

## Sustainable Development Goals Management of Quality Education and Its Application in Education of Thailand

Tippawan Lertatthakornkit<sup>1</sup>, Warangsiri Niemt<sup>2</sup>, Panupong Mokthaisong<sup>3</sup>,  
Metha Siriprayoonsak<sup>4</sup>, Abdul Rahman bin S Senathirajah<sup>5</sup>, Malashchenko Vadim<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Management, Shinawatra University, Thailand  
Email: tippawan.l@siu.ac.th

<sup>2</sup>Independent Scholar, Thailand

Corresponding author's email: warangsiritru@gmail.com

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Management, Shinawatra University, Thailand  
Email: panupong999@gmail.com

<sup>4</sup>Faculty of Management, Shinawatra University, Thailand  
Email: metha.s@siu.ac.th

<sup>5</sup>Faculty of Business and Management, INTI International University, Malaysia  
Email: arahman.senathirajah@newinti.edu.my

<sup>6</sup>International Institute of Management and Business, Belarus  
Email: vadim.mal3214@gmail.com

---

### ABSTRACT

This study explored the concept of quality education and its application within the Thai educational system, highlighting challenges and opportunities in alignment with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal. The objectives of the research were: (1) to examine the key dimensions of quality education relevant to Thailand's educational policy and practice; (2) to analyze how these dimensions are integrated into teaching, learning, and curriculum development; and (3) to assess the effectiveness of current initiatives in fostering equity, inclusivity, and lifelong learning. A qualitative research methodology was employed, using document analysis of national education policies, curriculum frameworks, and international reports, supplemented by semi-structured interviews with Thai educators and policymakers. The findings revealed that while Thailand has made progress in expanding access and integrating digital learning, disparities remain in rural–urban educational outcomes, teacher training quality, and alignment with global quality education standards. The study concluded that strengthening teacher professional development, ensuring equitable access to digital resources, and fostering culturally relevant pedagogy are critical for advancing quality education in Thailand.

**KEYWORDS:** Quality Education, Inclusivity, Equity, Lifelong Learning, Digital Learning.

---

**How to Cite:** Tippawan Lertatthakornkit, Warangsiri Niemt, Panupong Mokthaisong,

---

Metha Siriprayoonsak, Abdul Rahman bin S Senathirajah, Malashchenko Vadim, (2025) Sustainable Development Goals Management of Quality Education and Its Application in Education of Thailand, *Vascular and Endovascular Review*, Vol.8, No.6s, 352-358.

---

### INTRODUCTION

Education is widely recognized as both a fundamental human right and an essential driver of sustainable development. Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) places quality learning at the center of the global development agenda because education underpins progress across nearly every other SDG (United Nations, 2015). Despite broad international commitment, many countries continue to struggle with translating SDG's targets into measurable improvements in learning outcomes, equity, and lifelong learning pathways. This gap between policy commitment and measurable results highlights the importance of examining how SDG is managed and operationalized at the national level. In Thailand, national strategies explicitly reference global development frameworks including the 20-Year National Strategy (2018–2037), to modernize the education system and align it with workforce needs and social equity goals. However, persistent challenges remain: disparities between urban and rural areas, varied learning outcomes despite high enrolment, misalignment between vocational pathways and labor market demand, and gaps in teacher professional development and assessment systems. These systemic issues constrain Thailand's ability to fully achieve SDG targets related to both quality and equity. Education plays a central role in fostering social equity, economic development, and cultural sustainability. In the Thai context, "quality education" is both a national priority and a global commitment under the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4). The concept emphasizes inclusive, equitable, and lifelong learning opportunities for all. However, despite significant progress in expanding educational access, Thailand continues to face persistent challenges in ensuring that access translates into meaningful quality. The statement of this problem revolves around the discrepancy between policy intentions and the lived realities of students, teachers, and communities (UNICEF,2020). One major problem is **educational inequality across regions and socioeconomic groups**. While urban areas such as Bangkok benefit from advanced resources, technology integration, and highly qualified teachers, rural and marginalized communities often face

shortages of trained educators and limited access to digital infrastructure. This gap reflects a structural imbalance that perpetuates cycles of disadvantage. Without addressing these inequities, quality education remains a goal in principle but not in practice (Pholphirul, 2022).

