

APPENDIX TABLES

**TABLE 1. EFFICACY OF HEALTH CARE REFORM PLANS
AT ACHIEVING UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE**

“In your view, how effective would these two general approaches be in achieving universal coverage?”

Base: 221 respondents

		Total (n=221)	Academic/ Research Inst. (n=112)	Health Care Delivery (n=56)	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry (n=59)	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy (n=25)
		%	%	%	%	%
Tax incentives for individual insurance market	Very effective/ Effective (Net)	8	4	4	20	4
	Very effective	2	1	4	7	4
	Effective	5	4	0	14	0
	Somewhat effective	32	31	39	36	32
	Not effective	59	63	57	42	64
	Not sure	1	1	0	2	1
Mixed private- public group insurance system	Very effective/ Effective (Net)	61	65	59	51	60
	Very effective	29	30	29	22	36
	Effective	32	35	30	29	24
	Somewhat effective	30	26	29	36	32
	Not effective	8	8	13	12	8
	Not sure	1	1	0	2	0

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

Source: Commonwealth Fund Health Care Opinion Leaders Survey, January 2008.

TABLE 2. SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES' HEALTH CARE REFORM PROPOSALS

“To what extent do you favor or oppose the following features of the presidential candidates’ healthcare reform proposals?”

Base: 221 respondents

		Total (n=221)	Academic/ Research Inst. (n=112)	Health Care Delivery (n=56)	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry (n=59)	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy (n=25)
		%	%	%	%	%
Require everyone to have health insurance with premium subsidies for low- and moderate- income families	Strongly favor/ Favor (Net)	83	85	82	78	80
	Strongly favor	39	40	41	32	40
	Favor	44	45	41	46	40
	Oppose	10	7	13	12	4
	Strongly oppose	4	4	4	5	8
	Not sure	3	3	2	5	4
	No response	1	1	0	0	4
Require employers to either offer coverage or pay a percent of their payroll that would help finance expanded coverage	Strongly favor/ Favor (Net)	71	70	64	66	64
	Strongly favor	32	31	30	25	36
	Favor	39	38	34	41	28
	Oppose	14	12	20	24	16
	Strongly oppose	7	10	5	5	8
	Not sure	6	7	11	5	12
	No response	1	2	0	0	0
Implement market regulations against risk selection such as guaranteed issue and community rating	Strongly favor/ Favor (Net)	86	83	88	86	92
	Strongly favor	53	48	59	58	60
	Favor	33	35	29	29	32
	Oppose	6	5	5	8	4
	Strongly oppose	4	4	2	3	0
	Not sure	3	4	4	0	0
	No response	2	3	2	2	4
Set a minimum floor on the percentage of premium revenues going for medical care	Strongly favor/ Favor (Net)	62	60	70	61	68
	Strongly favor	30	34	36	19	36
	Favor	32	26	34	42	32
	Oppose	18	15	14	22	12
	Strongly oppose	7	9	2	8	8
	Not sure	12	14	14	8	12
	No response	1	2	0	0	0
Allow individuals, small businesses, and associations to buy private insurance across state lines	Strongly favor/ Favor (Net)	62	55	73	66	72
	Strongly favor	29	22	43	37	36
	Favor	33	33	30	29	36
	Oppose	17	22	11	14	12
	Strongly oppose	10	10	5	7	4
	Not sure	10	12	11	8	12
	No response	1	1	0	0	0

