JOURNAL OF NACAA

ISSN 2158-9459

VOLUME 18, ISSUE 2 – DECEMBER, 2025

Editor: Bindu Poudel-Ward, PhD

Tomis, S.[1], Siegel-Miles, A.[2], Wallace, V.[3]
[1]Assistant Extension Educator One Health - Agriculture and Community Engagement, University of Connecticut, Norwich, Connecticut, 06360
[2]Research Technician, University of Connecticut, Norwich, Connecticut, 06360
[3]Sustainability, Turf & Landscapes Senior Extension Educator, University of Connecticut, Norwich, Connecticut, 06360

Impacts of the Connecticut Native Plant Availability List – An Extension Resource in Action

Abstract

The Connecticut Native Plant Availability List is an extension publication designed to connect consumers with local nurseries and educational resources to broaden the use of native species in Connecticut landscapes. Survey research was conducted to evaluate the impacts of the Connecticut Native Plant Availability List on participating nurseries and end-users. Users indicated an awareness of new native plant species, increased the number of native plants purchased for personal or professional work, and saved time locating native plants. Findings will be used to inform resource improvement. Evaluating the impacts of an on-demand extension publication has value for partners, target audiences, and program leaders alike.

Abbreviations: CIPWG (Connecticut Invasive Plant Working Group), CNLA (Connecticut Nursery and Landscape Association), CRPA (Connecticut Recreation and Parks Association), CT DEEP (Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection), IPM (Integrated Pest Management), NPAL (Native Plant Availability List), UConn (University of Connecticut)

Keywords: native plants; extension publication; impact evaluation

Introduction

Plants are considered native to a region if they have persisted in that area for centuries and were not introduced as a result of human interference (Norcini, 2006). The potential benefits of native plants are extensive. Native plant species provide habitat for a wide variety of insects, birds, and other animals (Gillis & Swim, 2020) and improve air quality (e.g., heat reduction, oxygen production) more effectively compared to non-native species (Tartaglia & Aronson, 2024). Many native plants with deep root systems help regulate climate extremes by slowing water movement during flood events (MSU Extension, n.d.). Native plants that have been used for culinary, recreational, medicinal, or spiritual purposes for generations have significant value in many cultures, serving as important cultural touchstones (MSU Extension, n.d.). Furthermore, native plant species are crucial to preserving biodiversity because they co-evolved with the organisms that existed in the same area over an extended period of time (Wilde et al., 2015). Heavy reliance on exotic plant species in urban and suburban landscapes is correlated with the decline of native animal species (Burghardt et al., 2009).

People are paying attention to the impact of non-native plants on the environment and seeking ways they can contribute to ecological solutions (Yue et al., 2011; Yue et al., 2012). The considerable amount of United States land that is privately owned (PAD-US, 2025) and managed provides an opportunity for home landscapes to contribute to environmental restoration and preservation. For example, homeowners and landscape professionals can protect biodiversity by choosing to plant native species (Burghardt et al., 2009). Incorporating native species into managed landscapes is a critical tactic to preserve ecosystem services in the face of biodiversity loss and climate change.

To encourage the prioritization and availability of native plants, increased production of indigenous species in the nursery industry is needed. However, many small businesses that sell native plants are exposed to increased economic risk as they expand their inventory of native species, which typically take longer to grow to a sellable size and therefore entail greater uncertainty and higher production costs (White et al., 2018).

Other challenges include lack of grower knowledge related to pest management and nutrient requirements (Errickson et al., 2024).

Partnerships among native plant producers, botanists, horticulturists, governmental policymakers, change agents, and land managers are necessary to address industry and environmental needs. These partnerships are important to provide community education, to drive funding, and to coordinate communication between diverse stakeholders. They are also a critical component of driving sustained demand for native plants in the nursery industry. As a nationwide system with a longstanding history of community engagement, Cooperative Extension can serve as a key partner in this vital effort.

