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## Introduction

The Commonwealth Fund Health Care Opinion Leaders (HCOL) Survey was conducted by Harris Interactive on behalf of The Commonwealth Fund and Modern Healthcare, with responses from a broad group of 289 opinion leaders in health policy and innovators in health care delivery and finance. This was the ninth in a series of surveys designed to highlight leaders' perspectives on the most timely health policy issues facing the nation. This survey focused on priorities for the new Congress.

## Summary

The U.S. health care system is in what many experts would call a crisis due, in large part, to the ever-increasing number of Americans living without health care coverage. Health insurance, health care costs, and the quality of care are pressing issues in policy circles-and in American homes. As in the HCOL survey conducted in January 2006, we asked leaders to share their views on the health care issues Congress should prioritize in the next five years. Once again, there is broad consensus among health care opinion leaders that expanding coverage to the uninsured is of great importance, with eight of 10 leaders describing this issue as absolutely essential or very important. The issue is the priority most often referred to as absolutely essential or very important among all four groups of leaders in the survey: academic/research institutions (90\%), health care delivery (83\%), government/labor/consumer advocacy (84\%), and business/insurance/other health care industry (80 \%).

The other issues most often referred to as absolutely essential or very important are: ensuring Medicare's long-run solvency (80\%), expanding the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) (76\%), moderating the rise in health care costs (81\%), and increasing the use of information technology (80\%).

Health care opinion leaders see many achievable and desirable goals/targets for policy action within the next 10 years. Along the lines of expanding coverage for the uninsured, health care leaders would also like to reduce the proportion of the under-65 population that has no health insurance from 18 percent to 5 percent in the next decade, and think it can be done with the appropriate policy changes. They also favor decreasing the proportion of households spending more than 10 percent of their income on out-of-pocket health care costs and premiums from the current 17 percent to 10 percent in 10 years, while holding the total cost of health care as a proportion of gross domestic product (GDP) at the current figure of 16 percent.

The leaders also believe that the proportions of recommended care that children and adults receive can be dramatically increased (from the current $44 \%$ and $55 \%$, respectively, to $80 \%$ and $75 \%$ ) in the next 10 years, with similar increases in the proportions of recommended preventive
care that both children and adults receive (from the current $43 \%$ and $49 \%$, respectively, to $85 \%$ and $75 \%$ ).

As a whole, almost three of five health care leaders think that mandating that all individuals buy coverage and providing subsidies and a pooled mechanism for the uninsured to purchase affordable insurance (57\%) and providing federal matching funds for Medicaid/SCHIP coverage of adults below 150 percent of the federal poverty level and children below 300 percent of poverty (57\%) would be extremely or very effective ways to expand coverage, with establishing a single-payer insurance system run by the federal government (54\%) and covering everyone under Medicare (53\%) receiving slightly less support. Other options that were judged extremely/very effective by at least half of health care opinion leaders included: requiring employers who don't provide coverage to contribute to a fund that would pay for such coverage, and allowing individuals and small businesses to buy into the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program or a similar federal group option. By contrast only 14 percent think promoting tax-free health savings accounts would be an extremely/very effective way to expand coverage, and only 13 percent think permitting association health plans to provide coverage without state licensing restrictions would be extremely/very effective at expanding coverage.

While health care opinion leaders clearly agree on the need to expand coverage of the uninsured, they differ somewhat on what kind of reforms would be most effective in doing so. Among leaders from academic/research institutions, the top two choices as extremely or very effective options were establishing a single-payer insurance system run by the federal government (66\%) and covering everyone under Medicare (63\%), although a majority of leaders in this group also indicated that several other options had promise.

By contrast, leaders from both the health care delivery and business/insurance/other health care industry sectors most often responded that mandating all individuals to buy coverage and providing subsidies and a pooled mechanism for the uninsured to purchase affordable insurance ( $62 \%$ and $57 \%$, respectively) would be extremely or very effective, with providing federal matching funds for Medicaid/SCHIP coverage of adults below 150 percent and children below 300 percent of the poverty line ( $58 \%$ and $53 \%$, respectively) also viewed as a promising option.

Meanwhile, the options viewed as most promising by leaders from the government/labor/consumer advocacy sector were requiring employers who don't provide coverage to contribute to a fund that would pay for coverage (62\%), with establishing a singlepayer insurance system run by the federal government (54\%), covering everyone under Medicare (54\%), and opening up Medicare to everyone not covered by an employer plan (54\%) also viewed as potentially effective options.

In addition to the high number of uninsured, the relentless increase in health care costs is seen as presenting a major challenge to the nation's health care system. When asked to assess a list of potential approaches to control health care costs and improve the quality of care, three of four health care leaders report that reducing inappropriate care would be extremely or very effective. The biggest support for this approach came from members of the business/insurance/other health care industry (83\%). Other approaches that health care leaders most often thought would be extremely or very effective are use of evidence-based guidelines to determine whether a test or procedure should be done (70\%), increased and more effective use of information technology
(66\%), increased use of disease and care management strategies for the chronically ill (65\%), and rewarding providers who are more efficient and provide higher-quality care (61\%).

Detailed findings are provided below.

## Key Findings

## IMPORTANCE OF HEALTH CARE ISSUES FOR CONGRESS (Table 1)

Health care policy opinion leaders were asked to indicate which health care issues were absolutely essential or very important for Congress to address in the next five years, based on a list of 17 issues.

Expanding health insurance coverage to the uninsured is considered absolutely essential or very important for Congress to address by 88 percent of health care opinion leaders. There is near consensus among all sectors, with between 80 percent and 90 percent indicating this particular issue as absolutely essential/very important for Congress to address. Among the business/insurance/other health care industry leaders, 80 percent thought this issue to be absolutely essential or very important while 90 percent of health care opinion leaders from academic or research institutions thought so.

