

MARINE CONSERVATION EDUCATION AND COASTAL YOUTH ENGAGEMENT

Dr. Aditi S. Nair

Assistant Professor

Department of Marine Science and Coastal Studies

School of Environmental Sciences

Institute of Ocean and Coastal Research

Kochi, Kerala, India

Abstract

Coastal ecosystems sustain food systems, livelihoods, cultural practices, biodiversity, and protection from natural hazards. Their long-term care depends not only on regulation and scientific management, but also on the capacity of coastal communities to understand ecological change and participate in conservation decisions. This study examines the role of marine conservation education in strengthening coastal youth engagement. It considers how school learning, community-based activities, local ecological knowledge, citizen science, youth leadership, and digital communication can together build practical stewardship among young people living near seas, estuaries, islands, lagoons, and fishing settlements. The study uses a qualitative, literature-based analytical approach. It reviews environmental education research, ocean literacy frameworks, participatory conservation scholarship, youth civic engagement literature, and coastal governance principles. The analysis is organised around the pathway through which learning can lead to action: awareness of marine systems, emotional connection with place, ecological knowledge, practical skills, collective participation, leadership opportunities, and continuing support from institutions. Findings indicate that information-only programmes have limited influence when youth are excluded from real decision-making or when local environmental pressures are treated as distant global concerns. More effective initiatives link classroom concepts with shoreline observation, waste audits, habitat restoration, community dialogue, fisheries knowledge, and visible local outcomes. The paper proposes a coastal youth engagement framework based on inclusion, place relevance, intergenerational learning, safety, equity, reflection, and accountability. It concludes that marine conservation education should be designed as a sustained civic and ecological learning process through which young people are recognised as contributors to coastal resilience rather than merely as future beneficiaries of conservation.

Keywords: Marine Conservation, Coastal Youth, Ocean Literacy, Environmental Education, Community Participation, Blue Economy, Citizen Science, Coastal Resilience, Youth Leadership, Sustainable Development

1. INTRODUCTION

Coastal regions are places of intense ecological interaction and human activity. Beaches, coral reefs, mangroves, seagrass meadows, estuaries, wetlands, fishing harbours, ports, and island settlements support diverse forms of life while also sustaining employment, food security, tourism, transport, and cultural identity. These spaces are increasingly affected by pollution, habitat loss, overharvesting, unplanned development, climate-related hazards, and changing marine conditions. The quality of local conservation depends on public understanding of these pressures and on the ability of communities to act collectively. Young people in coastal areas experience environmental change directly.

They may observe erosion near homes and schools, declining fish catch in family networks, plastic accumulation along shorelines, altered monsoon patterns, loss of mangrove cover, or reduced access to safe recreational spaces. At the same time, they are often treated as recipients of conservation messages rather than as people with knowledge, interests, responsibilities, and creative capacity. This position limits the contribution that youth can make to locally grounded environmental action.

Marine conservation education offers a route for addressing this gap. It can connect scientific concepts with everyday coastal experience and help learners understand relationships among biodiversity, livelihoods,

governance, consumption, risk, and social justice. Effective education does not only explain what an ecosystem is. It creates opportunities to observe, question, discuss, measure, communicate, collaborate, and make decisions. In this sense, it is both an educational activity and a form of democratic participation.

The purpose of this paper is to analyse how marine conservation education can support meaningful coastal youth engagement. The paper examines the conditions under which education is likely to contribute to stewardship, identifies common obstacles, and proposes a practical framework for institutions that work with young people in coastal settings. The focus is not on a single location or programme. Instead, it considers recurring challenges across coastal communities where young people may be affected by ecological change but have unequal access to information, resources, safe public spaces, and decision-making platforms.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The idea of ocean literacy has expanded environmental education by emphasising that the ocean influences human life and that human activity influences the ocean. It encourages learners to understand marine systems as interconnected rather than as distant or separate from daily life. Ocean literacy frameworks commonly include knowledge of currents, ecosystems, climate connections, coastal processes, human uses of marine resources, and the social consequences of environmental degradation. For coastal youth, however, literacy must go beyond general awareness. It must be linked to the realities of living, studying, working, travelling, and participating in communities shaped by the sea.