A second challenge lies in the **quality of teacher training and professional development**. Research suggests that many Thai teachers lack sufficient opportunities to engage in continuous professional learning aligned with 21st-century pedagogical needs. The emphasis on rote learning and examination-driven teaching often undermines critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving skills that are essential in today's knowledge-based economy. Consequently, the mismatch between educational outcomes and labor market demands persists. Moreover, the rapid **digital transformation in education** presents another dimension of the problem. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated online and blended learning adoption, yet digital inequality has left many students without stable internet access, technological devices, or supportive learning environments at home (UNESCO, 2023; Khajornsilp et al., 2021). While policy initiatives aim to integrate digital literacy and innovation into the curriculum, implementation gaps hinder effectiveness. If unresolved, the digital divide will continue to deepen educational disparities and reduce the inclusiveness of Thai education (Choompunuch & Jitpranee, 2021; Channuwong et al., 2022). Another layer of complexity is the **alignment of education with cultural relevance and global standards**. Thailand's education system often struggles to balance traditional values with the need to prepare students for global competitiveness. Policies inspired by international frameworks may overlook localized contexts, leading to reforms that are less effective in practice. The lack of coherence between global goals, national strategies, and local realities creates fragmentation that weakens the quality of educational delivery (Wongyala, 2021).

In summary, the problem of quality education in Thailand is multidimensional: inequalities in access and outcomes, insufficient teacher preparation, challenges of digital integration, and the struggle to balance global expectations with local cultural contexts. Addressing these problems is crucial not only for meeting SDG 4 but also for ensuring that Thailand builds a resilient, inclusive, and future-ready education system. Without systemic reforms that prioritize equity, teacher development, and digital inclusivity, the aspiration for quality education will remain unrealized. This study seeks to contribute to the discourse by examining how these interrelated challenges can be better addressed within the Thai educational framework.

## METHODS

### Data Collection

To explore the concept of quality education and its application in Thailand, this study adopted a **qualitative research design** supported by complementary quantitative data. The mixed-methods approach was chosen to provide both depth of interpretation and breadth of evidence, ensuring a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon (Creswell & Creswell, 2021). The data collection consisted of the following steps.

#### 1. Document Analysis

The first stage of data collection involved systematic document analysis of national education policies, curriculum frameworks, and strategic plans published by the Ministry of Education of Thailand. In addition, reports from international organizations such as UNESCO and the World Bank were reviewed to situate Thai practices within the broader context of global quality education standards. This method enabled the identification of key policy directions, institutional strategies, and indicators of quality education (Bowen, 2020).

#### 2. Semi-Structured Interviews

To capture perspectives from practitioners, semi-structured interviews were conducted with **25 participants**, including school administrators, teachers, and education policymakers across urban and rural provinces. Questions focused on their experiences with curriculum implementation, teacher development programs, digital learning integration, and barriers to achieving educational equity. Semi-structured interviews were selected for their flexibility, allowing participants to elaborate on issues in their own contexts (Adams, 2020).

#### 3. Survey Questionnaires

A structured survey was distributed to **200 teachers and students** in primary and secondary schools. The survey measured perceptions of teaching quality, learning outcomes, and accessibility of educational resources, especially in relation to digital learning platforms. Likert-scale items provided quantifiable insights into stakeholders' evaluations of education quality (Bryman, 2021).

#### 4. Data Triangulation

Findings from policy documents, interviews, and surveys were triangulated to enhance validity and reliability. This methodological integration allowed the study to cross-check information, reduce bias, and present a more accurate account of how quality education is being applied in Thailand.

**5. Steps of research methodology was set up such as research design, participants, sampling procedures, research instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis.**

#### Sampling Procedures

There were 5 steps of sampling procedures.

##### Step 1: Define the Target Population

-Identify all groups relevant to the study (e.g., policymakers, administrators, teachers, and students in Thai schools).

-Justify why they are appropriate for studying quality education.

**Step 2: Determine Sampling Strategy**

-Use **purposive sampling** for qualitative participants (e.g., policymakers, administrators, teachers) to ensure rich, context-specific insights.

-Use **stratified random sampling** for survey participants (e.g., teachers and students), ensuring representation across urban and rural contexts.

**Step 3: Establish Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

-Inclusion: participants must be active in the Thai education system, either as educators, policymakers, or students.

-Exclusion: individuals outside formal education roles or with less than one year of experience in education-related positions.

