First Workshop on Behavioral and Experimental Health Economics Oslo, January 6-7, 2014



The medical game: social preferences and financial incentives in a multitasking environment

Mylène Lagarde, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine

Duane Blaauw, University of Witwatersrand

RESYST RESILIENT & RESPONSIVE HEALTH SYSTEMS

Overview

- Introduction
 - Motivation
 - Related literature
 - Contribution of this paper
- Experimental design
- Results
- Conclusions

Motivation



- Remuneration mechanisms provide key incentives to providers
 - Level of medical services provided
 - Health care expenditures
 - Quality of care provided
- Several ways to pay individual providers
 - Low-powered incentives for quantity of medical services provided
 - Salary
 - Capitation
 - High-powered incentives for quantity of medical services provided
 - FFS

Mixed evidence



- Evidence from field studies is limited (Gosden et al 2001, Scott et al 2012)
 - Some evidence that FFS leads to over-provision of medical services
 - Lack of experimental evidence limits ability to establish causal effect
 - Many confounding factors: institutional characteristics, contextual factors
 - Payment characteristics (e.g. rates)
 - Difficulty to observe some outcomes
 - "Quality" of care provided?
- Altruistic doctors?
 - Isolating impact of patient's welfare on doctor's decisions is impossible

Experimental health economics



- Many advantages of laboratory experiments
- Nascent literature in health economics
 Following Hennig-Schmidt 2011 (JHE)
- All following similar experimental design chosen effort experiment

Experimental literature on incentives



- Chosen effort experiments
 - Participants choose hypothetical level of effort, for which they will be remunerated according to a specified rate and method
- Real effort experiments
 - Simple tasks: e.g. additions, counting letters, data entry
 - Actual effects of real effort: boredom, intrinsic motivation (van Dijk et al. 2001)
 - Closer to real life?
 - people ignore their production function, do repetitive tasks during set period of time – cost of time

This study



- Real effort experiment
 - Data entry over short period of time
 - Framing related to medical world (data entry of medical test results)
- Seeks to mimic more dimension of medical work
 - Multi-tasking environment : quantity of effort and quality of output (substitutes)
 - Some choice over patients seen
 - Differentiated capitation rates
- Explicit evaluation of the impact of the presence of benefits to others

Experimental design overview



- Real effort experiment
 - The "medical effort" task
- Within- and between-subject design
- Experimental procedures



			REF. N	JMBER 3
NA NTC				
	DEGIT AND BIOCHEMISTRY RE	<u>130113</u>		
	Test	Result	Units	Reference Rang
l Blood	Count			
II DIOOU	RED BLOOD CELLS	3.8	$x 10^{12}/L$	4.5 - 6.5
	HAEMOGLOBIN	12.0	a/dL	13.8 - 18.8
	HAEMATOCRIT	34.8	%	40 - 56
	MCV	91.6	fL	79 - 100
	MCH	31.6	pg	27 - 35
	MCHC	34.5	g/dL	29 - 37
	WHITE BLOOD CELLS	3.0	$x 10^9/L$	4.0 - 12.0
	PLATELETS	134	$x 10^9/L$	150 - 450
E				
	SODIUM	142.6	mmol/L	135 - 150
	POTASSIUM	4.9	mmol/L	3.5 - 5.1
	CHLORIDE	101.4	mmol/L	98 - 107
	BICARBONATE	28.2	mmol/L	21 - 29
	UREA	6.4	mmol/L	2.1 - 7.1
	CREATININE	90.3	µmol/L	80 - 115
	tion Tast			
	BILIRUBIN - TOTAL	25.6	umol/L	2 - 26
	BILIRUBIN - CONJUGATED	5.9	umol/L	1 - 7
	ALT	17.3	IU/L	0 - 40
	AST	15.4	IU/L	15 - 40
	ALKALINE PHOSPHATASE	95.2	IU/L	53 - 128
	TOTAL PROTEIN	65.0	g/L	60 - 80
	ALBUMIN	40.7	g/L	35 - 50
	GLOBULIN	24.3	q/L	19 - 35

Long reports: 22 test results to enter

10 out of 15 reports handed out are long (in a given data entry period)