- Other issues thought to be most important for Congress to address included: reforming Medicare to ensure its long-run solvency (with $80 \%$ indicating it as absolutely essential or very important); expanding the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) to reach all uninsured children (76\%); enacting reforms to moderate the rising costs of health care for the nation (81\%); and increasing the use of information technology to improve the quality and safety of care ( $80 \%$ ).


## ACHIEVABLE/DESIRABLE GOALS FOR POLICY ACTION (Table 2)

Health care policy opinion leaders were asked what they see as both an achievable and desirable goal or target for policy action within the next 10 years, based on a list of seven goals/targets.

- Currently, the proportion of the under-65 population that has no health insurance is 18 percent. Health care opinion leaders aim to decrease this number to 5 percent within the next 10 years. Over the same time frame, they would like to-and believe it is possible to-decrease the proportion of households spending more than 10 percent of their household income on out-of-pocket health care costs and premiums from the current 17 percent to 10 percent.
- Currently, adults receive little more than half (55\%) of the recommended care and children receive less than half (44\%). Leaders are in agreement that increasing those proportions to 75 percent and 80 percent, respectively, is an achievable goal in the next 10 years. The proportions of recommended preventive care received by adults and children are even lower ( $49 \%$ and $43 \%$, respectively), but the 10 -year goals would be to increase those proportions to 75 percent and 85 percent.
- Health care opinion leaders foresee the total cost of health care as a percentage of GDP staying about the same over the next 10 years.
- With regard to achievable and desirable goals, all sectors provided similar responses.


## EFFECTIVENESS OF PROPOSED APPROACHES TO CONTROLLING RISING

 HEALTH CARE COSTS (Table 3)Health care opinion leaders were asked to identify the approaches that they think will be effective in controlling the rising costs of health care and improving the quality of care, based on a list of 19 approaches.

- Three of four (75\%) surveyed health care opinion leaders think that reducing inappropriate medical care will be effective/very effective in controlling rising costs of health care and will improve the quality of care. This is the case across all sectors, with business/insurance/other health care industry viewing this option most favorably (83\%). Also, using evidence-based guidelines to determine whether a test or procedure should be done ( $70 \%$ ), increased and more effective use of technology ( $66 \%$ ), increased use of disease and care management strategies for the chronically ill (65\%), and rewarding providers who are more efficient and provide higher-quality care (61\%) all followed closely behind, capturing the majority of support across all sectors.
- The approach least considered effective/very effective is requiring consumers to pay a substantially higher share of their health care costs (16\%).


## EFFECTIVENESS OF REFORMS TO EXPAND COVERAGE FOR UNINSURED

 (Table 4)Health care opinion leaders were asked to identify which reform would be effective in expanding coverage for the uninsured, based on a list of 15 reforms.

- Health care leaders' support was spread across the reform options presented. Almost three of five leaders support mandating that all individuals buy coverage and providing subsidies and a pooled mechanism for the uninsured to purchase affordable insurance (57\%), and providing federal matching funds for Medicaid/SCHIP coverage of adults below 150 percent and children below 300 percent of poverty (57\%). These approaches were viewed as promising by a majority of the leaders in each sector.
- Other reforms viewed favorably by a majority of leaders were establishing a single-payer insurance system run by the federal government (54\%) and covering everyone under Medicare (53\%). Approximately two of three (66\%) leaders from academic/research institutions support establishing a single-payer insurance system run by the federal government.
- In general, health care opinion leaders from the health care delivery sector and business/insurance/other health care industry tended to favor a combination of publicprivate mixed approaches, such as mandated individual responsibility with subsidies for the uninsured and federal matching funds for low-income adults and children under Medicaid/SCHIP.
- Options such as promoting tax-free health savings accounts and permitting association health plans to provide coverage without state licensing restrictions were viewed as extremely or very effective by only 14 percent and 13 percent, respectively, of health care
opinion leaders. While opinion leaders from business/insurance/other health care industry were somewhat more supportive, only two of 10 viewed these options as extremely or very effective.


## About the Respondents

Respondents come from a broad range of employment positions and settings. For analytical purposes we combined respondents into four sectors (for a more detailed description of respondents' place of employment please refer to Table 6):

- Academic/Research Institutions (48\%)*
- Health Care Delivery (33\%),* including medical societies or professional associations, allied health societies or professional associations or organizations, hospital or related professional associations or organizations, hospitals, nursing homes/long-term care facilities, clinics, and physician or other clinical practices.
- Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry (33\%),* including health insurance, pharmaceutical, other industries/businesses, and health care improvement organizations.
- Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy (13\%),* including government, labor, and consumer advocacy.**

Respondents are teachers, researchers, or professors (30\%), CEOs or presidents (27\%), policy analysts (25\%), or administration/management (25\%), followed by physicians (18\%), consultants (11\%), or health care purchasers (10\%). Others work as consumer advocates (9\%), department head/deans (7\%), or foundation officers (6\%). Most respondents agreed to be named by The Commonwealth Fund as one of the survey participants (87\%).

* Percentages add up to more than 100 as respondents were able to give more than one answer. ** Because the sample sizes for these groups were so small, we combined respondents who identified themselves as working for government, labor, or consumer advocacy into one group.

TABLE 1

## IMPORTANCE OF HEALTH CARE ISSUES FOR CONGRESS

"How important do you think the following health care issues are for Congress to address in the next five years?"
Base: 289 Respondents

