



## Report

**Cite this article:** Gardner CJ (2021) Not teaching what we practice: undergraduate conservation training at UK universities lacks interdisciplinarity. *Environmental Conservation* 48: 65–70. doi: [10.1017/S0376892920000442](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0376892920000442)

Received: 1 July 2020

Revised: 5 October 2020

Accepted: 9 October 2020

First published online: 9 November 2020

**Author for correspondence:**

Charlie J Gardner, Email: [cg399@kent.ac.uk](mailto:cg399@kent.ac.uk)

# Not teaching what we practice: undergraduate conservation training at UK universities lacks interdisciplinarity

Charlie J Gardner 

Durrell Institute of Conservation and Ecology, University of Kent, Canterbury CT2 7NR, UK

### Summary

The practice and science of conservation have become increasingly interdisciplinary, and it is widely acknowledged that conservation training in higher education institutions should embrace interdisciplinarity in order to prepare students to address real-world conservation problems. However, there is little information on the extent to which conservation education at the undergraduate level meets this objective. I carried out a systematic search of undergraduate conservation degree programmes in the UK and conducted a simple text analysis of module descriptions to quantify the extent to which they provide social science training. I found 47 programmes, of which 29 provided module descriptions. Modules containing social science content ranged from 3.8% to 52.2% of modules across programmes, but only 55.2% of programmes offered a social-focused conservation module, and only one programme offered a module in social science research methods. On average, almost half of the modules offered (46.2%) comprised biology and ecology modules with no conservation focus, and 17.9% comprised skills-based modules (research and vocational skills). Conservation-focused modules comprised a mean of only 22.5% of modules. These results show that undergraduate conservation teaching in the UK is still largely biocentric and is failing to deliver the interdisciplinary education that is widely called for.

### Introduction

Over 1 million species are threatened with extinction over the coming decades as a result of human actions (IPBES 2019), and the unravelling of ecosystem services and functions as a result of habitat loss, overharvesting, pollution and global heating threatens the very existence of human civilization (MEA 2005, Gowdy 2020). Efforts to slow and eventually reverse this loss of biodiversity require a scientific underpinning, thus the field of conservation biology evolved in the 1980s to inform conservation action and provide conservationists with the required evidence base (Meine 2010).

Intrinsically crisis-orientated and problem-solving (Soulé 1985), the field of conservation is value-laden and adopts the normative position that biodiversity is good and should be preserved (Noss 1999). Although conservation biology emerged from ecology and was initially dominated by the biologists who first noticed and became concerned by the loss of species and ecosystems, it rapidly became clear that a purely biocentric approach is insufficient to address the ecological crisis (Hilborn & Ludwig 1993, St John et al. 2013). This is because most biodiversity loss is anthropogenic in origin, arising from human actions such as deforestation and other habitat conversion, overharvesting of plants and animals, climate change and environmental pollution of various kinds (Mazor et al. 2018), and so efforts to address it necessarily involve changing human behaviour and mitigating its impacts. As a result, the field transitioned from conservation biology to conservation science, and it began to embrace disciplines as diverse as economics, anthropology, sociology, political ecology, human geography and psychology (Daily & Ehrlich 1999, Mascia et al. 2003). Defined more by its goal than the academic disciplines it draws from, conservation science can be considered a pragmatic meta-discipline (Gardner 2015).

As conservation scientists have increasingly embraced interdisciplinarity, they have long recognized the need for conservation education to do similarly in order to train and prepare students for the complexities of real-world conservation policy and practice (e.g., Jacobson & Robinson 1990, Touval & Dietz 1994, Noss 1997, Bonine et al. 2003). Such calls have continued into more recent times (Andrade et al. 2014, Schedlbauer et al. 2016, Drakou et al. 2017, Kroll 2017). An interdisciplinary education is also desired by conservation students (Fisher et al. 2009, Ameyaw et al. 2017) because it makes them more versatile and enhances their job prospects in a field where current training is mismatched to the capacity requirements of the conservation job market (Muir & Schwartz 2009, Andrade et al. 2014, Lucas et al. 2017, Elliott et al. 2018). However, understanding of the extent to which the provision of conservation education by higher education institutions meets these recommendations remains patchy.

