

Do You Trust Me? Why Do Some Quitlines Trust NAQC's Central Administrative Office More Than Others?



Keith Provan, PhD¹; Jonathan Beagles, MS¹; Robin Lemaire, PhD²; Scott Feyereisen, MBA¹; Scott J. Leischow, PhD³

1 University of Arizona, Tucson AZ; 2 Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg VA; 4 Mayo Clinic, Scottsdale AZ

Research Questions & Study Rationale

General: What aspects of network structure and relationship conditions explain the trust of organizations, not relative to each other, but relative to the network's administrative organization, or NAO?

Specific: What are the clusters of characteristics of North American Quitline Consortium (NAQC) organizations (both funders and providers) that can help explain why some of them have high trust relations with the NAO while others have only moderate trust?

This is an important question for NAQC since NAQC is organized around a central administrative office (i.e., an NAO) that is designed to facilitate the flow of critical information both to and among NAQC members (*i.e.*, funders and providers). Thus, trust of NAQC's central office/NAO by network members is critical to NAO success, and ultimately, to the overall effectiveness of

The Study

- Part of larger NCI-funded KIQNIC study.
- Data collected in 2009 from all NAQC organizations in the US and Canada: n = 85 of 94 total (90.4% response rate) using an online survey plus considerable follow-up.
- Key informants identified for each organization
 ranged from 1 to 5 respondents.
- 78 QL organizations used in this study (all who provided data on NAO trust): US = 65, Canada = 13.

Measures – Trust

Trust was measured using a 5-item scale. The survey question was as follows:

Most quitline organizations, whether funder or service provider, interact in one way or another with NAQC central office through its staff. Please go through the items below and rate how you feel about the relationship your organization has with the NAQC central office. In no case will any of the information you provide for this question be identifiable. The results will be reported in summary fashion only. Rate using the following scale for each item:

 $1 = \text{strongly disagree} \quad 4 = \text{agree}$

2 = disagree

5 = strongly agree

3 = neutral or not sure

a. NAQC can always be counted on to do what they say on key issues

1 2 3 4 5

b. We have a very good working relationship with NAQC

1 2 3 4 5

c. NAQC sometimes does things that can have negative consequences for us on important issues (item was reverse coded)

1 2 3 4 5

d. If we have any differences with NAQC, we can always work them out

1 2 3 4 5

e. We consider NAQC to be highly trustworthy

1 2 3 4 5

Reliability alpha for scale = 0.9157

Measures for Explaining Trust

- Engagement in NAQC Platform
- Perceived importance of NAQC methods for disseminating information measured by 10 item scale, alpha = 0.93 (ISQ5).
- Network Position Core, Periphery, & "Status Seeker"
- Based on blockmodeling using Concor (Breiger *et al.*, 1975) for US QL organizations (shows structural similarity).
- Powerful Providers
- Providers serving many QLs, measured as more than 10 QLs.
- Reputation Count of which QLs are "most admired".

Method of Analysis

Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) (Ragin, 2008)

- Bridges qualitative & quantitative analysis
- Crisp Set used (dichotomous coding of variables)
 vs. Fuzzy Set.
- Ideal for small-to-intermediate N research.
- Causal Complexity: Different combinations, or "recipes" of factors/conditions that explain subsets of cases. QCA groups cases (QL orgs) based on patterns of similarities & differences re: key variables.
- Equifinality: Same outcome (*i.e.*, trust), but different paths.
- Not inference testing and not linear.

In our study, we explore different paths or recipes associated with trust of NAQC's NAO. The recipe for some high trust QL organizations may be very different for other organizations and different from QLs with lower trust.

Analysis and Outcome Measure

Outcome: High Trust of NAO

- Overall scale mean = 4.00; US mean = 4.02, Canadian mean = 3.88
- Crisp Set for High Trust QL organizations
- US organizations' trust of NAO > 4.02
- Canadian organizations' trust of NAO > 3.88
- Number of cases where high trust present = 42
- Crisp set for Not High Trust = 36 cases

Causal Conditions

Engagement in NAQC platform [hengage]

- Crisp Set of High Engagement
- US organizations' score > 3.27 (US mean)
- Canadian organizations' score > 2.40 (Canadian mean)

Power/Reputation [hpower]

- Crisp Set of High Power = Providers serving more than 10 QLs, or,
- Funders and Single Providers of highly admired QLs
 US reputation score > 5 mentions
- Canadian reputation score > 2 mentions

Network Position

• 3 broad categories based on network block association: Core [core], Periphery [peri], Status Seeker [coreperi] (*i.e.*, QL organizations that are tied to core members, but are periphery based on their total ties.

Acknowledgements

The KIQNIC project is funded by Grant Number R01CA128638 from the National Institutes of Health to the Mayo Clinic in Arizona.







Causal Combinations – High Trust

Causal Recipe	Interpretation	Raw Coverage	Consistency	Cases
CORE * hpower	Core organizations that are not high powered	0.476190	1.000000	20
PERI * HENGAGE	Periphery organizations that are highly engaged	0.428571	0.782609	15
Solution Coverage	0.904762	•		
Solution Consistency	0.883721			

Causal Combinations – Not High Trust

Causal Recipe	Interpretation	Raw Coverage	Consistency	Cases
HPOWER	Highly Powerful	0.277778	1.000000	10
COREPERI * hengage	Status seeker organizations (peripheral but tied to core) and not engaged	0.11111	1.000000	4
PERI * hengage	Periphery organizations that are not engaged	0.416667	0.782609	15
Solution Coverage	0.805556			
Solution Consistency	0.906250			

Conclusions

Those QL organizations with high NAO trust are either:

- Highly embedded in the network of relationships (*i.e.*, core), but not very powerful, or
- Not highly embedded in the network (peripheral) but highly engaged in the NAQC platform.

Those QL orgs with not high trust are either:

- Very powerful/high reputation, or
- Not highly embedded in the network (peripheral) and not highly engaged in the NAQC platform.
- Involvement is key for high QL trust of NAQC's central office/NAO, either through involvement in the network of relationships among QLs or through commitment to the initiatives organized by and through the NAO.
- Exceptions are the powerful multi-QL providers and high reputation QLs.