|  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{n}=289) \end{array}$ | Academic/ <br> Research Inst. $(\mathrm{n}=138)$ | Health <br> Care <br> Delivery $(\mathrm{n}=95)$ | Business/ Insurance/Othe $r$ Health care Industry ( $\mathrm{n}=94$ ) | Government/ <br> Labor/ <br> Consumer <br> Advocacy $(\mathrm{n}=37)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Expand coverage for the uninsured | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 88 | 90 | 83 | 80 | 84 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 60 | 63 | 59 | 47 | 57 |
|  | Very important | 28 | 27 | 24 | 33 | 27 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 11 | 9 | 15 | 18 | 14 |
|  | Somewhat important | 11 | 9 | 14 | 17 | 11 |
|  | Not at all important | * | - | 1 | 1 | 3 |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Reform Medicare to ensure its long-run solvency | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 80 | 75 | 87 | 87 | 65 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 44 | 42 | 53 | 44 | 43 |
|  | Very important | 36 | 33 | 35 | 44 | 22 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 18 | 22 | 11 | 9 | 30 |
|  | Somewhat important | 17 | 19 | 9 | 9 | 27 |
|  | Not at all important | 2 | 4 | 1 | - | 3 |
|  | No response | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
| Expand the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) to reach all uninsured children | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 76 | 78 | 71 | 70 | 76 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 42 | 48 | 43 | 31 | 30 |
|  | Very important | 34 | 30 | 27 | 39 | 46 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 22 | 19 | 27 | 28 | 22 |
|  | Somewhat important | 20 | 15 | 25 | 26 | 22 |
|  | Not at all important | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | - |
|  | No response | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Enact reforms to moderate the rising costs of health care for the nation | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 81 | 83 | 85 | 74 | 84 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 41 | 43 | 45 | 40 | 51 |
|  | Very important | 40 | 39 | 40 | 34 | 32 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 17 | 16 | 14 | 22 | 11 |
|  | Somewhat important | 15 | 14 | 12 | 19 | 8 |
|  | Not at all important | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
|  | No response | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| Increase the use of information technology to improve the quality and safety of care | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 80 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 81 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 39 | 36 | 45 | 43 | 35 |
|  | Very important | 40 | 39 | 35 | 43 | 46 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 19 | 23 | 19 | 13 | 16 |
|  | Somewhat important | 17 | 20 | 16 | 12 | 16 |
|  | Not at all important | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | - |
|  | No response | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

## TABLE 1 (continued) <br> IMPORTANCE OF HEALTH CARE ISSUES FOR CONGRESS

"How important do you think the following health care issues are for Congress to address in the next five years?"
Base: 289 Respondents

|  |  | Total ( $\mathrm{n}=289$ ) | Academic/ <br> Research Inst. $(\mathrm{n}=138)$ | Health Care Delivery $(\mathrm{n}=95)$ | Business/ <br> Insurance/ <br> Other Health care <br> Industry ( $\mathrm{n}=94$ ) | Government/ <br> Labor/ <br> Consumer <br> Advocacy $(\mathrm{n}=37)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Simplify and standardize the health insurance process to reduce administrative costs | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 60 | 58 | 79 | 55 | 46 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 31 | 34 | 46 | 23 | 16 |
|  | Very important | 29 | 24 | 33 | 32 | 30 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 39 | 41 | 20 | 43 | 51 |
|  | Somewhat important | 33 | 33 | 19 | 35 | 51 |
|  | Not at all important | 6 | 7 | 1 | 7 | - |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Address the shortage of trained health professionals (e.g., primary care physicians and nurses) | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 70 | 63 | 81 | 69 | 78 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 30 | 27 | 46 | 31 | 19 |
|  | Very important | 40 | 36 | 35 | 38 | 59 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 29 | 36 | 18 | 29 | 19 |
|  | Somewhat important | 24 | 29 | 17 | 21 | 19 |
|  | Not at all important | 5 | 7 | 1 | 7 | - |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Ensure that families are not exposed to excessive out-ofpocket costs in relation to income | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 75 | 76 | 72 | 66 | 78 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 27 | 33 | 19 | 22 | 24 |
|  | Very important | 48 | 43 | 53 | 44 | 54 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 24 | 22 | 27 | 32 | 19 |
|  | Somewhat important | 22 | 20 | 26 | 30 | 19 |
|  | Not at all important | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | - |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Control the rising cost of prescription drugs | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 66 | 66 | 74 | 61 | 68 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 27 | 30 | 29 | 27 | 16 |
|  | Very important | 39 | 36 | 44 | 34 | 51 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 33 | 32 | 25 | 36 | 30 |
|  | Somewhat important | 28 | 27 | 23 | 31 | 30 |
|  | Not at all important | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | - |
|  | No response | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Reform Medicare payment to reward performance on quality and efficiency | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 64 | 64 | 65 | 67 | 65 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 24 | 21 | 25 | 32 | 19 |
|  | Very important | 40 | 43 | 40 | 35 | 46 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 35 | 35 | 34 | 31 | 32 |
|  | Somewhat important | 31 | 29 | 28 | 29 | 32 |
|  | Not at all important | 4 | 6 | 5 | 2 | - |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

## TABLE 1 (continued) <br> IMPORTANCE OF HEALTHCARE ISSUES FOR CONGRESS

"How important do you think the following health care issues are for Congress to address in the next five years?"
Base: 289 Respondents

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{n}=289) \end{gathered}$ | Academic/ <br> Research <br> Inst. (n=138) | Health <br> Care Delivery (n=95) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Business/ } \\ \text { Insurance/ } \\ \text { Other Health } \\ \text { care } \\ \text { Industry } \\ (\mathrm{n}=94) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy ( $\mathrm{n}=37$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Narrow the gap between payments for primary care providers' and specialists' services | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 54 | 55 | 62 | 56 | 57 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 24 | 22 | 37 | 23 | 16 |
|  | Very important | 30 | 33 | 25 | 33 | 41 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 45 | 43 | 36 | 41 | 38 |
|  | Somewhat important | 35 | 33 | 28 | 33 | 35 |
|  | Not at all important | 9 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 3 |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Reduce racial/ethnic disparities in care | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 64 | 67 | 66 | 55 | 65 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 24 | 29 | 31 | 17 | 8 |
|  | Very important | 40 | 38 | 36 | 38 | 57 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 34 | 30 | 32 | 43 | 32 |
|  | Somewhat important | 31 | 28 | 26 | 39 | 32 |
|  | Not at all important | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | - |
|  | No response | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Improve Medicaid coverage | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 60 | 64 | 64 | 46 | 65 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 18 | 22 | 17 | 10 | 19 |
|  | Very important | 42 | 42 | 47 | 36 | 46 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 38 | 34 | 35 | 51 | 32 |
|  | Somewhat important | 34 | 31 | 29 | 43 | 32 |
|  | Not at all important | 4 | 3 | 5 | 9 | - |
|  | No response | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Reform the system for handling malpractice complaints, judgments, and awards | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 43 | 31 | 65 | 54 | 30 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 17 | 9 | 31 | 22 | 11 |
|  | Very important | 26 | 22 | 35 | 32 | 19 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 56 | 67 | 34 | 44 | 68 |
|  | Somewhat important | 41 | 47 | 29 | 33 | 54 |
|  | Not at all important | 15 | 20 | 4 | 11 | 14 |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Improve the quality and efficiency of nursing home and long-term care | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 61 | 67 | 64 | 55 | 59 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 16 | 19 | 18 | 10 | 14 |
|  | Very important | 46 | 49 | 46 | 46 | 46 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 38 | 31 | 35 | 43 | 38 |
|  | Somewhat important | 36 | 29 | 35 | 41 | 38 |
|  | Not at all important | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | - |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