LABORATORY REPORT

HAEMATOLOGY AND BIOCHEM

Full Blood Count

RED BLOOD CELLS HAEMOGLOBIN HAEMATOCRIT MCV MCH MCHC WHITE BLOOD CELLS PLATELETS

Test

U&E

SODIUM POTASSIUM CHLORIDE BICARBONATE UREA CREATININE

Liver Function Test

BILIRUBIN - TOTAL BILIRUBIN - CONJU(ALT AST ALKALINE PHOSPHAT; TOTAL PROTEIN ALBUMIN GLOBULIN

LAB REPORT - D	ATA ENTRY	REF. NU	IMBER:	3	
Full Blood Count		Data already entered	Dat	a to be entered	
	RED BLOOD CELLS				
	HAEMOGLOBIN				
	HAEMATOCRIT				
	MCV				
	MCH				
	MCHC				
	WHITE BLOOD CELLS				
	PLATELETS				
119 5					
Ode	SODILIM				
	POTASSILIM				
	CHLORIDE				
	BICARBONATE				
	LIREA				
	CREATININE				
	0.12.11.11.12				
Liver Function Test					
	BILIRUBIN - TOTAL				
	BILIRUBIN - CONJUGATED				
	ALT				
	AST				
	ALKALINE PHOSPHATASE				
	TOTAL PROTEIN				
	ALBUMIN				
	GLOBULIN				

Your earni



			REF. N	UMBER 2
IAEIVIA		RESULIS		
	Test	Result	Units	Reference Rang
	ad Count			
	RED BLOOD CELLS	3.8	x 10 ¹² /T.	45-65
	HAEMOGLOBIN	12.0	a/dī.	13.8 - 18.8
	HAEMATOCRIT	34.8	8	40 - 56
	MCV	91.6	fL	79 - 100
	MCH	31.6	pg	27 - 35
	MCHC	34.5	g/dL	29 - 37
	WHITE BLOOD CELLS	3.0	$x 10^9/L$	4.0 - 12.0
	PLATELETS	134	$x 10^9/L$	150 - 450
J&E				
	SODIUM	142.6	mmol/L	135 - 150
	POTASSIUM	4.9	mmol/L	3.5 - 5.1
	CHLORIDE	101.4	mmol/L	98 - 107
	BICARBONATE	28.2	mmol/L	21 - 29
	UREA	6.4	mmol/L	2.1 - 7.1
	CREATININE	90.3	µmol/L	80 - 115

Short reports:14 test results to enter

5 out of 15 reports handed out are short (in a given data entry period)







	LABORATORY REI	PORT				
REF	FERENCE NUMBER 4				Remaining	g time [sec]: 430
НА	EMATOLOGY AND BIOCH	In this first period, you are pa You will be paid for each number you enter irrespective of whether or not it is c	id R1 for each number you enter. orrect, and irrespective of whether or not it has already	been entered on the system.	Your earnings so far: R	0
		LAB REPORT - DATA ENTRY	REF. NUMBE	i R : 1		
	Evenu ether report come	ood Count	Data already entered	Data to be entered		
Full	Every other report some	RED BLOOD CELLS HAEMOGLOBIN				
	data is already entered	HAEMATOCRIT				
		MCV				
	on the system: It is	MCH				
	UNNECESSARY to	WHITE BLOOD CELLS				
		PLATELETS				
	enter it again		$\widehat{}$			
		SODIUM	143.4			
118		POTASSIUM	4.9			
	Objective: detecting	BICARBONATE	25.1			
	over-servicing	UREA				
	ever servioling	CREATININE				
	BICARBONAT	Liver Function Test				
	UREA	BILIRUBIN - TOTAL				
	CREATININE	BILIRUBIN - CONJUGATED				
	- Function Test	AST				
		ALKALINE PHOSPHATASE				
	BILIRUBIN	TOTAL PROTEIN				
	ALT	ALBUMIN				
	AST	GLOBULIN				
	AIKALINE PI	RE	CORD DATA			
	TOTAL PROTI		1			
	ALBUMIN 35.	2 g/L 35 - 50				
I	GLOBULIN 21	7 g/L 19 - 35				