Environmental education research has consistently shown that knowledge alone rarely produces lasting behaviour change. People are more likely to participate when learning is relevant, when they see that their actions matter, when they have skills and social support, and when institutions create realistic pathways for participation. In coastal contexts, this means that a lesson about plastic pollution becomes more meaningful when students can investigate waste flows in their own area, speak with local workers, identify

sources of leakage, and take part in a community response that is visible and sustained.

Participatory conservation scholarship also demonstrates that local outcomes improve when affected groups are treated as partners in defining problems and evaluating solutions. Young people may contribute observations about changing shorelines, species sightings, water quality, fishing practices, tourism pressures, and public-space conditions. Their perspectives are especially valuable because they move across schools, homes, digital networks, recreation spaces, and community events. Yet youth participation must not be symbolic. When adults invite young people to meetings but reserve all meaningful decisions for institutions, participation can become discouraging rather than empowering.

Coastal education is also shaped by inequality. Some young people have access to field equipment, trained educators, transport, safe beaches, digital devices, and environmental clubs. Others may face household responsibilities, work pressures, gender-based restrictions, disability barriers, language exclusion, or limited mobility. A programme that assumes all learners can volunteer outside school hours or travel to distant sites may unintentionally exclude those who could benefit most. Equity must therefore be treated as a central design principle rather than as an additional feature.

2.1 MARINE CONSERVATION EDUCATION IN COASTAL COMMUNITIES

- Marine conservation education combines ecological knowledge with understanding of local livelihoods, public health, climate risk, waste systems, fisheries, tourism, and coastal governance.
- Place-based learning helps learners connect abstract concepts with nearby beaches, wetlands, harbours, markets, rivers, mangrove belts, or reef systems.
- Experiential activities such as transect walks, shoreline clean-up audits, biodiversity mapping, water-quality observation, and oral-history interviews can develop both skills and a sense of responsibility.
- Education is more durable when it creates repeated contact with a site over time,

allowing youth to observe change rather than completing a one-day awareness activity.

- Community partnerships can connect schools with fishers, local government, civil-society groups, coastal scientists, protected-area staff, and small businesses.

2.2 YOUTH ENGAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CITIZENSHIP

- Youth engagement refers to active involvement in identifying concerns, developing ideas, carrying out activities, communicating findings, and evaluating outcomes.
- Environmental citizenship develops when young people understand both rights and responsibilities in relation to shared natural resources and public decision-making.
- Leadership opportunities must include meaningful roles such as peer facilitation, project planning, local presentations, data collection, and participation in consultations.
- Digital media can extend participation through storytelling, mapping, citizen-science reporting, and awareness campaigns, but it should complement rather than replace field-based learning.
- Intergenerational dialogue is important because coastal knowledge is often distributed across elders, fishers, women workers, youth groups, teachers, and local officials.

2.3 BARRIERS TO SUSTAINED PARTICIPATION

- Short-term programmes can raise interest without building the skills, mentorship, or institutional support needed for continued action.
- Conservation messages may appear disconnected from livelihood concerns when they do not acknowledge fishing, tourism, housing, safety, employment, or access to public space.

- Technical language, English-only materials, and one-way lectures may exclude young people who have strong practical knowledge but limited confidence in formal academic settings.
- Unpaid volunteer expectations can create inequity when youth must balance studies, family work, care responsibilities, and paid employment.
- Weak feedback mechanisms can make participants feel that surveys, meetings, and clean-up drives have no influence on policy or local practice.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The present study examines marine conservation education as a pathway for coastal youth engagement. The object of study is the educational and social process through which young people develop the knowledge, values, skills, relationships, and opportunities required to participate in care for coastal and marine environments. The analysis does not evaluate a single school, village, city, or coastal programme. It considers the broader design principles that apply across varied settings, including fishing settlements, urban waterfronts, island communities, tourism zones, estuarine villages, and coastal campuses.

The theoretical basis of the study is that meaningful conservation learning combines ecological understanding with agency. A learner may know that mangroves reduce erosion or that plastic harms marine species, but this knowledge becomes socially significant when the learner can connect it to local conditions, discuss it with others, examine evidence, and take part in collective action. The study therefore treats youth engagement as a connected system involving schools, families, community organisations, local government, scientists, traditional knowledge holders, and accessible public spaces.

