

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361561130>

# Evaluation of Sustainable Development Goals in Terms of Democracy, Participation and Governance

Conference Paper · May 2022

CITATIONS

0

READS

57

1 author:



**Sinem Şahnagil**

Balıkesir University

46 PUBLICATIONS 92 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



## Evaluation of Sustainable Development Goals in Terms of Democracy, Participation and Governance

**Res. Assist. Dr. Sinem ŞAHNAGİL**

Balıkesir University  
sinem.sahnagil@balikesir.edu.tr  
Orcid: 0000-0003-0920-6948

### ABSTRACT

Sustainable development is a concept that is expressed as meeting the present needs of society through the use of resources at a level that will not deprive future generations of their ability to meet their own needs. The 17 goals, which were planned to be realized by the United Nations in 2015, under the name of Sustainable Development Goals, planned to be implemented until 2030, still contain the most important policies in the world. Sustainable development, which has goals such as sustainable city and life, peace and justice, and reduction of inequalities, needs planning with a common mind, a multi-faceted organization and most importantly an effective participation mechanism in order to achieve the desired goals. The architecture of this organization is undertaken by the concept of governance. Because the higher the level of governance in a society, the easier it is to achieve sustainable development goals, thanks to the implementation of a participatory approach.

From this point of view, in the study, it was argued that the sustainable development goals were developed within the framework of democratic governance principles, and it was acted on with the thesis that these goals can be achieved in an atmosphere where participatory governance practices are widespread in local, national and international areas for a behavioral transformation on a global scale. In this context, first of all, sustainable development is discussed conceptually and theoretically in the study. In the second part, the concepts of democracy, governance and participation were evaluated holistically and their positive effects on sustainable development were analyzed. In the third part, it is aimed to evaluate this effect on the basis of sustainable development goals.

**Keywords:** Sustainable Development, Democracy, Governance, Participation

## INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of the 20th century, the view that the steps taken by countries individually and globally is not limited to the increase in economy, income and production. The World Commission on Environment and Development expressed this view in the report it prepared in 1987 and named as "Our Common Future". The Commission emphasized that sustainable development should be handled with its economic, social and environmental dimensions. In other words, the report underlined that economic welfare, social justice and environmental sustainability should be considered as a whole and interrelated. The report explained the basic philosophy of sustainable development as ensuring that present and future generations benefit equitably from the opportunities brought by development. For this purpose, global "Sustainable Development Goals" have been established. It was decided to initiate an intergovernmental process that is open to all stakeholders, comprehensive and transparent, in order to realize the 17 determined targets. Therefore, the concept of governance came into play as the important driving force of the process. Governance, which establishes a complementary relationship with participation and democracy within the scope of globalization, creates the appropriate environment for the realization of sustainable development goals with its multi-actor structure. Because one of the most important issues foreseen for the realization of these goals is local, national and international cooperation.

In this context, in the first part of the study, the concept of sustainable development is explained with its various dimensions. In the second part of the study, the effect of governance on sustainable development as an important power that can make common sense and multi-faceted planning necessary for sustainable development is evaluated. In the last part, the mechanisms that ensure the functionality of governance within the scope of 17 objectives determined by the United Nations are expressed and suggestions are made on how these mechanisms can be used more functionally.

### 1. Sustainable Development with its General Framework

Within its broadest sense; sustainability refers to the ability of a society, ecosystem, or any such ongoing system to continue to function in the unclear future without being forced to decline through depletion or overload of essential resources (Gilman, 1992). Sustainable development is explained as an environmentalist world-view which aims to ensure economic development without sacrificing the principle of using environmental values and natural resources with rational methods, considering the rights and benefits of the present and future generations (Keles, 1998:112). The concept of "sustainable development" (Guney, 2015: 349), which advocates that today's resource-use should be at a level to cause the least harm to future resource use, gained its most common definition under *the Brundtland Report*, prepared by the World Environment and Development Commission in 1987.