Conducting evaluations to understand programmatic outcomes is a frequent practice in Cooperative Extension (Workman & Scheer, 2011). Impact evaluations can be used to determine program outcomes, including those that were planned for or unexpected (Giancola, 2021). Exploring the impacts of an outreach resource, such as an extension publication, has the potential to yield comparable insights but is considerably less common. Often, data may be limited to the number of users on a site wherein the resource is hosted or informal feedback from users at a related event. As a lean communication channel with the potential to reach large audiences efficiently (Daft & Lengel, 1984), publications can extend extension resources and provide on-demand information transfer that meets audience needs in real time. Therefore, understanding the impact of extension publications can support professionals in meeting community needs and influencing change through lean media.

The Connecticut Native Plant Availability List (NPAL) is an annually updated extension publication that is developed and maintained by the University of Connecticut (UConn) Extension Sustainable Landscapes Program and the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (CT DEEP). The NPAL provides salient native plant information for Connecticut residents, including tree, shrub, and perennial species availability amongst participating nurseries throughout the state. The publication is designed to assist home gardeners, landscape professionals, municipal employees, and

conservation organizations in locating native planting stock that can be used to restore wildlife habitat and enhance biodiversity while supporting the local nursery industry. Within this study, we seek to:

1. Provide an example of an extension resource advancing the use of native plants within diverse managed landscapes;
2. Explore the impacts of the NPAL on participating nurseries and end-users and identify opportunities for resource improvement;
3. Demonstrate how an impact evaluation can be conducted for a stand-alone, on-demand extension publication.

Materials and Methods

Resource development

The original editions of the NPAL were developed and distributed by CT DEEP in 1995, 2000, and 2005. Data collection was facilitated by mail using the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station list of registered nurseries, which included approximately 300 businesses. Around 60-70 nurseries participated in the three original editions. The project was discontinued due to limited staff support and the considerable time requirements for paper data collection and analysis.

The resource was revitalized in 2023 through a collaboration between CT DEEP Wildlife Division of Environmental Protection and the UConn Extension Sustainable Landscapes Program. The original list of native plants was refined and a survey instrument was developed to collect species availability data throughout the state. In February 2023, nurseries with active vendor licenses maintained through the Connecticut Department of Administrative Services & Department of Consumer Protection were contacted with a description of the project and a Qualtrics survey (Qualtrics, Provo, UT, USA). Businesses interested in participating in the List were asked to provide information about their nursery, including location, contact details, social media and webpage links, and vending type (wholesale, retail, or both). They were also asked to indicate which

native tree and shrub species they sold, specifying in-stock and special-order availability. This distinction was noted in the finalized resource.

Native plant availability data were collected from February 2023 to March 2023. Twenty-seven Connecticut nurseries participated in the 2023 edition, entitled the “Connecticut Native Tree and Shrub Availability List.” The updated 2023 resource also included improvements to resource recommendations, educational information on the use of native trees and shrubs for wildlife food and cover, and a map that featured participating nurseries by county. The List was published on the UConn Extension Sustainable Landscapes Program website with a PDF option for ease of printing. Following publication, distribution emails were sent to listservs maintained by the Connecticut Invasive Plant Working Group (CIPWG); the UConn School IPM and Sustainable Landscapes Program; CT DEEP; the UConn Home and Garden Center; and the UConn Master Gardener program.

To update the resource in 2024, two Qualtrics surveys were distributed to the annual licensed nursery list in addition to participating nurseries from 2023. One survey instrument focused on trees and shrubs, and the other focused on flowering perennials, ferns, grasses, and sedges. Nurseries were asked to indicate if their available perennial plants were straight species, cultivars, or if they carried both. Data were collected from January 2024 to February 2024, with participating nurseries totaling 45 businesses. Publishing of the resource, renamed the “Connecticut Native Tree, Shrub, and Perennial Availability List,” followed the same procedure as the 2023 edition. In addition to the listservs that received the List in 2023, distribution in 2024 also included emails to UConn Public Works, Connecticut Recreation and Parks Association (CRPA), and Connecticut Nursery and Landscape Association (CNLA) listservs.

As an annually updated resource, the data collection and distribution process was repeated for 2025. Availability data were collected from 60 participating nurseries during December 2024 to January 2025. For processing efficiency, returning nurseries were asked to complete a Kuali Build (Kuali, Lehi, UT, USA) form to indicate changes in

species availability or business details. The 2025 edition (Siegel-Miles et al., 2025) can be found at: https://ipm.cahnr.uconn.edu/connecticut-native-availability.