3.1 COASTAL EDUCATION SETTINGS AND YOUTH ENGAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS

S. No.	Coastal Setting	Illustrative Learning Activity	Primary Engagement Value	Essential Support
1	Fishing villages and landing sites	Interviews on seasonal change, fish diversity, gear use, and waste management	Links marine ecology with household livelihood knowledge	Respectful facilitation, consent, and dialogue with fishers and women workers

2	Urban beaches and waterfronts	Waste characterisation, litter-source mapping, public-awareness design	Builds evidence-based understanding of consumption and municipal systems	Safe access, protective materials, and formal feedback to local authorities
3	Mangrove and estuarine areas	Biodiversity walks, nursery monitoring, habitat restoration participation	Creates place attachment and awareness of coastal protection functions	Trained guides, low-impact protocols, and seasonal follow-up
4	Island and remote coastal communities	Community mapping of water, waste, transport, and climate-risk concerns	Supports local planning and intergenerational knowledge exchange	Language inclusion, transport support, and locally appropriate materials
5	Tourism-dominated coastlines	Visitor behaviour studies and sustainable tourism campaigns	Develops communication and stakeholder-engagement skills	Partnerships with operators, safety planning, and protection from tokenism

3.2 STUDY OBJECTIVES

- To examine the contribution of marine conservation education to the participation of young people in coastal environmental action.
- To identify knowledge, skills, relationships, and institutional conditions that strengthen youth stewardship of coastal and marine ecosystems.
- To compare learning opportunities across fishing, urban, estuarine, island, and tourism-oriented coastal settings.
- To analyse barriers related to inequality, participation design, safety, language, livelihood pressures, and weak links to decision-making.
- To develop a practical framework for schools, community organisations, and public institutions seeking to support sustained coastal youth engagement.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study uses a qualitative and literature-based methodology. It synthesises scholarly work on environmental education, ocean literacy, youth participation, participatory conservation, coastal resilience, and community-based resource management. Policy guidance, educational frameworks, and practice-oriented reports are also considered because the research question concerns the design of real-world learning and engagement processes rather than the measurement of a single biological indicator.

The analytical strategy is comparative. Coastal contexts differ in ecological features, livelihood patterns, social relations, public

infrastructure, and institutional capacity. A programme that is suitable for an urban beach may not be appropriate for a remote fishing settlement or an island community. The study therefore examines how learning goals and participation arrangements should be adapted according to site conditions, exposure to environmental change, population needs, and available support.

The research process follows the pathway from learning opportunity to sustained engagement. It considers how a programme defines its conservation purpose, identifies local concerns, recruits participants, builds ecological knowledge, develops practical skills, supports youth voice, connects participants with institutions, records outcomes, and maintains accountability. This approach helps reveal why some activities remain isolated events while others develop into continuing community practice.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN: QUALITATIVE ANALYTICAL APPROACH

- The research follows a qualitative design based on thematic interpretation of environmental education, marine conservation, and youth participation literature.
- The study compares programme elements according to relevance to local ecosystems, inclusiveness, duration, skill development, decision-making access, and potential for continuing engagement.
- The analysis links educational design with social outcomes, including confidence,

collective action, trust, place attachment, and environmental citizenship.

- The findings are interpreted as a practice-oriented framework rather than as a statistical estimate of programme impact.

4.2 COASTAL YOUTH ENGAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

The framework used in this study has seven connected dimensions. The first is place relevance: learning should begin with ecosystems and concerns that young people recognise in their own surroundings. The second is ecological understanding: participants need accurate, age-appropriate information about marine systems and human impacts. The third is practical capability: youth require opportunities to observe, measure, communicate, organise, and reflect. The fourth is inclusion: activities must be accessible across gender, language, income, ability, and location. The fifth is intergenerational learning: programmes should value both scientific knowledge and community experience. The sixth is institutional connection: participants need routes through which their observations and proposals can reach responsible organisations. The seventh is continuity: engagement must be supported beyond a single event through mentorship, feedback, and repeated action.

These dimensions are mutually reinforcing. A beach clean-up without discussion of waste pathways may create activity without understanding. A classroom lesson without local observation may create knowledge without place attachment. A youth consultation without feedback may create frustration rather than agency. A strong programme links each stage so that young people can see how ecological learning, community relationships, and public decisions influence one another.

4.3 COASTAL AND INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

- The study considers coastal communities where learners may encounter marine ecosystems through family livelihoods, public recreation, tourism, transport, education, or local cultural practices.
- Marine conservation education is understood as a combination of field learning, classroom reflection, community dialogue, creative communication, and

participation in practical conservation activities.