The World Environment and Development Commission, established by the United Nations in 1983, was followed by *the Stockholm Conference* in 1972, which is accepted as the first step taken at the international level to find solutions to environmental and ecological problems that threaten the future of humanity, and the concept of sustainable development was officially first introduced in this period. The report, called *Our Common Future* which was published in 1987 and also known as the "Brundtland Report", opened the concept to be discussed on the international platform (Torunoglu, 2004). Sustainable development, according to the Report, is defined as 'development' that meets the needs of today without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs (Yeni, 2014: 184). In this context, the concept of sustainable development means "development by preserving the delicate balance

between human and nature, and by observing the rights of future generations on the environment” (Kalaycioglu and Goymen, 2010: 113). In order to achieve sustainable development, it is first of all required an economic system which can provide sustainable surplus production and technical information. A political system follows it to ensure effective participation of the public in decision-making processes. A production system respecting the protection of the environmental basis necessary for development, a dynamic technological system continuously seeking solutions, an international system supporting sustainable orders in trade and finance, and finally, a management system capable of adapting to changing conditions are important requirements for the healthy actualization of sustainable development (UNWCED, 1987).

For Munasinghe (2009: 34-35), sustainable development consists of various dimensions interrelated. Sustainable development, which describes the balance of the society in terms of economic, social, and environmental aspects, includes such important topics as social dimension when considered from the human point of view; economic and cultural dimensions when considered for society; ecological dimension when considered for the environment. Therefore, sustainable development has three basic dimensions as economic, social, and environmental (Holmberg and Sandbrook, 1992; Kates, Parris, and Leiserowitz, 2005; Ozmete, 2010: 79). Sustainable development, which focuses on empowering human welfare by increasing the consumption of goods and services within its economic dimension; in other words, on maintaining growth and consumption at the highest level under natural resource constraints, focuses on protecting the integrity and flexibility of ecosystems within its environmental dimension, and the quality and quantity of the natural environment. The social dimension of the concept, on the other hand, emphasizes the enrichment and strengthening of human relations, as well as ensuring that people reach their goals in individual and group (Munasinghe, 2009: 34-35; Yeni, 2014: 192). Since the study mainly focuses on the relationship of sustainable development and its goals with the concepts of participation and governance, it is emphasized the social dimension of sustainable development.

Especially since the 1990s, the popularity of socio-economic issues such as poverty and unemployment, as well as social exclusion, gender inequality, democracy, participation, and empowerment of society in terms of political rights draw attention to the social dimension of sustainability (Wise, 2001). Because the completion of the sustainable development chain is closely related to supporting social capital as well as ensuring economic growth and development; in other words, ‘social sustainability’.

The social dimension that focuses on social sustainability is concerned with the extent to which social values, identity, relationships, and institutions will continue into the future. Social sustainability requiring preserving the integrity of the society and the ability to work towards common goals (Moldan et al., 2012) should ensure that social services including equality, political responsibility, and participation are carried out at an adequate level (Harris, 2000). In order for the social dimension of sustainable development to be operational, it is of great importance that equality, diversity, commitment, quality of life, and particularly democracy and governance are implemented as basic principles. Equal opportunities should be ensured for all members of society, especially those who are financially incapable and vulnerable, and it should be established systems and structures within the society to enable interconnection at the formal, informal, and institutional level. Addedly, it should be ensured to meet the basic needs of all members at the level of the individual, institution, and society and developed a good quality of life. Ultimately, it should be provided democratic processes in addition to transparent and accountable governance structures for the community (McKenzie,

2004). Because the concept of sustainable development gains meaning together with other indispensable concepts of democracy, human rights, participation, transparency, efficiency, accountability, and governance.

Increasing interdependence and change in the world with the effect of globalization leads to a new form of relationship between the state, community, and civil society in many countries (Goymen, 1999: 75). According to Guney (2015: 349), this new form of relationship, called “governance”, constitutes an important power that can make the common mind and multi-faceted planning that are necessary for sustainable development.

## **2. The Effect of Participation and Governance Relationship on Sustainable Development**

The concept of participation generally means that the public becomes effective and active in the policy-making process. The concept of participation, which emphasizes the public’s participation in the public policy-making processes that consists of stages such as the determination, implementation, and supervision of policy, also expresses the ability to influence decision makers. Participation, among the determinants of democracy, explains the ability of organized or unorganized segments of the public to direct the administrative or political processes of decision (Kazanci, 1978: 85; Citci, 1996:10). While Eroglu (2006: 192) defines participation as the ability of individuals to have a say to solve the problems arising in their own living spaces, Uysal (1984: 63) based the concept on the process of forming and sharing the authority.