Performance measures



Quantity of effort

- Number of items entered
- Number of reports completed

Quality of output

- Number of correct (and necessary) entries
- % of correct entries made (quality index)
- Number of forms for which less than 90% of entries are correctly made (shirking behaviour)

Unintended consequences

- Over-servicing: number of unnecessary entries
- Cheating: dummy =1 when at least 80% of data entries were made with the same single-digit number
- Cream-skimming: dummy detecting propensity to prioritise basic reports first

Experimental design



• Within-subject



• Between subject: 3 x 2 design

	No Patient Benefit	Patient Benefit
No quality-enhancing intervention	BASELINE	PATIENT

Payment schemes - doctor



- Fee-for-service
 - ZAR 1 (USD0.10) for each number entered

"irrespective of whether or not it is correct, and irrespective of whether or not it has already been entered on the system"

- Capitation
 - ZAR 12 (USD1.93) /R15 (USD1.45) for basic/extended report done *"irrespective of whether or not individual entries are correct, and irrespective of whether or not some information has already been entered"*
- Salary
 - ZAR125 (USD12.1) for the period

"does not depend on the number of reports or individual entries you make"

Benefits to patients



- Social benefit treatment only
- R0.50 (USD0.05) for each number entered correctly
- Choice of a list of 6 charities (cancer, TB, HIV, children)
- Money to treat patients

Hypotheses



- 1. FFS leads to highest quantity of services, CAP and salary lead to low quantity of services
- 2. Salary leads to higher quality (low-powered incentive)
- 3. FFS leads to over-servicing
- 4. Adjusted CAP does not yield cream-skimming
- 5. Patient benefit treatment increases quality

Experimental procedures



- Recruitment of medical students
 - Leaflets, advert on web page, invitation in person
- Total of 19 sessions (about 70mn), in a computer lab
- Unique experimenter introducing session, then onscreen instructions
- Average payouts:

	ZAR	USD
Per participant	183.13*	17.20
Total to charities	3551	333.5

*In addition to a ZAR50 (USD4.83) show-up fee

Subject pool



- N=361
- 3rd and 4th year medical students, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg (SA)

	Social Benefit	No Social Benefit
No quality-enhancing intervention	N=66	N=66



Impact of doctor compensation scheme on quantity of effort provided



Baseline PATIENT

Impact of doctor compensation scheme on quantity of effort provided



	Number of it	tems entered	Number of rep	orts completed
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
SAL	-51.636***	-51.636***	-2.045***	-2.045***
	(10.235)	(9.591)	(0.619)	(0.590)
CAP	-11.273	-11.273	-0.318	-0.318
	(10.679)	(9.291)	(0.468)	(0.399)
Period 2		22.455 **		1.061**
		(7.007)		(0.332)
Period 3		22.182***		1.212**
		(5.696)		(0.376)
Constant	199.364***	184.485***	10.682***	9.924***
	(6.536)	(5.011)	(0.336)	(0.360)
Observations	198	198	198	198
\mathbb{R}^2	0.255	0.312	0.209	0.284

Impact of doctor compensation scheme on quantity of effort provided



	Number of items entered			Number of reports completed			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
SAL	-43.061***	-51.636***	-51.636***	-1.826***	-2.045***	-2.045***	
	(8.426)	(10.248)	(9.520)	(0.488)	(0.620)	(0.586)	
CAP	-9.652	-11.273	-11.273	-0.197	-0.318	-0.318	
	(6.958)	(10.692)	(9.140)	(0.292)	(0.469)	(0.392)	
PATIENT	-13.414			-0.818			
	(12.317)			(0.596)			
PATIENT * FFS		-20.212	-20.212		-1.045	-1.045	
		(15.742)	(15.687)		(0.714)	(0.709)	
PATIENT * SAL		-3.061	-3.061		-0.606	-0.606	
		(11.320)	(11.869)		(0.585)	(0.615)	
PATIENT * CAP		-16.970	-16.970		-0.803	-0.803	
		(13 342)	(12572)		(0.684)	(0.639)	
Period 2		(10:012)	25 902***			1 295***	
			(6,700)			(0.318)	
Period 3			24 773***			1 386***	
1 01100 0			(3.945)			(0.180)	
Constant	195 965***	199 36/***	189 /79***	10 568***	10 689***	9 788***	
Constant	(18320)	(10,010)	(10.178)	(0.883)	(0.964)	(0.956)	
	(10.320)	(19.910)	(19.170)	(0.003)	(0.304)	(0.950)	
Observations	396	396	396	396	396	396	
\mathbb{R}^2	0.211	0.220	0.308	0.189	0.191	0.304	







