Quitlines make decisions every day about how to operate and what practices to use to best help tobacco users quit. The KIQNIC research project is designed to collect information about this decision-making process. Our hope is that learning more about this process will lead to better decisions in the future.

KIQNIC IS…
- a five-year research grant from the National Cancer Institute to the University of Arizona.
- looking at how quitline organizations, including quitline funders and service providers, interact with each other, and how those relationships affect how quitlines implement practices.
- learning more about how each quitline is connected to the larger network of quitlines and NAQC – we hope these connections can help us identify ways to make it easier and faster to share information about new and evidence-based practices and speed their implementation.
- partnering with NAQC and consulting with a workgroup of NAQC members for all major research and analysis questions.

KIQNIC IS NOT…
- the NAQC Annual Survey of Quitlines – while the KIQNIC survey also asks about specific quitline practices, it asks key questions about implementation that the NAQC Annual Survey does not.
- connected to the CDC data collection or reporting requirements.
- setting policy for NAQC or its members. Tools and resources resulting from KIQNIC outcomes are informational, not instructional. They are not in any way intended to tell quitline organizations how they should or should not operate, or which policies they should or should not set.

For more information see the KIQNIC page of the NAQC website at http://www.naquitline.org/?page=kiqnic.

KIQNIC is the only survey that looks at the relationships between quitline organizations. It does not ask for any information about reach, budgets, or operations.

COMPONENTS OF THE STUDY
There are three main parts of the KIQNIC survey and study: social network analysis, decision-making, and implementation of practices.

- **Social network analysis (SNA):** SNA looks at how the involvement of an organization in a network affects its actions as an organization (e.g. Does an organization occupy a central, or a more peripheral position in the network, and how does this affect awareness and adoption of practices by that organization?), as well as how the relationships among all organizations in the network affect network-level activities (e.g. What is the overall level of connectedness among organizations in the network? And how much density is beneficial, versus a “looser” network?).

  - **What we have learned so far:**
    - The North American network of quitlines is made up of two quite distinct groups: US quitlines and Canadian quitlines.
    - There are a few “connector” organizations that serve as the primary links between these two sub-networks of quitline organizations.
    - There are a few “super connector” organizations that serve as hubs of information generally in the network.
    - Intensive connections to tobacco control researchers, and strong connections to NAQC’s staff, predict awareness of quitline practices.
    - NAQC plays a central information sharing role in the quitline network, connecting many organizations that would not otherwise be connected.
What we are looking at next:
- Are there organizations that serve as “hubs” for specific types of information?
- Is there any connection between date of creation, quitline budget, or quitline reach and the degree of connectedness (centrality) of organizations?
- Is there any connection between the degree of connectedness of organizations and the types of practices that they have implemented or considered?

Decision-Making: Quitlines make decisions every day about what types of practices to use to recruit and serve tobacco users. The decision-making section of the survey examines what factors are most important to quitlines when making these types of decisions, such as how much it costs, how many other quitlines have already implemented it, and the level of evidence that exists for its effectiveness.

What we have learned so far:
- Quitline funders and service providers have different perceptions about decision-making around implementing quitline practices.
- Canadian quitlines are more likely to report that their service providers make most decisions about implementing practices.
- U.S. quitlines are more likely to report that decisions to implement practices are more often either made primarily by funders, or are shared between funder and service provider.

What we are looking at next:
- Is there any relationship between the types of factors that quitlines consider to be important and the types of practices that they implement?

Implementation of Practices: The KIQNIC survey asks about more than 20 specific practices, and where each quitline is at on the spectrum of awareness to full implementation of each practice. The survey design allows us to track implementation (or discontinuation) of practices over time, which can help answer questions about the impact of quitline budget changes, external mandates, or other factors affecting the process of considering adoption and implementation of new practices.

What we have learned so far:
- There are several practices that most quitlines use, including proactive multi-call protocols and media campaigns for the general population.
- There are a few practices that many quitlines are aware of, but very few have implemented, such as text messaging.
- The levels of evidence for the quitline practices we looked at vary dramatically, and depend on whether the practices are intended to increase effectiveness (quit rates) or reach.

What we are looking at next:
- How do levels of awareness and implementation of specific practices change over time?
- What factors influence increases or decreases in awareness and implementation of practices over time?

WHAT CAN YOU EXPECT NEXT?
- Additional information about the study and its findings will be provided to the quitline community over the next several months (February – May, 2011).
- The third survey for the KIQNIC project will be launched in May, 2011. Members of the research team will be contacting you in April to confirm which members of your organization should be asked to participate in the final survey for this grant. The KIQNIC page on the NAQC website http://www.naquitline.org/?page=kiqnic will be updated regularly with new findings, presentations, and information of interest to quitlines. 📚

If you have any specific questions about the KIQNIC project, or would like to volunteer on the NAQC KIQNIC Workgroup, please feel free to contact Tamatha Thomas-Haase at tthomas-haase@naquitline.org.
GLOSSARY OF SOCIAL NETWORK ANALYSIS TERMS

Social Network Analysis (SNA): Examines specific types of relationships between organizations within a network, to identify patterns of interactions.

Centrality: An organization with a high centrality score reflects that it has many ties to other organizations, and/or is able to reach many other organizations in the network either directly (degree centrality) or through a combination of direct and indirect ties through others who are not themselves directly connected (betweenness centrality). [see Sample Network diagram, below]

Centralization: The extent to which a network is organized around one or a small number of central actors/organizations.

Cliques: Small clusters of organizations that are densely connected to one another, but that may be only weakly, or not at all connected to others in the network. [see Sample Network diagram, below]

Density: The number of ties in a network divided by the maximum number of ties possible. A network where a high proportion of possible relationships exist is said to be a “dense” network. A network with a low proportion of all possible relationships is a “loose” or weakly connected network. [see Sample Network diagram, below]

Fragments: Organizations that are connected to each other, but not to the rest of the network. [see Sample Network diagram, below]

Hub: Organizations that have the highest total number of ties in a network are called hubs. [see Sample Network diagram, below]

Isolates: Organizations that are not connected to any others in the network.

Multiplexity: An indicator of tie strength. Organizations connected in more than one way (e.g. two quitline organizations connected through sharing of information about general management, service delivery and outreach/promotion) are said to be multiplex, and thus, strong, since a break in one type of tie means the relationship is still maintained.

Structural holes and brokers: Structural holes exist in a network when the network has two or more sub-networks that are not connected to each other. Brokers are network actors/organizations that connect these structural holes and who have high betweenness centrality.
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