TABLE 1 (continued)

## IMPORTANCE OF HEALTH CARE ISSUES FOR CONGRESS

"How important do you think the following health care issues are for Congress to address in the next five years?"
Base: 289 Respondents

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{n}=289) \end{gathered}$ | Academic/ Research Inst. ( $\mathrm{n}=138$ ) | Health Care Delivery $(\mathrm{n}=95)$ | Business/ Insurance/ Other Health care Industry ( $\mathrm{n}=94$ ) | Government/ <br> Labor/ <br> Consumer <br> Advocacy (n=37) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Control Medicaid costs | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 58 | 51 | 66 | 61 | 57 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 13 | 11 | 13 | 18 | 14 |
|  | Very important | 45 | 41 | 54 | 43 | 43 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 41 | 46 | 33 | 37 | 41 |
|  | Somewhat important | 35 | 38 | 28 | 33 | 38 |
|  | Not at all important | 6 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
|  | No response | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 3 |
| Provide incentives for individuals and employers to encourage the purchase of longterm care insurance | Absolutely essential/Very important (net) | 27 | 23 | 35 | 23 | 24 |
|  | Absolutely essential | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
|  | Very important | 22 | 18 | 31 | 21 | 19 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all important (net) | 72 | 75 | 63 | 74 | 73 |
|  | Somewhat important | 49 | 53 | 49 | 47 | 51 |
|  | Not at all important | 23 | 22 | 14 | 28 | 22 |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |

TABLE 2
ACHIEVABLE/DESIREABLE GOALS FOR POLICY ACTION
"What would you see as both an achievable and desirable goal or target for policy action within the next 10 years?"

Base: 289 Respondents

| Median Percentage | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{n}=289) \end{gathered}$ | Academic/ Research Inst. ( $\mathrm{n}=138$ ) | Health Care Delivery ( $\mathrm{n}=95$ ) | Business/ Insurance/Ot her Health care Industry $(\mathrm{n}=94)$ | Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy ( $\mathrm{n}=37$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Proportion of under-65 population that has no health insurance (Currently: 18\%) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 8 |
| Total cost of health care as a percentage of GDP (Currently: 16\%) | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 |
| Proportion of households spending more than 10 percent of their household income ( 5 percent for low-income households) on out-of-pocket health care costs and premiums (Currently: 17\%) | 10 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 10 |
| Proportion of recommended care adults receive (Currently: 55\%) | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| Proportion of recommended care children receive <br> (Currently: 44\%) | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 |
| Proportion of recommended preventive care adults receive (Currently: 49\%) | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| Proportion of recommended preventive care children receive (Currently: 43\%) | 85 | 85 | 90 | 85 | 85 |

TABLE 3

## EFFECTIVENESS OF PROPOSED APPROACHES IN CONTROLLING RISING HEALTH CARE COSTS

"Below is a list of approaches that have been proposed to control the rising costs of health care and improve the quality of care. How effective do you think each of these approaches would be?"
Base: 289 Respondents

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{n}=289) \end{gathered}$ | Academic/ Research Inst. (n=138) | Health Care Delivery ( $\mathrm{n}=95$ ) | Business/ Insurance/ Other Health care Industry $(\mathrm{n}=94)$ | Government/ <br> Labor/ <br> Consumer <br> Advocacy <br> ( $\mathrm{n}=37$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Reduce inappropriate medical care | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 75 | 72 | 76 | 83 | 73 |
|  | Extremely effective | 31 | 28 | 33 | 39 | 32 |
|  | Very effective | 44 | 44 | 43 | 44 | 41 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 24 | 27 | 24 | 17 | 22 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 22 | 25 | 23 | 17 | 22 |
|  | Not at all effective | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | - | - | 5 |
| Use evidence-based guidelines to determine whether a test or procedure should be done | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 70 | 63 | 69 | 79 | 78 |
|  | Extremely effective | 26 | 17 | 25 | 36 | 19 |
|  | Very effective | 43 | 46 | 44 | 43 | 59 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 30 | 37 | 31 | 21 | 19 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 26 | 33 | 26 | 16 | 19 |
|  | Not at all effective | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | - |
|  | No response | * | - | - | - | 3 |
| Increased and more effective use of information technology | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 66 | 62 | 68 | 69 | 54 |
|  | Extremely effective | 29 | 30 | 34 | 33 | 22 |
|  | Very effective | 37 | 31 | 35 | 36 | 32 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 34 | 38 | 32 | 31 | 43 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 31 | 33 | 31 | 30 | 41 |
|  | Not at all effective | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
|  | No response | * | - | - | - | 3 |
| Increase the use of disease and care management strategies for the chronically ill | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 65 | 58 | 73 | 67 | 62 |
|  | Extremely effective | 21 | 14 | 33 | 26 | 5 |
|  | Very effective | 45 | 43 | 40 | 41 | 57 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 34 | 42 | 27 | 33 | 35 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 31 | 38 | 24 | 32 | 30 |
|  | Not at all effective | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
|  | No response | * | - | - | - | 3 |
| Reward providers who are more efficient and provide higher quality care | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 61 | 57 | 63 | 67 | 65 |
|  | Extremely effective | 27 | 21 | 27 | 35 | 16 |
|  | Very effective | 34 | 36 | 36 | 32 | 49 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 38 | 43 | 36 | 33 | 32 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 34 | 37 | 33 | 31 | 32 |
|  | Not at all effective | 4 | 7 | 3 | 2 | - |
|  | No response | 1 | - | 1 | - | 3 |

