

## The Commonwealth Fund/Modern Healthcare Health Care Opinion Leaders Survey

# HEALTH POLICY PRIORITIES FOR THE INCOMING 112TH CONGRESS

February 2011

### 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 203 of innovators and opinion leaders in health policy, health care delivery, and finance. This was the 24<sup>th</sup> study in a series of surveys designed to highlight leaders' perspectives on the most timely health policy issues facing the nation. This survey focused on healthcare transparency in the United States.

Health care opinion leaders were identified by The Commonwealth Fund, *Modern Healthcare*, and Harris Interactive as individuals who are experts and influential decision makers within their respective industries.

### About the Respondents

Respondents represent a broad range of employment positions and professional 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* (54%)\*
- *Health Care Delivery* (23%)\*; 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* (22%)\*; including health insurance, pharmaceutical, other industries/businesses, and health care improvement organizations.
- *Government/Labor/Consumer Advocacy* (10%)\*; including government, labor, and consumer advocacy.\*\*

\* Percentages add to more than 100 as respondents were able to give more than one answer.

\*\* Respondents in these industries were combined due to the small sample sizes of the individual groups

**Contents**

TABLE 1 – VIEWS OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT (ACA) ..... 3

TABLE 2 – AFFORDABLE CARE ACT (ACA) PROVISIONS..... 4

TABLE 3 – EFFECTIVENESS OF COST-CONTAINMENT APPROACHES..... 7

TABLE 4 – APPROACHES TO REDUCE FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT .....11

TABLE 5 – TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT .....15

TABLE 6 – PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT .....16

**TABLE 1**  
**Views of the Affordable Care Act (ACA)**

“The Affordable Care Act (ACA) put in place policies aimed at substantially expanding health insurance coverage, developing new payment approaches to encourage and support improved delivery system performance, increasing transparency and accessibility of cost and quality information, and enhancing public health. Which of the following comes closest to your view regarding the strategic direction set by the new law?”

*Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding or no response*

Base: 203 respondents

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Academic/ Research Inst.</b>	<b>Health Care Delivery</b>	<b>Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry</b>	<b>Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>n=</b>	203	110	47	44	20
The course set by the ACA is generally appropriate, with some minor changes to the policies put in place by the law	45%	38%	47%	52%	40%
The health system should continue on the course set by the ACA and the policies put in place by the new law should be carried out as enacted	23%	34%	15%	11%	25%
The course set by the ACA is generally appropriate, but major changes are needed to the policies put in place by the law	23%	22%	26%	23%	15%
The ACA set the wrong course, and a different approach should be taken to improve health system performance	9%	5%	11%	14%	20%
No major changes are needed; the health system is on the right course	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	*	1%	2%	-	-

**TABLE 2**  
**Affordable Care Act (ACA) Provisions**

“Below are several major elements of the new health reform law. How important is it that each of the following provisions be implemented?”

*Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding or no response*

Base: 202 respondents

		Total	Academic/ Research Inst.	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
		%	%	%	%	%
Premium subsidies (income-based subsidies to offset the cost of coverage obtained through the state-based insurance exchanges)	<b>n=</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Very important/ Important</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>70%</b>
	Very important	68%	75%	64%	59%	55%
	Important	19%	15%	19%	23%	15%
	<b>Somewhat important/Not at all important</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>30%</b>
	Somewhat important	7%	3%	9%	16%	15%
	Not at all important	4%	4%	4%	2%	15%
Not Sure	2%	3%	4%	-	-	
State-based health insurance exchanges (mechanisms to facilitate access to information on alternative policies and access to them)	<b>n=</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Very important/ Important</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>75%</b>
	Very important	63%	74%	57%	44%	45%
	Important	23%	16%	30%	33%	30%
	<b>Somewhat important/Not at all important</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>25%</b>
	Somewhat important	10%	6%	9%	16%	15%
	Not at all important	4%	4%	4%	7%	10%
Not Sure	-	-	-	-	-	
Individual mandate (requirement that every individual obtain health insurance coverage, subject to specified affordability standards)	<b>n=</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Very important/ Important</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>85%</b>
	Very important	66%	68%	72%	64%	50%
	Important	18%	19%	13%	18%	35%
	<b>Somewhat important/Not at all important</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>15%</b>
	Somewhat important	6%	1%	9%	9%	5%
	Not at all important	7%	9%	6%	7%	10%
Not Sure	2%	3%	-	2%	-	

