

**THE COMMONWEALTH FUND
HEALTH CARE OPINION LEADERS SURVEY**

April 2005

**TABLE 1
PRICE**

“Total health care spending depends on both the prices charged for care and the amount of care provided. Focusing on **prices**, how effective do you think each of these possible actions would be to reduce the cost of health care services?”

Base: 289 Respondents

		Total	Academic/ Research Institution	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
		%	%	%	%	%
<p style="text-align: center;">Reward more efficient and high-quality medical care providers.</p> <p>Ranking of extremely/very effective by sector: Total: 1 Academic/Research Institution: 1 Health Care Delivery: 1 Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry: 1 Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy: 1</p>	Extremely/very effective	57	49	56	69	65
	Extremely effective	22	18	19	31	24
	Very effective	35	31	37	38	41
	Somewhat effective	26	32	29	17	22
	Not very/not at all effective	15	17	13	14	14
	Not very effective	11	13	10	9	8
	Not at all effective	3	4	3	5	5
	Not sure/No answer	2	3	1	—	—
<p style="text-align: center;">Have all payers, including private insurers, Medicare, and Medicaid, adopt common payment methods and rates.</p> <p>Ranking of extremely/very effective by sector: Total: 2 Academic/Research Institution: 2 Health Care Delivery: 2 Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry: 3 (tie) Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy: 2</p>	Extremely/very effective	44	46	49	40	46
	Extremely effective	15	18	13	15	11
	Very effective	28	28	35	24	35
	Somewhat effective	21	21	19	19	24
	Not very/not at all effective	30	28	29	35	19
	Not very effective	18	18	21	17	11
	Not at all effective	12	10	9	18	8
	Not sure/No answer	5	5	2	6	11
<p style="text-align: center;">Promote best practices and support provider learning collaboratives to improve efficiency and quality.</p> <p>Ranking of extremely/very effective by sector: Total: 3 Academic/Research Institution: 4 (tie) Health Care Delivery: 3 Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry: 2 Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy: 3</p>	Extremely/very effective	38	30	40	41	43
	Extremely effective	9	5	15	12	11
	Very effective	29	25	25	29	32
	Somewhat effective	38	43	38	35	32
	Not very/not at all effective	23	25	21	23	24
	Not very effective	17	18	15	18	16
	Not at all effective	6	7	6	5	8
	Not sure/No answer	1	2	1	1	—

TABLE 1
PRICE (continued)

		Total	Academic/ Research Institution	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
		%	%	%	%	%
<p align="center">Make public information available on comparative provider quality and total costs of care.</p> <p>Ranking of extremely/very effective by sector: Total: 4 Academic/Research Institution: 3 Health Care Delivery: 5 Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry: 3 (tie) Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy: 5</p>	Extremely/ very effective	35	31	26	40	35
	Extremely effective	8	7	3	13	11
	Very effective	26	24	24	27	24
	Somewhat effective	42	44	47	45	38
	Not very/ not at all effective	24	24	26	15	27
	Not very effective	19	19	19	13	22
	Not at all effective	4	5	7	3	5
	Not sure/No answer	*	1	—	—	—
<p align="center">Feed back comparative information on total resource consumption and quality to physicians and hospitals.</p> <p>Ranking of extremely/very effective by sector: Total: 5 Academic/Research Institution: 4 (tie) Health Care Delivery: 4 Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry: 3 (tie) Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy: 4</p>	Extremely/ very effective	33	30	35	40	41
	Extremely effective	8	6	12	5	14
	Very effective	25	24	24	35	27
	Somewhat effective	42	39	44	35	46
	Not very/ not at all effective	24	28	21	26	11
	Not very effective	19	23	16	21	3
	Not at all effective	5	5	4	5	8
	Not sure/No answer	1	2	—	—	3

* Note: Less than 1 percent.

**TABLE 2
UTILIZATION**

“How effective do you think each of these possible actions would be to reduce unnecessary utilization of health care services?”