**Table 1.** Classification of modules offered on undergraduate conservation degree programmes in the UK based on text analysis of online module descriptions.

Module classification	Example topics
<i>A: Explicitly conservation-focused</i>	
A1: Conservation (biological)	Conservation biology, habitat management and restoration, threats to biodiversity, wildlife management, zoo biology
A2: Conservation (social)	Conservation ethics, environmental policy, community-based conservation, human-wildlife conflict, natural resource management
A3: Conservation (mixed)	Anthropogenic impacts, any combination of biological and social topics
<i>B: Not conservation-focused</i>	
B1: Biological	Cell and molecular biology, genetics, disease biology, physiology
B2: Ecological	Animal behaviour, biodiversity, population and community ecology, evolution
B3: Other natural science	Agricultural science, physical geography, climate science, soil science, ocean science
B4: Social	Human dimensions of climate change, environmental ethics, environmental law, environment and culture, planning and development, environmental philosophy
B5: Mixed	Agriculture, sustainability, environmental policy and management, biotechnology, eco-innovation, animal welfare and ethics
<i>C: Skills-based</i>	
C: Research and vocational skills	Experimental design, data analysis and statistics, ecological survey and field skills, ecological modelling, Geographical Information Systems, laboratory skills, remote sensing, social science data collection and analysis, communication skills, study and employability skills, field courses
<i>D: Research project</i>	
D: Dissertation	Research projects (e.g., final-year dissertation)

While there has been a range of research investigating the degree of interdisciplinarity of degree programmes in conservation and related disciplines such as restoration ecology (Baxter et al. 1999, Bonine et al. 2003, Niesenbaum & Lewis 2003, Van-Heezik & Seddon 2005, Estevez et al. 2010, Vincent & Focht 2011, Elliott et al. 2018, Sansevero et al. 2018), this has been largely focused at postgraduate levels, namely master's and doctoral programmes. A number of papers have also highlighted the interdisciplinary approach adopted by particular degree programmes (Farnsworth et al. 2001, Zarin et al. 2003, Kainer et al. 2006, Fitzgerald & Stronza 2009, Vinhateiro et al. 2012, Welch-Devine et al. 2014, Battisti 2018, Kelley et al. 2019); however, these have also focused on postgraduate teaching. As a result, there is no information on the focus or interdisciplinarity of undergraduate conservation teaching in the UK or elsewhere, despite the belief held by over 50% of academics that undergraduate studies represent the most appropriate stage at which to introduce students to interdisciplinary approaches (Roy et al. 2013).

Newing (2010) finds that higher education institutions define interdisciplinarity in various ways in the context of conservation, including: (1) the interaction of different academic disciplines; (2) the use of integrative or practice-based exercises; (3) the provision of content related to human dimensions of conservation; (4) training in vocational skills; or (5) social science content in general. In this paper, I investigate the extent to which undergraduate conservation degree programmes at British universities reflect the interdisciplinary nature of the field, specifically in terms of the provision of modules focused on social science and related themes. I also quantify the provision of skills-based training alongside traditional, theory-based modules.

## Methods

I conducted a systematic web search to identify all undergraduate degrees in the UK with the term 'conservation' in the degree title. Searches were conducted using [whatuni.com](http://whatuni.com), Which University and Google in February 2019, providing information on programmes available for 2019/2020 entry. Programmes not relevant to biological conservation (e.g., those relating to architectural and textile conservation) were excluded. I searched the websites of each relevant programme for information on the modules offered, and,


when module descriptions were available, carried out a simple text analysis using the presence and preponderance of keywords defined a priori to classify modules. No ethical approval was required as I used only publicly available materials.

I classified each module in a two-stage process, first categorizing modules as either (1) explicitly conservation-focused, (2) non-conservation-focused, (3) skills-based or (4) research project. Modules were classed as conservation-focused if they included any material addressing either threats to biodiversity or the theory, policy and practice of efforts to address biodiversity loss. Field courses were classified by subject area rather than as skills-based modules, although these (and many theory-based modules) also provided skills-based training. It was not possible to reliably differentiate between research skills-based modules and vocational skills-based modules because many skills are used in both research and practice; therefore, these are grouped into a single category of skills-based modules.