- Institutional capacity is examined through educator preparation, safety procedures, transportation, learning materials, local partnerships, financial support, and responsiveness to youth input.
- Engagement is assessed in relation to coastal biodiversity, public health, livelihoods, climate adaptation, cultural continuity, and fair access to environmental decision-making.

4.4 PARAMETERS OF ANALYSIS

- Local relevance of the conservation issue and clarity of the learning purpose
- Accessibility of participation, including language, gender, mobility, disability, time, cost, and safety considerations
- Balance between scientific information, traditional knowledge, critical reflection, and hands-on activity
- Opportunities for youth to collect evidence, present findings, lead peer activity, and influence institutional responses
- Quality of partnerships among schools, community groups, scientists, municipal bodies, fishers, and coastal managers
- Continuity mechanisms such as mentoring, seasonal follow-up, public reporting, recognition, and routes for long-term involvement

4.5 PROCEDURE OF STUDY

- Review literature and educational frameworks related to ocean literacy, environmental citizenship, youth participation, and marine conservation.
- Identify recurring opportunities and barriers affecting youth involvement in coastal environmental activity.
- Compare representative coastal settings and the forms of learning, participation, and support that may be appropriate in each setting.
- Map programme features to outcomes such as knowledge, practical capability, collective action, leadership, inclusion, and community trust.
- Interpret the combined findings to formulate a framework for sustained marine conservation education and coastal youth engagement.

- Develop recommendations for schools, civil-society organisations, local governments, and conservation institutions.

4.6 ANALYTICAL APPROACH

- Thematic analysis of relationships between education, place attachment, agency, and participation.
- Comparative interpretation of coastal settings with different livelihood, ecological, and institutional conditions.
- Assessment of how programme duration, youth voice, equity, and local partnerships shape the likelihood of continued engagement.
- Identification of safeguards that prevent extractive, unsafe, or symbolic forms of youth participation.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The qualitative analysis suggests that marine conservation education is most effective when it is designed as a sequence rather than as a single awareness event. Early stages should create curiosity and connection with the local coast. This can involve observation, storytelling, maps, photographs, species identification, beach walks, or discussion of daily experiences. Subsequent stages should deepen understanding through inquiry: learners can ask why a shoreline is changing, where particular waste items originate, how mangroves support fisheries, or how tourism affects public access and habitat condition.

Practical participation becomes more meaningful when young people can see a relationship between their observations and a real response. For example, a waste audit can be linked to a meeting with municipal staff, a school campaign for refill systems, or dialogue with local vendors. A mangrove learning activity can be connected to nursery care, monitoring, restoration planning, and discussion of flood risk. A fisheries-focused programme can include respectful conversations with fishing families and attention to both ecological sustainability and livelihood realities. The important element is not that every project produces immediate large-scale change, but that participants can trace a credible path from learning to action.

The analysis also indicates that youth engagement is shaped by social recognition. When young people are invited to present

evidence, lead peer sessions, or contribute to local planning, they develop confidence in their capacity to participate. Recognition must be substantive rather than ceremonial. Certificates and public events can be helpful, but they should not substitute for access to information, feedback from authorities, and opportunities to influence decisions. Programmes that report back to participants on what changed, what did not change, and why, are more likely to sustain trust.

Equity is a recurrent theme. Coastal youth are not a uniform group. Some may have family links to fisheries, while others live in rapidly urbanising coastal neighbourhoods. Some have easy access to shoreline sites, while others face safety restrictions, transport barriers, or disability-related challenges. Girls and young women may encounter additional constraints in fieldwork or public meetings. Programmes that provide local-language materials, flexible schedules, safe group travel, trained adult support, and multiple forms of participation are better positioned to include diverse learners.

Intergenerational learning emerges as another important condition. Scientific education can benefit from local knowledge about currents, seasonal cycles, fish behaviour, shore access, storms, and resource use. At the same time, community knowledge should not be romanticised or treated as fixed. Good programmes create respectful dialogue in which different forms of evidence can be compared, questioned, and used together. This approach can reduce the false divide between formal science and lived coastal experience.

Finally, the analysis shows that institutional responsiveness determines whether educational momentum becomes durable. Schools may be able to start clubs and field activities, but they often need external partners for technical guidance, permits, equipment, restoration sites, or connections to local governance. Civil-society organisations may provide facilitation and continuity. Local authorities can support youth involvement by sharing relevant information, responding to proposals, and integrating youth-generated evidence into public communication. Without such links, even strong educational activity may remain isolated from the systems that shape coastal conditions.