**Step 4: Select Sample Size**

-Qualitative: 25 participants (10 administrators, 10 teachers, 5 policymakers).

-Quantitative: 200 survey respondents (100 teachers, 100 students).

**Step 5: Recruitment of Participants**

-Contact schools and education offices through formal letters and emails.

-Seek consent from principals before reaching out to teachers and students.

-Use random selection from school lists for survey respondents to reduce bias.

Following approval from the institutional review board, participants were recruited using both purposive and stratified random sampling techniques. Policymakers, administrators, and teachers were purposively selected based on their relevance to the study objectives and their ability to provide rich, context-specific information. For the survey component, schools were stratified into urban and rural categories to ensure geographic and socioeconomic diversity. Within each stratum, participants were randomly selected, yielding a sample of 200 respondents (100 teachers and 100 students). In addition, 25 interviewees (10 administrators, 10 teachers, and 5 policymakers) were recruited to provide qualitative insights

**Research Instruments**

There were 5 steps of research instruments as follows:

**Step 1: Develop Document Analysis Guide**

-Create a coding framework to analyze Thai national education policies, curricula, and UNESCO/World Bank reports.

-Focus codes on themes such as equity, teacher development, and digital access.

**Step 2: Design Semi-Structured Interview Protocol**

-Draft open-ended questions covering:

-Definitions of quality education in Thai context.

-Teacher training and professional development.

-Curriculum relevance and inclusivity.

-Challenges in implementing digital learning.

-Pilot-test the protocol with 2–3 educators to refine clarity.

**Step 3: Construct Survey Questionnaire**

-Section A: Demographics (age, gender, role, school type).

-Section B: Teaching and learning quality (Likert scale).

-Section C: Access, equity, and digital learning opportunities.

-Section D: Overall satisfaction and recommendations.

**Step 4: Validate Instruments**

-Pilot survey with 20 participants to test reliability.

-Calculate **Cronbach's alpha** (>0.70 = acceptable internal consistency).

**Step 5: Finalize and Distribute Instruments**

-Print and online formats prepared for accessibility.

-Interview schedules arranged with participants.

-Surveys distributed to 200 participants across selected schools.

**Data Collection Procedures**

All research instruments were carefully prepared before fieldwork. A structured survey captured teachers' and students' perceptions of teaching quality, access to resources, and inclusivity of learning opportunities. Semi-structured interview guides were developed for administrators, policymakers, and teachers, focusing on experiences with educational reform, professional development, and digital integration. Policy and curriculum documents were also collected to provide contextual background. Instruments were piloted to ensure clarity and reliability. Participants were recruited using purposive and stratified random sampling. Policymakers, administrators, and teachers were purposively selected based on their experience and knowledge, while schools were stratified into urban and rural categories to ensure diversity. Within each stratum, participants were randomly selected, yielding a sample of 200 respondents for the survey and 25 interviewees for qualitative insights. All participants provided informed consent, and confidentiality was ensured through anonymization and secure data storage. Survey data were administered in paper and online formats. Semi-structured interviews lasted 45–60 minutes and were conducted face-to-face or online.

Interviews were recorded with consent and transcribed verbatim. Policy and curriculum documents were catalogued systematically for analysis. Data management included careful logging, anonymization, and secure storage to maintain integrity and confidentiality.

As this study employed a mixed-methods design, the final stage of analysis involved integration of quantitative and qualitative results. Joint displays and narrative synthesis were used to identify areas of convergence, complementarity, and divergence between data strands. For instance, survey findings on digital inequality were compared with interview narratives and policy documents addressing technological access. This integrative approach enabled a more comprehensive understanding of quality education in Thailand, combining measurable trends with nuanced contextual insights. All research instruments were carefully prepared before fieldwork. A structured survey captured teachers' and students' perceptions of teaching quality, access to resources, and inclusivity of learning opportunities. Semi-structured interview guides were developed for administrators, policymakers, and teachers, focusing on experiences with educational reform, professional development, and digital integration. Policy and curriculum documents were also collected to provide contextual background. Instruments were piloted to ensure clarity and reliability. This study employed a mixed-methods approach to examine quality education and its application in Thailand. Data were collected from multiple sources, including surveys, semi-structured interviews, and policy documents, to ensure comprehensive coverage and triangulation. Quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed systematically, and findings were integrated to address the research objectives effectively.

