*Results*

The Luth survey company recruited participants to take part in the study. We set a target sample size of 1,500 participants, to be collected in two waves of 750. Luth collects data from participants in 20 minute sessions, and considers a complete survey to be one in which the participant finishes the entire 20-minute session. Because each session contains a number of studies, there is inevitably dropout between the first and last study in the session; this means that although ~1500 participants completed the total 20-minute session session, 2,780 participants completed the target study (“Referrals”) and correctly responded to our pre-registered attention check item. Similarly, although we refer to participants being split into two waves of 750, more than 750 participants completed the target study in each wave. The waves of the study are identified by when data collection began (10/12/18 for wave 1 and on 10/15/2018 for wave 2.)

**Wave 2 Results**

1,305 Wave 2 participants completed the study and correctly answered the pre-registered attention check item. This item was placed at the end of the study and required participants to correctly recall which condition they were assigned to (either the sender of product referrals, or the friend of someone who sent product referrals.)

We conducted a hierarchical linear regression on participants’ responses to the acceptable item, with participants’ responses predicted by condition, referral incentive (no incentive or 10 cent incentive), and their interaction term. Because all participants responded to the critical DV at both levels for referral incentive, responses are nested within participant. We found a significant effect of condition, *z* = -6.84, *b* = -.72, *p* < .001, a significant effect of incentive, *z* = 6.15, *b* = .42, *p* < .001, and a non-significant interaction effect, *z* = 1.44, *b* = .13 *p* = .15.

We likewise conducted a hierarchical linear regression on participants’ responses to the quality item, with participants’ responses predicted by condition, referral incentive (no incentive or 10 cent incentive), and their interaction term. Because all participants responded to the critical DV at both levels for referral incentive, responses are nested within participant. We found no significant effect for condition, *z* = .77, *b* = .08, *p* = .44, a non-significant effect for incentive, *z* = -.48, *b* = -.03 *p* = .63, and a significant interaction effect, *z* = 2.83, *b* = .28, *p* = .005.

The simple comparison for the effect of incentive on ratings of quality among receivers (identified as the key test) is not significant (but the comparison for ratings of quality among referrers does significantly increase):

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

| Contrast Std. Err. z P>|z| [95% Conf. Interval]

-----------------------------+----------------------------------------------------------------

quality\_ |

incentive@condition\_referrer |

(2 vs base) recipient | -.0348259 .0725899 -0.48 0.631 -.1770994 .1074476

(2 vs base) referrer | .2450142 .0672769 3.64 0.000 .1131539 .3768746

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Wave 1 Results**

1,475 Wave 1 participants completed the study and correctly answered the pre-registered attention check item. This item was placed at the end of the study and required participants to correctly recall which condition they were assigned to (either the sender of product referrals, or the friend of someone who sent product referrals.)

We conducted a hierarchical linear regression on participants’ responses to the acceptable item, with participants’ responses predicted by condition, referral incentive (no incentive or 10 cent incentive), and their interaction term. Because all participants responded to the critical DV at both levels for referral incentive, responses are nested within participant. We found a significant effect of condition, *z* = -7.09, *b* = -.71, *p* < .001, a significant effect of incentive, *z* = 5.60, *b* = .36, *p* < .001, and a non-significant interaction effect, *z* = .98, *b* = .09, *p* = .33.

We likewise conducted a hierarchical linear regression on participants’ responses to the quality item, with participants’ responses predicted by condition, referral incentive (no incentive or 10 cent incentive), and their interaction term. Because all participants responded to the critical DV at both levels for referral incentive, responses are nested within participant. We found a no significant effects for condition, *z* = .16, *b* = .02, *p* = .88, a significant effect of incentive, *z* = -2.47, *b* = -.17, *p* = .01, and a significant interaction effect, *b* = .24, *z* = 2.49, *p* = .01.

The simple comparison for the effect of incentive on ratings of quality among receivers (identified as the key test) is significant:

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

| Contrast Std. Err. z P>|z| [95% Conf. Interval]

-----------------------------+----------------------------------------------------------------

quality\_ |

incentive@condition\_referrer |

(2 vs base) recipient | -.1720588 .0697039 -2.47 0.014 -.3086759 -.0354417

(2 vs base) referrer | .0641509 .0644656 1.00 0.320 -.0621992 .1905011

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Total Sample Results**

We conducted a hierarchical linear regression on participants’ responses to the acceptable item, with participants’ responses predicted by condition, referral incentive (no incentive or 10 cent incentive), and their interaction term. Because all participants responded to the critical DV at both levels for referral incentive, responses are nested within participant. We found a significant effect of condition, *z* = -9.85, *b* = -.72, *p* < .001, a significant effect of incentive, *z* = 8.29, *b* = .39, *p* < .001, and a non-significant interaction effect, *z* = 1.70, *b* = .11, *p* = .09.

We likewise conducted a hierarchical linear regression on participants’ responses to the quality item, with participants’ responses predicted by condition, referral incentive (no incentive or 10 cent incentive), and their interaction term. Because all participants responded to the critical DV at both levels for referral incentive, responses are nested within participant. We found no significant effect for condition, *z* = .64, *b* = .05, *p* = .523, a significant effect for incentive, *z* = -2.14, *b* = -.11, *p* = .03, and a significant interaction effect, *b* = .26, *z* = 3.74 *p* < .001.

The simple comparison for the effect of incentive on ratings of quality among receivers (identified as the key test) is significant:

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

| Contrast Std. Err. z P>|z| [95% Conf. Interval]

-----------------------------+----------------------------------------------------------------

quality\_ |

incentive@condition\_referrer |

(2 vs base) recipient | -.1075604 .0503202 -2.14 0.033 -.2061863 -.0089345

(2 vs base) referrer | .1489646 .0465849 3.20 0.001 .0576599 .2402693

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------