Governance is at the forefront of the important mechanisms that make participation action functional for the actors at local, national, and international levels. According to Bozkurt et al. (1998: 274), governance that first came to the fore with the World Bank Report in 1989 means a *structure* or an *order* formed by the results obtained by the joint efforts of all relevant actors in a social political system, while according to Parlak (2011: 865), it is necessary to provide more frequent and predominantly contribution and participation of local governments, non-governmental organizations, and private sector organizations, as well as central governments, to the identification and solution processes of social problems. Addedly, Demirci (2013: 29-30) evaluates the actors in the society as “partners” and defined governance as a process emerged by the interaction between these economic, political, and social actors on the other hand.

Although the number of definitions on *governance* can be increased, we see there is consensus on some common points in general. The definitions on ‘governance’, which focus primarily on administrative functions and processes rather than administrative structures, are formed with a polycentric rather than a monocentric perspective. Governance, which is built as an administrative dimension to enable the multi-faceted interaction of public administration, citizens, non-governmental organizations, private sector organizations, and similar actors against the claims of inadequacy that representative democracy faces at the point of representation (Eryilmaz, 2012: 60), envisages the participation of all local, national, and global actors in the managerial process through various democratic mechanisms. Governance, which reveals an *effective, accountable, transparent, open, and efficient* public administration in terms of its administrative dimension, shifts the balance of responsibility in directing and managing the society from the state to civil society (Guler, 2003:106-107; Aydin, 2010: 68). Governance includes the concept of ‘participation’ with its features such as providing information to the citizens, seeking the opinions and knowledge of the citizens, and involving the citizens in the policy process through various mechanisms. Therefore, in order for participation to take place;

the state should be transparent and open and also continuous and consistent in the mutual informational flow, and there should be the existence of effective ways for citizens to obtain information about participation mechanisms (Bozkurt, 2014: 233). Governance, according to Guney (2015: 351), is an important variable having an impact on sustainable development due to the features that are described above. Because sustainable development needs planning and organizing to be made with a common mind in order to achieve the desired goals.

“*Agenda 21*” constitutes one of the most important steps in the presentation of the concepts of *governance* and *participation* into the global agenda as elements to support sustainable development. *Agenda 21*, as one of the main documents, emerging as a result of the Environment and Development Conference organized by the United Nations in Rio in 1992, has the feature of being an action plan that defines the activities that governments, development organizations, the UN organizations, and independent sectors should do in all areas that affect the environment and economy throughout the 2000s (Keles et al., 2009: 450). Governments were primarily held responsible for the successful implementation of *Agenda 21*, as the highest-level expression of global consensus and policy commitments in realizing the concept of sustainable development. In addition to the governments, the active participation of the public and non-governmental organizations in the process was also among the points that *Agenda 21* especially emphasizes. In other words; although stated that governments play a role as the main actor for the implementation of *Agenda 21*, the elements of multi-actorship and global partnership have emerged as indispensable (Emralp, 2005; Bozkurt, 2014: 233; Celik, 2019: 37).

### **3. Evaluation of Sustainable Development Goals with the Dimensions of Participation and Governance**

The 17 goals, planned to be implemented by the United Nations in 2015 under the name of *Sustainable Development Goals*, designed to be implemented until 2030, still contain the most important policies in the world. These targets include such topics as ending poverty and hunger and ensuring a healthy and quality life, quality education, gender equality, accessible and clean energy, decent work and economic growth, industrialization, innovation, and infrastructure. Additionally, such titles as reducing inequalities and supporting sustainable cities and communities and ensuring responsible production and consumption, climate action, life on water and land, peace, justice, and strong institutions and ultimately, partnerships for purposes are among the sustainable development goals. What is aimed with the sustainable development goals to be universally applied for everyone is to ensure that no country is left behind in the development process with the slogan of not leaving anyone behind (Ustun, 2020: 4; Celik et al., 2016: 337; Eskinat, 2016: 268). The existence of economic, financial, and ecological principles alone is not sufficient to achieve the goals in mention. In this context, decisive steps and mechanisms to increase civil society cooperation and participatory governance practices in local, national, and international fields are required primarily for the realization of democratic governance principles and for a behavioral transformation on a global scale.