TABLE 3 (continued)

## EFFECTIVENESS OF PROPOSED APPROACHES IN CONTROLLING RISING HEALTH CARE COSTS

"Below is a list of approaches that have been proposed to control the rising costs of health care and improve the quality of care. How effective do you think each of these approaches would
be?"
Base: 289 Respondents

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{n}=289) \end{gathered}$ | Academic/ Research Inst. ( $\mathrm{n}=138$ ) | Health Care Delivery $(\mathrm{n}=95)$ | Business/ <br> Insurance/ <br> Other Health <br> care <br> Industry <br> $(\mathrm{n}=94)$ | Government/ <br> Labor/ <br> Consumer <br> Advocacy $(\mathrm{n}=37)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Allow Medicare to negotiate drug prices | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 57 | 60 | 67 | 49 | 51 |
|  | Extremely effective | 28 | 35 | 35 | 19 | 22 |
|  | Very effective | 29 | 25 | 33 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 42 | 38 | 33 | 51 | 46 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 29 | 28 | 26 | 27 | 41 |
|  | Not at all effective | 13 | 11 | 6 | 24 | 5 |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | - | - | 3 |
| Reduce administrative costs of insurers and providers | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 54 | 57 | 73 | 46 | 41 |
|  | Extremely effective | 28 | 29 | 48 | 21 | 27 |
|  | Very effective | 25 | 28 | 24 | 24 | 14 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 46 | 43 | 27 | 54 | 57 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 39 | 36 | 26 | 46 | 51 |
|  | Not at all effective | 7 | 7 | 1 | 9 | 5 |
|  | No response | * | - | - | - | 3 |
| Establish a public/private mechanism to produce and disseminate information of effectiveness and best practices | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 54 | 49 | 56 | 59 | 49 |
|  | Extremely effective | 18 | 12 | 26 | 26 | 11 |
|  | Very effective | 36 | 38 | 29 | 33 | 38 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 46 | 50 | 44 | 41 | 49 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 39 | 41 | 39 | 36 | 46 |
|  | Not at all effective | 7 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | - | - | 3 |
| Have all payers, including private insurers, Medicare, and Medicaid, adopt common payment methods or rates | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 51 | 50 | 52 | 51 | 51 |
|  | Extremely effective | 21 | 20 | 29 | 19 | 14 |
|  | Very effective | 30 | 30 | 22 | 32 | 38 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 48 | 50 | 48 | 49 | 46 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 34 | 36 | 36 | 33 | 38 |
|  | Not at all effective | 15 | 14 | 13 | 16 | 8 |
|  | No response | * | - | - | - | 3 |
| Consolidate purchasing power by public and private insurers working together to moderate rising costs of care | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 50 | 50 | 52 | 48 | 62 |
|  | Extremely effective | 15 | 13 | 15 | 20 | 19 |
|  | Very effective | 35 | 37 | 37 | 28 | 43 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 49 | 50 | 47 | 52 | 35 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 37 | 39 | 37 | 35 | 22 |
|  | Not at all effective | 12 | 11 | 11 | 17 | 14 |
|  | No response | 1 | - | 1 | - | 3 |

TABLE 3 (continued)

## EFFECTIVENESS OF PROPOSED APPROACHES IN CONTROLLING RISING HEALTH CARE COSTS

"Below is a list of approaches that have been proposed to control the rising costs of health care and improve the quality of care. How effective do you think each of these approaches would
be?"
Base: 289 Respondents

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{n}=289) \end{gathered}$ | Academic/ Research Inst. ( $\mathrm{n}=138$ ) | Health Care Delivery $(\mathrm{n}=95)$ | Business/ <br> Insurance/ <br> Other Health <br> care <br> Industry <br> $(\mathrm{n}=94)$ | Government/ <br> Labor/ <br> Consumer <br> Advocacy $(\mathrm{n}=37)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Reduce reimbursement for procedures and increase reimbursement for primary care | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 47 | 51 | 53 | 47 | 51 |
|  | Extremely effective | 14 | 17 | 21 | 11 | 8 |
|  | Very effective | 33 | 33 | 32 | 36 | 43 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 52 | 49 | 47 | 53 | 46 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 41 | 39 | 37 | 40 | 41 |
|  | Not at all effective | 11 | 9 | 11 | 13 | 5 |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | - | - | 3 |
| Make information on the comparative quality and costs of care of hospitals and physicians available to the public | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 45 | 43 | 51 | 55 | 32 |
|  | Extremely effective | 12 | 11 | 14 | 18 | 5 |
|  | Very effective | 33 | 32 | 37 | 37 | 27 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 55 | 57 | 49 | 45 | 65 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 42 | 43 | 37 | 34 | 54 |
|  | Not at all effective | 13 | 14 | 13 | 11 | 11 |
|  | No response | * | - | - | - | 3 |
| Encourage small employers to join larger group purchasing pools to buy health insurance for their employees | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 41 | 39 | 59 | 40 | 30 |
|  | Extremely effective | 12 | 10 | 19 | 13 | 11 |
|  | Very effective | 29 | 29 | 40 | 28 | 19 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 58 | 61 | 41 | 60 | 68 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 44 | 48 | 34 | 41 | 43 |
|  | Not at all effective | 15 | 13 | 7 | 18 | 24 |
|  | No response | * | - | - | - | 3 |
| Create a national agency to set quality standards and practice guidelines | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 40 | 36 | 45 | 48 | 30 |
|  | Extremely effective | 10 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 8 |
|  | Very effective | 30 | 27 | 37 | 37 | 22 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 59 | 64 | 54 | 52 | 68 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 44 | 46 | 40 | 40 | 54 |
|  | Not at all effective | 15 | 18 | 14 | 12 | 14 |
|  | No response | 1 | - | 1 | - | 3 |
| Encourage competition among insurers and providers | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 35 | 33 | 41 | 43 | 32 |
|  | Extremely effective | 10 | 9 | 15 | 10 | 8 |
|  | Very effective | 24 | 24 | 26 | 33 | 24 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 64 | 66 | 59 | 56 | 65 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 39 | 40 | 37 | 36 | 43 |
|  | Not at all effective | 25 | 26 | 22 | 20 | 22 |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 3 |