Impact evaluation

To assess the impacts of the Connecticut Native Plant Availability List on green industry and consumer audiences, an evaluation was conducted in summer 2025. Two Qualtrics survey instruments were developed. One survey (Appendix A) was designed for participating NPAL nurseries and included 11 multiple choice, select-all-that-apply, and open-ended questions. Survey items for this audience focused on resource quality, value of participation, and impacts to business. The nursery survey instrument was distributed via email to any business that had engaged in the 2023, 2024, and/or 2025 version of the NPAL (N=60). Nursery impact data were collected from June 2025 to July 2025.

A second survey (Appendix B) was focused on end-user impacts of the resource, as well as use behavior and quality assessment. This survey was targeted towards home gardeners, land trust volunteers, school/municipal grounds managers, and landscape professionals. The instrument was comprised of 11 multiple choice, select-all-that-apply, and open-ended questions. An email containing the instrument was sent to CIPWG, UConn School IPM, UConn Home and Garden Center, UConn Master Gardener, UConn Public Works, Connecticut Grounds Keepers Association, CRPA, and CNLA listservs twice during June 2025 and/or July 2025. The survey link was also posted to the UConn Extension and UConn New London County Extension Facebook page in June 2025 and shared to the CIPWG group page. Distribution totaled approximately 15,740 contacts, including duplicates.

Survey outputs were descriptively analyzed by the lead researcher and confirmed by the research team. Diffusion of Innovations Theory (Rogers, 2003) was used as the conceptual framework for analysis and interpretation. End-user respondents were classified according to the stages of the innovation-decision process, which includes the knowledge stage, the persuasion stage, the decision stage, the implementation stage, and the confirmation stage (Rogers, 2003).

Results

Nursery data

Sixteen nursery representatives completed the survey. Of those 16 nurseries, 13 participated in 2025 and 10 had participated in the NPAL for two to three consecutive years. The majority of responding businesses are classified as retail nurseries (68.8%). Most nursery representatives (80%) rated the content quality of the publication as good, very good, or excellent, and 75% of respondents indicated that participation in the NPAL was somewhat valuable or very valuable to their business.

There was not a strong consensus amongst nursery representatives whether the NAPL had increased sales of native plants. Several respondents indicated that it was challenging to identify if their customers were using the List. One nursery representative shared,

> “I believe [the NPAL] has made more of the general gardening population look into and research native plants for their yard. I see the List being shared online on Facebook in the native plant groups a lot, so I am glad we are listed. I have not had any customer tell me they were shopping with us because of the List, but I like to think that is why some new customers have come in.”

As a result of the NPAL, 38.5% of responding nurseries added additional native species and cultivars to their inventory, and 23.1% stocked higher quantities of their native plants. Over 87% of respondents indicated that they planned to increase the quantity and diversity of native plants at their operation to address customer needs. One respondent observed that “some customers are looking for a specific plant and they see we list [it]. They usually leave with more plants than the plant they came in for.” Others shared that the NPAL “gives direction to customers” and that it has “made more people more aware of native plants.” One vendor stated, “This list has made zero impact unfortunately.” The amount of time it takes to participate in the NPAL was noted as a concern by two nursery representatives.

Of the responding nurseries, 57.1% had promoted the NPAL to their customers. Requests for improvement of the resource included more promotion, expansion of the native species included in the List, and the addition of garden designs for various landscape conditions.

End-user data

Three hundred and fifty end-user impact surveys were completed; three responses were removed for insufficient completion. Of the remaining 347 respondents, 123 indicated that they had not used the NPAL to purchase plants but chose to complete the survey. These respondents were classified as being in the *persuasion stage*, during which the individual forms an opinion about the resource, or the *decision stage*, wherein an individual decides if they will choose to use an innovation (Rogers, 2003). Data from respondents in the persuasion/decision stages of the innovation-decision process were analyzed for short-term impacts and resource feedback such as overall quality and relevance. The majority of respondents in this classification identified as home gardeners (88.6%) (Table 1). Fourteen (11.4%) were land trust volunteers, 12 (9.8%) identified as landscape professionals, and 3 (2.4%) identified as school or municipal grounds managers.