Base: 289 Respondents

		Total	Academic/ Research Institution	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
		%	%	%	%	%
<p align="center">Improve disease management services for patients with high-cost conditions and enhance primary care case management.</p> <p>Ranking of extremely/very effective by sector: Total: 1 Academic/Research Institution: 1 Health Care Delivery: 1 Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry: 1 Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy: 2</p>	Extremely/very effective	56	51	71	58	57
	Extremely effective	19	18	25	17	22
	Very effective	37	34	46	41	35
	Somewhat effective	35	39	21	35	32
	Not very/not at all effective	6	8	7	8	11
	Not very effective	5	6	3	5	5
	Not at all effective	1	3	4	3	5
	Not sure/No answer	3	2	1	—	—
<p align="center">Use evidence-based medicine guidelines or protocols to determine when a given test or procedure should be done.</p> <p>Ranking of extremely/very effective by sector: Total: 2 Academic/Research Institution: 2 Health Care Delivery: 2 Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry: 3 Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy: 1</p>	Extremely/very effective	52	50	57	49	65
	Extremely effective	16	16	22	14	16
	Very effective	36	34	35	35	49
	Somewhat effective	34	34	28	38	24
	Not very/not at all effective	10	14	13	13	11
	Not very effective	8	11	9	10	5
	Not at all effective	2	3	4	3	5
	Not sure/No answer	3	2	1	—	—
<p align="center">Expand the use of information technology.</p> <p>Ranking of extremely/very effective by sector: Total: 3 Academic/Research Institution: 3 Health Care Delivery: 3 Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry: 2 Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy: 3</p>	Extremely/very effective	46	42	56	51	51
	Extremely effective	16	13	16	19	14
	Very effective	30	30	40	32	38
	Somewhat effective	40	42	32	37	32
	Not very/not at all effective	10	11	9	12	14
	Not very effective	8	8	4	10	8
	Not at all effective	2	3	4	1	5
	Not sure/No answer	5	4	2	—	3

TABLE 2
UTILIZATION (continued)

		Total	Academic/ Research Institution	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
		%	%	%	%	%
<p style="text-align: center;">Implement better measures of over-utilization and reporting on over-utilization.</p> <p>Ranking of extremely/very effective by sector: Total: 4 Academic/Research Institution: 4 Health Care Delivery: 4 Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry: 4 (tie) Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy: 4</p>	Extremely/very effective	36	35	38	40	41
	Extremely effective	6	4	4	6	11
	Very effective	30	30	34	33	30
	Somewhat effective	43	44	47	40	41
	Not very/not at all effective	17	18	12	19	14
	Not very effective	14	15	7	14	8
	Not at all effective	3	4	4	5	5
	Not sure/No answer	4	3	3	1	5
<p style="text-align: center;">Patients pay a substantially higher share of their health care costs.</p> <p>Ranking of extremely/very effective by sector: Total: 5 Academic/Research Institution: 5 Health Care Delivery: 5 Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry: 4 (tie) Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy: 5</p>	Extremely/very effective	31	29	28	40	24
	Extremely effective	8	6	3	15	11
	Very effective	23	23	25	24	14
	Somewhat effective	31	32	35	29	19
	Not very/not at all effective	36	39	35	31	57
	Not very effective	27	30	22	23	38
	Not at all effective	8	9	13	8	19
	Not sure/No answer	2	1	1	—	—

TABLE 3
OVERHEAD

“Focusing on insurance overhead, how effective do you think each of these possible actions would be to reduce high insurance overhead (difference between premiums and medical outlays)?”

Base: 289 Respondents

		Total	Academic/ Research Institution	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
		%	%	%	%	%
Increasing collaboration among public programs and private insurers to streamline administrative costs, including standardizing insurance products and processes. Ranking of extremely/very effective by sector: Total: 1 Academic/Research Institution: 1 Health Care Delivery: 1 Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry: 1 Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy: 1	Extremely/very effective	41	43	56	36	43
	Extremely effective	8	8	9	6	14
	Very effective	34	35	47	29	30
	Somewhat effective	35	37	31	38	38
	Not very/not at all effective	18	20	13	23	16
	Not very effective	15	14	9	19	14
	Not at all effective	4	6	4	4	3
	Not sure/No answer	5	1	—	2	3
Making health insurance a public utility regulated by states. Ranking of extremely/very effective by sector: Total: 2 Academic/Research Institution: 2 Health Care Delivery: 3 (tie) Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry: 5 Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy: 1 (tie)	Extremely/very effective	29	35	29	19	43
	Extremely effective	11	16	9	6	14
	Very effective	18	19	21	13	30
	Somewhat effective	21	23	29	15	19
	Not very/not at all effective	40	34	35	60	32
	Not very effective	26	23	26	35	27
	Not at all effective	14	11	9	26	5
	Not sure/No answer	10	8	6	5	5
A more competitive market with strong competition among different insurers. Ranking of extremely/very effective by sector: Total: 3 Academic/Research Institution: 3 Health Care Delivery: 3 (tie) Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry: 2 Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy: 5	Extremely/very effective	25	24	29	32	11
	Extremely effective	7	9	6	9	3
	Very effective	17	15	24	23	8
	Somewhat effective	31	30	29	40	35
	Not very/not at all effective	37	42	40	26	46
	Not very effective	30	34	35	23	32
	Not at all effective	7	9	4	3	14
	Not sure/No answer	7	4	1	2	8