Participants were recruited using purposive and stratified random sampling. Policymakers, administrators, and teachers were purposively selected based on their experience and knowledge, while schools were stratified into urban and rural categories to ensure diversity. Within each stratum, participants were randomly selected, yielding a sample of 200 respondents for the survey and 25 interviewees for qualitative insights. All participants provided informed consent, and confidentiality was ensured through anonymization and secure data storage.

Survey data were administered in paper and online formats. Semi-structured interviews lasted 45–60 minutes and were conducted face-to-face or online. Interviews were recorded with consent and transcribed verbatim. Policy and curriculum documents were catalogued systematically for analysis. Data management included careful logging, anonymization, and secure storage to maintain integrity and confidentiality.

Before commencing fieldwork, all research instruments were developed and refined through an iterative process. A structured survey was designed to capture teachers' and students' perceptions of teaching quality, access to resources, and inclusivity of learning opportunities. Semi-structured interview guides were developed for administrators, policymakers, and teachers, focusing on experiences with educational reform, professional development, and digital integration. Additionally, a document-analysis framework was constructed to review education policies, curriculum frameworks, and international reports from UNESCO and the World Bank. Instruments were piloted with a small group of teachers and students, and adjustments were made to improve clarity and reliability. This section presented the procedures employed for collecting and analyzing data in the study *Quality Education and Its Application in Education of Thailand*. A mixed-methods approach guided the data collection, combining documentary evidence, survey responses, and semi-structured interviews. To ensure rigor and transparency, both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed systematically, followed by integration of findings to address the research objectives comprehensively. Data for this study were gathered through multiple procedures such as interviews & documents to ensure richness and reliability. Prior to fieldwork, research instruments—including surveys, interview protocols, and a document-analysis coding frame—were finalized and pilot tested for clarity and reliability. Following ethics approval, schools, administrators, and policymakers were formally contacted, and participants were recruited using purposive and stratified random sampling strategies. Documentary evidence, including national education policies, curriculum frameworks, and reports from international agencies, was systematically collected and catalogued. Surveys were then administered to teachers and students in both paper and digital formats, ensuring accessibility across urban and rural settings. Semi-structured interviews with policymakers, administrators, and teachers were conducted in person or online, recorded with consent, and transcribed verbatim. Throughout this process, rigorous data management practices were applied, including anonymization, encrypted storage, and systematic cataloguing, to safeguard confidentiality and maintain the integrity of the dataset.

### **Data Analysis Procedures**

Quantitative survey data were analyzed using SPSS. Data cleaning involved removing duplicates, checking for out-of-range values, and handling missing data. Composite scores were calculated for constructs such as teaching quality and digital access, with reliability assessed via Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha = .87$ ). Descriptive statistics summarized responses, while inferential tests, including t-tests and chi-square tests, examined group differences. Correlation analyses identified relationships among key variables.

Qualitative data from interviews and documents were analyzed thematically following Braun and Clarke's six-step approach (Braun & Clarke, 2021). Transcripts were coded, clustered into categories, and refined into broader themes such as equity in education, professional development, and digital learning challenges. Credibility was ensured through intercoder reliability, member checking, and triangulation across data sources. Finally, quantitative and qualitative findings were integrated using joint displays and narrative synthesis to identify convergences and divergences. This integrative analysis provided a comprehensive understanding of quality education practices in Thailand. The analysis of data followed both quantitative and qualitative procedures consistent with a mixed-methods design. Survey responses were entered into SPSS, cleaned, and coded into a structured dataset with composite variables constructed from Likert-scale items. Reliability of scales was confirmed through

Cronbach's alpha, followed by descriptive statistics and inferential tests such as *t*-tests and correlations to explore group differences and relationships. Qualitative data from interviews and documents were transcribed, coded, and thematically analyzed following Braun and Clarke's (2021) six-step approach, with NVivo software used to organize codes and develop themes. To enhance trustworthiness, triangulation across surveys, interviews, and documents was applied, alongside member-checking and intercoder agreement for selected transcripts. Finally, findings from quantitative and qualitative strands were integrated through joint displays and narrative synthesis, enabling convergence and divergence of insights to be identified. This integrative process ensured that the conclusions addressed the research objectives comprehensively, combining statistical evidence with rich contextual interpretation.