Table 1: Classification of End-User Respondents.

Category	**Respondents in the Persuasion/Decision Stage**		**Respondents in the Implementation/ Confirmation Stage**	
	No.	**%**	**No.**	**%**
Home Gardener	109	88.6%	191	85.3%
Land Trust Volunteer	14	11.4%	25	11.2%
Landscape Professional	12	9.8%	24	10.7%
School or Municipal Grounds Manager	3	2.4%	9	4%
Other	22	17.9%	40	17.9%

The NPAL was rated as slightly or very relevant by 58.5% of persuasion/decision respondents, and 88% rated the content quality as good, very good, or excellent. Sixty-six percent were somewhat or very likely to recommend the publication to a friend and

colleague; 20 had already shared the NPAL at the time of response. Impacts to individuals in the persuasion/decision stages included: increased awareness of new native species that they could include in their landscape designs (38.6%), increased knowledge of the benefits that native plants provide to wildlife (e.g., food source, cover, habitat) (31.7%), and increased knowledge of pollinator health tips (31.7%).

Many respondents in the persuasion/decision stages of the innovation-decision process shared that survey promotion for the present study made them aware of the NPAL. One such respondent shared, “Now that I am aware of it, I will certainly use it to find plants, research them, and find where to obtain them. I am happy to know about this!” This perception was reflected in many of the open-ended responses. Relatedly, respondents in the persuasion/decision classification recommended increased promotion when asked to indicate resource improvements. Suggested promotional channels included garden clubs, newspapers, conservation districts, agricultural science and technology schools, production nurseries, garden centers, land trusts, and social media. Other recommended changes included the addition of photos for each species and more information about the featured species. One respondent also suggested the inclusion of native seed availability.

The remaining 224 end-user respondents reported having used the NPAL to purchase plants in the previous three years. These respondents were classified as being in the *implementation stage*, during which an individual uses an innovation, or the *confirmation stage*, wherein adoption is either reinforced or reversed (Rogers, 2003). Many respondents in this group were home gardeners (85.3%) (Table 1). Twenty-five (11.2%) indicated they were land trust volunteers, and 24 (10.7%) identified as landscape professionals. Nine (4.0%) were school or municipal grounds managers. When asked to report how many times they had used the NPAL to purchase plants in the previous 12 months, 75.3% of implementation/confirmation stage respondents had used the resource 1-5 times. In the last three years (2023-2025), 83.9% had used the resource 1-10 times to purchase plants. A lesser number of respondents used the resource 11-20 times (12.1%) and 20+ times (4.0%) to purchase native species during the three-year timeframe.

Most implementation/confirmation stage respondents (87.4%) indicated the NPAL was slightly relevant or very relevant to their personal or professional work, and the majority (95.5%) rated the content quality as good, very good, or excellent. Similarly, 93.7% were slightly likely or very likely to recommend the NPAL to a friend or colleague. At the time of the survey, 142 had shared the resource with at least one person; these individuals are likely in the confirmation stage as they are actively encouraging others to adopt the innovation (Rogers, 2003). Over 74% slightly or strongly agreed that they purchased more native plants for their personal landscape or professional work due to the publication.

As a result of the NPAL, 74.4% of respondents in the implementation/confirmation stages of innovation-decision process became aware of new native species they could include in their landscape designs, 61.6% saved time locating native plants, and 56.6% increased their knowledge of the benefits that native plants provide to wildlife (e.g., food source, cover, habitat) (Table 2). Furthermore, 43.8% of implementation/confirmation respondents increased their knowledge of pollinator health tips, 42.0% were able to easily locate specific native species/cultivars, and 37% made purchases at businesses they had not patronized before. Over 20% engaged online with businesses that were new to them.

Table 2. Impacts of the CT NPAL on respondents in the implementation/confirmation stages of the innovation-decision process.

Impact of the NPAL on implementation/confirmation stage respondents	**No. of Respondents**	**% of Respondents**
I became aware of new native species that I could include in my landscape designs	163	74.4%
I saved time in locating native plants	135	61.6%
I was able to easily locate specific native species/cultivars	92	42.0%
I engaged online with businesses that were new to me	48	21.9%
I made purchases at businesses I had not patronized before	81	37.0%
I increased my knowledge of the benefits that native plants provide to wildlife (e.g., food source, cover, habitat)	124	56.6%
I increased my knowledge of pollinator health tips	96	43.8%
Other	6	2.7%

When asked to describe the impact of the NPAL on themselves or their work to capture additional or unanticipated outcomes, many implementation/confirmation stage respondents indicated they used the publication as a resource for planning, identifying, and finding plants for enhancing native species implementation in Connecticut landscapes. Several responses are included below:

- “The List has opened my eyes to the different options available locally.” (Home Gardener)
- “It has just given me more knowledge in an area that I have minimal experience with.” (School or Municipal Grounds Manager)
- “It gives me a reputable, authoritative source for my native plants, and one I feel I can strongly recommend.” (Home Gardener/Land Trust Volunteer)
- “As a Planning Tech/Zoning Enforcement Officer we promote the planting of native plants. This has been a very helpful resource to share with the public as well as in my personal gardening.” (Home Gardener, Land Use Volunteer, Other: Municipal Land Use Employee)
- “In the absence of a formal education on native plants and ecosystems, this set of resources has provided the majority of my understanding of specific and native plants and their benefits.” (Home Gardener)
- “More customers are researching and requesting native plants to be included in their design install work. The listing increases awareness of broader plant availability.” (Landscape Professional)
- “Aside from influencing landscaping decisions in my personal garden, the List has increased my awareness and concern for native plant species. I have used this list to advise other local communities and businesses in their plant selection. The visual representation makes it easy for people who are not familiar with gardening to understand the need for plants which provide benefits at different times throughout the year. It's also made me more aware of the importance of natives vs. non-native or invasive species.” (Home Gardener)

Similar to nursery and persuasion/decision stage respondents, implementation/confirmation stage respondents recommended additional promotion of

the NPAL, such as through garden clubs, libraries, and schools. They also requested additional plant photos and descriptions (i.e., growing conditions), the inclusion of more nurseries in the List, and additional native species.

Discussion

Most NPAL end-users identified as home gardeners. Given the amount of private land in the US (PAD-US, 2025), there is tremendous potential for gardeners to increase the area of native plant habitat by incorporating these plants into their home landscapes. However, municipalities and landscape professionals are also key players in native plant integration. These audiences may rely on industry networks to find and source native plants. Further exploration of municipal and landscape professional needs is required.

Nurseries and end-users had positive opinions of the NPAL content quality. The resource was somewhat or highly relevant for most end-users relative to their personal or professional work and increased native plant knowledge for many. As end-users utilized the NPAL to identify and purchase native plants for their personal or professional use, increased knowledge of the availability of native plants and their benefits may reduce barriers to adoption and allow users to progress from the persuasion/decision stages to the implementation/confirmation stages of the innovation decision process. However, other obstacles such as cost and customer preferences may exist. Descriptive responses indicated that the resource was used at multiple stages of the adoption process, and that current users (particularly those in the decision and confirmation stages of the innovation-decision process) helped to share the publication with relevant audiences. Research has shown that home gardeners are influenced by information they gather from friends, neighbors, and family (Kelly & Wehry, 2006). These individuals may act as opinion leaders to encourage adoption of behaviors related to native plant purchasing and use.

Based on participant responses, future resource improvements may include expanding the list to incorporate a wider range of native plant species, while maintaining readability. Distribution of the NPAL through additional and diverse communication channels, such as partnerships with garden clubs, schools, and conservation organizations, is needed to extend resource reach. Furthermore, the NPAL can be used in conjunction with additional educational resources pertaining to native plant selection and care to support consumers implementing native species in their landscapes.

Nursery representatives indicated that the NPAL had indirect and direct value for their businesses, and many made or planned to make changes to their native plant inventory because of the List. However, respondents struggled to determine if the NPAL had made a positive impact on sales. Nursery production, sales yard size, and operating processes may make it challenging for businesses to collect information about purchasing behavior relative to the NPAL. Therefore, consumers are likely in the best position to share their native plant purchasing and use behavior along with what drove their decision-making. As development of the NPAL takes considerable inputs of time and effort annually on behalf of both developers (UConn Extension and CT DEEP) and participating businesses, nurseries may seek to implement additional promotional strategies related to the List to encourage engagement by new and existing customers, such as a small discount for patrons who reference the resource. The number of participating nurseries is a limitation of this study; facilitating data collection during the slower winter months may have yielded a greater response rate for additional insights. Inquisitive dialogue with participating and prospective nurseries may illuminate additional opportunities to create and communicate value for businesses engaged in the NPAL.

As expected, impacts on audiences in the persuasion/decision stages were limited given their orientation within the innovation-decision process. However, many individuals within this group experienced changes in knowledge related to native plant benefits and pollinator health tips and indicated intention to adopt the resource to make native plant purchasing decisions. NPAL distribution and messaging amongst intended audiences related to the NPAL requires subsequent consideration, as many survey

respondents indicated they had not heard about the resource before but still chose to complete the survey. Participants in the present study may choose to implement the NPAL because of their exposure to the resource through the survey promotion.

For audiences in the implementation/confirmation stages of the innovation-decision process, impacts included short-term and medium-term outcomes. NPAL users purchased more native plants for their personal or professional work because of the publication and became aware of new native plant species to include in their designs. Time can serve as a barrier to innovation adoption (Wisdom et al., 2025); the NPAL may further support implementation of indigenous plants within managed landscapes as it saved end-users time locating native species. Furthermore, one-third of NPAL users reported that they purchased native plants at businesses that were new to them, indicating that novel connections with Connecticut businesses carrying native plant stock were made. Changes in native plant purchasing behaviors may have positive implications for the Connecticut nursery industry and landscapes, supporting the potential impacts that extension publications can have on the economy and the environment.

The results of the NPAL impact evaluation can be used to guide publication improvement, distribution approaches, and partnership activities. NPAL resource and distribution refinement will allow extensionists and CT DEEP partners to effectively reach new and existing audiences with relevant native plant availability and implementation resources, which may have subsequent outcomes for local green industry businesses. Furthermore, the findings demonstrate that impact evaluations can be leveraged for determining changes in knowledge, intention, and behavior resulting from engagement with extension publications.

Extension professionals may find value in replicating the NPAL for their state to encourage the use of native plants in managed and restored landscapes. In addition to facilitating knowledge and behavior change amongst targeted audiences, the NPAL created a native plant purchasing pipeline that supports the green industry along with individuals and organizations working to enhance native plant populations. Reciprocity

is critical to successful and equitable academic-community partnerships (Delaine et al., 2022); extension resources such as the NPAL that engage businesses and state agency partners can provide opportunities for both reciprocity and relationship building. Extension professionals seeking to develop a native plant availability resource should:

1. Partner with state agencies, community organizations, and local businesses to determine native plant priorities;
2. Create infrastructure for collecting and organizing native plant availability data from participating nurseries while minimizing burden on businesses;
3. Design a comprehensive and accessible extension resource that couples native plant availability with educational information related to native plant characteristics (including visual representations), ecosystem services, and prospective uses to encourage adoption;
4. Distribute the native plant availability resource through multimodal communication channels reaching diverse audiences;
5. Evaluate the impact of the native plant availability resource to determine value and opportunities for improvement.

This resource model can also be adopted for other industries and contexts to meet community needs.

Conclusion

The Connecticut Native Plant Availability List created change amongst end-user audiences, including home gardeners, and had impacts for green industry businesses. Increased purchasing of native plants because of the NPAL may have subsequent benefits for Connecticut ecosystems and the economy. Conducting an impact evaluation of an on-demand extension publication can illuminate impacts and reveal areas for improvement, advancing resource-development practice within extension programs.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge Peter Picone, CT DEEP Wildlife Biologist, for the original conceptualization and development of the NPAL, and for partnering with UConn Extension to revise the resource in 2023-2025.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Literature Cited

Burghardt, K.T., D.W. Tallamy, and W. Shriver. 2009. Impact of native plants on bird and butterfly biodiversity in suburban landscapes. *Conservation Biology* 23: 219– 224. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.01076.x

Daft, R.L. and R.H. Lengel. 1984. Information richness: A new approach to managerial behavior and organization design. *Research in Organizational Behavior 6*:191-233.