I then excluded skills-based and research project modules and further subdivided the remaining modules according to the principal subjects addressed within them, on a preponderance basis (Table 1): thus, conservation-focused modules were classified as either biological or social if c. 80% or more of the module content matched either of these categories, but mixed if the module content included c. 20% or more from both categories. Biological science modules that did not include a conservation component were classified as biological if they focused primarily at the sub-organismal level and ecological if they focused at the level of whole organisms and above. Modules addressing some broad themes were classified differently depending on their primary focus: for example, a module on climate change would be categorized as 'B3 Other natural science' if it focused on the physical science of climate change and its impacts, 'B5 Mixed' if it also focused on social aspects of climate change mitigation and/or adaptation or 'A1 Conservation – biological' if it included a focus on climate change impacts on biodiversity.

## Results

I found 47 undergraduate degree programmes including the word 'conservation' in the title, offered by 39 higher education institutions across the UK. Of programmes for which



**Fig. 1.** Percentage of modules on undergraduate conservation degree programmes according to subject focus. Conservation = explicitly conservation-focused (categories A1 + A2 + A3); Biology and ecology = biological-focused (B1 + B2); Social and mixed = social/mixed-focused (A2 + A3 + B4 + B5); Skills = research and vocational skills-focused (C). Totals do not add up to 100 because not all module classifications are shown, and some modules can be both conservation- and social-focused. UEA = University of East Anglia.

departmental information was available, 89.2% were housed in a school/department of natural science or biology (Supplementary Table S1, available online). The entry requirements of 80.9% of programmes included an A-level or AS-level in a natural science subject, and 70.2% of programmes offered a placement or sandwich year in industry. Full module descriptions were available for 29 programmes, which were subject to further analysis.

Programmes were highly heterogeneous in the extent of their provision of social science content. The percentage of (conservation and non-conservation) modules with a notable social science component ranged from 3.8% to 52.2%, with a mean of 18.8% (Fig. 1); social science-focused modules comprised less than 10% of available modules on five programmes. Only 55.2% of programmes offered a social science-focused conservation module, and only one programme (3.4%) offered a module in social science research methods (Table 2).

Conservation-focused content was provided in 4.7–44.0% of modules across programmes, with a mean of 22.5%. Overall, biology- and ecology-focused modules without any direct conservation focus comprised the largest component of programmes, with a mean of 46.2% of modules; these comprised over 50% of available modules on 12 programmes (41.4%) and over 75% on two programmes (at Edge Hill University and the University of Southampton). Skills-based modules comprised an average of 17.9% of modules across programmes.

## Discussion

Although conservationists have been calling for the provision of interdisciplinary conservation education for almost three

decades, this analysis shows that undergraduate conservation programmes in the UK have only embraced interdisciplinarity to a limited extent. While conservation practice is recognised as an inherently social endeavour, a mean of only 18.8% of modules offered across the 29 degree programmes contained a notable social component.

The lack of interdisciplinarity across degree programmes is worrying given the importance of such training in preparing conservationists for the real world of conservation science and practice (Andrade et al. 2014, Kroll 2017). However, it may be that such interdisciplinary training relevant to conservation is provided on other programmes that do not include the word ‘conservation’ in the degree title. For example, the University of Kent offered degrees in Human Ecology and Environmental Social Sciences that are related to its programme in Wildlife Conservation. Such programmes were not included in this analysis.

In terms of preparing students for the practical, applied nature of the field, over 70% of programmes offered a placement year in industry and thus provided students with the opportunity to gain experience of real-world conservation practice, while 17.9% of modules, on average, focused on skills provision. My analysis, however, only permitted the identification of modules that were entirely skills-based, which tended to focus on field skills, professional skills, research skills and analytical skills. Numerous further skills have been identified in the literature as critical to the conservationist’s skillset, including the ability to communicate science to the public and policymakers, group decision-making, programme design and management, critical thinking and problem-solving (Canon et al. 1996, Brewer 2001, Bonine et al. 2003, Niesenbaum & Lewis 2003, Muir & Schwarz 2009): such skills, and others, may

**Table 2.** Summary of module classifications for the 29 undergraduate conservation degree programmes for which online module descriptions were available, showing percentage of modules classified as follows: A1 = Conservation (biological); A2 = Conservation (social); A3 = Conservation (mixed); B1 = Biological; B2 = Ecological; B3 = Other natural science; B4 = Social; B5 = Mixed; C = Research and practical skills; D = Research project.