Impact of doctor compensation scheme on quality of output

	Number of correct entries		Quality index		Shirking behaviour	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
SAL	15.868***	14.613***	0.095^{***}	0.096^{**}	-1.225^{***}	-1.144^{**}
CAP	(4.276) 8.572* (4.536)	(4.490) 8.298* (4.304)	(0.027) 0.045 (0.026)	(0.030) 0.046 (0.027)	(0.358) (0.351)	(0.376) -0.534 (0.338)
Period 2	(1.000)	3.700 (5.316)	(0.020)	(0.021) (0.007) (0.031)	(0.001)	-0.203 (0.238)
Period 3		10.525 (7.363)		0.001 (0.044)		-0.667 (0.396)
Entries made	-0.393** (0.128)	-0.417** (0.135)	-0.004*** (0.001)	-0.004*** (0.001)		
Completed reports					$\begin{array}{c} 1.423^{***} \\ (0.139) \end{array}$	1.463*** (0.122)
Constant	143.267*** (24.047)	143.372*** (24.585)	$\begin{array}{c} 1.186^{***} \\ (0.161) \end{array}$	$1.185^{***} \\ (0.162)$	-7.370*** (1.468)	-7.505*** (1.351)
Observations R ²	$\begin{array}{c} 198 \\ 0.403 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 198\\ 0.419\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 198 \\ 0.617 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 198\\ 0.618\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 198 \\ 0.786 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 198 \\ 0.793 \end{array}$

Impact of doctor compensation scheme on quality of output

	Numbe	er of correct	entries	(Quality index			rking behavi	iour
-	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
SAL	16.089***	19.100***	17.482***	0.092***	0.082***	0.081**	-1.298***	-1.520***	-1.456***
	(1.991)	(5.463)	(5.731)	(0.016)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.160)	(0.345)	(0.364)
CAP	8.816***	9.277**	8.924**	0.048***	0.043*	0.042*	-0.619***	-0.593*	-0.583*
	(3.137)	(4.019)	(3.748)	(0.016)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.177)	(0.322)	(0.316)
PATIENT	19.769*** (6.240)	(NR) 98	20740 - 56	0.088*** (0.026)	58 - 3X	NG) 92	-0.957** (0.379)	12 H	
PATIENT * FFS	22	22.022***	21.389***	10 II.	0.078**	0.077**		-1.087***	-1.054***
		(7.769)	(7.869)		(0.034)	(0.033)		(0.333)	(0.336)
PATIENT * SAL		16.247*	16.151*		0.097**	0.097**		-0.649	-0.630
		(8.777)	(9.064)		(0.041)	(0.041)		(0.571)	(0.587)
PATIENT * CAP		21.154***	20.622***		0.088***	0.088***		-1.139**	-1.114**
		(6.632)	(6.475)		(0.028)	(0.027)		(0.487)	(0.486)
Period 2			5.183*			-0.004			-0.159
			(2.974)			(0.016)			(0.145)
Period 3			13.282***			0.018			-0.635**
			(3.912)			(0.025)			(0.264)
Entries made	-0.333***	-0.330***	-0.362***	-0.004***	-0.004***	-0.004***			
	(0.070)	(0.067)	(0.070)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)			
Completed reports							1.281***	1.279***	1.310***
							(0.066)	(0.064)	(0.062)
Constant	132.455***	130.790***	130.880***	1.231***	1.237***	1.236***	-5.914***	-5.830***	-5.898***
	(10.982)	(9.406)	(10.011)	(0.055)	(0.050)	(0.050)	(0.652)	(0.564)	(0.559)
Observations	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396	396
R ²	0.407	0.408	0.448	0.684	0.685	0.687	0.787	0.788	0.797

