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Infertility is a complex and emotionally sensitive issue. For prospective parents, the desire to conceive is a physiologically, psychologically, and sociologically undeniable need (Spar, 2006). It’s a yearning so strong that philosophers, ethicists, and lawyers have asked whether individuals have an unalienable right to biological children, or perhaps more feasibly, whether the government is responsible for providing universal access to artificial reproductive technologies (Warnock, 2003). Critical evaluation egg donation may inform future policy and regulation, and could ultimately increase the accessibility of this procedure for the 6.7 million American women who struggle with infertility.

In my analysis of the donation recruitment process, is not my intent to criticize, antagonize, or alienate the infertility community. Rather, I hope to draw attention to the current challenges of the commercial management of the egg donation process. I am advocating for the ethical treatment of donors; the artificial reproductive technology industry should strive for empirically-valid studies on the long-term risks of the procedure, justification for donor compensation guidelines, and informative, risk-disclosing communication. As scholars, we need to examine this multi-faceted issue to protect the best interests of all parties involved and to inform the regulation decisions that will ultimately govern the procedure.
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Abstract

Oocyte retrieval, more commonly referred to as human egg donation, is an outpatient surgical procedure commonly used to obtain reproductive cells for fertility treatments. Before retrieval, donors have to complete physical and mental health screenings, and are responsible for self-injecting a three-week series of intramuscular hormones. The known side effects of human egg donation include: ovarian hyper-stimulation syndrome (OHSS), acute ovarian trauma, infection, and, in extreme cases, infertility. There are currently no empirically-validated studies regarding presence or prevalence of long-term side effects. Further, because of its unique bio-commerce framework, there are currently no federal regulations for this procedure. Increasingly, ethicists, lawyers, scientists, and public policy scholars (among others) are discussing the complicated facets of donor advocacy. This project lends two additional perspectives to the scholarly conversation: through pedagogical application and rhetorical research. The first piece uses the unique body of egg donor scholarship to teach information literacy to nursing students. The second piece examines the presence of unethical rhetoric in 2010-2013 Stanford Daily egg donor solicitations via content-analysis. The complex socio-scientific dimensions of this topic make it a compelling niche for future studies. The immediate plans for continued research include follow-up quantitative and qualitative studies to validate the preliminary findings.
Introduction

The idea for this project stemmed from a seemingly innocuous late-night Google search. During my first semester of graduate school, I was tasked with the ambiguous chore of identifying “a contemporary issue with legal repercussions” that had “implications for my future career.” As many scholars will readily acknowledge, “a contemporary issue with legal repercussions,” is, broadly speaking, just about any newsworthy conflict. Further, to say that I had even the faintest idea of what my “future career” entailed would have been a massive overstatement. At the time, I had just graduated with a Biology degree and had recently abandoned my aspirations of becoming a molecular geneticist; less than six months later, I found myself in a composition program discussing the long-term ramifications of the 2010 Plain Writing Act.

I began mindlessly sifting through source-materials pertaining to genetic privacy, gene patenting, and stem cell research. I skimmed abstracts about informed consent documents, the challenges of the upcoming 2014 Affordable Care Act, and modern-day applications of the Hippocratic Oath. I remained stationed until the library’s traffic dwindled to the most elite campers: caffeine-driven procrastinators and teary-eyed organic chemistry students. It wasn’t until my computer began to melodramatically announce its battery’s imminent death that I arrived on my first captivating article of the evening: a piece titled, “What about the women? Ethical and policy aspects of egg supply for cloning research,” by feminist bioethicist Katrina George.

The first sentence of the abstract reads, “As more and more countries open their doors to human cloning and embryonic stem cell research, scientists will be confronted with one fundamental problem: where will all the eggs come from?” (George, 2007, pp. 127). I immediately recalled the rather scarring experiment in my undergraduate
developmental biology course when we were asked to cultivate our own stem cell line from a chicken embryo. It was a messy, intricate process of cracking an egg shell, macerating a fetal bird, centrifuging its organic matter to separate the bodily tissue into density-dependent layers, and spreading the gelatinous stem-cell substance on a petri-plate to grow in the (ironic) safety of a bacterial culture.

Scientists do not have the luxury of being able to casually destroy a developed *human* fetus to create a stem-cell line. Today’s developmental biology research occurs at the much less offensive microscopic level. An egg and sperm are fused in-vitro (Latin for *in-glass*, but perhaps a more appropriate reference would read “in test tube”) to create a blastocyst. The stem cell extraction and cloning occurs at a less visually graphic stage, before the cells have any sort of distinguishable form. This is also the first step in many artificial reproduction processes, namely the most common procedure, in-vitro fertilization (IVF). Acknowledging the widespread use of this process, the question, “where will the eggs come from?” is both markedly practical and profound.

The question haunted me as I fell headlong into an engaged investigation of “human egg donation literature.” In the throes of my inquiry, I came across reviews for a 2009 documentary titled, *Eggsploitation: The Infertility Industry has a Dirty Little Secret*. I eagerly awaited its interlibrary loan arrival, and became deeply fascinated with both its message and delivery. Its producers, associates from The Center for Bioethics and Culture, made a startling claim: the women who participate in egg donation are deceived and coerced with little regard for their well-being. The documentary functions as a fascinating piece of rhetoric, one that—through its use of music, lighting, and eerie, foreboding anecdotes—verges on the genre of indie horror film. Despite the film’s rather
large leaps of correlation and causation, the independent testimonies of women who felt victimized by the egg donation process raised some interesting prospective research questions: *Does the donor compensation cause undue coercion for women in financial need?*; *What do we actually know about the long-term risks of this procedure?*; *How can women file for malpractice in an unregulated clinical environment?*

One woman featured in the film, Calla Papademas, a healthy Stanford graduate student, responded to an egg donor advertisement promising $50,000 to individuals who met the specified criteria (Lahl, 2009). Before initiating the donor process, Papademas extensively researched the procedure:

…and so I went to the library and explored those data bases and did searches in medical journals for “egg donation”, “risks of egg donation,” I took the drugs that I learned I might be taking and did research on them…there was nothing stating that there were risks to egg donors. (Lahl, 2009).

After initiating the procedure, she spent several weeks in the hospital, experienced seizures, partial paralysis, and ultimately lost her reproductive ability following a severe adverse reaction to the drug Lupron (a fertility medication commonly used prior to donation). Her story really resonated with me, because even though I was studying the process for academic purposes, I was also having problems locating reliable scholarship on the subject. I became acutely aware of what little information existed about the procedure, and marveled at how inaccessible that small body of scholarship was—particularly to individuals with limited access to academic resources.

A few weeks later, I was so invested in the subject that it seemed to bleed into my every classroom conversation, business meeting, and casual social encounter. I was taken
aback during a long distance phone conversation, when a friend from high-school interrupted my academic musings.

“I almost donated my eggs last year.”

“You what?!”

“Yeah, it was listed on our student homepage as an ‘off-campus job’, and frankly, it pays more money than the ophthalmology lab… I don’t know though, I read about the three-weeks of self-injected hormones and thought about how awkward it would be to run into my almost-progeny, and decided to forgo it,” she paused, but casually continued, “I’m really not looking forward to working with the mice again though.”

This conversation served as an anchor for the rest of my thesis. I became interested in exploring egg donation artifacts that directly reached the college-student audience. It was my hope that a rhetorical lens could shed light on the perhaps unethical persuasive techniques used in donor solicitations. It was at this phase of the thesis where I encountered my first issue of “scope.” First, I needed to determine exactly what type of communication artifact I was interested in analyzing and second, I needed to determine how I was going to collect those materials (e.g., Would I limit my materials by timeframe or location? How many samples would I need to collect to generate robust significance for my study?)

Initially, I was interested in analyzing was egg donor websites. Carter, Gezinski, and Karandikar-Chheda (2012) had very recently released a study on the communication methods used on such webpages, and I felt that using a rhetorical lens to complete a similar study would provide critical information on the persuasive methods used to recruit donors. However, upon further reading, I came across research conducted by
Kenney and McGowan (2010) that implied these sites functioned more as an informative resource for donors following recruitment (rather than an a solicitation tool). Their mixed-methods retroactive study on donor perceptions indicated that 70.5% of the study participants first heard about the egg donation process through print or broadcast media, and that 20 women (~25% of study participants) heard about the procedure through their campus newspaper (Kenny and McGowan, 2010). Accordingly, I began to explore various college publications for primary artifacts for my research.

Once I determined to focus on campus newspaper egg donor solicitations, I decided to limit my artifact collection to advertisements from The Stanford Daily publication, because the Ivy League Campus has been almost notoriously solicited for donors. Calla Papadema’s public testimony, the state of California’s numerous fertility clinics, and the rich legal history with artificial reproductive technologies made for a compelling rhetorical environment. As the Stanford Daily electronic archives are not due to launch for another six-months, I decided to get in direct contact with the Stanford Daily’s Chief Operating Officer. Using the publication’s internal content management system, we were able to extract a collection of donor solicitations that ran from 2010-2013.