5.1 THEMATIC SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Theme	Observed Educational Need	Risk When Absent	Illustrative Response
Place relevance	Link lessons with nearby ecosystems and daily coastal experiences	Marine issues appear distant and abstract	Regular shoreline observation, local maps, and community interviews
Practical agency	Provide skills for inquiry, communication, and collaborative action	Youth remain passive recipients of messages	Citizen-science projects, waste audits, peer facilitation, local presentations
Equity and safety	Design for diverse time, mobility, language, and gender needs	Participation is limited to already privileged groups	Accessible materials, transport support, safe field protocols, flexible involvement
Institutional response	Create routes from youth evidence to responsible bodies	Participation becomes symbolic and discouraging	Feedback meetings, public dashboards, youth representation in local forums
Continuity	Support repeated engagement across seasons and school years	Interest declines after one-off events	Mentoring, clubs, coastal calendars, follow-up monitoring, shared ownership

6. DISCUSSION

The findings show that marine conservation education should be approached as an enabling condition for youth participation rather than as a communication tool alone. The sea and coast are often discussed through broad global narratives of biodiversity loss, climate change, plastic pollution, and sustainable development. These narratives are important, but they can appear remote when they do not connect with local realities. For a young person living near an estuary, the most immediate concerns may be flooding, access to clean water, unsafe waste disposal, family livelihood uncertainty, or the disappearance of familiar species. Education becomes more powerful when it begins with these lived concerns and then links them to wider ecological processes.

A central implication is that conservation learning must include critical thinking about power and responsibility. Young people should be able to ask who produces coastal waste, who benefits from development, whose knowledge is recognised, who is consulted, and who carries the burden of environmental harm. Such questions do not make education political in a partisan sense; they make it honest about the social context in which

conservation decisions are made. Avoiding these questions can reduce learning to individual behaviour advice while leaving structural pressures unexplored.

The discussion also highlights the importance of avoiding token participation. Youth may be asked to join beach clean-ups, awareness rallies, poster competitions, or social-media campaigns, but these activities do not necessarily give participants meaningful influence. A more substantial approach involves shared planning, transparent roles, opportunities to present evidence, and feedback on how institutions responded. Adults remain responsible for safety, resources, and legal decisions, but they can create genuine space for youth insight and leadership.

Digital tools have a useful but limited role. Mobile applications, online maps, photographs, short videos, and messaging platforms can help document changes, coordinate activity, and share local stories. They may also allow young people in remote areas to connect with broader networks. However, digital participation should not replace outdoor observation or community dialogue. It should be used to strengthen,

record, and communicate grounded engagement. Programmes must also consider unequal access to devices, data costs, online safety, and the risk that public sharing of sensitive sites could create unintended pressure on habitats.

A further implication concerns evaluation. Many programmes measure success through attendance counts, numbers of clean-up bags, or social-media reach. These indicators are easy to collect but do not show whether youth have gained agency, skills, confidence, or sustained relationships with institutions. Evaluation should therefore include reflective journals, peer feedback, evidence of local problem-solving, follow-up participation, changes in understanding, and records of institutional response. The aim is not to demand that every activity deliver rapid ecological transformation, but to assess whether it is building a credible foundation for long-term stewardship.

The strongest model is collaborative and sustained. It combines school-based learning, community knowledge, field practice, youth-led communication, and institutionally supported pathways for action. In this model, conservation is not presented as a task carried out by experts for communities. It becomes a shared practice in which young people contribute to the social capacity needed to care for coastal ecosystems over time.

7. CONCLUSION

This study examined the relationship between marine conservation education and coastal youth engagement. It found that education can

contribute to stronger stewardship when it connects ecological knowledge with lived coastal experience, practical skills, local relationships, and genuine opportunities to participate. Programmes are more likely to create lasting value when they are place-based, inclusive, intergenerational, safe, and supported by institutions that respond to youth observations and proposals.

The analysis indicates that information-only approaches are insufficient. Young people need opportunities to observe environmental conditions, ask questions, collect and interpret evidence, communicate with others, and participate in actions whose purpose and outcomes are clear. Engagement should be designed as a continuing process rather than as a one-day event. It should recognise the diversity of coastal youth and address barriers related to language, gender, income, mobility, time, safety, and access to public decision-making.