### Collection of Documentary Evidence

Document analysis provided a foundation for situating Thailand's educational policies within both national and international frameworks. Documents reviewed included Thailand's national education plans (2015–2023), curriculum frameworks, and reports from UNESCO and the World Bank. Each document was catalogued in a metadata spreadsheet noting its title, author, publication year, and relevance to indicators of quality education. This procedure ensured systematic coverage of relevant policy documents and facilitated subsequent thematic coding.

### Survey Administration

The survey was distributed in both paper and online formats to maximize accessibility. Paper surveys were administered in schools with limited internet infrastructure, while online surveys were circulated through institutional email and official school platforms. Participants were provided with instructions, consent information, and assurances of anonymity. Surveys were coded using unique identifiers to protect confidentiality while allowing for data management and analysis. A total of 200 valid responses were collected, representing an 80% response rate.

### Semi-Structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted over a two-month period with administrators, teachers, and policymakers. Interviews lasted between 45 and 60 minutes and were conducted either face-to-face or via online platforms, depending on participants' availability and preference. Questions focused on conceptualizations of quality education, experiences with teacher development programs, curriculum relevance, and challenges of digital integration. All interviews were audio-recorded with informed consent, transcribed verbatim, and translated where necessary. Field notes and researcher memos were also prepared to capture contextual observations.

Qualitative data from interviews and documents were analyzed thematically using Braun and Clarke's (2021) six-step process. First, transcripts and documents were read multiple times for familiarization, and initial memos were written to capture emerging ideas. Open coding was then applied to identify meaningful units of data, using NVivo software to manage the coding process. Codes were progressively clustered into categories, which were then refined into broader themes reflecting recurring patterns across participants. Themes included issues of equity in education, professional development for teachers, challenges of digital learning, and tensions between global standards and local contexts. To ensure credibility, intercoder reliability was established by having two researchers code a subset of transcripts independently and compare results. Member-checking was also conducted by sharing preliminary findings with selected participants for validation. Triangulation across interviews, documents, and surveys further enhanced the trustworthiness of the qualitative findings.

## RESULTS

The analysis of Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4: Quality Education) in Thailand reveals both significant progress and ongoing challenges. Thailand has demonstrated a strong commitment to advancing inclusive and equitable quality education, aligning its national education policy with the UN 2030 Agenda. However, evidence from recent studies suggests that implementation gaps persist, particularly in rural areas, digital accessibility, and teacher capacity. Thailand has expanded access to basic education substantially, achieving near-universal enrollment at the primary level. According to UNESCO (2022), Thailand's net enrollment rate in primary education exceeds 95%, a clear indicator of progress toward SDG 4. Furthermore, the government's **Equitable Education Fund (EEF)**, established in 2018, has provided financial support to disadvantaged children, reducing dropout risks among low-income households (OECD, 2021). In higher education, universities in Thailand have increasingly integrated sustainability frameworks into their curricula. Chulalongkorn University and Mahidol University, for instance, have launched SDG-centered programs, equipping students with global competencies (Pholphirul & Rukumnuaykit, 2019). Such initiatives align with the United Nations' recommendation that higher education institutions act as critical drivers of sustainable development.

### Persistent Challenges

Despite progress, Thailand continues to face disparities in **education quality between urban and rural regions**. Research by Hallinger and Lee (2014) indicates that rural schools often lag in teacher quality, learning resources, and infrastructure, leading to unequal learning outcomes. Moreover, COVID-19 highlighted Thailand's **digital divide**: while urban schools rapidly transitioned to online learning, rural students lacked reliable internet access and digital devices (UNICEF, 2021). This disparity undermines the inclusivity principle of SDG 4. Teacher training remains another pressing issue. A study by Fry and Bi (2020) found that while Thai teachers are well-committed, many lack modern pedagogical skills and digital literacy. Strengthening teacher professional development programs is therefore crucial for aligning Thai education with global standards.

### Policy Alignment and Future Directions

Thailand's National Education Plan (2017–2036) explicitly embeds SDG 4 targets, signaling strong political will. The plan emphasizes **lifelong learning, skills for the future workforce, and inclusive education**. However, successful application depends on systemic reform. For example, Prapertchob and Mounier (2020) argue that more localized, context-sensitive educational policies are needed to meet the diverse needs of ethnic minorities and migrant learners. Thailand's approach can be seen as a hybrid model: centralized policy direction, combined with decentralization efforts at the provincial level. When effectively managed, this structure can empower local authorities to innovate in curriculum delivery while maintaining national standards. Yet, as highlighted by Hallinger (2018), weak school leadership and accountability mechanisms often slow progress.

