

ONLINE APPENDIX

The Ethics of Incentivizing the Uninformed. A Vignette Study.

Sandro Ambuehl and Axel Ockenfels

Contents

1 Data and additional analysis	1
2 Vignette	6

1 Data and additional analysis

Data We fielded the survey on October 31 and November 1, 2016. A total of 502 respondents recruited on Amazon Mechanical Turk completed the survey. Each respondent was paid \$5 lump sum. The mean and median time to completion were 21 and 18 minutes, respectively.

Preliminary analysis A total of 542 subjects had started the survey, but 40 (7.38%) did not finish. There is no evidence of differential attrition. Defining the 4 treatments as described in the main paper, the p -value of a test of joint significance of these dummies on the attrition probability exceeds 0.5. In each condition, completion rates lie between 90.3% and 94.8%. In addition, notice that most of our results derive from within-subject comparisons.

After reading the first part of the vignette, subjects could proceed only if they correctly answered a comprehension check. Additionally, at the end of the survey, we included 5 attention check questions. Two of them are related to demographics, and were answered both correctly by 88.65% of subjects.¹ Three more concern the vignette. One of them asked respondents to recall whether, according to the survey, higher incentives disproportionately affect smarter, less smart, richer, or poorer women. The correct answer depends on the treatment condition. Subjects' recall rates differ significantly across conditions. If the correct answer concerns ability, subjects are significantly less likely to remember correctly than in the conditions in which it concerns financial resources (61.2% vs. 90.9%, s.e. of difference 3.4%).² Overall, a total of 64.54% of subjects answered all five attention check questions correctly. Our following analysis is based on the entire sample, including those subjects who incorrectly answered some attention check questions. None of the conclusions differ if we restrict analysis to the subsample of subjects who answered all attention check questions correctly.

¹The first question asked subjects to state their year of birth, after they had earlier indicated their age. The second asked subjects whether they have a college degree, after they had earlier indicated the highest level of education completed.

²The remaining two questions ask subjects to recall which name was associated with which woman, and which side effect had been associated with egg donation, according to the study. There are no substantial differences in the rates of correct responses for these questions, although subjects for whom the women varied by ability are a statistically significant 3.6 percentage points less likely to remember the side effect that had been mentioned.

Randomization check We check for random assignment of respondents to treatment by regressing each demographic variable on four treatment dummies. Out of 28 tests, three are significant at the 5% level, and one more is significant at the 10% level. Table 1 displays the results.

<i>Treatment</i>					<i>p-value</i>
Varied dimension	ability	ability	income	income	
Level on constant dimension	low	high	low	high	
Male	0.49	0.55	0.52	0.51	0.82
Age	35.55	35.04	37.94	37.99	0.06*
Family income (in \$1,000)	53.36	48.67	55.56	53.50	0.32
<i>Marital Status</i>					
Single / never married	0.51	0.59	0.41	0.39	0.01**
Married currently	0.42	0.33	0.51	0.51	0.01**
Divorced	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.98
Widowed	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.35
<i>Education</i>					
High school	0.12	0.15	0.12	0.14	0.89
Some college	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.28	0.96
College	0.46	0.42	0.41	0.44	0.86
Masters degree	0.10	0.09	0.15	0.13	0.36
Doctorate	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.70
Organ donor	0.60	0.66	0.54	0.62	0.26
<i>Know egg donor</i>					
Closely	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.72
Remotely	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.06	0.28
No	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.92	0.70
<i>Religion</i>					
Catholic	0.16	0.09	0.07	0.20	0.01**
Protestant (evangelical)	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.71
Protestant (mainline)	0.08	0.06	0.11	0.09	0.56
Other Christian	0.08	0.11	0.14	0.07	0.22
Jewish	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.10
Muslim	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.58
Other religion	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.94
None	0.51	0.59	0.48	0.46	0.17
Frequency of religious service	1.00	0.87	1.13	1.14	0.48
<i>Conservative vs. Liberal</i>					
Republican vs. Democrat	-0.84	-0.70	-0.78	-0.53	0.55
Social issues	-1.11	-1.16	-0.99	-0.75	0.25
Economic issues	-0.43	-0.24	-0.23	0.06	0.18

Table 1: Respondents' demographic characteristics by treatment. The rightmost column displays the p -value of an F -test for the hypothesis that the respective variable does not differ by treatment.