It is seen that the main needs come to the fore, when the sustainable development goals are evaluated as a whole. First of all; it is necessary to provide customized aids for the fragile sections of society, to increase the support for the integration of individuals into the labor market, to produce more data on relative poverty and so, to develop disaggregated policies under the light of these data. In addition, increasing the number of health personnel per population, facilitating access to pre-school education, preparing the education system for digital transformation, and determining like this curriculum, and training the manpower suitable

for future competitive business lines are among the needs. Particularly, it is important emerging requirements to deal with the policies of strengthening policies to eliminate gender inequality in such areas as political representation, participation into labor force, education, and use of technology, adopting an integrated approach in the development of water resources management, continuing the efforts to reduce inequalities on the basis of regional, sectoral, and fragile groups, improving income distribution, and reducing discrimination understanding, with a whole understanding. While the number and scope of policies and measures that need to be implemented in line with the targets can be expanded more, it is important to provide the economic environment, financial resources, and international cooperation necessary for the implementation of the targets (Ministry of Development, 2017). Taking the steps of sustainable development in line with sustainable development goals depends on a strong institutional capacity and an effective coordination. When examined these targets, it is seen that each target is in the field of activity and responsibility of one or more organizations in terms of scope. That is; the issue of increasing the coordination between the institutions and making them permanent emerges as an area of development. In this context, it is considered there is a need for an institutional framework to increase inter-institutional communication and interaction for each objective and make this coordination of public institutions more defined and effective (Ministry of Development, 2017: 14). The framework, built by the development goals, enables the establishment of policy processes both locally and nationally. On the other hand, for Erbay and Ozden (2018: 261); it serves for establishing this cooperation between the local governments and the central government through this framework, ensuring that stakeholders are included in the managerial process, and providing a maximum benefit in favor of society.

In the realization of sustainable development goals, city councils are at the forefront of the mechanisms that are established to take an executive role. The city councils, which aim to expand democratic participation at the local level and to develop citizenship law and awareness of common life, undertake the function of ensuring the local adoption approach of governance with multi-partner and multi-actor. Moreover, the city councils cause an atmosphere of participation for many actors involved in the realization of sustainable development goals from municipalities to non-governmental organizations and universities to representatives of public institutions and organizations (Emrealp, 2005: 176; Gorun, 2006: 168; Akman, 2018). The city councils, which are established on the basis of *Local Agenda 21* aiming to achieve the goals of *Agenda 21* at the local level, acts in line with such purposes as managing problems at the source, raising awareness of local people on environmental and developmental issues and actively participating in solution groups, tackling problems, and finally, making the local governments personally a part of the solution in line with sustainable development goals (Soyguzel, 2015: 79; Celik, 2019; Karakuzulu, 2021).

Long-term strategic plans are prepared for the solution of sustainable development problems, and the preparation and implementation of these plans are accompanied by universities as well as central and local actors in line with the objectives of the relevant development goal. While the relevant ministries are involved in the center with the offices and boards formed by them within their own structure, the formations led by the local government units at the local level carry out the process. In order to ensure that the public is a part of this process, many local governments form working groups, research groups, round tables, and organize conferences (Carter and Darlow, 1997: 49). Civil society groups, which carry out activities specific to the problem and solution area of each development goal, also contribute greatly to the governance dimension of the process. Foundations and associations formed in various fields such as education, health, environment, city, and democratic participation support the process with the working groups that they form. These organizations provide activities on

such issues as ensuring the active participation of women and youth, representation of disadvantaged compatriot groups, and framing a common mind to put forward both local and national solutions in line with sustainable development goals.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Sustainable development is a systems-based approach requiring holistic and long-term thinking. The aims and objectives of the new global agenda approach the three pillars of sustainable development, *-environment, society, and economy*, at an equal distance, and establish a direct relationship between each issue. Development is no longer considered only through the issue of economic growth but also in a way that includes environmental and social concerns. In this context, the social dimension of sustainable development constitutes an important stage to achieve the goals determined. This dimension, which can also be expressed as social sustainability, means increasing the capacity of stakeholders at different levels and institutions at all levels to interact effectively and developing a dialogue environment between them in direction of the same goals and objectives. At this point, the concepts of participation and governance come into play.

