

By the People - Deliberation Week 200!
Deliberative Opinion Poll Results for: Healthcare

Location of Deliberation	National online	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
Local focus of deliberation	cost and insurance	HIV, eldercare, uninsured	Medicaid, uninsured	rural Healthcare challenges	costs, uninsured, medical research	responsibility for health & wellness	Medicare, uninsured	cost and coverage

Q1	<i>Here is a list of problems our Healthcare system might face. Which of these do you think is most important?</i>							
	National online	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)	358	59	39	41	67	35	53	43
The cost of health insurance	29.9%	44%	67%	41%	39%	54%	51%	26%
The number of Americans without health insurance	49.1%	46%	21%	51%	46%	34%	42%	72%
The cost of prescription drugs	6.4%	5%	5%	5%	10%	9%	0%	0%
Medical errors or mistakes	0.9%	3%	3%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
The medical malpractice system	11.8%	0%	3%	0%	3%	3%	6%	2%
Quality of Healthcare provided to those with insurance	1.8%	2%	3%	2%	0%	0%	2%	0%

Q2	<i>Here is a list of problems our Healthcare system might face. Which of these do you think is the SECOND most important?</i>							
	National online	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)	353	60	39	42	68	36	54	43
The cost of health insurance	40.2%	38%	31%	31%	43%	22%	37%	53%
The number of Americans without health insurance	19.1%	30%	41%	29%	16%	36%	39%	19%
The cost of prescription drugs	31.8%	23%	26%	26%	28%	25%	17%	14%
Medical errors or mistakes	3.3%	2%	0%	2%	3%	8%	6%	0%
The medical malpractice system	3.9%	2%	3%	7%	3%	3%	2%	0%
Quality of Healthcare provided to those with insurance	1.6%	5%	0%	5%	7%	6%	0%	14%

Q3	<i>To what degree do you think your elected representatives in Washington share your priorities for how to improve Healthcare.</i>							
	National online	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)	358	60	41	44	68	36	54	43
0 - Completely different priorities	19.5%	10%	10%	14%	4%	3%	9%	5%
1	7.5%	5%	0%	9%	10%	8%	4%	5%
2	16.8%	3%	10%	16%	13%	6%	17%	9%
3	8.4%	10%	20%	20%	16%	11%	20%	14%
4	9.0%	8%	15%	5%	12%	14%	6%	5%
5	17.5%	27%	12%	11%	19%	31%	26%	26%
6	3.0%	12%	2%	9%	3%	6%	6%	2%
7	4.6%	12%	7%	5%	7%	3%	4%	7%
8	5.3%	7%	7%	2%	6%	6%	4%	5%
9	2.5%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	5%
10 - Completely the same	2.6%	3%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%
11 - Don't know/DNR	3.2%	2%	17%	9%	9%	11%	4%	19%

Q4	<i>To what degree do you think your elected state representatives at the state capital share your priorities for how to improve Healthcare?</i>							
	National online	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)		60	41	44	68	36	54	43
0 - Completely different priorities		3%	7%	11%	10%	3%	4%	0%
1		0%	0%	14%	7%	3%	6%	5%
2		7%	15%	2%	13%	11%	17%	7%
3		15%	12%	23%	13%	8%	13%	9%
4		8%	10%	2%	10%	19%	15%	7%
5		28%	17%	11%	13%	22%	22%	12%
6		7%	10%	16%	9%	14%	7%	9%
7		13%	7%	2%	6%	3%	9%	12%
8		12%	5%	0%	6%	0%	2%	7%
9		3%	0%	5%	1%	0%	0%	0%
10 - Completely the same		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
11 - Don't know/DNR		3%	17%	14%	10%	17%	6%	33%

Q5	<i>Would you be willing to pay more than you do now for Healthcare if this meant that many more Americans would have health insurance coverage?</i>							
	National online	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)	358	60	40	43	68	36	54	43
Yes, at least slightly more	51.8%	55%	38%	60%	62%	61%	65%	60%
Yes, significantly more	10.2%	12%	15%	12%	7%	6%	6%	19%
No	31.1%	27%	40%	21%	25%	31%	22%	9%
Couldn't say	6.9%	7%	8%	7%	6%	3%	7%	12%

Q6	<i>How effective or ineffective would this be at controlling Healthcare costs? Increasing co-pays and deductibles for consumers</i>							
	National online	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)	355	60	40	44	68	36	54	42
Very effective	4.4%	8%	5%	9%	3%	6%	6%	2%
Somewhat effective	25.7%	38%	30%	34%	44%	47%	43%	17%
Neither effective nor ineffective	14.5%	22%	15%	16%	22%	19%	24%	14%
Somewhat ineffective	19.4%	13%	28%	16%	9%	8%	11%	26%
Very ineffective	33.4%	15%	20%	18%	19%	11%	17%	33%
Couldn't say	2.5%	3%	3%	7%	3%	8%	0%	7%

Q7	<i>How effective or ineffective would this be at controlling Healthcare costs? Relying on managed care through HMOs</i>							
	National online	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)	356	60	41	44	68	36	54	43
Very effective	3.9%	3%	5%	0%	12%	0%	6%	5%
Somewhat effective	18.3%	30%	33%	36%	44%	28%	61%	23%
Neither effective nor ineffective	12.7%	27%	5%	18%	4%	11%	15%	13%
Somewhat ineffective	22.7%	17%	20%	18%	22%	28%	6%	18%
Very ineffective	35.5%	22%	28%	20%	13%	19%	7%	33%
Couldn't say	7.0%	2%	10%	7%	4%	14%	6%	10%

Q8	<i>How effective or ineffective would this be at controlling Healthcare costs? Limiting government funds for healthcare</i>							
	National online	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)	355	60	41	44	68	36	54	43
Very effective	5.0%	3%	0%	2%	0%	3%	9%	2%
Somewhat effective	12.9%	22%	10%	19%	29%	19%	11%	2%
Neither effective nor ineffective	11.6%	22%	12%	7%	4%	17%	19%	17%
Somewhat ineffective	16.9%	15%	46%	26%	31%	25%	22%	17%
Very ineffective	45.4%	37%	27%	42%	31%	25%	31%	59%
Couldn't say	8.3%	2%	5%	5%	4%	11%	7%	2%

Q9	<i>How effective or ineffective would this be at controlling Healthcare costs? Increasing government control of/involvement in healthcare</i>							
	National online	Baton Rouge	Bowling Green	Charlottesville	Kansas City	Muncie	Pittsburgh	Seattle
TOTAL (n=)	343	60	41	44	68	35	54	40
Very effective	22.5%	20%	7%	27%	10%	11%	11%	25%
Somewhat effective	22.1%	35%	49%	43%	41%	31%	44%	48%
Neither effective nor ineffective	10.3%	15%	15%	7%	4%	11%	15%	8%
Somewhat ineffective	7.9%	10%	17%	11%	21%	14%	7%	8%
Very ineffective	34.0%	15%	12%	9%	22%	23%	20%	8%
Couldn't say	3.3%	5%	0%	2%	1%	9%	2%	5%

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 event. 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 events.