Disaggregated analysis Due to space constraints, tables in the main text pool answers across some categories that the survey elicited more finely. For completeness, Tables 2 and 3 replicate the respective panels of the tables from the main text without aggregating the data.

1A.	<i>Raise incentive?</i>	Do not		Do		Indifferent
		definitely	probably	probably	definitely	
		15.6	43.6	8.0	2.8	
	Ability	8.7	23.4	13.1	7.9	30.0
	Income					46.8
1B.	<i>Target whom?</i>	Low		High		Indifferent
		much more ethical	a little more ethical	a little more ethical	much more ethical	
		0.8	2.4	19.6	8.8	
	Ability	1.2	5.6	4.8	2.4	68.4
	Income					86.1
2A.	<i>Which policy?</i>	Information		Pay		Neither
		definitely	likely	likely	definitely	
	<i>Cannot buy info.</i>					
	More ethical	30.9	36.9	9.2	7.6	15.5
	Donors prefer	3.8	6.6	40.6	38.2	10.8
	<i>Can buy info.</i>					
	More ethical	16.7	24.7	21.5	20.1	16.9
	Donors prefer	1.8	5.0	31.3	53.4	8.6
2B.	<i>Law</i>	Oppose		Support		Neither
		strongly	moderately	moderately	strongly	
		6.8	17.5	37.3	25.1	
	Mandatory info.	11.4	16.9	32.5	23.9	13.3
	Exam					15.3
3B.	<i>Predict selection</i>	Low		High		Equal
		mostly	more frequently	more frequently	mostly	
	Ability	21.2	42.8	11.6	6.8	17.6
	Income	38.9	36.9	13.1	6.0	5.2

Table 2: Replication of the indicated Table / Panel of the main text with disaggregated data.

		Ability			Income		
		Low	High	Difference	Low	High	Difference
1C.	$P(\text{incentive unethical})$	15.6*** (1.9)	4.8** (1.9)	-10.8*** (2.7)	10.7*** (1.8)	8.3*** (1.8)	-2.4 (2.6)
3A.	$\Delta P(\text{ask another donor})$						
	First donor encouraging	-0.55*** (0.05)	-0.09* (0.05)	0.46*** (0.07)	-0.65*** (0.05)	-0.32*** (0.05)	0.33*** (0.06)
	First donor discouraging	0.37*** (0.05)	0.50*** (0.05)	0.13* (0.07)	0.61*** (0.04)	0.44*** (0.04)	-0.17*** (0.06)
	Difference	-0.92*** (0.07)	-0.59*** (0.07)	0.33*** (0.1)	-1.26*** (0.07)	-0.75*** (0.07)	0.51*** (0.10)
	<i>Decision in best interest</i>						
	Participate	0.49*** (0.03)	0.76*** (0.03)	0.28*** (0.04)	0.78*** (0.03)	0.38*** (0.03)	-0.40*** (0.04)
	Abstain	0.72*** (0.03)	0.71*** (0.03)	0.01 (0.04)	0.55*** (0.03)	0.76*** (0.03)	0.21*** (0.04)

Table 3: Replication of the indicated Table / Panel of the main text with disaggregated data. *, ** and *** denote statistical significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels, respectively.

Demographic correlates of respondents’ judgments Here we study how respondents’ judgments depend on their demographics. We simultaneously regress each of the variables listed in the top row in Table 4 on a vector of demographics, using seemingly unrelated regression. We pool across treatments and correct for multiple hypothesis testing using the Sidak-Holm procedure.

Table 4 displays the result. It contains a small number of statistically significant correlations. First, younger people are more likely to think the decision to participate is not in a woman’s best interest, and more likely to think that the decision to abstain is in her best interest. Second, men and people with a doctorate are less likely to approve of mandatory information policies; the latter are also significantly less approving of exams to test women’s comprehension of the consequences of the transaction. Third, respondents who rate themselves as liberal regarding social issues are more likely to approve of such exams.