Once I obtained my artifacts, I completed a small pilot analysis on eleven of the donor advertising images. This analysis allowed me to narrow my research question to: are donors able to provide informed consent for this procedure? My brief investigation of donor advertisements indicated that, at least in the early stages of recruitment, women were not receiving the information needed to make a reasoned, medical decision. There are two key reasons for this. First, the information—about long term and short term risks
of the procedure—simply does not exist (Cahn and Collins, 2014). Because the egg donation procedure is anonymous, there are no national registries to systematically donor demographics and health (interview with author Renee Almeling via Yale University, 2011). Second, because egg donation is commercially managed by the fertility industry, there are no regulations that enforce informed consent protocol typically seen in other clinical procedures.

Throughout my time as a master’s degree candidate in the field of Writing, Rhetoric and Technical Communications, I have been trained to perpetually ask myself two questions: “So what?” and “Who cares?” These engrained mantras have forced me to consider both the significance and audience of my writing. Since initially stumbling on this topic, I have collected a litany of reasons why studying egg donation is significant. Even as the artificial reproduction industry continues to grow, egg donation remains relatively unaddressed by scholars and public policy makers. Since its onset, I have always felt confident in my ability to promote the importance of this project.

The second question (i.e.: Who cares? Who is the audience?) was particularly important to my thesis director. Rather than following a traditional thesis format, we decided to adhere to University of Virginia’s Curry School manuscript-style dissertation guidelines. Under this model, I completed two submittable articles and a linking document rather than one large-scale manuscript. There are two immediate benefits for approaching my thesis in this way. First, it allows me to leave this program with scholarship ready for submission, and second, it allows me to demonstrate my ability to meet a diverse set of audience needs. Next year, I will be working as a hospital administrator and attending the University of Hawaii for my Doctorate in Public Health.
Accordingly, I have catered my writing to unconventional audiences: nurse educators and bioethicists. I will be (and have been) interacting with these professionals on a daily-basis, and this process helped me to gain practical experience articulating my rhetorical expertise, learn how to defend its value for these respective fields, and assume authority as a scholar in these interdisciplinary contexts.

Despite the magnitude of this project, the biggest challenge of writing this thesis has been limiting word count to accommodate publication standards. Collectively, I have written three-fold above and beyond what is permissible for the scholarly journals I am targeting. It has been a humbling to relearn advice I constantly give my first-year writing students: Writing is a drafting process grounded in revision. As writers, we enter the craft acknowledging that only a portion of what we compose will actually be read by others. That said, I am saving my various drafts, tangential ideas, and experimental musings in hope that I can continue this work for my doctoral dissertation.

I am especially interested in following-up on the contemporary and historical perspectives on egg donation at Stanford University. The project presented in the following chapters was appropriate for the scope of thesis expectations; however, I hope to continue my studies with rigorous on-site qualitative research (e.g., in-person interviews, surveys, and ethnographic observations) on egg donation. Additionally, I will continue to examine the effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) of California’s law on regulating donor solicitations (AB 1317). I firmly believe my future studies have the capacity to shape future policy revision, and act as a catalyst for similar legislation in other states.
Educational Innovations

*Teaching the 2013 ACRL Information Literacy Competencies for Nursing: A Sample Assignment*

**Abstract**

Successful nurses are inherently lifelong learners. With ever-evolving healthcare policies, medical knowledge, and biotechnologies, the field demands individuals who can intuitively locate, evaluate, and apply knowledge. Integrating Information Literacy (IL) in undergraduate nursing classroom provides students with tools for perpetual inquiry and professional development in the workplace (Nayda and Rankin, 2008). While scholarship has illustrated the benefit of integrating IL in the classroom, there are few resources that instruct educators on how to effectively do so (Beck et al, 2012). With the recent release of nursing specific-guidelines from the Association of College Research Libraries (ACRL), it is important to examine how to integrate and assess IL development in BSN curricula. The following article models how educators can use a bioethical issue (human egg donation) to introduce nursing students to the 2013 ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Nursing in an explicit and accessible manner.

**Introduction**

An individual who is “information literate” has the ability to effectively locate, evaluate, and apply information. This process has become increasingly more complex with the dawn of the “Information Era” and the unfiltered resources that accompany it. The ACRL has placed new emphasis on students’ capacity to access source authenticity, validity, and reliability (American Library Association, n.d.). Accordingly, evidence-based health sciences fields are integrating IL training into their curriculum to promote effective decision-making and research design (Barnard et al, 2005).
In October of 2013, with the aid of the ACRL Health Science Interest Group, nursing became the first scientific discipline to create subject-specific information literacy standards. The ACRL “Information Literacy Competency Standards for Nursing” were developed by a nine-person collaborative of health sciences librarians and were informed by foundational documents from the American Association of Colleges for Nursing (Phelps, 2013). These nursing-specific guidelines not only provide a common language for educators, administrators, and librarians to discuss IL, they provide learning outcomes (e.g., “Recognizes how scientific, medical, and nursing practice information is formally and informally produced, organized, and disseminated,” “Initiates and facilitates professional discourse and discussions as a team member, mentor, practitioner, preceptor, and/or educators,” etc.) to connect IL skills to future workplace outcomes.

**Translating ACRL Standards for Nursing Pedagogy**

The ACRL Information Literacy Competencies designed for all disciplines are broken into five standards, which include the ability to:

1) identify a need for information,
2) effectively locate the information,
3) critically evaluate source material,
4) purposefully synthesize and communicate the information, and--
5) understand the legal and ethical issues surrounding the information.

The appropriate application of these IL standards has been linked to educational success, self-directed learning, and lifelong learning: goals universities at large aim to promote and instill among their students (Nayda & Rankin, 2008). At an increasing number of universities, educators are responsible for defining, teaching, and describing the long-term applicability of IL to their students.

As IL serves as a prerequisite for evidence-based clinical practice and translational research, these skills have been emphasized in (and tailored for) the nursing
field (ACRL, 2014). The ACRL nursing-specific competencies parallel the general ACRL competency guidelines, but are written in a manner that makes connections to workplace application more explicit (see Table 1 for a few examples of the language changes).

Table 1.

*Language Comparison between General and Nursing-Specific IL Competency Standards*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General IL Competency Standards</th>
<th>Nursing-Specific IL Competency Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 4:</strong> The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system.</td>
<td><strong>Standard 4:</strong> The information literate nurse critically evaluates the procured information and its sources, and as a result, decides whether or not to modify the initial query and/or seek additional sources and whether to develop a new research process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 2, Performance Indicator 3:</strong> N/A</td>
<td><strong>Standard 2, Performance Indicator 3:</strong> [The information literate nurse] has a working knowledge of the literature in nursing related fields and how it’s produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Outcome developed specifically for ACRL Information Literacy Standards for Nursing Standards.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 1, Performance Indicator 1, Learning Outcome d:</strong> Defines or modifies the information needed to achieve a manageable focus.</td>
<td><strong>Standard 1, Performance Indicator 1, Learning Outcome c:</strong> Forms a focused question by breaking it down into unique concepts to search for individually (e.g., PICO, PICOT, PICOTT).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 1, Performance Indicator 1, Learning Outcome c:</strong> Explores general information sources to increase familiarity with the topic.</td>
<td><strong>Standard 1, Performance Indicator 1, Learning Outcome e:</strong> Explores general information sources including textbooks, organizational websites, government websites, and resources of their employer, to gain background information on the topic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discipline-specific language allows IL standards to be more directly connected to students’ future careers, is expected to foster higher levels of engagement and subsequently improve student learning (Phelps, 2013). The complete 2013 ACRL Information Literacy Standards for Nursing include a total of five standards, 23 performance indicators, and 139 learning outcomes and are accessible online via the American Library Association.
Using the ACRL Information Literacy Standards for Nursing

The 2013 ACRL Information Competency Standards are divided into three hierarchical categories (see Figure 1). The five standards are meant to serve as key guidelines for instructors throughout curriculum development, and provide a navigable framework for students to engage with the IL process (American Library Association, 2014). The performance indicators provide instructors with illustrations of how a competency standard may manifests in student work. The outcomes are meant to be used to access each IL skill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The information literate nurse accesses needed information effectively and efficiently.

**Performance Indicators:**
The information literate nurse:

1. Selects the most appropriate investigative methods or information retrieval systems for accessing the needed information.

**Outcomes Include:**

- a. Recognizes where to look for research literature and other sources of evidence at each stage of the research process.
- b. Investigates the scope, content, and organization of information retrieval systems.
- c. Selects efficient and effective approaches for accessing the information needed from an information retrieval system.
- d. Locates primary or secondary quantitative or qualitative data.

Figure 1. Excerpt from the 2013 Information Literacy Competency Standards for Nursing. This figure illustrates the hierarchical structure of the learning objectives of created by the ACRL (i.e.: standards, performance indicators, and outcomes).