Marine conservation education is therefore best understood as a form of ecological and civic learning. It can strengthen awareness of biodiversity and coastal processes, but it can also support confidence, collaboration, accountability, and care for shared places. Schools, community organisations, local governments, and conservation institutions should work together to create sustained pathways through which young people can become informed, respected, and active participants in coastal resilience and marine conservation.

8. REFERENCES

1. Ardoin, N. M., Bowers, A. W., & Gaillard, E. (2020). Environmental education outcomes for conservation: A systematic review. *Biological Conservation*, 241, 108224.
2. Ballantyne, R., & Packer, J. (2005). Promoting environmentally sustainable attitudes and behaviour through free-choice learning experiences: What is the state of the game? *Environmental Education Research*, 11(3), 281-295.
3. Bennett, N. J. (2016). Using perceptions as evidence to improve conservation and environmental management. *Conservation Biology*, 30(3), 582-592.
4. Chawla, L., & Cushing, D. F. (2007). Education for strategic environmental behavior. *Environmental Education Research*, 13(4), 437-452.
5. Christie, P., Bennett, N. J., Gray, N. J., Wilhelm, T. A., Lewis, N., Parks, J., Ban, N. C., Gruby, R. L., Gordon, L., Day, J., Taei, S., & White, A. (2017). Why people matter in ocean governance: Incorporating human dimensions into large-scale marine protected areas. *Marine Policy*, 84, 273-284.
6. Cava, F., Schoedinger, S., Strang, C., & Tuddenham, P. (2005). Science content and standards for ocean literacy: A report on ocean literacy. College of Exploration.

7. Falk, J. H., & Dierking, L. D. (2010). The 95 percent solution: School is not where most Americans learn most of their science. *American Scientist*, 98(6), 486-493.
8. FAO. (2022). *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2022: Towards Blue Transformation*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
9. Guest, H., Lotze, H. K., & Wallace, D. (2015). Youth and the sea: Ocean literacy in the classroom and beyond. *Marine Policy*, 53, 1-8.
10. Halpenny, E. A. (2010). Pro-environmental behaviours and park visitors: The effect of place attachment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30(4), 409-421.
11. IPBES. (2019). *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.
12. IUCN. (2020). *Nature 2030: One Nature, One Future*. International Union for Conservation of Nature.
13. Krasny, M. E., & Tidball, K. G. (2009). Community gardens as contexts for science, stewardship, and civic action learning. *Cities and the Environment*, 2(1), 1-18.
14. Levin, P. S., Fogarty, M. J., Murawski, S. A., & Fluharty, D. (2009). Integrated ecosystem assessments: Developing the scientific basis for ecosystem-based management of the ocean. *PLoS Biology*, 7(1), e1000014.
15. Lotze, H. K., Guest, H., O'Leary, J., Tuda, A., & Wallace, D. (2018). Public perceptions of marine threats and protection from around the world. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 152, 14-22.
16. Monroe, M. C., Andrews, E., & Biedenweg, K. (2008). A framework for environmental education strategies. *Applied Environmental Education and Communication*, 7(4), 205-216.
17. OECD. (2020). *Education for Sustainable Development: A Roadmap*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
18. O'Neill, S., & Nicholson-Cole, S. (2009). Fear won't do it: Promoting positive engagement with climate change through visual and iconic representations. *Science Communication*, 30(3), 355-379.
19. Orr, D. W. (2004). *Earth in Mind: On Education, Environment, and the Human Prospect*. Island Press.
20. Reid, A., Jensen, B. B., Nikel, J., & Simovska, V. (Eds.). (2008). *Participation and Learning: Perspectives on Education and the Environment, Health and Sustainability*. Springer.
21. Sterling, S. (2010). Learning for resilience, or the resilient learner? Towards a necessary reconciliation in a paradigm of sustainable education. *Environmental Education Research*, 16(5-6), 511-528.
22. Steel, B. S., Smith, C., Opsommer, L., Curiel, S., & Warner-Steel, R. (2005). Public ocean literacy in the United States. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 48(2), 97-114.
23. Stern, M. J., Powell, R. B., & Hill, D. (2014). Environmental education program evaluation in the new millennium: What do we measure and what have we learned? *Environmental Education Research*, 20(5), 581-611.
24. United Nations. (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations.