

By the People - Deliberation Week 2005

Deliberative Opinion Poll Results for: Healthcare

Location of Delib National onlin Baton Rouge Bowling Green Charlottesville Kansas City Muncie Pittsburgh Seattle  
 Local focus of de cost and insur HIV, eldercare Medicaid, uninsured rural Healthcar costs, uninsured responsibility Medicaid, cos cost and cover

Q1 Here is a list of problems our Healthcare system might face. Which of these do you think is most important?

	National onlin	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)	358	59	39	41	67	35	53	43
The cost of healt	0.299	0.44067797	0.666666667	0.414634146	0.388059701	0.54285714	0.50943396	0.25581395
The number of A	0.491	0.45762712	0.205128205	0.512195122	0.462686567	0.34285714	0.41509434	0.72093023
The cost of presc	0.064	0.05084746	0.051282051	0.048780488	0.104477612	0.08571429	0	0
Medical errors or	0.009	0.03389831	0.025641026	0	0.014925373	0	0	0
The medical malj	0.118	0	0.025641026	0	0.029850746	0.02857143	0.05660377	0.02325581
Quality of Health	0.018	0.01694915	0.025641026	0.024390244	0	0	0.01886792	0

Q2 Here is a list of problems our Healthcare system might face. Which of these do you think is the SECOND most important?

	National onlin	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)	353	60	39	42	68	36	54	43
The cost of healt	0.402	0.38333333	0.307692308	0.30952381	0.426470588	0.22222222	0.37037037	0.53488372
The number of A	0.191	0.3	0.41025641	0.285714286	0.161764706	0.36111111	0.38888889	0.18604651
The cost of presc	0.318	0.23333333	0.256410256	0.261904762	0.279411765	0.25	0.16666667	0.13953488
Medical errors or	0.033	0.01666667	0	0.023809524	0.029411765	0.08333333	0.05555556	0
The medical malj	0.039	0.01666667	0.025641026	0.071428571	0.029411765	0.02777778	0.01851852	0
Quality of Health	0.016	0.05	0	0.047619048	0.073529412	0.05555556	0	0.13953488

Q3 To what degree do you think your elected representatives in Washington share your priorities for how to improve Healthcar

	National onlin	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)	358	60	41	44	68	36	54	43
0 - Completely di	0.195	0.1	0.097560976	0.136363636	0.044117647	0.02777778	0.09259259	0.04651163
1	0.075	0.05	0	0.090909091	0.102941176	0.08333333	0.03703704	0.04651163
2	0.168	0.03333333	0.097560976	0.159090909	0.132352941	0.05555556	0.16666667	0.09302326
3	0.084	0.1	0.195121951	0.204545455	0.161764706	0.11111111	0.2037037	0.13953488
4	0.09	0.08333333	0.146341463	0.045454545	0.117647059	0.13888889	0.05555556	0.04651163

5	0.175	0.26666667	0.12195122	0.113636364	0.191176471	0.30555556	0.25925926	0.25581395
6	0.03	0.11666667	0.024390244	0.090909091	0.029411765	0.05555556	0.05555556	0.02325581
7	0.046	0.11666667	0.073170732	0.045454545	0.073529412	0.02777778	0.03703704	0.06976744
8	0.053	0.06666667	0.073170732	0.022727273	0.058823529	0.05555556	0.03703704	0.04651163
9	0.025	0.01666667	0	0	0	0	0.01851852	0.04651163
10 - Completely t	0.026	0.03333333	0	0	0	0.02777778	0	0
11 - Don't know/	0.032	0.01666667	0.170731707	0.090909091	0.088235294	0.11111111	0.03703704	0.18604651

Q4 To what degree do you think your elected state representatives at the state capital share your priorities for how to improve

	National onlin	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)		60	41	44	68	36	54	43
0 - Completely different priorit	0.03333333	0.073170732	0.113636364	0.102941176	0.02777778	0.03703704		0
1	0	0	0.136363636	0.073529412	0.02777778	0.05555556	0.04651163	
2	0.06666667	0.146341463	0.022727273	0.132352941	0.11111111	0.16666667	0.06976744	
3	0.15	0.12195122	0.227272727	0.132352941	0.08333333	0.12962963	0.09302326	
4	0.08333333	0.097560976	0.022727273	0.102941176	0.19444444	0.14814815	0.06976744	
5	0.28333333	0.170731707	0.113636364	0.132352941	0.22222222	0.22222222	0.11627907	
6	0.06666667	0.097560976	0.159090909	0.088235294	0.13888889	0.07407407	0.09302326	
7	0.13333333	0.073170732	0.022727273	0.058823529	0.02777778	0.09259259	0.11627907	
8	0.11666667	0.048780488	0	0.058823529	0	0.01851852	0.06976744	
9	0.03333333	0	0.045454545	0.014705882	0	0	0	
10 - Completely the same	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11 - Don't know/DNR	0.03333333	0.170731707	0.136363636	0.102941176	0.16666667	0.05555556	0.3255814	

Q5 Would you be willing to pay more than you do now for Healthcare if this meant that many more Americans would have hea

	National onlin	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)	358	60	40	43	68	36	54	43
Yes, at least slight	0.518	0.55	0.375	0.604651163	0.617647059	0.61111111	0.64814815	0.60465116
Yes, significantly	0.102	0.11666667	0.15	0.11627907	0.073529412	0.05555556	0.05555556	0.18604651
No	0.311	0.26666667	0.4	0.209302326	0.25	0.30555556	0.22222222	0.09302326
Couldn't say	0.069	0.06666667	0.075	0.069767442	0.058823529	0.02777778	0.07407407	0.11627907

Q6 How effective or ineffective would this be at controlling Healthcare costs? ☑Increasing co-pays and deductibles for consume

	National onlin	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
--	----------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------	-------------	--------	------------	---------

TOTAL (n=)	355	60	40	44	68	36	54	42
Very effective	0.044	0.08333333	0.05	0.090909091	0.029411765	0.05555556	0.05555556	0.02380952
Somewhat effect	0.257	0.38333333	0.3	0.340909091	0.441176471	0.47222222	0.42592593	0.16666667
Neither effective	0.145	0.21666667	0.15	0.159090909	0.220588235	0.19444444	0.24074074	0.14285714
Somewhat ineffe	0.194	0.13333333	0.275	0.159090909	0.088235294	0.08333333	0.11111111	0.26190476
Very ineffective	0.334	0.15	0.2	0.181818182	0.191176471	0.11111111	0.16666667	0.33333333
Couldn't say	0.025	0.03333333	0.025	0.068181818	0.029411765	0.08333333	0	0.07142857

Q7 How effective or ineffective would this be at controlling Healthcare costs? ☐Relying on managed care through HMOs

	National onlin	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)	356	60	41	44	68	36	54	43
Very effective	0.039	0.03333333	0.05	0	0.117647059	0	0.05555556	0.05
Somewhat effect	0.183	0.3	0.325	0.363636364	0.441176471	0.27777778	0.61111111	0.225
Neither effective	0.127	0.26666667	0.05	0.181818182	0.044117647	0.11111111	0.14814815	0.125
Somewhat ineffe	0.227	0.16666667	0.2	0.181818182	0.220588235	0.27777778	0.05555556	0.175
Very ineffective	0.355	0.21666667	0.275	0.204545455	0.132352941	0.19444444	0.07407407	0.325
Couldn't say	0.07	0.01666667	0.1	0.068181818	0.044117647	0.13888889	0.05555556	0.1

Q8 How effective or ineffective would this be at controlling Healthcare costs? ☐Limiting government funds for healthcare

	National onlin	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)	355	60	41	44	68	36	54	43
Very effective	0.05	0.03333333	0	0.023255814	0	0.02777778	0.09259259	0.02439024
Somewhat effect	0.129	0.21666667	0.097560976	0.186046512	0.294117647	0.19444444	0.11111111	0.02439024
Neither effective	0.116	0.21666667	0.12195122	0.069767442	0.044117647	0.16666667	0.18518519	0.17073171
Somewhat ineffe	0.169	0.15	0.463414634	0.255813953	0.308823529	0.25	0.22222222	0.17073171
Very ineffective	0.454	0.36666667	0.268292683	0.418604651	0.308823529	0.25	0.31481481	0.58536585
Couldn't say	0.083	0.01666667	0.048780488	0.046511628	0.044117647	0.11111111	0.07407407	0.02439024

Q9 How effective or ineffective would this be at controlling Healthcare costs? ☐Increasing government control of/involvement i

	National onlin	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)	343	60	41	44	68	35	54	40
Very effective	0.225	0.2	0.073170732	0.272727273	0.102941176	0.11428571	0.11111111	0.25
Somewhat effect	0.221	0.35	0.487804878	0.431818182	0.411764706	0.31428571	0.44444444	0.475
Neither effective	0.103	0.15	0.146341463	0.068181818	0.044117647	0.11428571	0.14814815	0.075

Somewhat ineffe	0.079	0.1	0.170731707	0.113636364	0.205882353	0.14285714	0.07407407	0.075
Very ineffective	0.34	0.15	0.12195122	0.090909091	0.220588235	0.22857143	0.2037037	0.075
Couldn't say	0.033	0.05	0	0.022727273	0.014705882	0.08571429	0.01851852	0.05

All survey responses were gathered at the end of a structured deliberative process

Note on topics: the focus areas are indicated under the name of each location at the top. Local sites discussed the national issues as well as an issue of particular local concern. The online discussion was based on national background materials only; local discussions on a summary national backgrounder and a locally-generated document as well. See <http://www.newshour.org/btp>

Note on samples: the online participants were recruited through a random selection procedure supplemented by matching and stratification, from the nation as a whole; Kansas City participants were invited exclusively from among those randomly invited to participate in -- and who either attended or said they would attend - the fall 2004 deliberation; Pittsburgh's sample included all invitees to the October 2004 Charlottesville and Seattle participants included previous invitees selected in this way as well as additional participants recruited through local partners to reflect the diversity of their area. Bowling Green and Muncie consisted of new randomly invited samples. Baton Rouge included participants from the fall 2004 deliberation, new randomly invited recruits, and participants in their local Public Square