These nursing-specific competencies were created to foster common IL discourse and objectives for the field. There has been a demonstrated need for such a resource. Pravikoff, Tanner and Pierce (2005) concluded, in their survey on nursing perceptions of evidence-based readiness, that nurses did not feel confident using field-specific search engines (e.g., PubMed or CINAHL). The participants also indicated that they did not
value or receive training in IL strategies (Pravikoff, Tanner, Pierce, 2005). Nayda and Rankin (2008) evaluated IL interventions in nursing classrooms. They found that neither the students or the instructors surveyed could articulate IL concepts, and that most participants associated the term with general literacy or writing skills (Nayda and Rankin, 2008). The 2014 ACRL IL Competency Standards for nursing were designed as a response to an increasing number of instructors and health-librarians recognizing that the field did not have a cohesive instructional approach for these IL strategies (Phelps, 2014).

Now that such an exhaustive resource exists, nursing educators need to integrate IL throughout their curriculum (Beck, Blake-Campbell, and McKay, 2012). This article provides an introductory IL unit which guides instructors through the explicit instruction of the skills, expectations, and meta-language used in the 2013 ACRL Information Competency Standards for Nursing (hereafter referred to as the IL Nursing Competencies). This framework establishes a preliminary understanding of IL concepts which can be applied, refined, and validated throughout students’ academic and professional careers.

The primary objective of this unit is to progress students from informal information-seeking habits to scholarly, discipline-specific search strategies. This unit uses a three-phase scaffolding approach to introduce students to IL processes and demonstrate their applicability to the future workplace. In this model, students use a socio-scientific issue (human egg donation) to examine how IL can be used for both evidence-based practice and translational research purposes. By the end of the exercise, students will have engaged in all five IL nursing competencies and should be able to describe IL and its application. The final student deliverable is a patient education
material (PEM) for prospective egg donors: a real-world writing task that demonstrates their ability to gather and communicate the information from the IL research and discussion exercises (see Appendix A for the assignment prompt).

**Why Human Egg Donation?**

Any bioethical issue with multidisciplinary scholarly contributions can be adapted for this unit. The model presented here uses the compelling example of human egg donation. Human egg donation, or oocyte retrieval, is a commercially-managed medical procedure. Accordingly, there are few (if any) nursing literature resources that discuss the procedure. For students to complete this exercise, they will need to use creative search strategies to seek credible information inside and outside of their discipline.

Human egg donation has unique ramifications for several fields, and has been studied by economists, socio-linguists, public-policy makers, and feminists (among others). This body of literature organically fosters classroom conversations about what does and does not qualify as nursing literature (ACRL Standard 1, Outcome 3). Students should notice throughout this exercise that there are currently no empirical studies on the long-term effects of the procedure (Cahn and Collins, 2014). The lack of peer-reviewed (clinical) studies also makes it easier for introductory students to immediately engage in otherwise sophisticated or challenging IL tasks (e.g., identifying gaps in the literature or proposing original research studies).

Beyond the IL benefits of this topic, human egg donation is a timely and engaging topic for use in the undergraduate classroom. It has increasingly appeared in public discourse (e.g., *The Atlantic, ABC World News, and New York Times*), particularly with regard to the unethical donor solicitation strategies. Several scholars assert that fertility
industry advertisements fail to meet the informed consent expectation required of medical ethics by withholding risk information and offering overly-enticing compensation rates (Papdimos and Papdimos, 2004; Levine, 2010; Cahn and Collins 2014). The scholarship surrounding human egg donation examines whether college students are being unfairly targeted for the procedure, and provides very little information on the long term physical and mental well-being of donors.

For the proposed unit, students are asked to complete several different information-seeking tasks. Nursing students are asked to study human egg donation as: 1) an individual who is generally curious about the procedure, 2) as a nurse attempting to understand the procedure and its side effects, and 3) as a prospective donor. Each information-seeking task prefaces key points of IL instruction and aims (through discussion questions) to address novice information-seeking, IL for Evidence Based Practice, and IL for Translational Research, respectively. The following sections list the IL objectives of each task and model the how each task could be presented in the classroom. Guided questions are provided to encourage students to identify how their search strategies differ for each task and describe the long-term implications these IL strategies have on their future practice.

**Novice Information-Seeking**

*Competency Standard 1:*

*The information literate nurse determines the nature and extent of information needed (Performance Indicators: 1, 2, and 4).*

Completing an informal pre-test of students’ natural information-seeking habits serves as a straightforward introduction for IL instruction. As an in-class exercise, using a computer lab or allowing access to personal electronic devices, give students fifteen minutes to respond to the following prompt:
Your roommate mentions that a recent episode of the sitcom “2 Broke Girls”\(^1\) referenced human egg donation and asks what you know about the it. “Not much,” you respond. “Let’s look it up.” *Identify some information to share with your roommate.*

After some students have had time to “research” the subject, begin a class discussion about what information they discovered and how they located that information. Ideally, they will obtain a variety of source materials, ranging from informal Wikipedia entries to more formal peer-reviewed journal articles. However, students may not choose to collect more scholarly source materials because of the informal nature of the prompt. This is intentional. Students who do not access more formal academic materials may not know how to go about accessing them (which further justifies the unit on IL). It may also indicate students’ ability to differentiate between a general and focused topic (Standard 1, Outcome 1f), compare source reliability (Standard 2, Outcome 2e) and appropriately weigh the costs and benefits of acquiring the information (Standard 1, Outcome 4).

**Using IL for Evidence-Based Practice**

**Competency Standard 2:**

*The information literate nurse assesses needed information effectively and efficiently.*

*(Performance Indicators 1, 2, and 4)*

**Competency Standard 3:**

*The information literate nurse critically evaluates the procured information and its sources, and as a result, decides whether or not to modify the initial query and/or seek additional resources and whether to develop a new research process.*

*(Performance Indicators 1, 2, 3, and 6)*

The ARCL identifies evidence-based practice as one of the primary workplace for the IL Nursing Competencies. Evidence-based practice demands the perpetual use of innovative

---

\(^1\) The episode referred to here is called, “And The Egg Special.” The promotional video is accessible online.
research and data to make informed decisions for patient care (Adams, 2014). Ideally, evidence-based practice is a means to improve patient outcomes because it critically compares current clinical routines to the best available information (and should therefore be a priority for all health practitioners). Proficiency in the IL nursing competencies can provide students with the necessary tools to effectively search an ever-expanding knowledge base, and provide meaningful contributions to evidence-based practice at their future workplace.

The second information-seeking task--researching human egg donation as a nurse--requires more guided instruction. Instructors should facilitate a discussion of what constitutes strong primary and secondary resources in the nursing fields: empirical, original research, technical reports, systematic reviews, etc. As this is an introductory unit, it may not be possible to address every publication-type, but students should at minimum gain a working knowledge of how to distinguish unfiltered sources and peer-reviewed journals. Instructors may also choose to introduce students on the research strategies specific to their field. The ARCL IL Competency Standards for nursing identify several ways that IL nursing approaches differ from other fields. For example, nursing students should be taught how to effectively navigate scope notes, MeSh (Medical Subject Headings) and discipline-specific search engines (CINAHL).

Once students are given these research skills, instruct them to find one high-quality resource (relevant to human egg donation) to share with the class. Take this point in the instruction to discuss critical reading of scholarly materials. At the introductory level, students should be able to distill key points from the article and relay the information to the rest of the class. Encourage students to share article summaries with
the rest of the class (and take notes for their future writing assignment, the patient education material). After students have shared their summaries, ask the class to collectively identify what information they are missing about the procedure. This directs students to areas for additional inquiry and future research.

If the class can successfully identify a gap in the literature, instructors may choose to introduce students one of the key nursing-specific research strategies used throughout the ACRL Guidelines: PICO(TT). PICO(TT) is an acronym that stands for: Patient, Intervention, Comparison, and Outcome; occasionally, it will include two additional research questions, “Type” of question and “Type” of study. It is used to guide professionals in evidence-based inquiry. This model will be used frequently as nursing students reach their more advanced courses, and integrating a straightforward example will help them gain familiarity with the model, subsequently preparing them for future work (see Table 2 for an example).

Table 2.

*Model of the Evidence-Based Query Model: PICO(TT).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>Patient, Population, or Problem</th>
<th>Egg Donors (Female, ages 18-35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Intervention, Prognostic Factor, or Exposure</td>
<td>Oocyte Retrieval; Exposure to Intravenous Reproductive Hormones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Comparison to Intervention</td>
<td>Control Group (Female, ages 18-35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Outcome you would like to measure or achieve?</td>
<td>Measure for long-term side effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>what Type of question are you asking?</td>
<td>Harm/Etiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Type of study you want to find?</td>
<td>Systematic, Empirical, Long-Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PICO(TT) is designed to provide additional terminology to narrow a search field.
Instructors can describe how to effectively use Boolean Terms (e.g., Egg Donation “AND” Case Study, Egg Donation “OR” Oocyte Retrieval), to identify effective source material. Encourage students to apply the PICO(TT) model as they begin formally gathering information for their final project, the Egg Donation PEM.