In two cases, also the absence of correlations is interesting. First, income has no predictive power regarding judgments in our experiment. Second, being registered as an organ donor does not significantly correlate with any of the variables either. (We have also asked respondents about egg donation. Only two respondents claimed to have donated eggs, and an additional 19 respondents report they know an egg donor. These numbers are too small for meaningful inference.)

VARIABLES	(1) Incentive for egg donation is ethical	(2) Decision in best interest	(3)	(4) Support for policy	(5)	(6) Incentive more ethical than info	(7)
		participate	abstain	mandat. info.	exam	cannot buy info.	can buy info.
Male	-0.009 (0.075)	0.170 (0.096)	-0.215 (0.089)	-0.296** (0.082)	-0.139 (0.090)	0.226 (0.080)	0.130 (0.094)
Age	-0.007 (0.003)	-0.021*** (0.004)	0.013* (0.004)	0.000 (0.004)	0.007 (0.004)	-0.005 (0.004)	-0.001 (0.004)
<i>log</i> (income)	0.020 (0.051)	-0.014 (0.065)	0.005 (0.061)	0.001 (0.056)	0.002 (0.061)	-0.161 (0.054)	-0.184 (0.064)
<i>Education</i>							
Some College	0.026 (0.123)	0.131 (0.157)	-0.122 (0.146)	-0.379 (0.134)	-0.268 (0.147)	0.270 (0.131)	0.281 (0.154)
College	-0.011 (0.118)	0.094 (0.150)	-0.054 (0.140)	-0.305 (0.128)	-0.289 (0.141)	0.368 (0.125)	0.271 (0.147)
Master's degree	-0.041 (0.152)	0.130 (0.194)	0.018 (0.181)	-0.424 (0.165)	-0.232 (0.182)	0.490 (0.161)	0.097 (0.190)
Doctorate	-0.144 (0.251)	0.125 (0.320)	-0.122 (0.298)	-1.179*** (0.273)	-1.123*** (0.300)	0.663 (0.266)	0.404 (0.313)
Organ donor	0.112 (0.078)	0.197 (0.100)	-0.062 (0.093)	-0.165 (0.085)	-0.102 (0.093)	-0.051 (0.083)	-0.109 (0.097)
<i>Religion</i>							
Identifies with a relig.	-0.293 (0.096)	-0.115 (0.122)	0.136 (0.114)	0.136 (0.104)	0.020 (0.114)	-0.054 (0.101)	-0.133 (0.119)
Frequency of service	0.012 (0.028)	-0.004 (0.036)	0.016 (0.033)	0.001 (0.030)	-0.033 (0.033)	-0.014 (0.030)	-0.070 (0.035)
<i>Conservative vs. Liberal</i>							
Rep. vs. Dem.	-0.016 (0.031)	-0.014 (0.039)	0.003 (0.037)	-0.011 (0.034)	-0.065 (0.037)	0.015 (0.033)	0.015 (0.038)
Social issues	-0.056 (0.032)	-0.002 (0.041)	-0.024 (0.038)	0.094 (0.035)	0.146** (0.038)	-0.057 (0.034)	-0.081 (0.040)
Economic issues	0.054 (0.032)	-0.002 (0.041)	0.035 (0.038)	-0.061 (0.035)	-0.033 (0.039)	0.081 (0.034)	0.122 (0.040)
Treatment fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	900	900	900	900	900	900	900

Table 4: Attitudes and demographics. Excluded category for education is High School. Estimated with seemingly unrelated regression. For each respondent, there are 2 observations, one for each of the women presented in the vignette, respectively. Moreover, the first question was only asked for the last 450 respondents, bringing the total number of observations to 900. p -values corrected for multiple hypothesis testing using the Holm-Sidak procedure. *, ** and *** denote statistical significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels, respectively.

2 Vignette

Here we present the full text of our survey. It is structured into three parts. The first introduces the setting, describes the women, and asks about the quality of their individual decision making. The second asks subjects to predict how incentives affect the selection of people deciding to participate, as well as how they alter information acquisition. The third asks them to ethically assess these effects, and various policies. For readability, in this document, we structure the survey with corresponding section headers. Respondents did not see these headers.

In addition to the treatment variations described in the main text, we randomized the following two factors on the individual level: (i) the assignment of the names Sarah and Emily to the women, (ii) whether the high or the low type was presented first.