TABLE 3
OVERHEAD (continued)

		Total	Academic/ Research Institution	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
		%	%	%	%	%
State electronic clearinghouses with consolidated electronic information on enrollees and claims. Ranking of extremely/very effective by sector: Total: 4 Academic/Research Institution: 5 Health Care Delivery: 2 Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry: 3 (tie) Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy: 3	Extremely/very effective	22	18	35	21	30
	Extremely effective	4	4	4	4	11
	Very effective	18	15	31	17	19
	Somewhat effective	40	44	40	42	43
	Not very/not at all effective	24	25	21	28	19
	Not very effective	18	20	16	18	16
	Not at all effective	5	6	4	10	3
	Not sure/No answer	14	12	4	9	8
Public information on private insurance administrative overhead, including medical loss ratios by product line, expenses, profits, and reserves. Ranking of extremely/very effective by sector: Total: 5 Academic/Research Institution: 4 Health Care Delivery: 5 Business/Insurance/Other Health Care Industry: 3 (tie) Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy: 4	Extremely/very effective	21	22	26	21	19
	Extremely effective	6	6	6	6	5
	Very effective	16	16	21	14	14
	Somewhat effective	35	37	43	32	46
	Not very/not at all effective	39	40	31	46	30
	Not very effective	31	30	24	36	27
	Not at all effective	8	9	7	10	3
	Not sure/No answer	5	1	—	1	5

TABLE 4
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	
Medical, public health, nursing, or other health professional school	26
Think Tank/Health Care Institute/Policy Research Institution	19
University setting not in a medical, public health, nursing, or other health professional school	8
Foundation	9
Medical publisher	2
Health Care Delivery and Professional, Trade, or Consumer Organizations	
Medical society or professional association or organization	8
Hospital	8
Physician practice/Other clinical practice (patient care)	7
Clinic	2
Hospital or related professional association or organization	4
Nursing home/Long-term care facility	1
Allied health society or professional association or organization	*
Other Industry/Business Settings	
Health care consulting firm	7
CEO, CFO, Benefits manager	5
Accrediting body and organization (non-governmental)	1
Polling organization	1
Financial service industry	*
Other	2
Labor Consumer Advocacy Groups and Health Care Improvement Organizations	
Labor/Consumer/Seniors' advocacy group	4
Health care improvement organization	4
Health Insurance and Professional Organization	
Health insurance/managed care industry	4
Health insurance and business association or organization	3
Government	
Non-elected federal executive branch official	2
Staff for a federal elected official or federal legislative committee	2
Non-elected state executive branch official	1
Staff for a state elected official or state legislative committee	1
Staff for non-elected federal executive branch official	1
Staff for non-elected state executive branch official	1
Pharmaceutical Industry and Professional Organization	
Drug manufacturer	3
Pharmaceutical/Medical device trade association organization	1
Biotech company	1
Device company	*
No answer	4

* Fewer than 1 percent of respondents gave this answer.

TABLE 5
TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

“How would you describe your current employment position?”

Base: 289 Respondents

	%
Teacher, researcher, professor	37
Policy analyst	25
CEO/President	22
Physician	20
Administration/Management	16
Consultant	9
Foundation officer	8
Health care purchaser	7
Consumer advocate	6
Department head/Dean	4
Policymaker or policy staff (federal)	4
Lobbyist	4
Policymaker or policy staff (state)	3
Other health care provider (not physician)	3
Investment analyst	*
Other	2
Retired	3
No answer	4

TABLE 6
PERMISSION TO BE NAMED AS A SURVEY PARTICIPANT

Base: 289 Respondents

	%
Yes	86
No	10
No answer	4

APPENDIX

METHODOLOGY

The online survey was conducted by Harris Interactive with 289 opinion leaders in health policy and innovators in health care delivery and finance between April 7, 2005, and April 21, 2005.

The sample for this survey was developed through a two-step process. Initially, The Commonwealth Fund and Harris Interactive jointly identified a number of experts across different industries and professional sectors with 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 the health care industry. 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. The final list included 1,314 people.

Harris Interactive sent out individual e-mail invitations containing a password-protected link to the survey to the entire list. Of the 1,314 e-mail invitations, 58 were returned as undeliverable, resulting in a final sample of 1,256. Steps were taken to attempt to correct the e-mail addresses and locate the individuals, however these efforts were unsuccessful. Harris Interactive determined that the undeliverable e-mail addresses appeared to be randomly distributed among the different sectors and affiliations. Data collection took place between April 7, 2005, and April 21, 2005. A total of three reminders were sent to anyone who had not responded. The response rate was 23 percent. Typically, samples of this size are associated with a sampling error of +/- 6%.