TABLE 3 (continued)

## EFFECTIVENESS OF PROPOSED APPROACHES IN CONTROLLING RISING HEALTHCARE COSTS

"Below is a list of approaches that have been proposed to control the rising costs of health care and improve the quality of care. How effective do you think each of these approaches would
be?"
Base: 289 Respondents

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{n}=289) \end{gathered}$ | Academic/ Research Inst. ( $\mathrm{n}=138$ ) | Health Care Delivery ( $\mathrm{n}=95$ ) | Business/ Insurance/ Other Health care Industry $(\mathrm{n}=94)$ | Government/ <br> Labor/ <br> Consumer <br> Advocacy $(\mathrm{n}=37)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Reduce fraudulent billing | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 35 | 32 | 41 | 41 | 27 |
|  | Extremely effective | 10 | 9 | 15 | 12 | 8 |
|  | Very effective | 24 | 23 | 26 | 30 | 19 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 65 | 68 | 59 | 59 | 70 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 52 | 52 | 49 | 48 | 51 |
|  | Not at all effective | 13 | 16 | 9 | 11 | 19 |
|  | No response | * | - | - | - | 3 |
| Reform the malpractice system | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 30 | 20 | 52 | 37 | 22 |
|  | Extremely effective | 12 | 6 | 23 | 16 | 16 |
|  | Very effective | 18 | 14 | 28 | 21 | 5 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 70 | 80 | 48 | 63 | 76 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 52 | 56 | 43 | 49 | 49 |
|  | Not at all effective | 18 | 25 | 5 | 14 | 27 |
|  | No response | * | - | - | - | 3 |
| Legalize the importation of brand name prescription drugs from Canada or other countries | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 24 | 24 | 36 | 21 | 24 |
|  | Extremely effective | 8 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 5 |
|  | Very effective | 16 | 17 | 24 | 16 | 19 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 75 | 75 | 64 | 78 | 73 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 46 | 46 | 51 | 43 | 46 |
|  | Not at all effective | 28 | 29 | 14 | 35 | 27 |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 3 |
| Require consumers to pay a substantially higher share of their health care costs | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 16 | 12 | 21 | 18 | 8 |
|  | Extremely effective | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | - |
|  | Very effective | 14 | 11 | 20 | 15 | 8 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 83 | 88 | 79 | 82 | 89 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 47 | 43 | 53 | 51 | 41 |
|  | Not at all effective | 36 | 45 | 26 | 31 | 49 |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | - | - | 3 |

TABLE 4
EFFECTIVENESS OF REFORMS TO EXPAND COVERAGE FOR UNINSURED
"Below is a list of possible reforms to expand coverage for the uninsured. How effective do you think each of these reforms is?"

Base: 289 Respondents

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{n}=289) \end{gathered}$ | Academic/ Research Inst. ( $\mathrm{n}=138$ ) | Health Care Delivery ( $\mathrm{n}=95$ ) | Business/ Insurance/ Other Health care Industry $(\mathrm{n}=94)$ | Government/ <br> Labor/ <br> Consumer <br> Advocacy $(\mathrm{n}=37)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Mandate that all individuals buy coverage, and provide subsidies and a pooled mechanism for the uninsured to purchase affordable insurance | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 57 | 59 | 62 | 57 | 41 |
|  | Extremely effective | 20 | 24 | 25 | 16 | 14 |
|  | Very effective | 37 | 36 | 37 | 41 | 27 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 40 | 38 | 36 | 41 | 57 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 32 | 30 | 26 | 36 | 43 |
|  | Not at all effective | 8 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 14 |
|  | No response | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Provide federal matching funds for Medicaid/SCHIP coverage of adults below $150 \%$ of poverty and children below $\mathbf{3 0 0} \%$ of poverty | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 57 | 61 | 58 | 53 | 51 |
|  | Extremely effective | 14 | 18 | 15 | 12 | 5 |
|  | Very effective | 44 | 43 | 43 | 41 | 46 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 42 | 38 | 41 | 47 | 46 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 38 | 33 | 39 | 40 | 46 |
|  | Not at all effective | 4 | 4 | 2 | 6 | - |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 3 |
| Establish a single-payer insurance system run by the federal government | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 54 | 66 | 52 | 37 | 54 |
|  | Extremely effective | 32 | 40 | 27 | 23 | 27 |
|  | Very effective | 22 | 26 | 24 | 14 | 27 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 45 | 32 | 47 | 63 | 43 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 16 | 14 | 22 | 15 | 14 |
|  | Not at all effective | 29 | 17 | 25 | 48 | 30 |
|  | No response | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | 3 |
| Cover everyone under Medicare | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 53 | 63 | 49 | 35 | 54 |
|  | Extremely effective | 30 | 40 | 21 | 20 | 30 |
|  | Very effective | 22 | 23 | 28 | 15 | 24 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 45 | 33 | 48 | 65 | 43 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 18 | 18 | 25 | 18 | 19 |
|  | Not at all effective | 27 | 14 | 23 | 47 | 24 |
|  | No response | 2 | 4 | 2 | - | 3 |

TABLE 4 (continued)
EFFECTIVENESS OF REFORMS TO EXPAND COVERAGE FOR UNINSURED
"Below is a list of possible reforms to expand coverage for the uninsured. How effective do you think each of these reforms is?"