1. Description of the situation and quality of individual decisions

In this study, you will answer questions about women deciding to donate egg cells in exchange for money. All the following questions are based on the following text. Please read the text and answer the comprehension checks on the following page.

Egg Cell Donation. Women can donate egg cells to help infertile couples have children, similar to how men can donate sperm. Egg cell donation is a complicated procedure, much more so than sperm donation. Before a woman can donate, she must take powerful medication over the course of multiple weeks. The medication causes her body to produce many more mature eggs than it usually would. A medical doctor then sedates the woman and surgically removes several dozen mature egg cells. The procedure is generally considered safe. Nonetheless, each of these steps might put the woman at some risk. Some risks may realize only after several years (examples are the effects on one's own ability to have children, and on the likelihood of cancer). In addition, she may experience psychological side effects. These risks differ from woman to woman. On the one hand, factors such as age or previous medical history influence the likelihood of different side effects. On the other hand, women differ in how much they will suffer from any given side effect. For example, some women are very eager to eventually have their own children. For them, an increased risk of infertility may be a larger problem than for women who would prefer to remain childless anyway. In the United States, a woman can earn several thousand dollars each time she donates egg cells.

[Next page and comprehension checks] Consider Name 1, a Caucasian woman in her late twenties.

- (low ability) She has completed high school, but has never attended college. She has never been particularly interested in anything taught in school, and has usually just gotten by in school.
- (high ability) She has a college degree and quickly finds her way around complex information.

- (low financial resources) She earns an income of \$2000 per month. Two years ago, her parents have died. They were indebted, and did not leave her any inheritance. She struggles to make ends meet.
- (low financial resources) She earns an income of \$2000 per month. Two years ago, her parents have died, and left her an inheritance of \$500,000. Since then, she considers herself financially independent.

Name 1 has recently learned that she could donate egg cells at her local fertility center in exchange for \$8,000. Name 1 is interested. Before she makes a decision, she decides to spend a day learning about all the consequences and risks associated with egg donation.

- (high ability) She reads through several scientific studies that she understands with ease. She also reads through several in-depth interviews with previous egg donors. She finds learning about egg donation interesting and it is little effort for her. At the end of the day, she decides that she has learned enough to make a decision.
- (low ability) After searching the internet for a while, she comes across some scientific studies that she finds hard to understand—she is confused that their findings sometimes differ, and she does not quite know what to make of the many numbers and graphs they report. She then browses some internet forums and blogs by women who have donated eggs before. She feels that learning about egg donation is a drab and requires much effort. At the end of the day, she decides that while she does not fully understand what is involved in egg donation, she wants to make a decision.

The amount of information on the benefits and risks of egg cell donation that is available is vast. If someone searches through the information for one day, as Name 1 has done, one may come across some information, and miss other information, purely by chance. Please keep this in mind for the remainder of this survey.

[Next page] *Suppose that based on the information she has seen, Name 1 decides to donate egg cells in exchange for \$8,000. How likely do you think this decision is in her best interest? This decision is* [Answer choices: Very likely in her best interest; Moderately likely in her best interest; Slightly likely in her best interest; Slightly unlikely in her best interest; Moderately unlikely in her best interest; Very unlikely in her best interest]

As mentioned before, because there are such vast amounts of information about egg donation, if one searches for a day, one may come across some information, and miss other information, purely by chance.

So, suppose that by chance, Name 1 has seen a different selection of information that makes her decide AGAINST donating egg cells in exchange for \$8,000. How likely do you think this decision is in her best interest? This decision is [Answer choices as in previous question]

[Next page] Now consider Name 2. Like Name 1, she is a Caucasian woman,

- (variation ability) and she is in a very similar financial situation as Name 1. That is, she also earns about \$2,000 per month, (and considers herself financially independent since she has inherited about \$500,000 / and struggles to make ends meet). She also has recently learned that she could donate egg cells at her local fertility center in exchange for \$8,000. Unlike Name 1, Name 2 has (completed high school, but has never attended college. She has never been particularly interested in anything taught in school, and has usually just gotten by in school / a college degree and quickly finds her way around complex information.)
- (variation financial means) (who has completed high school, but has never attended college. Like Name 1 she has never been particularly interested in anything taught in school, and has usually just gotten by in school. / has a college degree and quickly finds her way around complex information.) She also has recently learned that she could donate egg cells at her local fertility center in exchange for \$8,000. Like Name 1, she earns an income of \$2000 per month, and has lost her parents some years ago. Unlike Name 1's parents, (Name 2's parents were indebted, and did not leave her any inheritance. Name 2 struggles to make ends meet / Name 2's parents had savings, and left her an inheritance of \$500,000. Since then, Name 2 considers herself financially independent).

