## APPENDIX

Table A1. Pet owners' and general members of the public's prior knowledge of non-native and invasive species, Florida, United States, 2017-2018.

|  | General members of the <br> public |  | Exotic pet owners |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | $\%$ | Number | $\%$ |
| Respondents who correctly indicated <br> whether an animal was native to Florida |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Capybara | 795 | 67.9 | 486 | 88.4 |
| Rhesus macaque | 913 | 78.0 | 502 | 91.3 |
| $\quad$ Monk parakeet | 528 | 45.1 | 429 | 78.0 |
| $\quad$ Burrowing owl | 977 | 83.4 | 517 | 94.0 |
| $\quad$ Cuban tree frog | 675 | 57.6 | 461 | 83.8 |
| $\quad$ Burmese python | 926 | 79.1 | 505 | 91.8 |
| $\quad$Gopher tortoise <br> Green iguana | 995 | 85.0 | 514 | 93.5 |
| Respondents who knew that a non-native <br> animal is considered invasive when it <br> causes damage to the environment, the | 614 | 52.4 | 460 | 83.6 |
| economy, and/or human health and <br> safety. | 908 | 77.5 | 524 | 95.3 |

Table A2. Pet owners' and general members of the public's responses to the question: "In your opinion, how likely is it that nonnative animals are introduced into Florida by the pet trade?", Florida, United States, 2017-2018.

|  | Median | Percent of responses |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | response | Not at all ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Slightly | Moderately | Highly | Extremely |
| All respondents | Highly | 2.1 | 6.7 | 14.2 | 33.1 | 44.0 |
| General members of the public | Highly | 2.3 | 4.5 | 11.5 | 35.1 | 46.5 |
| Exotic pet owners | Highly | 1.6 | 11.3 | 19.8 | 28.7 | 38.6 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Not at all $=1 ;$ slightly $=2 ;$ moderately $=3 ;$ highly $=4 ;$ extremely $=5$

Table A3. Pet owners' and general members of the public's responses to the question: "How concerned are you bout the following possible impacts of non-native invasive animals?", Florida, United States, 2017-2018.

| Impacts of invasive species | Median | Percent of responses |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | response | Not at all | Slightly | Moderately | Highly | Extremely |
| Eating native wildlife | Highly | 4.7 | 7.4 | 21.2 | 34.1 | 32.7 |
| Members of the public | Highly | 5.6 | 7.1 | 22.5 | 34.7 | 30.1 |
| Pet owners | Highly | 2.7 | 8.0 | 18.4 | 32.7 | 38.2 |
| Competing with native wildlife for food | Highly | 4.1 | 7.0 | 18.9 | 35.2 | 34.9 |
| Members of the public | Highly | 4.8 | 6.5 | 20.5 | 35.5 | 32.8 |
| Pet owners | Highly | 2.6 | 8.2 | 15.5 | 34.6 | 39.3 |
| Causing property damage (e.g. digging under walls) | Highly | 5.5 | 11.8 | 24.3 | 29.3 | 29.1 |
| Members of the public | Highly | 4.0 | 8.1 | 21.7 | 31.4 | 34.8 |
| Pet owners | Moderately | 8.7 | 19.8 | 29.6 | 24.9 | 16.9 |
| Harming cats and dogs | Highly | 6.9 | 12.0 | 20.1 | 26.6 | 34.5 |
| Members of the public | Highly | 4.0 | 8.2 | 17.3 | 29.2 | 41.4 |
| Pet owners | Moderately | 13.3 | 20.0 | 25.8 | 21.1 | 19.8 |
| Costing taxpayers money to control them | Highly | 3.9 | 8.6 | 19.7 | 31.5 | 36.4 |
| Members of the public | Highly | 2.9 | 6.9 | 16.9 | 31.7 | 41.8 |
| Pet owners | Highly | 5.8 | 12.8 | 25.5 | 31.0 | 25.0 |
| Biting people | Moderately | 9.8 | 16.8 | 24.4 | 19.3 | 29.7 |
| Members of the public | Highly | 4.5 | 12.2 | 25.5 | 22.1 | 35.8 |
| Pet owners | Moderately | 21.3 | 26.6 | 22.2 | 13.3 | 16.7 |
| Scratching people | Moderately | 11.5 | 19.2 | 24.6 | 19.1 | 25.6 |
| Members of the public | Highly | 5.3 | 14.8 | 26.2 | 22.4 | 31.2 |
| Pet owners | Slightly | 24.6 | 28.6 | 21.1 | 12.0 | 13.8 |
| Transferring disease to people | Highly | 6.8 | 12.7 | 20.8 | 22.3 | 37.4 |
| Members of the public | Highly | 3.4 | 7.9 | 20.7 | 23.9 | 4.9 |
| Pet owners | Moderately | 14.2 | 22.7 | 21.1 | 18.9 | 23.1 |

Table A4. Principal factor analysis of survey items that measured respondents' concern about the effects of invasive species and Cronbach's alpha for latent constructs, Florida, United States, 2017-2018.

| Construct and survey items | Factor <br> loadings | Eigenvalue | Cronbach's <br> alpha |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Concern about invasive species impacts on <br> wildlife |  | 4.4763 | 0.9234 |
| $\quad$ Eating native wildlife | 0.8648 |  |  |
| $\quad$ Competing with native wildlife for food | 0.8769 |  |  |
| Concern about invasive species impacts on |  | 1.2065 | 0.9140 |
| humans | 0.5933 |  |  |
| $\quad$ Cause property damage | 0.6287 |  |  |
| $\quad$ Harm cats and dogs | 0.5378 |  |  |
| Cost taxpayers money to control them | 0.9282 |  |  |
| Bite people | 0.9186 |  |  |
| Scratch people | 0.8267 |  |  |
| $\quad$ Transfer disease to people |  |  |  |

Table A5. Pet owners' and general members of the public's perceptions of the state government's effectiveness in mitigating the pet trade invasion risk, Florida, United States, 2017-2018.

|  | Median response | Percent of responses |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |
| The state government has the knowledge to manage the non-native pet trade | Agree | 5.0 | 10.2 | 27.4 | 35.4 | 21.9 |
| Members of the public | Agree | 2.6 | 8.0 | 30.3 | 36.3 | 22.9 |
| Pet owners | Agree | 10.2 | 15.1 | 21.3 | 33.6 | 19.8 |
| The state government has been effective in managing the non-native pet trade | Neutral | 14.9 | 29.1 | 38.5 | 11.9 | 5.5 |
| Members of the public | Neutral | 15.3 | 29.6 | 40.9 | 10.0 | 4.2 |
| Pet owners | Neutral | 14.0 | 28.2 | 33.5 | 16.0 | 8.4 |