Base: 289 Respondents

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{n}=289) \end{gathered}$ | Academic/ Research Inst. ( $\mathrm{n}=138$ ) | Health Care Delivery $(\mathrm{n}=95)$ | Business/ Insurance/ Other Health care Industry $(\mathrm{n}=94)$ | Government/ <br> Labor/ <br> Consumer <br> Advocacy $(\mathrm{n}=37)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Require employers who don't provide coverage to contribute to a fund that would pay for such coverage | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 50 | 48 | 54 | 46 | 62 |
|  | Extremely effective | 12 | 12 | 17 | 9 | 11 |
|  | Very effective | 38 | 36 | 37 | 37 | 51 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 49 | 51 | 45 | 54 | 35 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 38 | 41 | 38 | 37 | 30 |
|  | Not at all effective | 10 | 10 | 7 | 17 | 5 |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 3 |
| Allow individuals and small businesses to buy into the Federal Employees Health Benefits program or a similar federal group option | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 50 | 54 | 55 | 44 | 51 |
|  | Extremely effective | 13 | 14 | 17 | 11 | 3 |
|  | Very effective | 37 | 39 | 38 | 33 | 49 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 48 | 43 | 44 | 56 | 46 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 38 | 36 | 38 | 41 | 35 |
|  | Not at all effective | 10 | 8 | 6 | 15 | 11 |
|  | No response | 2 | 3 | 1 | - | 3 |
| Open up Medicare to everyone not covered by an employer plan | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 47 | 56 | 44 | 31 | 54 |
|  | Extremely effective | 16 | 17 | 14 | 13 | 16 |
|  | Very effective | 31 | 38 | 31 | 18 | 38 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 51 | 42 | 55 | 68 | 43 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 35 | 32 | 37 | 44 | 30 |
|  | Not at all effective | 17 | 10 | 18 | 24 | 14 |
|  | No response | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Let near-elderly adults buy into Medicare | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 46 | 46 | 43 | 38 | 51 |
|  | Extremely effective | 14 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 11 |
|  | Very effective | 32 | 33 | 29 | 27 | 41 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 53 | 51 | 55 | 61 | 46 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 43 | 43 | 41 | 49 | 43 |
|  | Not at all effective | 10 | 9 | 14 | 12 | 3 |
|  | No response | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |

TABLE 4 (continued)
EFFECTIVENESS OF REFORMS TO EXPAND COVERAGE FOR UNINSURED
"Below is a list of possible reforms to expand coverage for the uninsured. How effective do you think each of these reforms is?"

Base: 289 Respondents

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{n}=289) \end{gathered}$ | Academic/ <br> Research Inst. (n=138) | Health Care Delivery ( $\mathrm{n}=95$ ) | Business/ Insurance/ Other Health care Industry $(\mathrm{n}=94)$ | Government/ <br> Labor/ <br> Consumer <br> Advocacy (n=37) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Provide incentives or requirements to expand employer-based health insurance | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 43 | 33 | 51 | 45 | 46 |
|  | Extremely effective | 7 | 5 | 11 | 6 | 5 |
|  | Very effective | 36 | 28 | 40 | 38 | 41 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 55 | 65 | 48 | 55 | 51 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 46 | 54 | 41 | 48 | 43 |
|  | Not at all effective | 9 | 12 | 7 | 7 | 8 |
|  | No response | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | 3 |
| Establish an insurance system paid for by the federal government but provided through multiple private insurers | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 41 | 47 | 41 | 27 | 35 |
|  | Extremely effective | 14 | 17 | 13 | 10 | 8 |
|  | Very effective | 27 | 30 | 28 | 17 | 27 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 57 | 50 | 57 | 71 | 62 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 36 | 36 | 34 | 44 | 43 |
|  | Not at all effective | 21 | 14 | 23 | 28 | 19 |
|  | No response | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Eliminate the two-year waiting period for the disabled to qualify for Medicare benefits | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 40 | 43 | 40 | 35 | 49 |
|  | Extremely effective | 11 | 14 | 11 | 7 | 8 |
|  | Very effective | 29 | 30 | 29 | 28 | 41 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 59 | 55 | 59 | 65 | 49 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 49 | 46 | 52 | 52 | 41 |
|  | Not at all effective | 10 | 9 | 7 | 13 | 8 |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 |
| Provide reinsurance for small business insurance plans | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 36 | 28 | 47 | 43 | 38 |
|  | Extremely effective | 4 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 3 |
|  | Very effective | 31 | 24 | 40 | 38 | 35 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 62 | 69 | 52 | 56 | 59 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 52 | 60 | 46 | 44 | 51 |
|  | Not at all effective | 10 | 9 | 5 | 13 | 8 |
|  | No response | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 |

TABLE 4 (continued)
EFFECTIVENESS OF REFORMS TO EXPAND COVERAGE FOR UNINSURED
"Below is a list of possible reforms to expand coverage for the uninsured. How effective do you think each of these reforms is?"