Name 2 lives in a different state than Name 1 and does not know her. Name 2 is interested in donating egg cells for the \$8,000. Before she makes a decision, she decides to spend a day learning about all the consequences and risks associated with egg donation.

- (variation financial means, high cognitive ability) Like Name 1, Name 2 reads through several scientific studies that she understands with ease. She also reads through several in-depth interviews with previous egg donors and finds learning about egg donation an interesting task that is little effort for her. At the end of the day, she decides that she has learned enough to make a decision.
- (variation financial means, low cognitive ability) Like Name 1, Name 2 searches the internet for a while. Like Name 1, she has trouble understanding the scientific studies she comes across. She does not understand why the findings sometimes differ, and wonders what to make of the many numbers and graphs they report. She then browses some internet forums and blogs by women who have donated eggs before. Learning about egg donation is effortful and boring for her. At the end of the day, she decides that while she does not fully understand what is involved in egg donation, she wants to make a decision.
- (variation cognitive ability, high ability first) After searching the internet for a while, she comes across some scientific studies that she finds hard to understand—she is confused that their findings sometimes differ, and she does not quite know what to make of the many numbers and graphs they report. She then browses some internet forums and blogs by women who have donated eggs before.

She feels that learning about egg donation is a drab and requires much effort. At the end of the day, she decides that while she does not fully understand what is involved in egg donation, she wants to make a decision.

- (variation cognitive ability, low ability first) Unlike Name 1, Name 2 reads through several scientific studies that she understands with ease. She also reads through several in-depth interviews with previous egg donors and finds learning about egg donation an interesting task that is little effort for her. At the end of the day, she decides that she has learned enough to make a decision.

[comprehension check and next page]

Suppose that based on the information she happens to have seen, Name 2 decides to donate egg cells in exchange for \$8,000. How likely do you think this decision is in her best interest? This decision is [Answer choices as in previous question]

By chance, Name 2 might have seen a different selection of information that makes her decide AGAINST donating egg cells in exchange for \$8,000. How likely do you think this decision is in her best interest? This decision is [Answer choices as in previous question]

[Next page] We now compare Name 1 and Name 2. Suppose that based on the information each of them came across they both decide to donate egg cells in exchange for \$8,000.

Right before they sign up, which woman do you think is more confident that she is making the right decision? [Answer choices: Most likely Name 1; Moderately likely Name 1; They are likely both equally confident; Moderately likely Name 2; Most likely Name 2]

By chance, the women might have come across a different selection of information. Suppose that based on the information each of them have seen, both decide AGAINST donating egg cells in exchange for \$8,000. *At the point at which they decide to NOT donate their egg cells and forego the \$8,000, which woman do you think is more confident that she is making the right decision? [Answer choices as in previous question]*

2. Predicting selection effects and information acquisition

[Next page] We are now interested in what you think how an increase in the compensation a woman can receive for egg cell donation changes what kind of women will agree to donate their egg cells. Specifically, suppose that the local fertility center increases the price for egg donation from \$8,000 to \$12,000 in order to induce a larger number of women to donate eggs. There will be some women who decide to sell egg cells at \$12,000, but would not have sold them for \$8,000.

What do you think these women will be like? They will ... [Answer choices: mostly be like Name 1; a little more frequently be like Name 1; equally often be like Name 1 as like Name 2; a little more frequently be like Name 2; mostly be like Name 2]

- (Recall that Name 1 is financially better off than Name 2.)
- (Recall that Name 1 is financially less well off than Name 2.)
- (Recall that Name 1 is the more highly educated woman than Name 2.)
- (Recall that Name 1 is the less highly educated woman than Name 2.)