As a result, the understanding of governance, which is shaped on the relations of the ruling and the ruled in which participation is an important element, assumes a structural function for the social dimension of sustainable development with its prediction of a multi-actor process of participation. Then, achieving the goals, which are planned to be implemented by 2030 and built in a very broad perspective, requires a cooperation among international organizations, governments, private sector, and voluntary organizations, which are related to the goals. Sustainable development goals focus on a global development for sustainability, and their formation as a result of a participatory policy process is considered an important call in terms of ensuring a more solid basis for the decisions. In line with the importance and priority that are given to the formation of partnerships at various levels for the sustainable development in this context; some mechanisms have been established at both national and local levels besides the international organizations. In particular, such formations as city councils, foundations, associations, and working groups make great contributions to the establishment of sustainable development awareness and the socio-economic analysis stages in which the related sources are determined. Therefore, in order to increase the effect of these mechanisms for the process of making the sustainable development goals effective, a simultaneous democratization process involving the state and the civil society should be observed, and a technological and technical infrastructure should be provided for facilitating the network communication of the actors. In addition, it should be avoided from the practices to cause the relevant mechanisms to function as 'consulting'. Finally, it should be cared that the legal and administrative regulations that will enable these mechanisms to participate as stakeholders in the plans, programs, and strategies, prepared under the supervision of the central government in line with the sustainable development goals, are inclusive and binding.

## REFERENCES

1. Akman, Ç. (2018). Kent konseylerini yeniden düşünmek: Türkiye Kent Konseyleri Birliği'ne üye olan kent konseyleri üzerinden bir değerlendirme. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*. 5(3): 740-764.
2. Aydın, A. H. (2010). *Yönetim Bilim*. Ankara: Seçkin.
3. Bilgili, M. Y. (2017). Ekonomik, Ekolojik ve sosyal boyutlarıyla sürdürülebilir kalkınma. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*. (10): 559-569.
4. Bozkurt, Ö., Ergun, T. ve Sezen, S. (1998). *Kamu yönetimi sözlüğü*. Ankara: TODAİE Yayını.
5. Bozkurt, Y. (2014). Yerel demokrasi aracı olarak Türkiye'de kent konseyleri: yapı, işleyiş ve sorunlar. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. (40): 229-240.

6. Carter, N. ve Darlow, A. (1997). Local agenda 21 and developers: are we better equipped to build a consensus in the 1990s, *Planning Practice&Research*. 12(1): 48-53.
7. Çelik, H., Çelik, A. D. ve Füsunoğlu, M. (2016). 1990-2015 yılları arasında bin yıl kalkınma hedefleri ve yoksulluk: Türkiye örneği. International Conference On Eurasian Economies. 336-341.
8. Çelik, D. (2019). *Yerel demokrasi ve sürdürülebilir kalkınma çerçevesinde kent konseyleri: Manisa Kent Konseyi Örneği*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Manisa: Manisa Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
9. Çitçi, O. (1996). Temsil, katılma ve yerel demokrasi. *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler Dergisi*, 5(6): 5-14.
10. Demirci, M. (2013). Yönetişim, otorite ve meşruiyet. Genç, F. N. (Ed.) *Yönetişim: Türk Kamu Yönetimine Yansımaları*. Bursa: Ekin Kitabevi.
11. Emrealp, S. (2005). *Yerel gündem 21: uygulamaya yönelik kolaylaştırıcı bilgiler el kitabı*. İstanbul: IULA-EMME Yayını.
12. Erbay E. R. ve Özden, M. (2018). Kentler sürdürülebilir kalkınma hedeflerini gerçekleştirmeye nasıl yardımcı olabilirler?. *Social Sciences Research Journal*, 7(4): 255-268.
13. Eroğlu, H. T. (2006). Yönetimde katılma biçimleri ve yerel yönetimlerde demokratik mekanizmalar. *Selçuk Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*. (11): 191-206.
14. Eryılmaz, B. (2012). *Kamu yönetimi*. Bursa: Umuttepe Yayınları.
15. Eşkinat, R. (2016). Binyıl kalkınma hedeflerinden sürdürülebilir kalkınma hedeflerine. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, Prof. Dr. Akar Öcal Armağanı, 267-282.
16. Gilman, R. (1992). Sustainability By Robert Gilman From The 1992 UIA/ AIA Call For Sustainable Community Solutions. Definitions (Context.Org) Erişim Tarihi: 14.04.2022.
17. Görün, M. (2006). Yerel demokrasi ve katılım: İzmir, Konya ve Ağrı İl Genel Meclis üyeleri üzerinde bir araştırma. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*. 4(2): 159-183.
18. Göymen, K. (1999). Türk Yerel yönetimlerinde katılımcılığın evrimi: merkezîyetçi devlette yönetim dinamikleri. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*. 32(4): 69-83.
19. Güler, B. A. (2003). Yönetişim: tüm iktidar sermayeye. *Praksis*. (2): 93-116.
20. Güney, T. (2015). Yönetişim ve sürdürülebilir kalkınma: OECD ülkeleri üzerine bir panel veri analizi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*. 29(2): 349-363.
21. Harris, J. M. (2000). *Basic principles of sustainable development*, Global Development And Environment Institute Working Paper 00-04, Tufts University, USA.
22. Holmberg, J. ve Sandbrook, R. (1992). *Sustainable development: what is to be done in: making development sustainable* (Ed.J. Holmberg). International Institute For Environment And Development. USA.
23. Kalaycıoğlu, E. ve Göymen, K. (2010). Sürdürülebilir İstanbul İçin Yeni Yönetim Modeli”, Metropolitan Yönetişim. İstanbul: İstanbul Politikalar Merkezi Yayını.
24. Kates, R., Parris, T.M. ve Leiserowitz, A. A. (2005). What is sustainable development: goals indicators, values and practice. *Environment: Science And Policy For Sustainable Development*. 47(3):8-21.
25. Karakuzulu, Z. (2021). *Sürdürülebilir kentler ve kasabalar. Yerel Gündem 21 ve Bursa Örneği*. TÜCAUM VI. Ulusal Coğrafya Sempozyumu 2010- Bildiri Kitabı, 397-406.
26. Kazancı, M. (1978). *Halkla İlişkiler açısından yönetim ve yönetilenler*. Ankara: AÜSBF Yayınları.
27. Keleş, R. (1998). *Kentbilim terimleri sözlüğü*. İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi.
28. Keleş, R., Hamamcı, C. ve Çoban, A. (2009). *Çevre politikası*. Ankara: İmge.
29. Mckenzie, S. (2004). *Social sustainability: towards some definitions*, Hawke Research Institute Working Paper Series No 27, Hawke Research Institute University Of South Australia Magill, South Australia.
30. Moldan, B. Janousková, S. ve Hak, T. (2012). How to understand and measure environmental sustainability: indicators and targets. *Ecological Indicators*. (17): 4-13.
31. Munasinghe, M. (2009). *Sustainable development in practice: sustainomics methodology and applications*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
32. Özmete, E. (2010). Sosyal hizmette sürdürülebilir kalkınma anlayışı: kavramsal analiz. *Aile ve Toplum Dergisi*. 6(22): 79-90.
33. Parlak, B. (2011). *Kamu yönetimi sözlüğü*. Bursa: Mkm Yayıncılık.
34. Soygüzel, H. (2015). *Kent konseyleri arasında iletişim ve iş birliği: Türkiye Kent Konseyleri Birliği örneği*. II. Uluslararası Kent Konseyleri Sempozyumu Bildiri Kitabı, E. Battal Keskin ve E. Karakurt Tosun (Ed.). Bursa, 76-91.
35. Torunoglu, E. (2004). *TÜBİTAK Vizyon 2023: Panel İçin Notlar: Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma Paradigması Üzerine Ön Notlar*. Ankara: TÜBİTAK
36. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Kalkınma Bankası (2017). *Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma Hedefleri Kapsamında Türkiye'nin Mevcut Durum Analizi Projesi*. Ankara.



#### 4<sup>th</sup> International CEO Communication, Economics, Organization & Social Sciences Congress

37. Unwced (1987). Report Of The World Commission On Environment And Development: Our Common Future. Our Common Future: Report Of The World Commission On Environment And Development (Un.Org)
38. Uysal, B. (1984). *Siyasal katılma ve katılma davranışına ailenin etkisi*. Ankara: TODAİE Yayını.
39. Üstün, Ç. (2020). *Küreselleşme ve sürdürülebilir kalkınma*. Global Akademi Konuşmaları Serisi (İstanbul: Global Akademi Ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Konseyi).
40. Wise, T. A. (2001). Economics of sustainability: the social dimension-overview essay. J. M. Harris, T. A. Wise, K. P. Gallagher, & N. R. Goodwin (Ed.). *A Survey Of Sustainable Development: Social And Economic Dimensions*, Island Press, Washington, D. C., ss. 47-57.
41. Yeni. O. (2014). Sürdürülebilirlik ve sürdürülebilir kalkınma: bir yazın taraması. *Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*. 16(3): 181-208.