Using IL for Translational Research (Standards 4 & 5)

*Standard 4: The information literate nurse, individually or as a member of a group, uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.*

*(Performance Indicators 1, 2, and 3)*

*Standard 5: The information literate nurse understands many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally.*

*(Performance Indicators 1 and 3)*

Nurses have an instrumental role in patient advocacy (Squellati, 2010).

Accordingly, translational research—the study of how to actively apply and convey research at the bedside—is an essential professional skill. The final information-seeking task prompts students to research the procedure as a prospective donor, with the end-goal of creating a PEM accessible to this audience. There are a lot of questions students need to ask when obtaining this literature. For example:

*Where would a donor typically obtain information?*

*What kind of information does this individual have access to?*

*What is their motivation for donating (and does that bias how they seek or interpret information)?*

Seeking information as a donor serves two purposes. First, it provides instructors with an opportunity to address IL Nursing Competency Standard Five in a way that’s meaningful to patient care, and second, it allows students to critically think about how donors would hypothetically interact or assess their PEM. Undergraduate nursing students may take for granted their ability to access fee-based publications (a luxury that will continue to employment if they choose to work in a clinical setting). Asking students
to consider whether *all* prospective donors would have access to peer-reviewed materials is an important transition to discussing the challenges of free vs. fee-based information. Encourage students to articulate the differences in source reliability in these two realms (Standard 3, Outcome 3) and to consider the ethical implications of the limited accessibility of fee-based materials (Standard 5, Outcome 1b).

After completing all three information-seeking tasks (and the corresponding discussions), ask students to design a PEM describing the egg donation procedure and its risks. This tangible illustrates students’ competency in IL Nursing Competency 4, which asks students to *apply* the information they’ve collected. The final PEM should demonstrate a student’s ability to: apply information, revise search strategies to accomplish product goals, communicate information for a specific audience and genre (Standard 4, Outcomes 1-3). For this unit, standard four (and its corresponding outcomes) of the IL Nursing Competency Standards can serve as rubric standards for instructors (see Appendix B for an example). This exercise should illustrate to instructors how ACRL Guidelines can be seamlessly integrated in assessment standards.

**Limitations and Conclusions**

The newly established ACRL discipline-specific guidelines are an important new tool for both pedagogical innovation and assessment. There is currently very little research on the impact of the IL Nursing Competencies in the classroom and future workplace. There have, however, been several studies discussing the integration and application of the *general* ACRL guidelines in the nursing classroom. Currently, the preferred method for bringing IL to the undergraduate classroom is through thorough faculty-librarian partnerships. However, depending on program resources, these partnerships can be difficult to foster (Beck et al, 2012). Further, IL development is most
effective when it is woven into a wide-range of courses (Nayda and Rankin, 2008). A single course with an embedded librarian may not promote the on-going application of these skills, and may negate workplace transferability.

Likewise, the model presented in this article is not intended to stand alone. Rather, it is intended to serve as an example of how IL competencies can be integrated into the classroom with minimal time and resources. As an introductory unit, this IL model does not cover the breadth and depth the ACRL Guidelines. It assumes that higher level courses will continue to refine IL skills, particularly with regard to Standard 3 outcomes, where students are asked to “assess the quantity, quality, accuracy, currency and relevance” of information (Standard 2, Outcome 4e). This model was primarily concerned with locating discipline-specific scholarship, and should be accompanied by follow-up units to promote the critical reading of such texts. As students move throughout nursing curriculum, they should be guided toward more autonomous search processes, and ultimately (at the graduate level) should be able to use their IL skills as a foundation for original research contributions.

As educators, we need to look into creating a more consistent IL presence throughout nursing education courses. Flood, Gasiewica, and Delpier (2010) developed a five-semester assignment sequence to integrate incremental IL lessons throughout BSN curricula. However, their sequence does not address the 2013 nursing-specific guidelines and fails to provide proficiency assessment techniques. Programs continue to refine what it looks like to integrate IL the throughout all levels of nursing studies, this unit provides a straightforward model for how both students and instructors begin to engage with IL discourse and materials.
IL provides a fascinating area for future pedagogical research. Scholars should focus on validating the ACRL nursing-specific guidelines as an assessment tool. Further, we should qualitatively and quantitatively back the ACRL claims that IL skills contribute to Evidence-Based Practice and Translational Research in the workplace. The common language of the 2014 ACRL IL Nursing Competency guidelines provide an exciting opportunity for administrators, librarians, and instructors to collaborate on the advancement of IL studies. Nursing Educators should continue to discuss long-term curriculum development to ensure that these skills are implemented and refined in the upcoming generation of nursing students.
Informed Consent Rhetoric:
A Content Analysis of Stanford Daily Egg Donor Solicitations

Abstract
This content-analysis study examines a collection of 47 advertisement images, print classifieds, and online classifieds (pertaining to egg donation) that appeared in The Stanford Daily from 2010-2013. These solicitations collectively appeared over 230 times during a period of three years. The emergent coding schema uses ethical rhetoric scholarship to determine whether informed consent (comprised of disclosure, capacity, and voluntariness) is promoted through these advertisements. The analysis reveals a significant presence of: 1) emotional appeal (e.g.: altruism [51% of sample] and flattery [81% of sample]), 2) credibility (e.g.: of prospective parents [51% of the sample] and of matching programs [29% of the sample]), 3) and pseudo-logic (e.g.: compensation as a “fix” for school loans [present in 87% of the sample]). Despite the commercial status of the fertility industry, ethical rhetoric should be promoted--or perhaps enforced--to ensure reasoned autonomy for this medical procedure.

Introduction
On May 30th, 2012, The Stanford Daily published the article, “Genius Egg Donor Wanted, ‘B’ Students Need Not Apply” in response to a full-page advertisement that appeared in the newspaper 12 days prior (see Figure 2). The article admonished the unethical characteristics typically seen in egg donor solicitations: rampant compensation rates, distorted perceptions of risk, and eugenic overtones. The article concluded with an urgent call-to-action for the Stanford campus: “We have long implicitly tolerated these ads, expressing bemusement at their outlandish demands, but it is time to take a more
serious look at the troubling values such ads promote" (Stanford Daily Editorial Board, 2012). The following study attempts to answer that call.

Genius Egg Donor Wanted

to help us build our family

excellent compensation

Email: williamn@alumni.stanford.edu for more information.

We are a couple seeking a high-achiever egg donor to help build our family. You should have high standardized test scores, and preferably have some outstanding achievements and awards. You should be between 18-35 years old.

An example of our ideal egg donor:

21 year old Stanford student with A grade point average, near-perfect SAT score, several awards in high school and University. She wants to be an egg donor in order to help bring a child into the world with the same special gifts she has.

Your eggs will be fertilized with sperm from the husband, and the resulting embryos used to impregnate the wife, or possibly a surrogate mother.

About us:

We are a highly educated couple, but we are unable to have children due to infertility of the wife. The husband is a highly accomplished scientist/mathematician and businessman, the wife has a good graduate-level university degree.

We value education, and we live in one of the best school districts in the world. We hope that our child will be a top student, as each of us was, and that he/she will be able to go to university at Stanford or other top universities.

Figure 2. Egg Donor Solicitation from the Stanford Daily. This full-page advertisement was first published May 19, 2012.
**Background**

Oocyte retrieval, more commonly referred to as human egg donation, is an outpatient procedure used to obtain reproductive cells for fertility treatments or stem cell research. Human egg donation is full of promise. As a fertility treatment, the procedure offers hope for women who cannot independently produce viable eggs. Human egg donation also plays a crucial role in embryonic stem cell research, and provides a potential cure for a multitude of health concerns, including failing organ systems, Type 1 Diabetes, and Parkinson’s Disease (Cone, 2013). The intended use of the egg—whether for procreative or research purposes—has generated two separate regulatory models with distinct and potentially contradictory frameworks.

Eggs that are donated for fertility purposes rely on a self-regulated, free-market system with an asymmetric distribution of information. Donor compensation fluctuates based on fertility agency, geographic location, donor ethnicity, and often eugenic characteristics like intellect or athletic ability. Within this system, women can receive anywhere from $5,000 to $100,000 in compensation. This vast range is largely due to the fertility industry’s commerce system of ethics, where compensation is implicitly determined by the “quality” of genetic material.

In contrast, egg donation for embryonic research tends to be more regulated. Donations of this nature are subject to higher levels of government supervision, are monitored by an institutional review board process, and are required to demonstrate and document adequate informed consent from its participants. Women who donate for research purposes typically receive $5,000-$10,000 per donation cycle as per recommendations from the American Society for Reproductive Medicine (Zacher, 2011).
Embryonic research operates on a system of medical ethics, and compensation rates are determined by a more standard measure of donor time, inconvenience, and perceived risk.

