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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 NAQC?

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

This is an important question for NAQC because, as it is designed to facilitate the flow of critical administrative information (i.e., an NAO) that is required for the network’s administrative organization (i.e., NAQC), trust is critical to NAQC success, and it is important to clearly understand why some network participants have higher trust in the administrative office through its staff.

Study Rationale
- To explore the reasons why trust in a central office is high or low.
- To identify the characteristics of organizations that influence trust.
- To understand the relationship between trust and the performance of network organizations.

Methods of Analysis

- **Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA)** (Ragin, 2008)
  - **Briggs qualitative & quantitative analysis**
    - Crisp set used dichotomous coding of variables
    - Fuzzy set

- **Ideal for small-to-intermediate n research**
- **Causal Complexity**: Different combinations, or “recipes” of factors/conditions that explain subsets of cases.
- **Equifinality**: Same outcome, but different solutions.

- **Solution Consistency** = 0.906250
- **Solution Coverage** = 0.805556

Causal Conditions

- **Engagement in NAQC Platform**
  - Perceived importance of NAQC methods for disseminating information measured by 10 item scale, alpha = 0.93 (ISQ25).
  - 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 - Court of which QLs are “most admired”

Causal Combinations – High Trust

- **Core** × hengage
- **Periphery** × hengage
- **Coreperi** × hengage

Causal Combinations – Not High Trust

- **Core** × hengage
- **Periphery** × hengage

Conclusions

- **Those QL organizations with high NAQC trust are either**
  - Highly embedded in the network of relationships (i.e., core), but not very powerful.
  - 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 NAQC 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 NAQC.
- **Exceptions are the powerful multi-QL providers and high reputation QLs.**

Acknowledgements

The KIQNIC project is funded by Grant Number R25CA139738 from the National Institutes of Health to the Mayo Clinic in Arizona.