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Background: Partnerships between healthcare providers and researchers could increase the generalizability of research findings and increase uptake of research results across populations. Yet engaging clinicians in research is challenging.

Objective: Elicit healthcare provider perspectives on barriers to involvement in and attitudes towards research.

Methods: Using a multi-level community engagement approach, the Mid-South Clinical Research Data Network conducted semi-structured interviews with clinicians from various disciplines and healthcare settings. Inductive content analysis was used to analyze the data for emerging themes using Dedoose.

Results: The 59 participants include physicians, nurses, pharmacists and other clinicians and represented a range of health care settings including hospitals, private practice and community health centers. Emerging themes were: 1) desire to participate in research relevant and beneficial to practice’s patient population; 2) need to maintain efficiency of provider/practice; 3) desire for clarity regarding roles and time commitment; 4) need for compensation, incentives or public recognition for involvement; 5) need to maintain trust of patients, and 6) need to become more familiar with research and opportunities available to providers.

Conclusion: This study provides an in-depth understanding on the reasons providers decide to or not to be involved in research. It also demonstrates how to improve academic-provider partnerships as well as increase providers’ level of involvement and/or responsibilities on research projects. Findings can be used to guide the development of strategies to better engage providers in research in clinical settings, which could ultimately improve patient outcomes.