Quantity-quality trade-offs

Quantity-quality trade-offs

B – **PATIENT** treatment

Undesirable behaviours

Impact on undesirable behaviours

	Over-servicing		Gamir	Gaming rate		kimming
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
SAL	-2.163**	-2.213**	-0.084***	-0.077***	-0.186	-0.243
	(0.763)	(0.846)	(0.018)	(0.021)	(0.969)	(0.989)
CAP	-2.216***	-2.226***	-0.033	-0.032	0.828	0.782
	(0.551)	(0.537)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.892)	(0.908)
Period 2		0.159		-0.013		-0.465
		(0.856)		(0.018)		(0.856)
Period 3		0.400		-0.058*		-0.754
		(1.105)		(0.029)		(0.916)
Entries made	0.105^{***}	0.104***			-0.013*	-0.012
	(0.006)	(0.008)			(0.008)	(0.008)
Completed reports			0.066***	0.069***		
			(0.009)	(0.008)		
Constant	-5.702***	-5.698***	-0.356***	-0.368***	-2.402	-2.221
	(1.313)	(1.293)	(0.094)	(0.083)	(1.665)	(1.697)
Observations	198	198	198	198	198	198
\mathfrak{R}^2	0.698	0.698	0.563	0.578	-41.59	-41.21

Impact on undesirable behaviours

	Over-servicing			Gaming rate		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
SAL	-1.967***	-2.860***	-2.832***	-0.058***	-0.087***	-0.082***
	(0.375)	(0.825)	(0.834)	(0.012)	(0.025)	(0.027)
CAP	-2.107***	-2.368***	-2.362***	-0.019	-0.033	-0.033
	(0.412)	(0.581)	(0.558)	(0.017)	(0.025)	(0.026)
PATIENT	-0.330			-0.063**		
	(0.820)			(0.027)		
PATIENT * FFS		-1.084	-1.073		-0.092**	-0.090**
		(1.041)	(1.061)		(0.046)	(0.045)
PATIENT * SAL		0.642	0.644		-0.035	-0.033
		(0.849)	(0.848)		(0.023)	(0.024)
PATIENT * CAP		-0.576	-0.567		-0.064*	-0.062*
		(1.194)	(1.199)		(0.037)	(0.037)
Period 2			-0.508			-0.028***
			(0.405)			(0.010)
Period 3			0.186			-0.065***
			(0.750)			(0.009)
Entries made	0.092***	0.091***	0.092***			
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)			
Completed reports				0.064***	0.064***	0.066***
				(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.005)
Constant	-3.520***	-3.011***	-3.012***	-0.353***	-0.337***	- 0.334***
	(0.736)	(0.968)	(0.880)	(0.042)	(0.045)	(0.046)
Observations	396	396	396	396	396	396
\mathbb{R}^2	0.574	0.578	0.581	0.560	0.565	0.586

Benefit-cost ratios

	Salary	CAP	FFS
PANEL A: Baseline treatment			
Total cost (in ZAR)	125.00	190.75	199.36
Total number of items entered	147.73	188.09	199.36
Benefit cost ratio	1.18	0.99	1.00
Total number of items correctly entered	101.11	77.95	64.95
Benefit cost ratio	0.81	0.41	0.33
PANEL B: Social benefit treatment			
Total cost (in ZAR)	125.00	176.52	179.15
Total number of items entered	144.67	171.12	179.15
Benefit cost ratio	1.16	0.97	1.00
Total number of items correctly entered	118.36	104.71	93.65
Benefit cost ratio	0.95	0.59	0.52

Summary of results

- Confirm some theoretical predictions
 - FFS leads to highest quantity of effort
 - Low-powered incentives (salary) leads to higher quality (non-incentivised)
 - Quantity-quality trade-off
 - Over-servicing when high powered incentives linked to quantity
- Support models of altruistic physicians
- Results less clear for Incentives of CAP because instructions not clear enough?

Future work

- Finish analysis of rest of the data!
 - Impact of quality-enhancing mechanisms (public reporting, bonus)
 - Determinants of self-selection into remuneration schemes
- Future research
 - More analysis of quantity-quality trade-offs in health care context (seeing more patients vs. spending more time with them)?
 - Efficiency frontier of individual physicians

Thank you