Base: 289 Respondents

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{n}=289) \end{gathered}$ | Academic/ Research Inst. ( $\mathrm{n}=138$ ) | Health Care Delivery ( $\mathrm{n}=95$ ) | Business/ Insurance/ Other Health care Industry ( $\mathrm{n}=94$ ) | Government/ <br> Labor/ <br> Consumer <br> Advocacy (n=37) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Provide tax credits or other subsidies to low-wage workers to buy coverage | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 25 | 20 | 25 | 28 | 22 |
|  | Extremely effective | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | - |
|  | Very effective | 20 | 14 | 20 | 22 | 22 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 74 | 78 | 73 | 71 | 76 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 52 | 52 | 58 | 50 | 57 |
|  | Not at all effective | 22 | 25 | 15 | 21 | 19 |
|  | No response | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Promote tax-free health savings accounts | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 14 | 8 | 19 | 22 | 14 |
|  | Extremely effective | 5 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 5 |
|  | Very effective | 9 | 5 | 11 | 17 | 8 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 85 | 91 | 80 | 78 | 84 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 39 | 33 | 54 | 41 | 27 |
|  | Not at all effective | 46 | 57 | 26 | 36 | 57 |
|  | No response | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 3 |
| Permit association health plans to provide coverage without state licensing restrictions | Extremely/Very effective (net) | 13 | 8 | 15 | 19 | 8 |
|  | Extremely effective | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | - |
|  | Very effective | 11 | 7 | 13 | 17 | 8 |
|  | Somewhat/Not at all effective (net) | 84 | 88 | 82 | 79 | 89 |
|  | Somewhat effective | 39 | 40 | 51 | 37 | 49 |
|  | Not at all effective | 45 | 49 | 32 | 41 | 41 |
|  | No response | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |

TABLE 5
TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT
"How would you describe your current employment position?"

Base: 289 Respondents

|  | \% |
| :--- | :---: |
| Teacher, Researcher, Professor | 30 |
| CEO/President | 27 |
| Policy Analyst | 25 |
| Administration/Management | 25 |
| Physician | 18 |
| Consultant | 11 |
| Health care purchaser | 10 |
| Consumer advocate | 9 |
| Department head/Dean | 7 |
| Foundation officer | 6 |
| Other | 4 |
| Retired | 4 |
| Other health care provider (not physician) | 3 |
| Lobbyist | 3 |
| Policymaker or policy staff (federal) | 2 |
| Policymaker or policy staff (state) | 1 |
| Regulator | $*$ |
| Investment analyst | - |

TABLE 6
PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT
"Which of the following best describes the type of place or institution for which you work?"
Base: 289 Respondents

|  | \% |
| :---: | :---: |
| Academic and Research Institutions | 48 |
| Medical, public health, nursing, or other health professional school | 24 |
| Think tank/Health care institute/Policy research institution | 12 |
| University setting not in a medical, public health, nursing, or other health professional school | 8 |
| Foundation | 7 |
| Medical publisher | 1 |
| Business/Insurance/Other Health Industry | 33 |
| Health insurance and business association or organization | 6 |
| Pharmaceutical/Medical device trade association organization | - |
| Financial services industry | - |
| Health insurance/Managed care industry | 8 |
| Drug manufacturer | 3 |
| Device company | - |
| Biotech company | 1 |
| CEO, CFO, Benefits Manager | 5 |
| Polling organization | * |
| Health care consulting firm | 6 |
| Health care improvement organization | 8 |
| Accrediting body and organization (nongovernmental) | 1 |
| Health Care Delivery | 33 |
| Medical society or professional association or organization | 8 |
| Hospital | 13 |
| Physician practice/Other clinical practice (patient care) | 7 |
| Hospital or related professional association or organization | 5 |
| Clinic | 4 |
| Nursing home/Long-term care facility | 2 |
| Allied health society or professional association or organization | 2 |


| Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy | $\mathbf{1 3}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Labor/Consumers/Seniors' advocacy group | 4 |
| Staff for a federal elected official or federal <br> legislative committee | - |
| Non-elected federal executive branch official | 1 |
| Staff for non-elected federal executive branch <br> official | 1 |
| Non-elected state executive branch official | 1 |
| Staff for a state elected official or state legislative <br> committee | 1 |
| Staff for non-elected state executive branch official | 1 |
| Other | 4 |

## Appendix A

## Methodology

This survey was conducted online by Harris Interactive on behalf of The Commonwealth Fund among 289 opinion leaders in health policy and innovators in health care delivery and finance within the United States between November 14, 2006, and December 8, 2006. No weighting was applied to these results.

The original sample for this survey was developed using a two-step process. Initially, The Commonwealth Fund and Harris Interactive jointly identified a number of experts across different sectors and professions who have a range of perspectives, based on their affiliations and involvement in various organizations and institutions. Harris Interactive then conducted an online survey with these experts, asking them to nominate others within and outside their own fields whom they consider to be leaders and innovators in health care. Based on the result of the survey and after careful review by Harris Interactive, The Commonwealth Fund, and a selected group of health care experts, the sample for this poll was created. This sample included 1,246 people. In 2006, The Commonwealth Fund and Harris Interactive joined forces with Modern Healthcare to add new members to the panel. The Fund and Harris were able to gain access to Modern Healthcare's database of readers. The Fund, Harris, and Modern Healthcare identified the readers in the database considered health care opinion leaders and invited them to participate in the survey. The final list included 1,467 people.

Harris Interactive sent out individual e-mail invitations containing a password-protected link to the entire sample. Data collection took place between November 14, 2006, and December 8, 2006. A total of four reminder e-mails was sent to anyone who had not responded. A total of 289 respondents completed the survey.

With a pure probability sample of 289 adults, one could say with a 95 percent probability that the overall results have a sampling error of +/- 5.8 percentage points. However, that does not take other sources of error into account. This online survey is not based on a probability sample and therefore no theoretical sampling error can be calculated.

## About Harris Interactive

Harris Interactive is the 13th largest and fastest-growing market research firm in the world. The company provides research-driven insights and strategic advice to help its clients make more confident decisions, which lead to measurable and enduring improvements in performance. Harris Interactive is widely known for The Harris Poll, one of the longest-running, independent opinion polls, and for pioneering online market research methods. The company has built what could conceivably be the world's largest panel of survey respondents, the Harris Poll Online. Harris Interactive serves clients worldwide through its offices in the United States, Europe, and Asia; its wholly-owned subsidiary Novatris in France; and through a global network of independent market research firms. The service bureau HISB provides its market research industry clients with mixed-mode data collection and panel development services as well as syndicated and tracking research consultation. More information about Harris Interactive may be obtained at www.harrisinteractive.com.

To become a member of the Harris Poll Online, visit www.harrispollonline.com.