**TABLE 2 (cont.)  
Affordable Care Act (ACA) Provisions**

“Below are several major elements of the new health reform law. How important is it that each of the following provisions be implemented?”

*Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding or no response*

Base: 203 respondents

		Total	Academic/ Research Inst.	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
		%	%	%	%	%
Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation (organization within the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services created to develop and implement new payment and delivery system approaches)	<b>n=</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Very important/ Important</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>85%</b>
	Very important	65%	65%	70%	66%	65%
	Important	17%	18%	17%	18%	20%
	<b>Somewhat important/Not at all important</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>15%</b>
	Somewhat important	12%	14%	9%	9%	5%
	Not at all important	3%	3%	4%	5%	10%
	Not Sure	1%	-	-	2%	-
Medicaid expansion (inclusion of nearly all individuals under 65 with incomes up to 133 percent of the federal poverty level)	<b>n=</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Very important/ Important</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>75%</b>
	Very important	70%	74%	72%	61%	55%
	Important	12%	13%	6%	16%	20%
	<b>Somewhat important/Not at all important</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>25%</b>
	Somewhat important	<b>8%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>5%</b>
	Not at all important	8%	6%	9%	7%	20%
	Not Sure	1%	1%	2%	-	-
Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (private non-profit organization to set priorities and carry out research to develop evidence on best practices in health care delivery and organization)	<b>n=</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Very important/ Important</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>90%</b>
	Very important	47%	47%	51%	55%	45%
	Important	32%	28%	28%	32%	45%
	<b>Somewhat important/Not at all important</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>10%</b>
	Somewhat important	<b>17%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>5%</b>
	Not at all important	3%	2%	9%	5%	5%
	Not Sure	1%	1%	-	-	-

**TABLE 2 (cont.)  
Affordable Care Act (ACA) Provisions**

“Below are several major elements of the new health reform law. How important is it that each of the following provisions be implemented?”

*Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding or no response*

Base: 202 respondents

		Total	Academic/ Research Inst.	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government/ Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
		%	%	%	%	%
	<b>n=</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
Independent Payment Advisory Board (independent board with a mandate to develop policies to reduce the growth of Medicare spending if it is projected to exceed specified targets)	<b>Very important/ Important</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>50%</b>
	Very important	41%	51%	23%	45%	30%
	Important	30%	26%	38%	32%	20%
	<b>Somewhat important/Not at all important</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>50%</b>
	Somewhat important	17%	12%	21%	14%	35%
	Not at all important	11%	10%	17%	7%	15%
	Not Sure	1%	1%	-	2%	-

**TABLE 3**  
**Effectiveness of Cost-Containment Approaches**

“Below are several health care payment options. How effective do you think each of the following payment approaches would be in achieving a high performance health care system?”

*Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding or no response*

Base: 203 respondents

		Total	Academic/ Research Inst.	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government / Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
		%	%	%	%	%
Improve coordination of care for patients with chronic conditions	<b>n=</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Extremely effective/Very effective</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>85%</b>
	Extremely effective	65%	64%	77%	66%	45%
	Very effective	26%	26%	17%	25%	40%
	<b>Somewhat effective/Not effective</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>15%</b>
	Somewhat effective	7%	8%	4%	7%	15%
	Not effective	0	1%	-	-	-
	Not Sure	1%	1%	2%	2%	-
Make permanent the ACA’s provisions for temporary increases in Medicare and Medicaid payments for primary care physicians	<b>n=</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Extremely effective/Very effective</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>70%</b>
	Extremely effective	39%	36%	60%	36%	25%
	Very effective	33%	32%	32%	32%	45%
	<b>Somewhat effective/Not effective</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>30%</b>
	Somewhat effective	14%	15%	6%	23%	10%
	Not effective	10%	13%	2%	7%	20%
	Not Sure	4%	5%	-	2%	-
Establish greater alignment of payment methods and rates across public and private payers, to reduce variation in payment rates for the same services across providers and payers and slow cost growth	<b>n=</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Extremely effective/Very effective</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>75%</b>
	Extremely effective	41%	41%	48%	36%	40%
	Very effective	28%	30%	17%	30%	35%
	<b>Somewhat effective/Not effective</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>25%</b>
	Somewhat effective	17%	15%	17%	18%	10%
	Not effective	9%	6%	15%	9%	15%
	Not Sure	5%	7%	2%	7%	-

**TABLE 3**  
**Effectiveness of Cost-Containment Approaches (cont.)**

“Below are several health care payment options. How effective do you think each of the following payment approaches would be in achieving a high performance health care system?”

*Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding or no response*

Base: 203 respondents

		Total	Academic/ Research Inst.	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government / Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
		%	%	%	%	%
Value-based insurance design (structuring copayments to reflect existing evidence as to the effectiveness of alternative services in preventing illness or restoring health)	<b>n=</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Extremely effective/Very effective</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>65%</b>
	Extremely effective	28%	25%	32%	30%	15%
	Very effective	40%	39%	40%	41%	50%
	<b>Somewhat effective/Not effective</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>35%</b>
	Somewhat effective	23%	25%	17%	20%	30%
	Not effective	4%	4%	4%	9%	5%
	Not Sure	5%	6%	6%	-	-
Accelerate the implementation of the ACA’s provisions for bundled payment for acute and post-acute care	<b>n=</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Extremely effective/Very effective</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>65%</b>
	Extremely effective	30%	31%	28%	32%	25%
	Very effective	36%	43%	23%	39%	40%
	<b>Somewhat effective/Not effective</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>35%</b>
	Somewhat effective	21%	13%	28%	20%	25%
	Not effective	8%	8%	17%	7%	10%
	Not Sure	4%	5%	4%	2%	-
Reference pricing (requiring patients to pay the difference if lower-priced but equally effective services are available)	<b>n=</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Extremely effective/Very effective</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>75%</b>
	Extremely effective	26%	27%	9%	25%	45%
	Very effective	34%	31%	50%	34%	30%
	<b>Somewhat effective/Not effective</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>25%</b>
	Somewhat effective	26%	26%	33%	23%	15%
	Not effective	8%	7%	2%	14%	10%
	Not Sure	6%	8%	7%	5%	-



**TABLE 3**  
**Effectiveness of Cost-Containment Approaches (cont.)**

“Below are several health care payment options. How effective do you think each of the following payment approaches would be in achieving a high performance health care system?”

*Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding or no response*

Base: 203 respondents

		Total	Academic/ Research Inst.	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government / Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
		%	%	%	%	%
Revise payment rates to more accurately reflect the cost of providing physician services	<b>n=</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Extremely effective/Very effective</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>50%</b>
	Extremely effective	30%	27%	49%	20%	20%
	Very effective	29%	30%	19%	34%	30%
	<b>Somewhat effective/Not effective</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>50%</b>
	Somewhat effective	25%	23%	23%	27%	40%
	Not effective	10%	11%	2%	14%	10%
	Not Sure	6%	9%	6%	5%	-
Strengthen the role of the state-based health insurance exchanges to promote competition in the health insurance market and encourage the implementation of payment and delivery reforms	<b>n=</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Extremely effective/Very effective</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>50%</b>
	Extremely effective	23%	24%	28%	16%	20%
	Very effective	33%	35%	34%	30%	30%
	<b>Somewhat effective/Not effective</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>
	Somewhat effective	32%	32%	26%	32%	25%
	Not effective	9%	5%	11%	18%	25%
	Not Sure	3%	5%	2%	5%	-
Allow consumers to purchase insurance across state lines	<b>n=</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>Extremely effective/Very effective</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>32%</b>
	Extremely effective	22%	20%	30%	14%	21%
	Very effective	15%	16%	17%	9%	11%
	<b>Somewhat effective/Not effective</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>63%</b>
	Somewhat effective	20%	23%	15%	25%	26%
	Not effective	33%	33%	26%	43%	37%
	Not Sure	9%	8%	13%	9%	5%

**TABLE 3**  
**Effectiveness of Cost-Containment Approaches (cont.)**

“Below are several health care payment options. How effective do you think each of the following payment approaches would be in achieving a high performance health care system?”

*Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding or no response*

Base: 203 respondents

		Total	Academic/ Research Inst.	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government / Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
		%	%	%	%	%
Expand the use of health savings accounts and high deductible health plans	<b>n=</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>Extremely effective/Very effective</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>21%</b>
	Extremely effective	10%	7%	17%	14%	16%
	Very effective	12%	13%	19%	9%	5%
	<b>Somewhat effective/Not effective</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>79%</b>
	Somewhat effective	31%	23%	34%	40%	42%
	Not effective	46%	57%	28%	35%	37%
	Not Sure	1%	-	2%	2%	-

**TABLE 4**  
**Approaches to Reduce Federal Budget Deficit**

“Please indicate your support for or opposition to the following approaches that have been proposed by the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform and others to reduce the federal budget deficit.”

*Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding or no response*

Base: 203 respondents

		Total	Academic/ Research Inst.	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government / Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
Expand successful cost-containment pilots mandated in the ACA, such as pay-for-performance programs and the bundling of post-acute care services	<b>n=</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Strongly Support/ Support</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>70%</b>
	Strongly Support	32%	34%	30%	42%	25%
	Support	49%	50%	53%	37%	45%
	Neither Support Nor Oppose	11%	8%	11%	14%	10%
	<b>Oppose /Somewhat Oppose</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>15%</b>
	Oppose	4%	4%	2%	2%	10%
	Strongly Oppose	1%	1%	4%	2%	5%
Not Sure	2%	3%	-	2%	5%	
Extend Medicaid prescription drug rebates established in the ACA to people eligible for both Medicare and Medicaid	<b>n=</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Strongly Support/ Support</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>55%</b>
	Strongly Support	17%	22%	15%	5%	10%
	Support	45%	40%	51%	58%	45%
	Neither Support Nor Oppose	22%	20%	17%	23%	25%
	<b>Oppose /Somewhat Oppose</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>10%</b>
	Oppose	6%	6%	4%	2%	5%
	Strongly Oppose	3%	3%	4%	7%	5%
Not Sure	7%	9%	9%	5%	10%	
Add a robust public option and/or all-payer system in state health insurance exchanges	<b>n=</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Strongly Support/ Support</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>50%</b>
	Strongly Support	32%	37%	17%	30%	20%
	Support	29%	30%	36%	30%	30%
	Neither Support Nor Oppose	9%	9%	13%	9%	15%
	<b>Oppose /Somewhat Oppose</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>30%</b>
	Oppose	11%	8%	13%	9%	20%
	Strongly Oppose	14%	12%	19%	20%	10%
Not Sure	3%	4%	2%	2%	5%	

**TABLE 4 (cont.)**  
**Approaches to Reduce Federal Budget Deficit**

“Please indicate your support for or opposition to the following approaches that have been proposed by the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform and others to reduce the federal budget deficit.”

*Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding or no response*

Base: 203 respondents

		Total	Academic/ Research Inst.	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government / Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
Accelerate the discontinuation of the exemption of health insurance benefits from income tax and lower the threshold for premiums subject to tax	<b>n=</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Strongly Support/ Support</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>45%</b>
	Strongly Support	15%	23%	4%	14%	5%
	Support	34%	32%	38%	39%	40%
	Neither Support Nor Oppose	17%	9%	23%	16%	25%
	<b>Oppose /Somewhat Oppose</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>30%</b>
	Oppose	16%	17%	15%	16%	20%
	Strongly Oppose	12%	10%	19%	14%	10%
	Not Sure	5%	9%	-	2%	-
Redesign Medicare cost-sharing by establishing a universal deductible of \$550 for Part A and Part B, with 20% coinsurance above \$550 and 5% coinsurance after costs exceed \$5500, and an annual cap of \$7500 on out of pocket costs	<b>n=</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Strongly Support/ Support</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>35%</b>
	Strongly Support	9%	12%	4%	5%	10%
	Support	30%	25%	36%	39%	25%
	Neither Support Nor Oppose	26%	25%	34%	25%	45%
	<b>Oppose /Somewhat Oppose</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>20%</b>
	Oppose	14%	17%	11%	11%	15%
	Strongly Oppose	7%	6%	6%	7%	5%
	Not Sure	14%	16%	9%	14%	-
Strengthen the IPAB by giving it broader authority over payment not only by Medicare but also other public and private payers	<b>n=</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Strongly Support/ Support</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>40%</b>
	Strongly Support	12%	15%	9%	18%	10%
	Support	26%	25%	13%	32%	30%
	Neither Support Nor Oppose	19%	21%	13%	11%	30%
	<b>Oppose /Somewhat Oppose</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>20%</b>
	Oppose	18%	15%	33%	18%	15%
	Strongly Oppose	14%	11%	22%	16%	5%
	Not Sure	11%	13%	11%	5%	10%

**TABLE 4 (cont.)  
Approaches to Reduce Federal Budget Deficit**

“Please indicate your support for or opposition to the following approaches that have been proposed by the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform and others to reduce the federal budget deficit.”

*Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding or no response*

Base: 203 respondents

		Total	Academic/ Research Inst.	Health Care Delivery	Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry	Government / Labor/ Consumer Advocacy
		%	%	%	%	%
Replace the cuts in Medicare physician fees under the sustainable growth rate (SGR) mechanism in current law with a payment freeze through 2013 and a 1 percent cut in 2014, reinstating the SGR until new system is in place	<b>n=</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>Strongly Support/ Support</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>32%</b>
	Strongly Support	7%	8%	6%	5%	-
	Support	29%	31%	28%	34%	32%
	Neither Support Nor Oppose	22%	21%	15%	18%	26%
	<b>Oppose /Somewhat Oppose</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>26%</b>
	Oppose	20%	15%	21%	27%	16%
	Strongly Oppose	11%	10%	19%	7%	11%
	Not Sure	12%	15%	11%	9%	16%
Restrict first-dollar coverage under Medicare supplemental insurance (Medigap)	<b>n=</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Strongly Support/ Support</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>15%</b>
	Strongly Support	9%	11%	6%	5%	-
	Support	25%	28%	19%	34%	15%
	Neither Support Nor Oppose	23%	17%	30%	20%	30%
	<b>Oppose /Somewhat Oppose</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>55%</b>
	Oppose	22%	24%	23%	25%	35%
	Strongly Oppose	12%	11%	9%	11%	20%
	Not Sure	9%	9%	13%	5%	-
Convert Medicaid into a block grant program in which the federal government would provide a fixed amount to each state to run its program	<b>n=</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Strongly Support/ Support</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>20%</b>
	Strongly Support	6%	6%	4%	7%	5%
	Support	20%	19%	15%	34%	15%
	Neither Support Nor Oppose	13%	12%	21%	16%	15%
	<b>Oppose /Somewhat Oppose</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>60%</b>
	Oppose	22%	19%	30%	16%	30%
	Strongly Oppose	30%	36%	26%	20%	30%
Not Sure	7%	9%	4%	7%	5%	

**TABLE 4 (cont.)**  
**Approaches to Reduce Federal Budget Deficit**

“Please indicate your support for or opposition to the following approaches that have been proposed by the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform and others to reduce the federal budget deficit.”

*Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding or no response*

Base: 203 respondents

		<b>Total</b>	<b>Academic/ Research Inst.</b>	<b>Health Care Delivery</b>	<b>Business/ Insurance/ Other Health Care Industry</b>	<b>Government / Labor/ Consumer Advocacy</b>
	<b>n=</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>20</b>
Convert Medicare into a premium support program, in which beneficiaries would be given vouchers to use in purchasing their own insurance in the private market	<b>Strongly Support/ Support</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>15%</b>
	Strongly Support	8%	7%	6%	14%	5%
	Support	14%	12%	17%	18%	10%
	Neither Support Nor Oppose	11%	6%	21%	11%	10%
	<b>Oppose /Somewhat Oppose</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>70%</b>
	Oppose	25%	28%	32%	18%	30%
	Strongly Oppose	36%	40%	21%	32%	40%
Not Sure	6%	6%	2%	7%	5%	

**TABLE 5  
TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT**

"How would you describe your current employment position?"

*Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding or no response*

Base: 202 respondents

	%
Researcher/Professor/Teacher	35%
CEO/President	28%
Physician	22%
Policy analyst	20%
Management/Administration	14%
Consultant	11%
Dean or department head	6%
Consumer advocate	5%
Healthcare purchaser	5%
Foundation officer	4%
Policymaker or policy staff (state)	3%
Other healthcare provider (not physician)	2%
Lobbyist	2%
Policymaker or policy staff (federal)	2%
Regulator	*
Investment analyst	-
Retired	8%
Other	2%

**TABLE 6  
PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT**

"Which of the following best describes the place or institution for which you work or if retired last worked?"

*Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding or no response*

Base: 201 respondents

	%
<b>Academic and Research Institutions</b>	<b>55%</b>
Medical, public health, nursing, or other health professional school	23%
Think tank/Healthcare institute/Policy research institution	19%
University setting not in a medical, public health, nursing, or other health professional school	11%
Foundation	6%
Medical publisher	-
<b>Professional, Trade, Consumer Organizations</b>	<b>19%</b>
Medical society or professional association or organization	6%
Hospital or related professional association or organization	6%
Health insurance and business association or organization	5%
Labor/Consumer/Seniors' advocacy group	2%
Allied health society or professional association or organization	1%
Pharmaceutical/Medical device trade association organization	*
Financial services industry	*
<b>Health Care Delivery</b>	<b>13%</b>
Hospital	5%
Physician practice/Other clinical practice (patient care)	4%
Clinic	4%
Health insurance/Managed care industry	4%
Nursing home/Long-term care facility	1%
<b>Government</b>	<b>4%</b>
Non-elected state executive-branch official	1%
Staff for a state elected official or state legislative committee	1%
Non-elected federal executive-branch official	1%
Staff for non-elected federal executive-branch official	1%
Staff for a federal elected official or federal legislative committee	*
Staff for non-elected state executive-branch official	-
<b>Pharmaceutical Industry</b>	<b>*</b>
Drug manufacturer	*
Device company	-
Biotech company	-
<b>Other Industry/Business Settings</b>	<b>16%</b>
Healthcare consulting firm	8%
Healthcare improvement organization	5%
CEO, CFO, Benefits Manager	3%
Polling organization	1%
Accrediting body and organization (non-governmental)	1%

Please note that respondents may fall into more than one of these categories.