Delaine, D., D. Nabrit, N.L.R. Harris, C. Nabrit, C. Ratcliff, and P.J. Penn-Nabrit. 2022. Factors that promote reciprocity within community-academic partnership initiation. *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement* 10(1), Article 7. https://doi.org/10.37333/001c.66271

Errickson, W., T. Waller, M. Bakacs, and C. Cuite. 2024. Native Plant Needs Assessment of Nursery and Landscape Professionals. *Journal of the National Association of County Agricultural Agents* 17(1). https://www.nacaa.com/file.ashx?id=051df8a0-48d1-4fe6-9164-7390cb511d84

Giancola, S.P. 2021. *Program Evaluation: Embedding Evaluation Into Program Design and Development.* SAGE Publications, Inc.

Gillis, A.J. and J.K. Swim. 2020. Adding native plants to home landscapes: The roles of attitudes, social norms, and situational strengths. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 72: 101519. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2020.101519

Kelley, K. M. and R. H. Wehry. 2006. Consumer interest in gardening topics and preferred information sources. *The Journal of Extension* 44(2), Article 18. https://open.clemson.edu/joe/vol44/iss2/18

Michigan State University (MSU) Extension. n.d. Native plants and ecosystem services. https://www.canr.msu.edu/nativeplants/ecosystem_services/

Norcini, J.G. 2006. Native plants: An overview. *University of Florida IFAS, #ENH1045.* https://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/publication/EP297

Protected Areas Database of the United States (PAD-US). 2025. ProtectedLands.net. https://www.protectedlands.net/map/. Accessed September 8, 2025.

Rogers, E.M. 2003. *Diffusion of Innovations* (5th Ed.). Simon & Schuster.

Tartaglia, E. and M. Aronson. 2024. Plant native: comparing biodiversity benefits, ecosystem services provisioning, and plant performance of native and non-native plants in urban horticulture. *Urban Ecosystems* 27:2587-2611. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11252-024-01610-5

White, A., J.B. Fant, K. Havens, M. Skinner, and A. Kramer. 2018. Restoring species diversity: Assessing capacity in the U.S. native plant industry. *Restoration Ecology* 26(4):605-611. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/rec.12705

Wilde, H.D., J. Kamal, and G. Colson. 2015. State of the science and challenges of breeding landscape plants with ecological function. *Horticulture Research* 2(2015):14069. https://doi.org/10.1038/hortres.2014.69

Wisdom, J.P., K.H. Chor, K.E. Hoagwood, and S.M. Horwitz. 2014. Innovation adoption: a review of theories and constructs. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health* 41(4):480–502. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0486-4

Workman, J.D. and S.D. Scheer. 2012. Evidence of impact: Examination of evaluationstudies. *The Journal of Extension* 50(2), Article 57. https://doi.org/10.34068/joe.50.02.57

Yue, C., T. Hurley, and N. Anderson. 2011. Do native and invasive labels affect consumer willingness to pay for plants? Evidence from experimental auctions. *Agricultural Economics* 42(2):195-205. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-0862.2010.00510.x

Yue, C., T. Hurley, and N. Anderson. (2012). Heterogeneous consumer preferences for native and invasive plants: Evidence from experimental auctions. *HortScience* 47:1091-1095. https://doi.org/10.21273/HORTSCI.47.8.1091

Appendix A: Nursery Impacts Survey Instrument

Nursery Impacts: Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List

Thank you for your participation in the **Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List** (ipm.cahnr.uconn.edu/connecticut-native-availability/). We are seeking your feedback to explore the impact of the resource on your business, as well as areas for improvement. This survey should take less than 5 minutes to complete and is anonymous. Thank you for your input.

Q1. In which years has your business participated in the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List (Select all that apply)?

- ☐ 2025
- ☐ 2024
- ☐ 2023
- ☐ I don't know

Q2. Which best describes your business:

- o Wholesale
- o Retail
- o Both

Q3. How would you rate the content quality of the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List?