[Next page]

- (variation in ability) Fertility clinics know that if they advertise higher compensation in exchange for donor eggs, more women will be interested in donating. They have also noticed, that as they raise compensation, the additional women who become interested in donating are mostly women who have difficulty fully understanding the risks and consequences associated with egg cell donation, and find obtaining additional information overly exhausting (like [corresponding name]). Only a smaller part of them are women who have informed themselves very thoroughly about the risks and consequences of egg cell donation, and fully understood all the information (like [corresponding name]).

How ethical do you think it is for fertility clinics to raise the compensation they pay for women, given that higher compensation attracts a larger fraction of women who find it difficult to fully inform themselves, and a smaller fraction of women who find it easy to fully inform themselves?

- (variation in financial resources) Fertility clinics know that if they advertise higher compensation in exchange for donor eggs, more women will be interested in donating. They have also noticed, that as they raise compensation, the additional women who become interested in donating are mostly women who have little financial resources (like [corresponding name]). Only a smaller part of them are women who have ample financial resources (like [corresponding name]).

How ethical do you think it is for fertility clinics to raise the compensation they pay for women, given that higher compensation attracts a larger fraction of women who have little financial resources, and a smaller part of them are women who have ample financial resources.

[Answer choices: Ethically speaking, clinics should *definitely not* do this; clinics should *probably not* do this; it does not make a difference whether clinics do this; clinics should *probably* do this; clinics should *definitely* do this]

[next page] We would now like to know how you think women will decide to inform themselves about what egg cell donation entails, and how this depends on the amount of money she can earn from donating. In addition to searching the internet, the women talk to previous donors to inform themselves about egg donation. So far, Name 1 has talked to one previous donor. That donor had been quite happy with her

donation, and recommends that Name 1 donate too. Name 1 considers searching for and talking to one more previous donor to get one more opinion. But she is not quite sure whether it is worth the effort. Before she decides whether to contact another previous donor, Name 1 learns that the fertility center has raised the compensation for egg donors by \$4,000, from the previous \$8,000 to \$12,000.

How do you think this increase in compensation changes whether Name 1 contacts an additional donor if the first woman she had talked to had been happy about her own donation? [Answer choices: Name 1 becomes much more likely to look for another previous donor; Name 1 becomes a little more likely to look for another previous donor; Name 1 will be just as likely to look for another previous donor; Name 1 becomes a little less likely to look for another previous donor; Name 1 becomes much less likely to look for another previous donor]

Suppose instead that the one previous donor that Name 1 has talked to had been unhappy with her donation, and has recommended that Name 1 should not donate.

How do you think learning that egg donors will receive \$4,000 more compensation than she had expected will affect Name 1's decision about whether to talk to one more donor in this case? [Answer choices as in previous question]

[Next page] How do you think Name 2 (the less intelligent woman / the more intelligent woman / the financially better-off woman / the financially less well-off woman) would decide about contacting one more previous donor as she learns the compensation is \$4,000 higher than she had expected? Specifically, suppose that Name 2 has talked to one previous donor who was happy with her donation and recommends that Name 2 donate too.

As Name 2 learns that egg donors will receive \$4,000 more compensation than she had expected, how do you think this changes whether Name 2 contacts an additional donor if the first woman she had talked to had been happy about her own donation? [Answer choices as in previous question]

What if instead the one previous donor had been *unhappy* with her donation, and has recommended that Name 2 should not donate? *As Name 2 learns that egg donors will receive \$4,000 more compensation than she had expected, how do you think this changes whether Name 2 contacts an additional donor if the first woman she had talked to had been unhappy about her own donation?* [Answer choices as in previous question]

3. Judging policies

[next page] Policy makers have discussed the ethical soundness of incentives for egg donation. They have made several proposals for new laws and guidelines about paid egg donation. We are interested in your opinion on these proposals. It has been suggested there should be a law according to which women are allowed to donate egg cells in exchange for money only if they have participated in **mandatory**

informational sessions. They would have to read a 50 page document about egg cell donation that includes information about the possible medical consequences. They would also be required to talk to at least 5 previous egg donors. Potential donors would receive compensation only if they decide to sell egg cells. And it would still be up to the women to decide whether to absentmindedly sit through the sessions just to satisfy the formal requirement, or instead to carefully attend to the information and make good use of it.