Both models use the same procedure and target the same age demographic, but differ drastically in their approach to donor compensation and recruitment strategies. These discrepancies illuminate the major ethical question of artificial reproductive technology (ART): how do we appropriately manage conflicting commercial and medical regulatory frameworks? Currently, there are only two federal regulations relevant to human egg donation: 1) entities handling genetic material must be registered under the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and 2) donors must complete a physical exam and medical history interview prior to donation (Cahn and Collins, 2014). State-level legislation is disparate and non-comprehensive, ranging from prohibiting egg compensation (e.g.: Georgia, Louisiana, and Oklahoma) to explicitly permitting it for IVF purposes (e.g.: Indiana, Florida and Virginia). Only twenty states have any form of regulation in place (Cone, 2013).

Arguably, the most concerning aspect of the bio-consumerism model of egg donation is the inconsistent informed consent standards. Western cultures have a moral obligation to provide disclosure and promote reasoned decision-making among patients (Papadimos and Papadimos, 2004). Consent can only be provided if participants are given all of the information necessary to appropriately weigh the consequences of the decision. The ethical rhetoric framework stipulates that individuals must be presented this information in a straightforward, non-manipulative manner. The abuse of rhetoric (over-reliance on credibility or emotional appeal, or extensive presence of logical fallacy)
undercuts reasoning, and could ultimately hamper informed consent. Assuming this procedure is guided by a medical ethics framework, donor recruitment should consistently exhibit the ethical use of rhetoric.

Ethical rhetoric is ingrained and enforced in medical ethics through the field’s heavy emphasis of disclosure (via documents like the Belmont Report and the Declaration of Helsinki), but such transparent communication is not required in commercial industries. However, many bioethicists feel that because egg donation is a medical procedure, donors should have the right to informed autonomy and consent regardless of whether the genetic material is be used for research or fertility purposes (Papadimos and Papadimos, 2004; Cahn and Collins, 2014; Skillern et al, 2013). In the forthcoming article, “Risk Disclosure and the Recruitment of Oocyte Donors: Are Advertisers Telling the Full Story,” Alberta, Berry, and Levine (2014) claim that (under a medical ethics framework) egg donation solicitation should reflect clinical research recruitment by promoting informed consent and risk disclosure in the first communication with prospective participants.

According to bioethics literature, informed consent is comprised of disclosure, capacity, and voluntariness. “Disclosure” refers to information provided to and comprehended by the patient. “Capacity” refers to the patient’s ability to understand information and consequences. “Voluntariness” refers to the patient’s right to make decisions free of coercion, persuasion, or manipulation. According to the article, “The student and the ovum: The lack of autonomy and informed consent in trading genes for tuition,” there are several ways rhetoric can impede informed consent. For example, an

---

2 These terms were originally defined in the article “Bioethics for Clinicians: 1. Consent” in 1996, but are now common and consistent throughout bioethics literature.
appeal to emotion, a focus on the financial need cultivated by high tuition rates, or a withholding of risk-communication may negate the voluntary nature of consent (George, 2007). This content-analysis uses rhetorical lenses to discern whether the advertisement materials used to solicit prospective donors for ART purposes (such as the aforementioned Stanford Daily advertisement) hinder informed consent for prospective donors.

**Scope**

This study builds on prior qualitative research from other academic disciplines. Hobbs (2007) analyzed 36 donor advertisements that appeared in the Daily Braun (a student newspaper based at the University of California) from 2000-2001. Hobbs (2007) used a sociolinguistic lens to comment on the advertisements’ various discursive strategies and metaphors. In 2010, a broader study was completed by Public Policy scholar Aaron Levine for the Hastings Center Report. Levine (2010) examined 105 different advertisements from 36 different newspapers and quantitatively identified factors that influenced donor compensation rates (e.g.: SAT score, appearance, and ethnicity). More recently, Levine and his colleagues, Alberta and Berry (2014), completed an analysis of Craigslist advertisements to assess whether the solicitations included risk disclosure (of the 424 advertisements analyzed, only 16% mentioned risk).

The lies at the intersection of Levine and Hobbs’ studies by using content-analysis to *rhetorically* analyze artifacts taken from a single California-based campus newspaper: The Stanford Daily. The rationale for using egg donor advertisements from a campus newspaper (as opposed to a donor webpages, social media advertisements, etc.) is supported by a mixed-methods study conducted by researchers Kenny and McGowan in
2010. Kenny and McGowan (2010) conducted a retroactive study of donor perceptions and found that 36 women (45% of the sample) were students when they first donated, and that 25% of participants specifically mentioned that they first heard of the procedure through their campus newspaper. Pulling artifacts from the same publication—rather than collecting randomized samples from several different publications—provided a narrower context and ultimately, a deeper analysis. To date, this is the only study that focuses on the egg donor solicitations from a single university. Doing so allows the coding criterion for compliance to be specifically informed by California’s legislation on egg donor solicitation.

**Legal Precedence.** Focusing on *The Stanford Daily*, reveals socio-cultural and legal context in which these artifacts are situated. The state of California provides a fascinating rhetorical environment for several reasons. According to the Center for Disease Control, the state of California has the largest number of ART clinics nationwide, with 61 faculties in all (Cone 2013; Sunderam et al, 2012). Moreover, the extensive presence of reproductive technology may directly correlate with state wealth. Santa Clara, home of Stanford University, is one of the wealthiest counties in the United States.

The evidence of ART’s prevalence can also be seen through the state’s on-going legal commentary regarding the issue. The Supreme Court of California has been

---

3 One plausible limitation of this study is that there is such little scholarship on the effectiveness of current recruitment strategies. Kenny and McGowan’s 2010 article, “Looking back: egg donors’ retrospective evaluation of their motivations, expectations, and experiences during their first donation cycle” is the only survey of its kind. The anonymity of the egg donation process makes it challenging to study which solicitations (online, social media, broadcast, or print) are actually successful in recruiting donors. Further, because this study is a retrospective study, the participants may have been donating before the online and social media advertising was as prevalent as it is now. Regardless, the use of campus advertising is compelling for this study because it is targeted specifically at the college audience (individuals with a known financial need), rather than the general population.
grappling with the sociological impact of ART technologies for several decades, beginning with the Johnson v. Calvert case in 1993 (which established precedence for parental rights in surrogacy contracts). Egg donation was specifically addressed in the California Supreme Court in 1998, during the case of Buzzanca v. Buzzanca. The case led to the 2000 revision of the Uniform Parentage Act, which now includes “consent to assisted reproduction” as a way to establish paternity.

Furthermore, California is the only state that has drafted legislation to regulate egg donor solicitations (Cahn and Collins, 2014). In 2009, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger implemented a disclosure policy for donor recruitment advertising via the California Assembly Bill 1317. The bill, while short, represents a large advocacy step for prospective donors, and resulted in the California Health and Safety Code 125235. The disclaimer functions almost like a Surgeon General’s warning, and is legally mandated to appear in every donor solicitation. It reads:

Egg donation involves a screening process. Not all potential egg donors are selected, not all selected egg donors receive the monetary amounts or compensation advertised. As with any medical procedure, there may be risks associated with human egg donation. Before an egg donor agrees to begin the egg donation process, and signs a legally binding contract, she is required to receive specific information on the known risks of egg donation. Consultation with your doctor prior to entering into a donor contract is advised. (AB 1317, 2009)

The policy allows persons or entities who certify that they are registered with American Society for Reproductive Medicine (ASRM) to be exempt from this requirement. This exemption was made because, according to the ASRM accreditation standards, ASRM
affiliates are required to include risk disclosure in their advertisements. However, because ASRM is not federally supported, there is no way to hold agencies accountable to these standards, so the policy—while well intended—is criticized as being largely ineffective (Cone 2013).

The most recent California legislation involving human egg donation was taken to the California State Assembly on May 2, 2013. The proposed bill would have revoked the 7-year ban on paying women for egg donated for research purposes (perhaps in order to compete with the rampant fertility market; Lifsher 2013). The bill was ultimately vetoed by California governor Jerry Brown on grounds that compensation above and beyond direct expenses for the procedure may cause undue coercion for women who are financially vulnerable. Lawmakers have yet to acknowledge how (or if) this viewpoint applies to women who donate for reproductive purposes (Cone 2014). Both pieces of legislature (AB 1317 and the vetoed AB 926) subdue the commercial aspects of this procedure and move toward a medical ethics framework for human egg donation.

One event that has seemingly halted this effort is the recent class-action lawsuit filed against the ASRM, the Society for Reproductive Medicine, and the Pacific Fertility Center (located in San Francisco, California). The 2011 lawsuit challenged ASRM’s donor compensation guidelines on the grounds that they were in violation of United States anti-trust laws. The complaint, filed by Lindsay Kamakahi, alleges that the guidelines violate the Sherman Act because they illegally cap the price of oocyte-donation. The ASRM defense is that the guidelines combat the potential coercion of a free-marketplace. However, since ASRM guidelines are not enforced, exorbitant free-market pricing occurs regardless (Levine, 2010). As stated in the article, “Kamakahi v.
ASRM: The Egg Donor Price Fixing Litigation, “To acknowledge that the [ASRM] guidelines are ineffective is to concede that…industry self-regulation has failed. To defend the effectiveness of these guidelines is to concede that they reduce egg-donor compensation below the level that they operate in a market free of restraints, thus assisting the plaintiffs’ case” (Krawiec, 2014, pp. 7). The Kamakahi v. ASRM suit is still under litigation, and elegantly highlights the tension of conflicting medical and commercial paradigms.