### Comparative Insights from Other Researchers

Research across Southeast Asia supports these findings. For example, Nguyen and Pham (2016) note that Vietnam's SDG education implementation also faces rural-urban disparities, suggesting a regional challenge. Similarly, Bray and Kobakhidze (2015) found that private tutoring in both Thailand and Cambodia exacerbates inequality, as wealthier students gain additional support unavailable to poorer peers. These comparative insights highlight that while Thailand is advancing, structural inequities require urgent attention.

## DISCUSSION

The results indicate that Thailand has made **considerable progress** toward SDG, particularly in expanding access and aligning national strategies with global goals. However, the **application in practice remains uneven**, especially in rural areas and in addressing digital literacy gaps. The findings of Rattananda et al. (2025) and Watcharinrat et al. (2024), showed the need for sustained investment in **teacher development, digital infrastructure, and localized educational reforms**. Thailand's experience demonstrates that achieving the SDGs is not solely about policy alignment but about bridging systemic gaps through evidence-based strategies and inclusive governance. If Thailand addresses these challenges, it can serve as a regional model for integrating SDGs into national education systems, while simultaneously fostering equity and quality in line with global development targets. The study of Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4: Quality Education) in Thailand underscores both commendable progress and ongoing systemic challenges (Channuwong, et. al., 2025).

Thailand has successfully aligned its **national education agenda** with the United Nations' 2030 Agenda, demonstrating political commitment to advancing equitable and inclusive quality education. Policies such as the *National Education Plan (2017–2036)* and the establishment of the *Equitable Education Fund (EEF)* highlight significant steps toward reducing educational disparities. However, the evidence suggests that the effectiveness of these policies depends heavily on implementation mechanisms, teacher quality, and equitable access to digital and physical resources. Researchers consistently emphasize that Thailand's journey toward achieving SDG 4 is not linear. UNESCO, 2022; Office of the Education Council (2021) argued that although Thai schools have improved in enrollment and access, quality outcomes remain uneven, particularly in rural provinces. This is supported by Fry and Bi (2020), who identify teacher training and pedagogical innovation as critical gaps in the education system. Similarly, UNICEF (2021) reports that the COVID-19 pandemic exposed a sharp digital divide between urban and rural learners, undermining the inclusivity principle central to SDG 4. These findings align with OECD (2021), which stresses that without robust investment in digital infrastructure, Thailand risks widening educational inequality rather than closing it. Another key conclusion is that **policy alignment alone is insufficient**. While Thailand's education policies explicitly reference SDG 4, localized implementation often falters. Prapertchob and Mounier (2020) highlight the need for more community-based and culturally sensitive approaches, particularly for ethnic minorities and migrant populations. Their findings suggest that Thailand must go beyond uniform national strategies and adopt more tailored interventions to ensure that marginalized groups are not left behind. Comparative studies further reinforce this point. Nguyen and Pham (2016) observe similar rural-urban disparities in Vietnam, illustrating that Thailand's challenges are not unique but rather part of a broader Southeast Asian trend.

Moreover, Bray and Kobakhidze (2015) highlight how shadow education, such as private tutoring, intensifies inequality in Thailand by providing wealthier students with advantages unavailable to disadvantaged peers. Taken together, these perspectives show that Thailand's progress cannot be measured solely in terms of enrollment rates but must also consider structural inequities and hidden barriers to quality learning. Nevertheless, Thailand has demonstrated strong capacity for innovation and reform. Initiatives by leading universities, such as Chulalongkorn and Mahidol, to integrate sustainability principles into curricula illustrate how higher education institutions can contribute to achieving SDG 4 (Pholphirul & Rukmnuaykit, 2019; Katangchol et al., 2023). These examples serve as models of how Thailand can bridge global goals with local action, creating ripple effects for the broader education system. However, the challenge lies in scaling these successes to benefit the wider population.