University, degree programme	No. of modules	Conservation-focused			Non conservation-focused					Skills	Research
		A1	A2	A3	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	C	D
Aberystwyth University, BSc Wildlife Conservation	29	6.9	0	20.7	10.3	37.9	6.9	0	0	13.8	3.4
Anglia Ruskin University, BSc Marine Biology with Biodiversity and Conservation	29	6.9	0	10.3	17.2	51.7	0	0	0	10.3	3.4
Bangor University, BSc Environmental Conservation	33	6.1	9.1	22.1	0	36.4	3.0	3.0	6.1	12.1	3.0
Bangor University, BSc Zoology with Conservation	31	3.2	0	12.9	22.6	41.9	0	0	0	16.1	3.2
Bangor University, BSc Forestry with Conservation	26	11.5	3.8	26.9	0	15.4	3.8	0	3.8	23.1	11.5
Bournemouth University, BSc Ecology and Wildlife Conservation	33	9.1	3.0	15.2	6.1	30.3	12.1	6.1	0	15.2	3.0
Edge Hill University, BSc Ecology and Conservation	26	3.8	0	3.8	42.3	34.6	3.8	0	0	7.7	3.8
Harper Adams University, BSc Wildlife Conservation and Environmental Management	23	4.3	4.3	13.0	0	21.7	0	13.0	21.7	17.4	4.3
Newcastle University, BSc Biology (Ecology and Conservation)	38	0	0	7.9	34.2	23.7	5.3	0	0	21.1	7.9
Nottingham Trent University, BSc Wildlife Conservation	19	15.8	10.5	5.3	10.5	36.8	0	0	0	15.8	5.3
Nottingham Trent University, BSc Ecology and Conservation	20	10.0	5.0	10.0	0	35.0	0	0	10.0	25.0	5.0
University of Aberdeen, BSc Conservation Biology	23	4.3	8.7	4.3	21.7	30.4	0	0	0	26.1	4.3
University of Chester, BSc Wildlife Conservation and Ecology	21	28.6	0	9.5	4.8	19.0	0	0	0	33.3	4.8
University of East Anglia, BSc Ecology and Conservation	27	7.4	7.4	11.1	14.8	37.0	7.4	0	0	11.1	3.7
University of Exeter, BSc Conservation Biology and Ecology	50	6.0	2.0	6.0	32.0	30.0	2.0	0	2.0	18.0	2.0
University of Greenwich, BSc Animal Conservation and Biodiversity	25	24.0	8.0	12.0	8.0	20.0	0	0	0	24.0	4.0
University of Kent, BSc Wildlife Conservation	26	3.8	11.5	19.2	11.5	19.2	0	7.7	3.8	19.2	3.8
University of Lancaster, BSc Ecology and Conservation	36	8.3	0	13.9	16.7	19.4	13.9	2.8	11.1	11.1	2.8
University of Leeds, BSc Ecology and Conservation Biology	43	2.3	0	2.3	18.6	32.6	7.0	2.3	11.6	23.3	0
University of Lincoln, BSc Ecology and Conservation	30	6.7	0	3.3	23.3	40.0	3.3	0	6.7	13.3	3.3
University of London Royal Holloway, BSc Ecology and Conservation	31	3.2	0	12.9	38.7	32.3	0	0	0	6.5	6.5
University of Plymouth, BSc Conservation Biology	21	19.0	0	4.8	14.3	33.3	0	0	4.8	19.0	4.8
University of Plymouth, BSc Ocean Science and Marine Conservation	25	8.0	0	8.0	0	8.0	36.0	0	4.0	32.0	4.0
University of Salford, Manchester, BSc Wildlife Conservation with Zoo Biology	29	13.8	3.4	10.3	6.9	34.5	0	0	3.4	20.7	6.9
University of Salford, Manchester, BSc Wildlife and Practical Conservation	28	14.3	3.6	7.1	3.6	35.7	0	0	3.6	25.0	7.1
University of Southampton, BSc Ecology and Conservation	48	4.2	0	4.2	56.3	25.0	2.1	0	0	6.3	2.1
University of Stirling, BSc Conservation Biology and Management	42	7.1	2.4	2.4	23.8	21.4	11.9	0	9.5	19.0	2.4
University of Suffolk, BSc Wildlife, Ecology and Conservation Science	20	0	5.0	25.0	15.0	20.0	5.0	0	0	25.0	5.0
University of Sussex, BSc Ecology, Conservation and Environment	32	9.4	3.1	9.4	12.5	50.0	0	0	3.1	9.4	3.1
Mean		8.6	3.1	10.8	16.1	30.1	4.3	1.2	3.6	17.9	4.3
Range		0–28.6	0–11.5	0–26.9	0–56.3	8–50.0	0–36.0	0–13.0	0–21.7	6.5–33.3	0–11.5