Would you support or oppose such a law? I would ... [Answer choices: strongly support such a law; moderately support such a law; neither support nor oppose such a law; moderately oppose such a law; strongly oppose such a law]

Another suggestion is that in addition to requiring people to inform themselves as in the above question, there should be a law according to which women are allowed to donate egg cells only if they **pass a thorough exam** about its possible risks and consequences.

Would you support or oppose such a law? I would ... [Answer choices as in previous question]

[next page] Suppose that the fertility center decides to increase their spending per egg donor by \$4,000, from \$8,000 to \$12,000. The board of the center considers the following two options.

- *Spend \$4,000 on better information.* The center could, for each donor, spend the additional \$4,000 to help the donor become better informed. The money would pay for interventions that are not otherwise easily available to potential donors, such as personal communication with previous donors and previous recipients of egg cells, a larger variety of medical tests, psychological counseling and other interventions. Each donor would continue to receive \$8,000 in compensation.
- *Spend \$4,000 on higher compensation.* The center could pay the \$4,000 as additional compensation for donating egg cells. Each donor would then receive \$12,000 in compensation. In that case, the fertility center would not have the resources to provide the additional sources of information (like meetings with more previous donors).

The fertility center estimates that each policy would lead to about 100 additional donors per year.

Which of the options do you think is more ethically sound? [Answer choices: Definitely better information (without an increase in compensation); Likely better information (without an increase in compensation); Both policies are equally ethically sound; Likely the increase in compensation (without the provision of better information); Definitely better compensation (without the provision of better information)]

Which of the options do you think women thinking about becoming egg donors would prefer? [Answer choices as in previous question]

[next page] The fertility center considers the same two options as on the previous page. But now, people have recommended that if the fertility center uses the additional \$4,000 to increase compensation, the potential donors should be given the opportunity to spend any part of that on getting better information (by asking the fertility center to arrange visits to previous egg donors, organizing workshops and so forth). *In this case, which of the proposed policies do you consider more ethically sound?* [Answer choices: Definitely better information (without an increase in compensation); Likely better information (without an increase in compensation); Both policies are equally ethically sound; Likely the increase in compensation (with the possibility of voluntarily spending a part or all of it on better information); Definitely better compensation (with the possibility of voluntarily spending a part or all of it on better information)]

Which of the options do you think women thinking about becoming egg donors would prefer? [Answer choices as in previous question]

[next page] We would now like to know your opinion about how ethical it is, in general, to offer women money in order to induce them to donate their egg cells.

Do you think it is more ethically sound to offer Name 1 \$8,000 in exchange for donating her eggs, or to offer the same amount to Name 2? [Answer choices: It is much more ethically sound to offer it to Name 1 than Name 2; It is a little more ethically sound to offer it to Name 1 than Name 2; It is just as ethically sound to offer it to Name 1 as to Name 2; It is a little more ethically sound to offer it to Name 2 than Name 1; It is much more ethically sound to offer it to Name 2 than Name 1]

[next page] *How ethically sound do you think it is to offer Name 1 \$8,000 in exchange for donating egg cells?* [Answer choices: It is very unethical; It is slightly unethical; It is neither ethical nor unethical; It is slightly ethical; It is very ethical]

How ethically sound do you think it is to offer Name 2 \$8,000 in exchange for donating egg cells? [Answer choices as in previous question]

[next page] Now, recall that [appropriate name] (is in a financially better position / more easily finds her way through complex information, and is more highly educated) than [appropriate name]. Suppose that ten years after donating egg cells, both Name 1 and Name 2 are diagnosed with cervical cancer (the cervix is a part of their birth canals). Luckily, both survive, and have all costs covered by their health insurance. They think back to their decision to donate their egg cells in exchange for \$12,000, which might have contributed to their cancers.

Do you think one of the women feels more regret about that decision? [Answer choices: Name 1 definitely feels more regret; Name 1 likely feels more regret; Both feel the same amount of regret; Name 2 likely feels more regret; Name 2 definitely feels more regret]