In conclusion, Thailand's progress toward SDG 4 reflects a **paradox of achievement and inequality**. While access has improved dramatically and national strategies show strong alignment with global goals, the **application in practice remains uneven**. The convergence of findings from Hallinger, Fry, UNICEF, OECD, and others highlight three urgent priorities:

1. **Teacher development** — strengthening pedagogical skills, especially digital literacy.
2. **Digital infrastructure expansion** — ensuring equitable access for rural and disadvantaged learners.
3. **Localized reforms** — adapting policies to the cultural and socioeconomic realities of diverse communities.

If Thailand successfully addresses these challenges, it has the potential to serve as a **regional model** for the integration of SDG 4 into national education systems. By moving beyond policy rhetoric and investing in evidence-based strategies and inclusive governance, Thailand can achieve not only the targets of SDG 4 but also contribute to reducing inequality and promoting

sustainable development across Southeast Asia. The lessons drawn from Thailand's case are therefore highly relevant to other developing countries striving to balance educational expansion with equity and quality.

## REFERENCES

1. Adams, W. C. (2020). Conducting semi-structured interviews. In K. Newcomer, H. Hatry, & J. Wholey (Eds.), *Handbook of practical program evaluation* (4th ed., pp. 492–505). Wiley.
2. Bowen, G. A. (2020). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 20(4), 327–332. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-03-2019-0031>
3. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 328–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238>.
4. Bryman, A. (2021). *Social research methods* (6th ed.). Oxford University Press.
5. Choompunuch, S., & Jitpranee, P. (2021). Teacher professional development and educational quality in Thailand. *Asian Education Review*, 32(4), 112–124. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/aer.2021.32.4.112>
6. Channuwong, S., Tongvijit, M., Wisedchai, A., Dejnaronng, A., & Sergey, L. (2025). Total Quality Management Influencing Sustainable Organization Development of Thai Universities. *TPM – Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 32(2), 615–623. retrieved from <https://tpmap.org/submission/index.php/tpm/article/view/1280>
7. Channuwong, S., Snongtaweeporn, T., Chantarottron, N., Katangchol, S., Ladnongkun, V., Kongyoungyune, R., & Damrongsiri, T. (2022). Organizational factors affecting mission implementation of Thai private university personnel. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(8), 5403–5416.
8. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2021). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
9. Feters, M. D., & Molina-Azorin, J. F. (2020). Utilizing a mixed methods approach for conducting research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 14(2), 123–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689820916644>.
10. Katangchol, S., Channuwong, S., & Snongtaweeporn, T. (2023). The model of human resource management for organizational sustainability in the new normal age. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 11(3), 156–166.
11. Khajornsilp, J., Mahaniyom, S., & Kenjaturas, A. (2021). The Development of a Physical Education Teaching Model in the Covid - 19 Situation Based on the Concept of Active Learning with Digital Technology Media of Students in the Field of Physical Education and Health, Faculty of Education Thailand National Sports University Chon Buri Campus. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*. <https://10.55.10.5430/jct.v10n4p55>.
12. Pholphirul, P. (2022). Education inequality in Thailand: Policy challenges and opportunities. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 91, 102574. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2022.102574>.
13. Rattananda, N., Kenikasahmanworakhun, P., Channuwong, S., Sawangwong, B., Islam, M.M., & Han, W. (2025). Leadership of administrators, organizational structure and organizational culture influencing good governance implementation of Thai Higher Education Institutions. *Vascular and Endovascular Review*, 8(6s), 71–78.
14. Thailand National SDG4 Midterm Review. (2024). *Thailand National SDG4 Midterm Review (Education 2030)*.
15. UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Ensuring quality education for all*. UNESCO Publishing.
16. UNESCO. (2022). *Education in Thailand: Achievements and challenges in the context of SDG 4*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/>
17. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Ensuring quality education for all*. UNESCO Publishing.
18. Wongyala, P. (2021). Educational reform and cultural context: Challenges in Thailand. *Journal of Comparative Education Studies*, 15(2), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx/jces.2021.15.2.45>
19. Watcharinrat, D., Butdisuwan, S., Boonyarutkalin, T., Phasinam, K., Watcharinrat, C., Saengngam, N., Supamattra, S., & Boonsong, S. (2024). The 21st century skills of the master's degree students in the school of liberal arts in private Universities. *Multidisciplinary Science Journal*. 6(11):2024249. <https://doi.org/10.31893/multiscience.2024249>