Socio-Cultural Environment. California has been one of the most proactive states in regard to egg donation legislation and policy. As a result, there also seems to be a heightened public awareness of egg donor advocacy issues. Stanford University has had a significant voice in this conversation; its in-house publications frequently discuss suggesting that fertility clinics in the area unfairly target Ivy League students to recruit “high quality” donations. Despite having published several engaging articles on the unethical nature of donor solicitations, the on-campus newspaper publication (Stanford Daily) has printed an extensive number of donor solicitations over the last two decades (Hamilton 2000; The Stanford Daily Editorial Board 2012). However, public outcry against these ads has steadily increased since the highly publicized testimony of Calla Papademas, a 22-year old Stanford Student who experienced seizures and loss of reproductive function as a result of the human egg donation procedure.

Calla Papademas’ story was first featured in a Stanford Magazine article in 2000, which called for formal egg donor regulations. Almost a decade later, her story was featured in a whistle-blower documentary by the Center for Bioethics and Culture (CBC, located in Pleasant Hill California). The CBC’s 2009 film documentary, “Eggsploration”
was awarded “Best Documentary” at the 2011 California Indie Film Festival and followed the lives of several women (including Calla Papademas) who experienced emotional, psychological, and physical distress following the egg donation procedure. The documentary called for increased research and regulation to safeguard donor safety.

Beyond drawing heightened attention to the issue, the CBC has demonstrated power to sway California state legislators toward a medical ethic framework. Namely, Jenifer Lahl (CBC President) is credited as having directly influenced Brown’s decision to overturn Assembly Bill 926 (Lifsher 2013). The organization continues to advocate for increased regulation of egg donor legislation. Their three-part legislative packet, titled the “Egg Guidelines and Governance Act” or “EGG Act” promotes standardized compensation, formalized donor documentation processes, and donor tracking for tort and civil action suits.

Stanford University’s Ivy League status and location among a dense population of ART facilities, coupled with the presence of egg donor advocacy in California’s legal and public discourse, make the Stanford Daily a distinct publication for this content analysis. This background information was used to inform the coding schema for this study. Understanding audience context (i.e.: the ever-evolving social and political landscape in which a text appears) was critical to completing an accurate, rhetorically-informed coding-system for this collection of artifacts.

Methods

Content analysis is a systematic, replicable technique that can be used to examine trends and patterns in documents (Stemler, 2001). This technique is used to identify concepts, code for them, and examine their presence in artifacts of the same genre. The
methodology used here is loosely based on the approach developed and refined by Krippendorff (1980). Once a research question is established (e.g.: *Do egg donor solicitations use commercial rhetoric?*), investigators must:

- Identify appropriate texts
- Use sampling to define coding criteria
- Apply coding schema to the entire collection
- Analyze the coded data (White and Marsh, 2006).

This content analysis uses an emergent coding system to identify persuasive strategies used throughout a collection of egg donor solicitations.

**Identifying the Appropriate Texts.** This study used a collection of 47 unique advertising images, print classifieds, and online classifieds (relevant to human egg donation) that appeared in *The Stanford Daily* from 2010-2013. All three forms of communication were included in this study to provide depth to the analysis. Accounting for the known re-prints of these artifacts, these solicitations would have collectively appeared over 230 times during a period of three years. The samples were obtained via direct contact with *The Stanford Daily’s* chief operating officer, who used the publication’s internal content management system to pull any advertising images that contained the word “egg” from January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2013. This same contact authorized a temporary username for *The Stanford Daily’s* electronic classifieds’ archive (run through campusave.com). The same search criterion was independently entered in this archive to extract both print and online classifieds. Direct communication with *The Stanford Daily* and the subsequent use of various internal content management systems provided a pragmatic way to extract artifacts from a large publication.

**Sampling to Identify Coding Criteria.** The coding criterion for this study was developed through emergent coding methods. *Emergent* coding establishes coding
following a preliminary examination of texts, whereas *a priori* coding uses pre-established categories (Stemler, 2001). In order to identify coding categories for this content analysis, eleven sample egg donor recruitment advertisements were analyzed to develop a coding template for the remainder of the analysis (*emergent coding*).

Moreover, this pilot analysis was completed using a theory-informed, rhetorical lens to specifically address whether unethical persuasive strategies were in use. Persuasive strategies were considered “unethical” if they presented a logical fallacy that could hamper logical reasoning, or if they were out of compliance with California Legislation.

The preliminary analysis resulted in a total of 32 categories (also referred to as “traits” or “recording units”) which were used to analyze the remainder of the samples. The recording units loosely fell into four categories: posting information, rhetorical appeals, legal communications, and miscellaneous/unique data (the coding entries are listed in Table 3).

Table 3.

*Emergent Coding Criteria for Content-Analysis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Recording Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posting Information</td>
<td>Picture ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posting Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertisement Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date(s) Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative # of Times Ran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classification of Text (Advertisement, Print Classified, Online Classified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same Author (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency or Private Solicitation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Appeals</td>
<td>Altruistic Language (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altruistic Language (Description)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flattery (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donor Flattery (Description) or Adjectives Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental Credibility (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Communications</td>
<td>Parental Credibility (Description) or Adjectives Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Match Service Credibility (Y/N or Intentional Distinction from)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentions Academic Institution (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Institution (Description) or Adjectives Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description of Convenience or Reward (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convenience/Reward (Description) or Adjectives Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentions Compensation (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compensation Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASRM Certified (Y/N or “Yes, but not mentioned”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certification Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AB 1317 Disclaimer Included? (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentions Application Process (N or Description Included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentions Number of Cycles (N or Description Included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentions Anonymity (N or Description Included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous/Unique</td>
<td>Mentions Ethnicity (N or Description Included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compelling Contact Info (N or Description Included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picture Used? (N or Description Included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unique Elements (Catch-All Description)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once these recording units were finalized, the collection of *Stanford Daily* artifacts were embedded in an excel spreadsheet; the categories were systematically documented and quantified (see Appendix C for a sample of the master spreadsheet).

**Results and Analysis:**

In order for donor recruitment advertisements to promote informed consent, the advertisements must be free of unethical persuasion. This section outlines the communication trends that short-cut autonomous decision making and, therefore, impede the autonomous and voluntary nature of the informed consent.

**Material Incentive and Pseudo-Logic.** In this sample, the most dominant recruitment strategy is to explicitly mention (or even emphasize) the financial gain of this procedure. While this does not necessarily negate autonomous decision making, it may present a system of pseudo-logic for a financially-strapped student. In other words, student loans may be considered an urgent problem and egg donation a straightforward,
“logical” solution. In rhetorical studies, this form of persuasion would be described as either “bribery” or “material incentive.” Depending on the depth of financial strain, some students may be unable to refuse such an incentive. Under an informed consent paradigm, students encountering high student loan debt would qualify as a “vulnerable population,” and this form of communication would therefore be considered unethical coercion. This pseudo-logic process may occur subconsciously for readers if compensation and personal financial need are high. However, some advertisements sampled in this study foster the audience connection of trading ova for donation in an overt and guided manner (see Figure 3).

The other concern with this form of persuasion is that women might be subject to a “bait and switch” method of recruitment, where advertisers use a large offer to attract donors, but will renegotiate following donor response (Tuller, 2010). Because compensation is not regulated, this form of false advertising has not been formally monitored, but it has been documented anecdotally in several exposé articles (e.g.: “Mother’s Helper: A Shocking Thing I Learned After Giving Up My Eggs,” The Atlantic, “Payment Offers to Egg Donors Prompt Scrutiny,” The New York Times).

Collectively, 42 of the 47 advertisements sampled explicitly mentioned compensation. The listed compensation rates ranged from $5,000 to $80,000. A small
collection of advertisements (5) intentionally emphasized the compensation rate through a bolded title or pull-quote.

**Altruistic Appeal.** Altruistic appeal, sometimes referred to as gift-giving rhetoric, is an emotional appeal that plays on a person’s desire to help others (or at the very least, to be perceived as someone who has the desire to help others). The metaphor of “giving the gift of life” or “participating in a miracle” has been frequently identified as a common appeal in previous egg donor scholarship, because women are perceived as having a “greater reputation for altruism and empathy than men” (George, 2007 pp. 130). Studies of the gendered appeals in egg and sperm donation indicate that women are more likely to consider the potential offspring that may result from their donation, and therefore, altruistic language is used to invite them to indirectly participate in a “miracle” as opposed to a “transaction” (Almeling, 2009; See figure 4).

