşme perspektifinde kentleşme ve çevre ilişkisi. *Coğrafya Dergisi*, 0(19), 95-105. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/iucogrfya/issue/25047/264427>.
- Doğan, A. & Yılmaz, V. (2020). D-8 Ülkelerinin sürdürülebilir kalkınma amaçlarını gerçekleştirme düzeylerinin tahlili. *Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 1-9
- Er, K. O. & Atıcı, S. (2016). Finlandiya ve Türkiye kimya dersi öğretim programlarının karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi . *Necatibey Eğitim Fakültesi Elektronik Fen ve Matematik Eğitimi Dergisi*, 10 (1) , 0-0 . DOI: 10.17522/nefmed.42066.
- Ertan, Y. (2018). Türkiye'de sürdürülebilirlik raporlaması (2005-2017). *Journal of Accounting and Taxation Studies*, 11 (3), 463-478. DOI: 10.29067/muvu.410926
- Erten, S. (2015). Üniversite öğrencilerindeki çevreyi korumaya yönelik ilgilerde kimin ve neyin etkisi olmaktadır? *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 38(38), 157-167. <http://dx.doi.org/10.9779/PUJE713>.
- Erten, S., Köseoğlu, P. & Gök, B. (2022). Fen öğretim programlarında çevre eğitimi: Türkiye, Kanada, Amerika örneği. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* , (63) , 220-246 . DOI: 10.21764/maeuefd.1019038.
- Genç, K. Y. (2022). Eğitim sisteminin girişimcilik davranışı üzerindeki etkisi: Finlandiya örneği. *Giresun Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(2), 55-73. DOI: 10.46849/guiibd.1206063.
- Gök, B. & Erdoğan, T. (2011). The investigation of the creative thinking levels and the critical thinking disposition of pre-service elementary teachers. *Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences (JFES)*, 44 (2), 29-52. DOI: 10.1501/Egifak_0000001223.
- Gök, B. & Sayıcı, E.(2022). İlköğretim fen bilimleri öğretim programlarının karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi: Türkiye, Singapur, Estonya örneği. *Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*.
- Göle, M.O., & Temel, Z.F. (2015), Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin nitelikli bir okul öncesi eğitim programında bulunması gereken özelliklere ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi, *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(3), 663-684.
- İnce, M. E., & Yıldırım, H. (2018). Air permeability and bursting strength of weft-knitted fabrics from glass yarn. Part I: cam setting and number of yarn ply effect. *The Journal of the Textile Institute*. doi:10.1080/00405000.2018.1492339.
- Korkmaz, G. (2020). Yenilenen öğretmen yetiştirme lisans programlarının sürdürülebilir kalkınma için eğitim bağlamında incelenmesi. *Journal of Advanced Education Studies*, 2 (2) , 111-132.
- Öztürk, M. (2017), Sürdürülebilir gelişme odaklı eğitim: Kuramsal Çerçeve, tarihsel gelişim ve uygulamaya dönük öneriler. *İlköğretim Online*, 16(4), 1-11.

Sultan, Ş., & İlhan, N. (2022). Fen bilimleri dersi beceri temelli sorulara (yeni nesil) yönelik kuramsal ve kavramsal çerçeve. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9(17), 17-36. <https://doi.org/10.29129/inujse.1089655>.

Şarlakkaya, K., & Sülün, A. (2022). Fen bilimleri öğretmen adaylarının 21. yüzyıl öğrenmelerinde teknoloji yeterliliği öz-değerlendirme düzeylerinin belirlenmesi. *Ege Bilimsel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 5(1), 1-21.

Şeker, F. & Aydın, B. (2021), Education and competencies for sustainable development from the perspective of science teachers. *e- Kafkas Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8, 460-479.

About The Authors

Sinan ERTEN, PhD, is Professor of Faculty of Education Department of Mathematics and Science Education at Hacettepe University in Ankara, Turkey. He holds a PhD in Didaktik Der Biyologie from Justus-Liebig Universitaet Giessen of Germany. His main area of interest is the study of environmental education, teacher education and sexual health education.

E-mail: serten@hacettepe.edu.tr , **ORCID:** 0000-0001-9546-2387

Pelin KOSEOGLU, is Research Assistant of Science Teaching at Süleyman Demirel University in Isparta, Turkey. She holds a master degree in Science Education from Ege University of Turkey. She is still continuing her doctoral education at Hacettepe University. Her main area of interest are science teaching, teacher training, environmental education and informal science education.

E-mail: pelinkoseoglu@sdu.edu.tr , **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5559-9052

Zubeyde GUNES, was born in the city of Kilis in 1996. She completed her primary and secondary education in the same city. She continued her education at Kilis 7 Aralık University for her undergraduate education in 2014 and her master's degree in 2018. STEM in science education in graduate education. She has conducted a study titled "Comparative Analysis of Applications with a Multiple Holistic Approach." Currently, she continues her education as a doctoral student in the field of science education at Hacettepe University, department of mathematics and science education.

E-mail: zubeydegness@gmail.com , **ORCID:** 0000-0002-2003-9637

Muge OZKANBAS, was born in Adana in 1991 and completed her primary, secondary and high school education in Adana and her university education was at Çukurova University in science teaching and classroom teaching. She completed her master's degree at Çukurova University. Her master's thesis topic was on POGIL in science education and the application of POGIL in secondary school students. She is also working on misconceptions of pre-service science teachers on gases, secondary school students' views on science curriculum, burnout levels of science teachers. She is currently continuing her doctoral education at Hacettepe University. At the same time, she has been working as a science teacher in the Ministry of National Education since 2013.

E-mail: mgeozk3@gmail.com , **ORCID:** 0000-0002-9932-6662

Scientific Ethics Declaration

The authors declare that the scientific ethical and legal responsibility of paper titled “**Türkiye’s position in the global sustainable development goals: A comparison on quality education**” belongs to the authors.