be taught in UK undergraduate conservation degrees as components of larger modules or using particular pedagogical techniques within them, and so would not have been picked up in my analysis. A deeper investigation into the learning outcomes and assessment patterns of existing modules would be required to ascertain the extent to which training in such skills is provided. It would have been interesting to test the suggestion that universities seek to prepare students for a life in academia rather than the applied world of conservation practice (Noss 1997, Lucas et al. 2017); however, I was unable to reliably distinguish between research skills and vocational skills because of the high overlap between them.

Given the time-constrained nature of undergraduate degree programmes, the provision of interdisciplinary training necessarily involves a trade-off – any time allocated to the teaching of social science-based material or vocational skills reduces the opportunities available for teaching more traditional biological science-based subjects. There is therefore a risk that striving for interdisciplinarity may leave students with a shallow understanding of a broad range of material, but a deeper mastery of none (Lau & Pasquini 2008, Muir & Schwartz 2009, Newing 2010). It has therefore been suggested that, given the breadth of the conservation movement, many forms of specialist training may only be required by relatively small numbers of people, and therefore that capacity-building needs within the sector may be best met through specialized training courses offered outside of traditional degree programmes (Clark et al. 2017). Some authors go further, arguing that conservation problems requiring interdisciplinary responses may be best addressed by interdisciplinary teams made up of specialists, rather than interdisciplinary individuals (Dick et al. 2016).

Nevertheless, it is important that conservation graduates have at least a rudimentary understanding of the social dimensions of conservation. In their review of conservation teaching, Newing (2010) suggested that undergraduate conservation degrees that are primarily ‘natural science-based’ should ‘as a minimum’ include an introduction to social science perspectives on the environment, training in social science research methods, vocational skills training and integrative problem-solving tasks. While my research method is unable to evaluate the provision of the latter two components, the results show that, a decade on, UK higher education institutions as a whole are still failing to provide students with the interdisciplinary training that is widely believed to be necessary. In particular, it is noteworthy that only one degree programme (3.4% of the sample) offered a module in social science research methods, and only two programmes offered a module in human dimensions of conservation other than human–wildlife conflict.

If it is true that early-career conservationists should be trained to be interdisciplinary and that undergraduate degrees are an appropriate place to start this, then it is important to consider why UK universities are largely failing to provide the education and training required. In part, this may reflect the same historical hangover that underlays the conservation movement as a whole: its emergence from ecology. Indeed, almost 90% of degree programmes (for which the relevant information was available) were housed in a school or department of natural science or biology, so it is unsurprising that their content should largely reflect their traditional areas of teaching. In some cases, the offer of conservation degrees may reflect market opportunism (i.e., the addition of some conservation modules to an existing ecology degree to market it as a conservation degree) rather than the core research interests of a particular department; this may be the case, for example, for some of the 12 programmes whose modules comprised at least 50%

biology and ecology modules with no direct conservation component. Only two programmes were offered by schools not focused on natural sciences: in Bath Spa University’s (School of) Culture and Environment and the University of Kent’s School of Anthropology and Conservation. Unfortunately, the small sample size (module data are not available for Bath Spa) precludes any statistical test of differences in the provision of interdisciplinary content between programmes offered by natural science schools and others.