		Total (n=221)	Academic/ Research Inst. (n=112)	Health Care Delivery (n=56)	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry (n=59)	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy (n=25)
Include a public plan option like Medicare in the new group insurance “connectors” so that people can choose between private and public plans	Strongly favor/ Favor (Net)	79	81	77	80	84
	Strongly favor	45	45	36	44	56
	Favor	34	37	41	36	28
	Oppose	8	6	4	12	8
	Strongly oppose	4	4	9	2	0
	Not sure	7	7	11	7	8
	No response	1	2	0	0	0
Expand Medicaid and the State Children’s Health Insurance Program to include adults at poverty level or above	Strongly favor/ Favor (Net)	78	79	75	76	76
	Strongly favor	46	52	41	37	48
	Favor	33	28	34	39	28
	Oppose	12	9	14	17	8
	Strongly oppose	5	4	7	3	8
	Not sure	3	4	4	3	8
	No response	2	3	0	0	0
Eliminate employer benefit tax exemption from personal income taxes and replace it with a standard income tax deduction or tax credit for people with private coverage.	Strongly favor/ Favor (Net)	45	50	34	53	44
	Strongly favor	11	11	7	14	16
	Favor	34	39	27	39	28
	Oppose	25	21	29	34	28
	Strongly oppose	15	19	14	7	20
	Not sure	14	9	23	7	8
	No response	1	2	0	0	0
Administer an individual mandate and income-related premium assistance through the tax code	Strongly favor/ Favor (Net)	52	58	48	49	64
	Strongly favor	17	19	18	17	8
	Favor	35	39	30	32	56
	Oppose	24	22	27	25	16
	Strongly oppose	9	9	11	8	8
	Not sure	13	9	14	17	12
	No response	1	2	0	0	0

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

Source: Commonwealth Fund Health Care Opinion Leaders Survey, January 2008.

TABLE 3. DESIRED GOAL FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM

“Do you think health care reform should . . .?”

Base: 221 respondents

	Total (n=221)	Academic/ Research Inst. (n=112)	Health Care Delivery (n=56)	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry (n=59)	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy (n=25)
	%	%	%	%	%
Preserve private insurance markets with reduced regulation	11	10	7	14	4
Organize and regulate private markets with an insurance connector (e.g., Massachusetts)	61	63	55	61	52
Replace private markets with public insurance (e.g., Medicare)	37	44	38	24	56
Allow public insurance (i.e., Medicare) to compete with private insurance	65	65	59	73	64
Not sure	7	6	11	7	4

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

Source: Commonwealth Fund Health Care Opinion Leaders Survey, January 2008.

TABLE 4. SUPPORT OF FINANCING EXPANDED HEALTH CARE COVERAGE

“To what extent do you favor or oppose the following methods of financing expanded health care coverage?”

Base: 221 respondents

		Total (n=221) %	Academic/ Research Inst. (n=112) %	Health Care Delivery (n=56) %	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry (n=59) %	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy (n=25) %
Increase in general taxes	Strongly favor/ favor (net)	66	71	59	56	64
	Strongly favor	17	18	9	12	28
	Favor	49	53	50	44	36
	Oppose	19	14	23	31	24
	Strongly oppose	7	5	11	8	8
	Not sure	5	6	5	5	4
	No response	3	4	2	0	0
Repeal of recent tax breaks for families with incomes above \$200,000 or letting them expire	Strongly favor/ favor (net)	75	86	71	63	76
	Strongly favor	45	53	32	36	36
	Favor	30	33	39	27	40
	Oppose	12	4	16	22	12
	Strongly oppose	8	6	7	14	8
	Not sure	2	2	4	2	4
	No response	2	2	2	0	0
Introduce new national sales tax or value-added tax	Strongly favor/ favor (net)	38	41	32	29	64
	Strongly favor	12	13	11	8	32
	Favor	26	28	21	20	32
	Oppose	33	27	34	42	28
	Strongly oppose	16	20	18	14	4
	Not sure	10	10	14	15	4
	No response	2	3	2	0	0
Increase taxes on tobacco or other products that are harmful to health	Strongly favor/ favor (net)	88	91	82	85	96
	Strongly favor	41	43	43	34	60
	Favor	47	48	39	51	36
	Oppose	5	3	9	7	0
	Strongly oppose	4	3	2	8	4
	Not sure	1	3	4	0	0
	No response	2	1	4	0	0
Implement a revenue assessment on hospitals	Strongly favor/ favor (net)	35	38	36	25	44
	Strongly favor	7	7	9	7	12
	Favor	28	31	27	19	32
	Oppose	36	32	36	42	20
	Strongly oppose	14	13	16	20	16
	Not sure	12	15	7	10	16
	No response	3	2	5	2	4