---

**Figure 4.** Altruistic Language in an Egg Donor Advertisement. First Published in the *Stanford Daily* on October 5, 2010.
This metaphor is likely bolstered by women’s culturally central role to familial structure. In her article, “Egg and Embryo Donation and the Meaning of Motherhood,” author Maggie Kirkman (2003) suggests that women are more vested in the egg donation because, “for women to become emotionally disengaged with the [procedure], would be perceived as a threat to motherhood” (pp.3). 24 of 47 of the artifacts in this sample explicitly use altruistic language.

Altruistic appeal is further amplified when readers are provided with imagery of the couple they are “gifting” to. This strategy relies on both emotional (pathos) and credibility (ethos) arguments by describing the success of the parent (e.g.: career-driven, fun-loving, highly educated) and casting them as devoted parents. Descriptions of this type were present in 24 of 47 (~51%) of the donor solicitations analyzed (See Table 4 for examples).

Table 4.

*Examples of Ethos in Stanford Daily Donor Advertisements.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prospective Parent Credibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Egg Donor Wanted for Stable Married Couple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are a successful, loving Stanford Couple (both with master's degrees in engineering)...similar backgrounds to our own: graduate students in science &amp; engineering who are kind, athletic, and outgoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…loving, professional couple (MD, JD Stanford grads...build[ing a family].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm an extremely loving, successful, and financially stable single woman residing in NYC who has been trying to have a child for some time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Another interesting trend in the “parent descriptions” was the disclosure of sexual orientation. In several advertisements, prospective parents shared that they were a homosexual couple hoping to start a family. This communication could meaningfully contribute to the decision to donate, particularly if the donors want to be seen as supportive of the LGBT community.
About us:
We are a highly educated couple, but we are unable to have children due to the infertility of the wife. The husband is a highly accomplished scientist/mathematician and businessman, the wife has a good graduate-level university degree.

We value education, and we live in one of the best school districts in the world. We hope that our child will be a top student, as each of us was, and that he/she will be able to go to university at Stanford or other top University.

I am a successful business owner, a contemporary art lover, and a world traveler.

Stanford and Harvard Graduate looking for the right egg donor.

Another distinct emotional appeal stems from the prospective parent infertility narrative. This strategy undercuts logical reasoning by relying on pity or sympathy to elicit an audience response. A particularly compelling example of this appeared in the Stanford Daily classifieds on October 16, 2013. The entry reads as follows: “Greetings, My wife and I are unable to conceive a child of our own, so we are in search of an egg donor, we are not an agency. We’re trying to find a woman with similar physical traits as my wife…” The rhetoric of this particular advertisement accomplishes several things. First, the infertility narrative provides a tangible image of a couple “in-need.” Second, acknowledging the wife rationalizes the specific demands for the donor traits that follow “…5’8” or taller, brunette, and a college athlete.” Finally, the intentional distinction from egg donor agencies provides an alternate justification for participating in the procedure. Rather than anonymously donating to a bank for compensation, women are partnering with a couple to help them conceive. Five other artifacts make a similar rhetorical move by intentionally distinguishing themselves from donor agencies, perhaps to personalize the advertising or to overcome negative perceptions of the fertility industry.

Agency Credibility. In contrast, several solicitations (14 of 47, approximately 30%) explicitly market the reputability of the agency that matches donors and recipients.
Extensive use of credibility (ethos) may threaten reasoned-decision making because it can generate a sense of blind-trust among readers. This form of appeal manifested in several ways: a vague mention of the agency’s reliability, an acknowledgement of the agency’s various accreditations (e.g.: Food and Drug Administration or ASRM) or a time-based claim (e.g.: “perfectly matching donors since 1988”). Another more implicit method used to establish match-service credibility was through the promotion of “donor advocates.” For example, donor solicitations authored by the match-service “Fertility Alternatives” promote their president and director—“an experienced egg donor & gestational carrier”—as a donor resource. While only a few of the Stanford Daily artifacts mention donor advocates, it is very common for match-service websites to promote the fact that social workers and psychologists are available to guide donors through the procedure. However, because the advocates are paid internally, rather than through a third-party service, ethicists question whether advocates can truly offer impartial advice to prospective donors (Carter, Gezinski, and Karandikar-Chheda, 2012).

Since all of these advertisements were taken from a California publication, readers might logically assume that match-service credibility would be conveyed through the AB 1317 safety notice or through ASRM certification. However, this content analysis—like the scholarship that precedes it—demonstrated underwhelming compliance with the both California Law and ASRM Guidelines (Levine, 2010; Keehn et al, 2012). Even though the law reads that any advertisement must include the disclaimer (or acknowledge ASRM certification), only 5 of the advertisements sampled included the disclaimer. Only two artifacts mentioned their ASRM certification to meet the policy exception.
An additional 11 advertisements were affiliated with an ASRM-certified agency, but failed to mention of ASRM accreditation directly in the text of their advertisement. These ASRM-supported advertisements fail to provide risk-information, even though the accreditation guidelines encourage them to adopt effective information disclosure processes (Ethics Committee of ASRM, 2007)\(^5\). Further, four advertisements affiliated with ASRM’s accrediting body were in direct violation of its compensation guidelines. Because scholars dispute whether AB 1317 applies to private solicitations, any private solicitations were excluded from this study’s survey of regulation compliance. The compliance rate among the advertisements was still shockingly low; only 16% of advertisements include the disclaimer or an acknowledgement of ASRM affiliation.

**Flattery.** Throughout this content analysis there were two interesting trends in flattery. The most common example of flattery can be seen in the donor descriptions. 38 of 47 (just over 80%) of the samples contain a very-specific, commendable description of an “ideal donor.”\(^6\) These descriptions highlight beauty, intellect, high-achievements, and athletic ability (among other traits). Some descriptions listed minimum SAT scores, maximum Body-Mass Index (BMI), desirable academic awards, or preferred college majors.\(^7\) Implicitly, and even explicitly at times, these advertisements encouraged potential donor matches to perceive themselves as elite and extraordinary. As described in the 2009 documentary from the Center for Bioethics and Culture, donor

---

\(^5\) The ASRM leaves it to the agency to determine *when* risk disclosure occurs, but states that programs, “should ensure that [donors] receive accurate and meaningful information on the potential physical, psychological, and legal effects of oocyte retrieval and donation...should be openly acknowledged.” (ASRM, 2007, pp. 307)

\(^6\) While on the surface level, these descriptions read as a checklist for an “ideal child,” it’s possible that the rhetorical construction of these descriptions is far more complex. Particularly if the author is the prospective mother, these descriptions might function as an ideal representation of themselves.

\(^7\) Some of these donor solicitations are so specific that it’s possible women who are strong matches may feel obligated to respond to these advertisements.
advertisements call for tall, attractive, athletic, intellectual individuals—“and what
woman doesn’t want to be seen that way”?

The second form of flattery uses Stanford brand to appeal readers’ sense of
belonging at the university. 40% of the artifacts surveyed invoke the brand of Stanford
University (see Table 5 for examples). Highlighting the donor’s sense-of-belonging at an
Ivy League school reinforces the perception of having an “elite-status.”

Table 5.

Examples of Donor Advertisements Using the Stanford Brand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentions Academic Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Loving Stanford Couple&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Stanford Grad Seeking Stanford Egg…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Center for Egg Options is seeking a Stanford Educated Egg Donor&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents are Stanford Grads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our ideal egg donor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Year old Stanford Student with A grade point average, near perfect SAT score, several awards in high school and university. She wants to be an egg donor to help bring a child into the world with the same special gifts she has.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Private Search by Stanford Alum for Exceptional Egg Donor.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of Stanford in these advertisements also harkens to the “blood is thicker than
water” fallacy: a flawed use of credibility that deems an action as correct because the
audience has established camaraderie (through family, friendship, knowledge, affections,
or experiences) with the author.

Conclusions and Implications:

The ethical rhetoric of consent promotes rational, informed decision-making.
Logical fallacies, intended or not, short-cut, mask, or deceive logical reasoning.
Therefore, for egg donation solicitations to cultivate an environment of ethical informed
consent, they need to limit logical fallacies. The results from this content analysis demonstrate that the current solicitation strategies heavily rely on credibility, flattery, and emotional appeal to recruit donors. If fertility agencies, prospective parents, the state of California, or ASRM want human egg donation to adopt a medical ethic framework, these stakeholders need to promote fair compensation and risk-disclosure from the first stages of communication (namely, donor solicitations).

The two most immediate concerns for the larger bioethics community are justifying (or revising) donor compensation guidelines and verifying the long- and short-term side effects of the procedure. The recent Kamakahi v ASRM lawsuit questions whether self-regulation has actually been effective in defending and enforcing price-caps for donor compensation. Perhaps even more alarming is that there are little to no long term studies conducted on this procedure (Cahn and Collins, 2014). It is impossible to scale risks, or realistically provide fully-informed consent, until the longitudinal research exists to accurately describe the potential risks and complications of the procedure.
Future Directions

The previous pieces were targeted for two peer reviewed journals: *Nursing Education Journal* and *The New Bioethics: A Multidisciplinary Journal of Biotechnology and the Body*, respectively. The work from this manuscript will be submitted to these publications summer of 2014. I hope to complete rigorous qualitative and quantitative follow-up studies for both pieces. With the pedagogy piece specifically, I am interested in how nursing staff are currently engaging with information literacy in hospital settings. It will be very feasible to complete surveys, interviews, and observations of this nature at my future workplace (a women and children’s non-profit hospital facility). Having evidence of how information literacy is applied in the clinical setting will provide much-needed validation for the ACRL Standards, and ultimately propel their integration within BSN curricula.