- o Poor
- o Fair
- o Good
- o Very Good
- o Excellent

Q4. How would you consider your business's participation in the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List:

- o Not valuable
- o Somewhat not valuable
- o Neither valuable nor not valuable
- o Somewhat valuable
- o Very valuable

Q5. Indicate your level of disagreement/agreement with this statement: The Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List has increased the sale of native plants through my business.

- o Strongly disagree
- o Somewhat disagree
- o Neither agree nor disagree

o Somewhat agree
o Strongly agree

Q6. In the last three years, please estimate how many of your customers have referenced the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List:
o 0 customers
o 1-10 customers
o 11-20 customers
o 21-30 customers
o 31+ customers

Q7. What impact, if any, has the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List had on you and/or your work? As a result of participating in the list (select all that apply):
▢ More first-time customers have visited my business
▢ I stock higher quantities of my native plants
▢ I added additional native species or cultivars to my inventory
▢ Other: _____

Q8. Describe the impact that the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List has had on you and/or your work (Optional):
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Q9. Indicate your level or disagreement/agreement with this statement: I plan to increase the quantity and diversity of native plants at my operation to address my customer needs.
o Strongly disagree
o Somewhat disagree
o Neither agree nor disagree
o Somewhat agree
o Strongly agree

Q10. Have you promoted the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List to your customers for additional sources of native plants?
o Yes
o No
o I don't know

Q11. Please provide recommendations for improving the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List (Optional):
_____
_____

Appendix B: End-User Impact Survey Instrument

End-User Impacts: Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List

The **Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List** (ipm.cahnr.uconn.edu/connecticut-native-availability/) is a resource to support the inclusion of native plants in Connecticut landscapes. We are seeking your feedback to explore the impacts of the resource as well as areas for improvement. This survey should take less than 5 minutes to complete and is anonymous. Thank you for your input.

Q1. I am a (Select all that apply):

- ☐ Home gardener
- ☐ Land trust volunteer
- ☐ School or municipal grounds manager
- ☐ Landscape professional
- ☐ Other (please specify)

  _____

Q2. How many times have you used the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List to purchase plants **in the last 12 months?**

- o 0 times
- o 1-5 times
- o 6-10 times
- o 11+ times

Q3. How many times have you used the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List to purchase plants **in the last 3 years (including in the last 12 months)?**

- o 0 times
- o 1-10 times
- o 11-20 times
- o 20+ times

Q4. How would you rate the relevance of the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List to your personal or professional work:

- o Very irrelevant
- o Slightly irrelevant
- o Neither relevant nor irrelevant
- o Slightly relevant
- o Very relevant

Q5. How would you rate the content quality of the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List?

- o Poor
- o Fair
- o Good
- o Very good
- o Excellent

Q6. How likely are you to recommend the use of the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List to a friend or colleague?

- o Very unlikely
- o Somewhat unlikely
- o Neither likely nor unlikely
- o Somewhat likely
- o Very likely

Q7. Have you shared the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List with at least one friend or colleague?

- o Yes
- o No
- o I don't know

Q8. Indicate your level or disagreement/agreement with this statement: As a result of the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List, I have purchased more native plants for my personal landscape or professional work.

- o Strongly disagree
- o Somewhat disagree
- o Neither agree nor disagree
- o Somewhat agree
- o Strongly agree

Q9. What impact, if any, has the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List had on you and/or your work? As a result of the list: (Select all that apply)

- ▢ I became aware of new native species that I could include in my landscape designs
- ▢ I saved time in locating native plants
- ▢ I was able to easily locate specific native species/cultivars
- ▢ I engaged online with businesses that were new to me
- ▢ I made purchases at businesses I had not patronized before
- ▢ I increased my knowledge of the benefits that native plants provide to wildlife (e.g., food source, cover, habitat)
- ▢ I increased my knowledge of pollinator health tips
- ▢ Other: _____

Q10. Describe the impact that the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List has had on you and/or your work (Optional):

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q11. Please provide recommendations for improving the Connecticut Native Perennial, Tree, & Shrub Availability List:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____