In conclusion, the undergraduate conservation degree programmes offered by higher education institutions in the UK are highly variable, but overall appear largely biocentric in focus and with only limited provision of either social science content or conservation-focused content. While conservation scientists have been calling for greater interdisciplinarity in conservation teaching for three decades, conservation education is still primarily provided by biology departments, and this may represent a barrier to training interdisciplinary conservationists and conservation scientists who are fully equipped to thrive in today’s complex socio-ecological environments.

**Supplementary material.** To view supplementary material for this article, please visit <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0376892920000442>.

**Acknowledgements.** I thank Jennifer Leigh for comments that guided the development of this research and Dave Seaman for the preparation of Fig. 1.

**Financial support.** None.

**Conflicts of interest.** The author works at the University of Kent and lectures on the BSc Wildlife Conservation that forms part of this study.

**Ethical standards.** None.

## References

- Ameyaw J, Wals AEJ, Arts B, Turnhout E (2017) Does a transdisciplinary approach to forestry education meet students’ career aspirations? Lessons from a curriculum innovation in Ghana. *International Forestry Review* 19: 397–412.
- Andrade K, Corbin C, Diver S, Eitzel MV, Williamson J, Brashares J, Fortmann L (2014) Finding your way in the interdisciplinary forest: notes on educating future conservation practitioners. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 23: 3405–3423.
- Battisti C (2018) Preparing students for the operational environmental career: an integrated project-based road map for academic programs. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences* 8: 573–583.
- Baxter GS, Hockings M, Carter RW, Beeton RJS (1999) Trends in wildlife management and the appropriateness of Australian university training. *Conservation Biology* 13: 842–849.
- Bonine K, Reid J, Dalzen R (2003) Training and education for tropical conservation. *Conservation Biology* 17: 1209–1218.
- Brewer C (2001) Cultivating conservation literacy: ‘trickle-down’ is not enough. *Conservation Biology* 15: 1203–1205.
- Cannon JR, Dietz JM, Dietz LA (1996) Training conservation biologists in human interaction skills. *Conservation Biology* 10: 1277–1282.
- Clark BL, Bevanda M, Aspillaga E, Jorgensen NH (2017) Bridging disciplines with training in remote sensing for animal movement: an attendee perspective. *Remote Sensing in Ecology and Conservation* 3: 30–37.
- Daily GC, Ehrlich PR (1999) Managing Earth’s ecosystems: an interdisciplinary challenge. *Ecosystems* 2: 277–280.
- Dick M, Rous AM, Nguyen VM, Cooke SJ (2016) Necessary but challenging: multiple disciplinary approaches to solving conservation problems. *Facets* 1: 67–82.
- Drakou EG, Kermagoret C, Comte A, Trapman B, Rice JC (2017) Shaping the future of marine socio-ecological systems research: when early-career researchers meet the seniors. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 74: 1957–1964.

- Elliott L, Ryan M, Wyborn C (2018) Global patterns in conservation capacity development. *Biological Conservation* 221: 261–269.
- Estevez RA, Sotomayor DA, Poole AK, Pizarro JC (2010) Creating a new cadre of academics capable of integrating socio-ecological approach to conservation biology. *Revista Chilena de Historia Natural* 83: 17–25.
- Farnsworth EJ, Holsinger KE, Mehrhoff LJ, Murray N, Preston J, Silander JA Jr (2001) The REAL team: a cooperative student training program in rapid ecological assessment. *BioScience* 51: 874–879.
- Fisher B, Balmford A, Green RE, Trevelyan R (2009) Conservation science training: the need for an extra dimension. *Oryx* 43: 361–363.
- Fitzgerald LA, Stronza AL (2009) Applied biodiversity science: bridging ecology, culture, and governance for effective conservation. *Interiencia* 34: 563–570.
- Gardner CJ (2015) *Reconciling Conservation and Development in Madagascar's Rapidly Expanding Protected Area System*. PhD thesis, University of Kent.
- Gowdy J (2020) Our hunter-gatherer future: climate change, agriculture and uncivilization. *Futures* 115: 102488.
- Hilborn R, Ludwig D (1993) The limits of applied ecology. *Ecological Applications* 3: 550–552.
- IPBES (2019) *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. Bonn, Germany: Intergovernmental Panel on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Secretariat.
- Jacobson SK, Robinson JG (1990) Training the new conservationist: cross-disciplinary education in the 1990s. *Environmental Conservation* 17: 319–327.
- Kainer KA, Schmink M, Covert H, Stepp JR, Bruna EM, Dain JL et al. (2006) A graduate education framework for tropical conservation and development. *Conservation Biology* 20: 3–13.
- Kelley PH, Dietl GP, Visaggi CC (2019) Model for improved undergraduate training in translational conservation science. *Conservation Science and Practice* 1: e5.
- Kroll AJ (2017) Integrating professional skills in wildlife student education. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 71: 226–230.
- Lau L, Pasquini M (2008) 'Jack of all trades'? The negotiation of interdisciplinarity within geography. *Geoforum* 39: 552–560.
- Lucas J, Gora E, Alonso A (2017) A view of the global conservation job market and how to succeed in it. *Conservation Biology* 31: 1223–1231.
- Mascia MB, Brosius JP, Dobson TA, Forbes BC, Horowitz L, McKean MA, Turner NJ (2003) Conservation and the social sciences. *Conservation Biology* 17: 649–650.
- Mazor T, Doropoulos C, Schwarmueller F, Gladish DW, Kumaran N, Merkel K et al. (2018) Global mismatch of policy and research on drivers of biodiversity loss. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 2: 1071–1074.
- MEA (2005) *Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Synthesis*. Washington, DC, USA: Island Press.
- Meine C (2010) Conservation biology: past and present. In: *Conservation Biology for All*, eds NS Sodhi, PR Ehrlich (pp. 7–26). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Muir MJ, Schwartz MW (2009) Academic research training for a non-academic workplace: a case study of graduate student alumni who work in conservation. *Conservation Biology* 23: 1357–1368.
- Newing H (2010) Interdisciplinary training in environmental conservation: definitions, progress and future directions. *Environmental Conservation* 37: 410–418.
- Niesenbaum RA, Lewis T (2003) Ghettoization in conservation biology: how interdisciplinary is our teaching? *Conservation Biology* 17: 6–10.
- Noss R (1997) The failure of universities to produce conservation biologists. *Conservation Biology* 11: 1267–1269.
- Noss RF (1999) Is there a special conservation biology? *Ecography* 22: 113–122.
- Roy ED, Morzillo AT, Seijo F, Reddy SMW, Rhemtulla JM, Milder JC et al. (2013) The elusive pursuit of interdisciplinarity at the human-environment interface. *BioScience* 63: 745–753.
- Sansevero JBB, Alonso JM, Booth MC, Bueno MM, Carvalho LS, Clemente N et al. (2018) On the teaching of ecological restoration in Brazil: an analysis of postgraduate courses. *Restoration Ecology* 26: 997–1004.
- Schedlbauer JL, Nadolny L, Woolfrey J (2016) Practising conservation biology in a virtual rainforest world. *Journal of Biological Education* 50: 320–328.
- Soulé M (1985) What is conservation biology? *BioScience* 35: 727–734.
- St John FAV, Keane A, Milner-Gulland EJ (2013) Effective conservation depends upon understanding human behaviour. In: *Key Topics in Conservation Biology 2*, eds DW Macdonald, KJ Willis (pp. 344–361). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Touval J, Dietz J (1994) The problem of teaching conservation problem solving. *Conservation Biology* 8: 902–904.
- Van-Heezik Y, Seddon PJ (2005) Structure and content of graduate wildlife management and conservation biology programs: an international perspective. *Conservation Biology* 19: 7–14.
- Vincent S, Focht W (2011) Interdisciplinary environmental education: elements of field identity and curriculum design. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences* 1: 14–35.
- Vinhateiro N, Sullivan KA, McNally CG (2012) Training for the next generation of coastal management practitioners. *Journal of Coastal Research* 28: 1297–1302.
- Welch-Devine M, Hardy D, Brosius JP, Heynen N (2014) A pedagogical model for integrative training in conservation and sustainability. *Ecology and Society* 19: 10.
- Zarin DJ, Kainer KA, Putz FE, Schmink M, Jacobson SK (2003) Integrated graduate education and research in Neotropical working forests. *Journal of Forestry* 101: 31–37.