I also have plans to continue the *Stanford Daily* study. While studying this topic, I have made several important networking contacts, including: Jennifer Lahl, President of the Center for Bioethics and Culture; Aaron Levine, author of the influential article “Self-Regulation, Compensation, and the Ethical Recruitment of Oocyte Donors”; and Miles Bennett-Smith, current Chief Operating Officer of the *Stanford Daily*. As I continue on to my dissertation, I would like to complete a more comprehensive study of egg donation at Stanford University. I imagine the final work will lie at the intersection of archival research and ethnography, building on the studies completed by sociologist Rene Almeling in her book *Sex Cells*.

I believe limiting my study to the Stanford area will provide new insight to the current scholarship. With this limited scope, I can follow the legislative history of one
state, and examine the donor perspectives at one university. There are three ways I hope to expand the content analysis presented in Chapter 3. First, once Stanford Daily’s electronic archives are released in fall of 2014, I would like to extract the donor solicitations over a longer span of time. Specifically, I hope to determine:

- if advertisement approaches change as various California regulations are put in place,

- if advertisement language varies when the procedure was receiving negative press in the area, or—

- if the campus publication print advertisements decrease as internet advertising becomes more prevalent.

I am also interested in completing on-site surveys of how Stanford women respond to these advertisements. Do they see them largely as a joke, as the Stanford Daily editorial board seems to in their article, “Genius Egg Donor Wanted, ‘B’ Students Need Not Apply”? Or, do the students view these advertisements as enticing? Currently, there are no studies actually examine whether these advertisements are effective in securing donors.

Arguably, internet advertising offers a more far-reaching, less expensive means to reach prospective donors. The forthcoming study by Alberta, Berry, and Levine looks at donor solicitations on Craigslist under this assumption. I anticipate there will be several additional studies of this nature as the genres of internet advertising continue to evolve. A colleague recently shared with me that egg donor advertising was promoted on her internet-radio station for hours at a time. As third-party advertisers continue to monitor our internet search decisions, it will become easier to identify how prospective donors can be reached most effectively, and given the commercial framing of this procedure, I imagine the advertising trends will shift to accommodate.
A final idea I have for extended research would be to apply my content-analysis coding schema to the donor education materials given out at various clinics. As a twenty-something graduate student, I theoretically belong to the ideal donor demographic. Assuming I receive approval of the appropriate Institutional Review Board affiliates, I would be very interested in visiting the Stanford area as a “prospective donor,” in order to collect education materials provided at nearby fertility clinics.

The timeliness of these various studies is irrefutable. It will be imperative to follow the state of California over the next few years, particularly in regards to the Kamakahi vs. ASRM class-action lawsuit. Human egg donation continues to sit precariously in the middle of two disparate regulatory frameworks. This lawsuit may guide policy-makers in determining whether egg donation should be treated as a regulated clinical trial or a strictly economic trade. I anticipate that a middle ground solution—a semi-regulated commercial market—will be pursued in the immediate future. However, such a structure is not sustainable without the proper data. Currently, there are no nation-wide studies examining how many donors there are, how many times these women are donating on average, or how their bodies respond to the procedure long-term. It is my hope that this piece (and any future work) will draw awareness to this bioethical issue, and that scholars will continue to discuss what medical, ethical, and regulatory framework will be most beneficial to all parties involved in the human egg donation process.
Appendix A: PEM Assignment Prompt

Project Description and Expectations

For this project, you are responsible for creating a Patient Education Material (PEM) for women interested in becoming egg donors. Be sure to include details about the procedure and its potential side effects in a straightforward, accessible manner. Your PEM must be evidence-based (i.e.: supported by scholarly, peer-reviewed materials accessed through the approved academic search engines) and the materials must be appropriately translated for your audience. You are allowed to supplement your research with generalized resources as well, provided you can justify that the information is necessary and cannot be accessed elsewhere.

Your final project should be approximately 500 words in length. Using the information literacy strategies discussed in you should locate, read, and integrate 4-5 sources to support your medical claims. To receive full credit on this assignment, you will be required to hand in a “References” page that adheres to APA citation standards.

For your final draft, take design considerations into account--make your PEM visually compelling for your readers. I recommend taking some time to research other patient education materials to identify how they are typically constructed.

Assessment

You will be graded on your ability to:

1. Distill and translate information from primary and secondary academic sources.
2. Select a communication medium that will effectively reach your audience.
3. Communicate the procedure and side effects in a clear and distinct manner.
4. Correctly reference and cite source material as per APA standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IL Nursing Competency</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 4, Outcome 1c, 1b, 3e</strong></td>
<td>Student relies on a wide variety of sources throughout their PEM (e.g., primary, secondary, trade, popular, etc.). Student synthesizes current scholarship about egg donation to successfully compose the body of the PEM. The writing clearly demonstrates a student’s ability to use an evidence-based approach when communicating with a patient.</td>
<td>Student relies on some source variety throughout their PEM (e.g., uses both general and scholarly sources). Student uses resources to inform their PEM, and demonstrates that he/she is able to distill key concepts and draw preliminary connections among ideas and concepts. Student integrates sources to illustrate that their claims are supported.</td>
<td>Student relies on one publication type throughout their writing (e.g., only uses popular source materials, only uses literature reviews, etc.). Student fails to draw make big-picture connections between the source materials. Student either relies too much on evidence that their own voice is lost, or student fails to support their own voice with credible evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selects and synthesizes appropriate sources.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 4, Outcome 3b, 3d</strong></td>
<td>Student provides information that is clear and succinct, and uses information that is accessible to the identified patient demographic. The content demonstrates clear focus on patient education and advocacy. Procedure details and potential side effects are described in a way that promotes clear decision making.</td>
<td>Student provides information in a clear manner, but could revise the narrative to be more succinct and accessible to the identified patient demographic. Student gives some thought to patient education, but the narrative contains some specialized language. PEM could be effectively explained with minor aid of a healthcare professional.</td>
<td>Student provides information that is clear to healthcare professionals, but may not be accessible to the identified patient demographic. Student either presents the procedure in an unclear manner or focuses primarily on clinical details, and does not effectively translate concepts for patient education or advocacy purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communicates in a clear, succinct, and accessible tone.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 4, Outcome 1a, 3a, 3c</strong></td>
<td>Student selects a communication medium that is effective for both the purpose and intended audience. Content organization and document design appropriate for the communication medium selected (e.g., patient instruction, care-plan, etc.). Any embedded images are used in meaningful ways.</td>
<td>Student selects an appropriate medium for the purposes of the assignment, and follows the general layout expectations of a PEM. Student illustrates some consideration for the audience by integrating images and a step-wise description of the procedure.</td>
<td>Student selects communication medium with little consideration of audience needs and expectations. Images used are either inappropriate or unexplained. Student either 1) gives little consideration to visual design, or 2) overwhelms readers with excessive use of design elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses an effective medium and visual design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 4, Outcome 1c</strong></td>
<td>Student acknowledges authors who provide outside information for their PEM. Student adheres to APA citation expectations throughout the PEM and in his or her accompanying References page. Direct quotes and paraphrasings are purposefully introduced or contextualized throughout the PEM.</td>
<td>Student acknowledges authors who provide outside information for their PEM. Student adheres to APA citation expectations throughout the PEM and in his or her accompanying References page. Direct quotes and paraphrasings are present throughout the PEM, but may not be effectively contextualized.</td>
<td>Student fails to acknowledge authors who provide outside information for their PEM. APA citations are not used properly PEM or accompanying References page. Direct quotes and paraphrasings are either: not present, not properly cited, or not contextualized for readers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 5, Outcome 3a, 3b</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Properly cites and integrates sources.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C: Content Analysis Excerpt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID and Picture</th>
<th>Posted</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Dates Published</th>
<th>Number of Times Ran</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25081</td>
<td>11/07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Would you consider becoming an egg donor? You can help yourself by helping others! If you are between the ages of 20 - 27 and are healthy, dependable, and don't smoke or do drugs then you could help! Please visit our website at fertilityconnections.com to educate yourself about the commitment needed as well as the medical facts involved or give us a call at 415.383.2553. $7000.00 - $7500.00 (plus expenses)</td>
<td>11/3/2011</td>
<td>Not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13772108</td>
<td>11/07</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Help yourself by helping others</strong> <strong>LOCAL EGG DONORS NEEDED</strong></td>
<td>11/3/2011</td>
<td>Not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15135232</td>
<td>11/07</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Help yourself by helping others</strong> <strong>LOCAL EGG DONORS NEEDED</strong></td>
<td>11/21/2011</td>
<td>Not provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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