

Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Student:	Aneta Bošková
Advisor:	Kateřina Chadimová
Title of the thesis:	Incentives for Blood Donation in the Czech Republic: Case Study of Prague

OVERALL ASSESSMENT (provided in English, Czech, or Slovak):

Please provide a short summary of the thesis, your assessment of each of the four key categories, and an overall evaluation and suggested questions for the discussion. The minimum length of the report is 300 words.

Short summary

The thesis by Aneta Boskova ask one important question: Are blood donors demotivated by monetary or non-monetary incentives for blood donation? She approaches this question by analyzing self-collected data. These come from a questionnaire collected at one of the blood donation centers in Prague. Analysis of this data suggests that some blood donors are demotivated by incentives, but the share of such demotivated donors is lower than the one detected in a similar study from Italy. An interesting finding is that the demotivating effect is stronger for women than for men (something that was also predicted by earlier literature) and that the demotivating effect is the strongest among donors whose first donation was triggered by an illness/accident in family or among friends.

Contribution

The question asked in this thesis is very important and, if conducted carefully, the results of the experiment could help choosing the best incentives system. There are, unfortunately, several shortcomings that limit reliability of the presented results. Still, the thesis by Aneta Boskova brings an interesting view on blood donors' behavior.

Methods

Aneta chose to collect data via a self-prepared questionnaire and most of my comments regard the structure and distribution of the questionnaire. The questionnaire is printed in an appendix to the thesis. It consists of 14 questions out of which 7 asked about demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the respondent and 7 asked about blood donations history and motivation. Among the latter there were three questions asking whether the respondent would consider donating more often, same often, less often or never if each donation was rewarded by (a) a lump sum of 500 CZK (b) a voucher to a pharmacy and (c) a small gift. Among the socio-economic questions there was a question about the net monthly income of a respondent (this was fortunately the last question in the survey). I appreciate smart ordering of questions.

I am a bit sceptical about collecting such data through a questionnaire. First, sample selection could be non-random in that just specific donors would choose to return the questionnaire. The author did not comment about this nor did she compare the characteristics of people who returned the questionnaire with the characteristics (at least gender and age?) of all donors who came to the center over the relevant period. Second, simple survey is not the best way of revealing donors' (or other individuals') preferences. Seeing all three questions one after another respondents could cross-coordinate their answers. This is why in the study by Lacetera and Macis (2010) – which has been the inspiration for this thesis – they have prepared two versions of the questionnaire and distributed them randomly among donors. Under this approach each respondent only saw one option (either a lump sum or a voucher or a gift) and his/her answers were not coordinated across potential scenarios. Third, as Aneta acknowledges in the discussion section, answers provided in a survey might not correspond to real behavior. However, I consider this as a minor issue from the point of view of a thesis. Conducting

Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Student:	Aneta Bošková
Advisor:	Kateřina Chadimová
Title of the thesis:	Incentives for Blood Donation in the Czech Republic: Case Study of Prague

a study where real behavior of blood donors would be observed would be organisationally (and morally!!) much more demanding.

The data is analysed using graphical analysis, statistical tests, and regression analysis. This is typical in experimental studies. Graphs are very illustrative, but they only present the structure of the sample. It would be great to present graphs reporting the frequency of answers to the questions about future intended blood donation behavior without any incentive (question 6) and blood donation behavior under different incentives (question 9).

Statistical analysis boils down to reporting a table with frequencies of answers to questions 6 and 9. These are actually the most important numbers in the whole analysis. The table presenting these results is very useful I would just suggest presenting simple frequencies for men and women (i.e. what share of women indicated that they would donate the same) rather than what is currently shown in the table. It is actually not explained in notes to the table, but it looks like distribution of answers among eight groups (men more than before, men same as before, men less than before, men stop donating... and the same for women). Next, the author compares the frequencies of answers in her study with the relevant frequencies from the study of Lacetera and Macis (2010). It is, however, not clear why the Italian study is chosen as a benchmark here.

Regression analysis is done to figure out which individual characteristics predict the demotivating effect of incentives. It is done econometrically correctly. The only missing thing is discussion of whether assumptions necessary for obtaining consistent estimates are satisfied. As written earlier, there might be a concern about random sampling.

The author presents LPM and probit regression results, which is a typical approach. She, however, does not comment which results are more reliable/more informative in her view. R-squared and Pseudo R-squared are reported, but these can not be compared between the models.

Literature

The literature review is very rich and gives the reader a good overview on the topic of blood donation and the role of incentives in it. I would just suggest smoother connection between the literature review and formulation of hypotheses to be tested in this thesis. It seems that the author was strongly motivated by the literature, what is great and should be highlighted in the thesis. Similarly, it should be explained to the reader why the paper by Lacetera and Macis (2010) deserved a separate sub-chapter in the Literature review. It becomes clear only later in the thesis that Aneta's approach has been motivated by their paper.

Manuscript form

The manuscript is generally well-structured and quite easy to follow. It is also written in good English.

Overall evaluation and suggested questions for the discussion during the defense

Overall, the thesis presents an interesting and useful analysis of blood donors' potential reaction to incentives. The biggest weakness of the thesis is the way how data has been collected. The biggest advantage is that such data have been collected and analysed.

In my view, the thesis fulfills the requirements for a bachelor thesis at IES, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, I recommend it for the defense and suggest a grade B."

The results of the Urkund analysis do not indicate significant text similarity with other available sources.

Report on Bachelor / Master Thesis

Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Student:	Aneta Bošková
Advisor:	Kateřina Chadimová
Title of the thesis:	Incentives for Blood Donation in the Czech Republic: Case Study of Prague

SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED (for details, see below):

CATEGORY	POINTS
<i>Contribution</i> (max. 30 points)	25
<i>Methods</i> (max. 30 points)	24
<i>Literature</i> (max. 20 points)	18
<i>Manuscript Form</i> (max. 20 points)	18
TOTAL POINTS (max. 100 points)	85
GRADE (A – B – C – D – E – F)	B

NAME OF THE REFEREE: *Barbara Pertold-Gebicka*

DATE OF EVALUATION: 30.5.2022

Digitálně podepsáno (30.5.2022)

Barbara Pertold-Gebicka

Referee Signature

EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIES AND SCALE:

CONTRIBUTION: *The author presents original ideas on the topic demonstrating critical thinking and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and empirics. There is a distinct value added of the thesis.*

METHODS: *The tools used are relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the author's level of studies. The thesis topic is comprehensively analyzed.*

LITERATURE REVIEW: *The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and command of recent literature. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way.*

MANUSCRIPT FORM: *The thesis is well structured. The student uses appropriate language and style, including academic format for graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables and disposes with a complete bibliography.*

Overall grading:

TOTAL	GRADE
91 – 100	A
81 - 90	B
71 - 80	C
61 – 70	D
51 – 60	E
0 – 50	F