		Total (n=221)	Academic/ Research Inst. (n=112)	Health Care Delivery (n=56)	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry (n=59)	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy (n=25)
Implement a revenue assessment on insurers	Strongly favor/ favor (net)	51	54	57	39	64
	Strongly favor	15	16	21	17	12
	Favor	35	38	36	22	52
	Oppose	24	20	23	36	12
	Strongly oppose	8	8	4	10	12
	Not sure	15	18	13	15	12
	No response	2	1	4	0	0
Redirect current subsidies for care of patients who are disproportionately uninsured or low-income	Strongly favor/ favor (net)	49	53	39	49	48
	Strongly favor	8	7	5	8	8
	Favor	41	46	34	41	40
	Oppose	19	16	21	17	24
	Strongly oppose	8	9	11	7	12
	Not sure	20	20	21	25	16
	No response	4	3	7	2	0

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

Source: Commonwealth Fund Health Care Opinion Leaders Survey, January 2008.

TABLE 5. DETERMINING APPROPRIATE AMOUNT FAMILIES PAY FOR PREMIUMS

“Determining how much families should pay for premiums and out of pocket expenses is a critical part of health care reform. The Massachusetts Commonwealth Health Insurance Connector Authority currently stipulates that families in Massachusetts with incomes

- Under 150% of the poverty line pay no premiums
- 150% up to 200% of the poverty line pay no more than an average of 2.4% of income in premiums
- 200% up to 300% of the poverty line pay no more than an average of 4.5% of income in premiums
- 300% up to 500% of the poverty line would pay an average of 8% of income in premiums

What do you think about the amount the guidelines require families to pay?"

Base: 221 respondents

		Total (n=221)	Academic/ Research Inst. (n=112)	Health Care Delivery (n=56)	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry (n=59)	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy (n=25)
		%	%	%	%	%
Under 150% of the poverty line pay no premiums	It is too much	1	0	0	2	4
	It is about the right amount	80	86	80	73	76
	It is not enough	6	4	5	12	8
	Not sure	13	10	14	14	12
150% up to 200% of the poverty line pay no more than an average of 2.4% of income in premiums	It is too much	18	17	16	12	20
	It is about the right amount	62	69	64	63	60
	It is not enough	4	3	5	5	0
	Not sure	16	12	14	20	20
200% up to 300% of the poverty line pay no more than an average of 4.5% of income in premiums	It is too much	19	15	16	19	16
	It is about the right amount	54	62	63	44	64
	It is not enough	6	5	4	10	0
	Not sure	20	16	18	27	20
	No response	1	2	0	0	0
300% up to 500% of the poverty line pay an average of 8% of income in premiums	It is too much	25	23	25	27	24
	It is about the right amount	45	51	50	34	44
	It is not enough	9	8	5	12	8
	Not sure	20	18	18	27	24
	No response	1	0	2	0	0

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

Source: Commonwealth Fund Health Care Opinion Leaders Survey, January 2008.

TABLE 6. EFFICACY IN IMPROVING HEALTH CARE QUALITY

“Below is a list of features in the presidential candidates’ health care reform proposals that aim to improve quality. How effective do you think these features would be in improving health care quality?”

Base: 221 respondents

		Total (n=221)	Academic/ Research Inst. (n=112)	Health Care Delivery (n=56)	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry (n=59)	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy (n=25)
		%	%	%	%	%
Uniform quality reporting and transparency of information on quality of provider	Very effective/ Effective (net)	61	62	52	64	76
	Very effective	29	23	27	44	40
	Effective	32	38	25	20	36
	Somewhat effective	31	31	32	29	20
	Not effective	7	5	14	5	4
	Not sure	1	1	0	2	0
	No response	1	1	2	0	0
Reward providers who provide higher quality care	Very effective/ Effective (net)	61	56	61	63	68
	Very effective	25	17	23	34	44
	Effective	36	39	38	29	24
	Somewhat effective	30	37	29	22	20
	Not effective	6	4	9	12	4
	Not sure	2	3	0	3	8
	No response	1	1	2	0	0
Support increased and more effective use of information technology	Very effective/ Effective (net)	70	70	68	75	88
	Very effective	35	30	30	51	52
	Effective	35	40	38	24	36
	Somewhat effective	26	25	25	24	12
	Not effective	2	3	4	0	0
	Not sure	1	1	2	2	0
	No response	1	1	2	0	0

		Total (n=221)	Academic/ Research Inst. (n=112)	Health Care Delivery (n=56)	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry (n=59)	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy (n=25)
Support increased use of “medical home” type models of care management where patients have a regular doctor knowledgeable of their medical history and easy access to care and enhanced coordination of care	Very effective/ Effective (net)	65	63	75	68	80
	Very effective	32	29	41	34	48
	Effective	33	33	34	34	32
	Somewhat effective	27	29	18	24	16
	Not effective	5	5	0	8	4
	Not sure	2	2	5	0	0
	No response	1	1	2	0	0
Hold hospitals accountable for ethnic and racial disparities in care	Very effective/ Effective (net)	26	25	25	29	36
	Very effective	7	8	11	2	16
	Effective	19	17	14	27	20
	Somewhat effective	39	39	36	41	36
	Not effective	28	29	30	29	20
	Not sure	7	6	7	2	8
	No response	1	1	2	0	0
A “consumer report” of quality of care by providers	Very effective/ Effective (net)	44	41	38	51	64
	Very effective	15	12	9	22	36
	Effective	29	29	29	29	28
	Somewhat effective	42	43	39	36	28
	Not effective	12	13	20	12	8
	Not sure	1	2	2	2	0
	No response	1	2	2	0	0

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

Source: Commonwealth Fund Health Care Opinion Leaders Survey, January 2008.

TABLE 7. PRIORITIES IN HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

“Most candidates’ plans also include provisions that would improve quality, efficiency, and cost control as well as increase coverage. In your view, which of the following provisions should the next president focus on?”

Base: 221 respondents

	Total (n=221)	Academic/ Research Inst. (n=112)	Health Care Delivery (n=56)	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry (n=59)	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy (n=25)
	%	%	%	%	%
Pursue universal coverage at the same time that he/she develops policies to improve quality, efficiency, and cost control.	70	73	75	56	72
Pursue universal coverage first and then address quality, efficiency, and cost control.	14	13	13	19	16
Address quality, efficiency, and cost control and then work on achieving universal coverage.	12	11	4	20	8
Not sure	3	4	5	3	0
No response	1	0	4	2	4

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

Source: Commonwealth Fund Health Care Opinion Leaders Survey, January 2008.

**TABLE 8. EFFICACY OF HEALTH CARE REFORM PLANS
AT CONTROLLING HEALTH CARE COSTS**

“How effective would these two general approaches be
in controlling health care costs?”

Base: 221 respondents

		Total (n=221)	Academic/ Research Inst. (n=112)	Health Care Delivery (n=56)	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry (n=59)	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy (n=25)
		%	%	%	%	%
Tax incentives for individual insurance market	Very effective/ Effective (Net)	7	4	9	14	8
	Very effective	3	1	4	3	8
	Effective	5	3	5	10	0
	Somewhat effective	26	27	27	24	24
	Not effective	64	68	61	61	68
	Not sure	3	2	2	2	0
	No response	0	0	2	0	0
Mixed private- public group insurance system	Very effective/ Effective (Net)	14	13	20	5	20
	Very effective	2	4	2	0	0
	Effective	12	10	18	5	20
	Somewhat effective	41	40	34	47	48
	Not effective	41	43	43	44	32
	Not sure	4	4	2	3	0
	No response	0	0	2	0	0

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

Source: Commonwealth Fund Health Care Opinion Leaders Survey, January 2008.

TABLE 9. EFFICACY IN REDUCING GROWTH OF HEALTH CARE COSTS

“Below is a list of features in the presidential candidates’ health care reform proposals that aim to control health care costs. How effective do you think each of these features would be in reducing the growth in health care costs?”

Base: 221 respondents

		Total (n=221)	Academic/ Research Inst. (n=112)	Health Care Delivery (n=56)	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry (n=59)	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy (n=25)
		%	%	%	%	%
Offer Medicare or other public plan option in the new group insurance “connectors”	Very effective/ Effective (net)	45	46	52	46	48
	Very effective	13	13	14	12	12
	Effective	33	33	38	34	36
	Somewhat effective	24	25	21	25	28
	Not effective	20	20	16	22	16
	Not sure	10	9	9	7	8
	No response	1	0	2	0	0
Allow individuals, small businesses, and associations to buy private insurance across state lines	Very effective/ Effective (net)	29	22	43	37	20
	Very effective	9	7	9	17	0
	Effective	20	15	34	20	20
	Somewhat effective	28	29	27	25	40
	Not effective	33	38	21	32	32
	Not sure	10	12	9	5	8
Encourage greater consumer cost-sharing	Very effective/ Effective (net)	29	23	36	42	36
	Very effective	11	9	7	20	12
	Effective	19	14	29	22	24
	Somewhat effective	39	44	38	32	32
	Not effective	28	30	25	22	28
	Not sure	2	2	2	3	4
	No response	1	1	0	0	0
Support benefit design incentives that encourage use of preventive services and chronic condition management	Very effective/ Effective (net)	62	59	75	64	64
	Very effective	33	28	45	37	40
	Effective	29	31	30	27	24
	Somewhat effective	29	34	18	25	28
	Not effective	7	6	4	8	8
	Not sure	1	1	4	2	0
Correct the imbalance between primary and specialty care	Very effective/ Effective (net)	65	63	64	73	64
	Very effective	36	33	46	39	32
	Effective	29	29	18	34	32
	Somewhat effective	23	25	21	15	28
	Not effective	9	10	7	12	4
	Not sure	3	3	7	0	0
	No response	1	0	0	0	4

		Total (n=221)	Academic/ Research Inst. (n=112)	Health Care Delivery (n=56)	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry (n=59)	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy (n=25)
Allow Medicare to negotiate prescription drug prices	Very effective/ Effective (net)	65	71	68	61	68
	Very effective	33	37	39	27	32
	Effective	32	35	29	34	36
	Somewhat effective	24	21	23	27	24
	Not effective	8	6	5	10	4
	Not sure	3	2	4	2	4
Reform the malpractice system	Very effective/ Effective (net)	30	25	50	34	20
	Very effective	15	12	25	19	8
	Effective	15	13	25	15	12
	Somewhat effective	38	38	38	41	56
	Not effective	28	34	11	24	20
	Not sure	3	4	2	2	4
Establish a private-public institute on comparative effectiveness to produce and disseminate information on effectiveness and best practices	Very effective/ Effective (net)	47	42	46	56	64
	Very effective	19	15	16	22	32
	Effective	29	27	30	34	32
	Somewhat effective	37	41	34	29	16
	Not effective	13	14	16	10	12
	Not sure	3	3	4	5	8
Legalize the importation of brand name prescription drugs from Canada or other countries	Very effective/ Effective (net)	30	33	36	31	40
	Very effective	11	13	20	14	8
	Effective	19	20	16	17	32
	Somewhat effective	42	38	45	39	44
	Not effective	24	25	16	29	16
	Not sure	3	3	4	2	0
	No response	1	1	0	0	0

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

Source: Commonwealth Fund Health Care Opinion Leaders Survey, January 2008.