

Research and Scholarly Activity: Faculty Attitudes and Awareness

Dr. Matthew McCoy
Assistant Professor
Director of Research
Life University Marietta, Georgia

ABSTRACT

Issues of participation in scholarship and how it is defined and compensated are ongoing and contentious issues within academia. This issue is significant as there has been a move among universities to better define scholarship and broaden its definition to include teaching and service related activities for the promotion and tenure process and to give equal weight to all three areas of scholarship. The contention is that committed faculty will identify with the mission, values, and goals of the institution, engage in the process of scholarship and want to maintain membership in it. The implication is that if faculty feel that the institution is promoting empowerment and there is evidence that this is actually happening then faculty will be more inclined to take risks and engage in behavior that is supportive of the institution. This paper reviews the literature on the topic as well as one institution's attempts to explore faculty attitudes.

Introduction

Life University and its programs are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and by two specialized accrediting agencies: the Council on Chiropractic Education and The Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education (CADE). All three accrediting agencies have specific requirements as regards the conduct of research and scholarly activity in order for institutions to maintain accreditation.

Consistent with these requirements as well as the desire of the institution the university includes within its mission statement specific references to the conduct of research and scholarly activity as does the College of Chiropractic and the College of Arts and Sciences. Goals and objectives further elaborate on these activities. A number of research related courses and requirements exist within each of the programs where students interface with these goals and objectives.

Life University has historically maintained a very centralized research structure whereby research occurred within a research center and was conducted by specific faculty and staff within this research center. This model was more consistent with those that exist within solitary purpose chiropractic educational institutions and is not well suited to a more diverse university environment.

Unfortunately, as Life University evolved into a university the research model was not altered to keep pace with the needs of a diverse university culture, the needs of the various programs of study, needs of the faculty, and those of the students.

This need was recognized during 2003 when a new Executive Administration with a history of leadership experience in a university setting came on board. Through discussion with a faculty committee, a proposal for the decentralization of research and the establishment of an Office of Sponsored Research and Scholarly Activity was developed and implemented.

Subsequent to the establishment of this office, an effort began to educate faculty who were accustomed to the more centralized approach about the new model and their role and responsibilities within it. Further changes in the culture of the university have led to the tying of promotion and rank to the conduct of research and scholarly activity. This signals a profound shift in the culture of the institution and anecdotally may have created some uneasiness among the faculty. In an effort to further understand the depth of knowledge about this change, and the attitudes and willingness of faculty to embrace such a cultural shift, a survey was carried out to assess the faculty's attitudes and awareness on these issues. It was expected that gaining objective data on faculty attitudes and awareness would assist the university leadership in developing a strategy to move the institution in the desired direction.

The gathering of objective data in this regard was expected to offer a starting point for measuring change in these attitudes following the implementation of a plan of supportive activities. During this process faculty would be shepherded through areas of inquiry that might interest them thereby encouraging their engagement in scholarly study and research.

Setting

Life University located in Marietta Georgia, is a private non-profit institution of higher education serving a diverse student population. The primary mission of the university is education of the whole student. In keeping with its founding principles, Life University strives to develop and enhance human potential through the university setting.

Accomplishment of these ideals occurs through the encouragement and support of scholarly studies and a commitment to public service (Life University, 2005).

Life University offers professional, graduate, and undergraduate degree programs and postgraduate education in the broad fields of health care, science, nutrition, and business. The university asserts that it recruits and retains outstanding faculty who are dedicated to teaching and advising; to scholarship, research and creativity; and to serving the university and the wider community (Life University, 2005). There are approximately 120 full and part time faculty and approximately 1200 students enrolled in the various programs.

The institution has recently established an Office of Sponsored Research and Scholarly Activity (OSRSA) that acts as the central administrative office for research and scholarship at the institution. The OSRSA has been charged with ensuring that the cultural shift of a decentralized research infrastructure and process becomes pervasive at the institution.

History and Background

As discussed previously, Life University has historically maintained a very centralized research structure whereby research occurred within a research center and was conducted by specific faculty and staff within this research center. This model is consistent with those that exist within other solitary purpose chiropractic educational institutions; however, it is not well suited to a more diverse university environment.

This model for the conduct of research had existed at the institution more likely than not since its inception in 1977 when Life was established solely as a chiropractic college. As Life evolved into a university and began to offer other degree programs the research model was not altered to keep pace with the needs of such a diverse university culture, the needs of the various programs of study, needs of the faculty, and those of the students.

Concerns regarding the extent of the conduct of research and scholarly activity were raised over the years through the self-study process and it was under the tenure of the past two administrations that the shift toward a more traditional university model of research and scholarly conduct began.

Research Mission, Goals and Objectives

The importance and significance of this project lies in the critical need for the university to fulfill its mission, goals, and objectives in the area of research and scholarly activity. The university overall has specific goals and objectives related to the conduct of research and scholarly activity that include:

Develop and enhance human potential of its students, staff, faculty, and administrators through training professional development, scholarly studies, research and public service. Employ a diverse faculty and staff dedicated to teaching and advisement, scholarship, research, creativity, and service to the university and the community (Life University, 2005).

The College of Chiropractic additionally has a Mission that includes the conduct of research as follows:

The College of Chiropractic at Life University is committed to providing leadership in the chiropractic profession through education, patient care clinical experience and research (Life University, 2005).

In support of the mission, the College of Chiropractic has goals and objectives related to the conduct of research and scholarly activity as follows:

Goal#4

To enhance the ability of faculty and students in research design, methodologies, and funding through collaboration with the Office of Sponsored Research & Scholarly Activity, the College through its various Divisions will provide research opportunities to conduct studies of the vertebral subluxation complex and other health/physical conditions, as well as research related to other university programs.

Objective:

A. The College and its Divisions in collaboration with the Office of Sponsored Research will provide faculty and student development programs that include the following research topics/opportunities:

1. Securing grants and funding for research
2. Documenting and publishing research
3. Conducting condition-based research
4. Conducting research involving the vertebral subluxation complex
5. Providing research Assistant Fellowships to students
6. Offering opportunities in research instrumentation to faculty and students (Life University, 2005).

Within the College of Arts and Sciences, the Department of Sport Health Science's Mission also includes the concept of scholarship:

It is the mission of the Department of Sport Health Science of Life University to educate and prepare students for careers in fields related to fitness, health, and sport. We seek to provide a depth of education as well as the specialized skills and sense of creative independence that will allow graduate students to practice in, and contribute to, a profession or field of scholarship (Life University, 2005).

Objectives of the Department of Sport Health Science include the following related to scholarship and research:

To provide an environment that supports and encourages scholarly interaction and accessibility among faculty and students;

To conduct research related to athletics, exercise, and sport chiropractic, and to disseminate information obtained from this research at appropriate sport science, chiropractic, and health science meetings as well as in appropriate sport science chiropractic, and health-related journals (Life University, 2005).

Lastly the Undergraduate Program's mission is "to create an environment that nurtures critical thinking, intellectual curiosity, and academic integrity while providing students with a solid foundation of knowledge in their chosen field" (Life University, 2005).

One of the major responsibilities an institution has to its constituencies is to ensure that it is fulfilling its mission goals, and objectives. This is also a responsibility of accrediting agencies and if an institution is not fulfilling its mission, then there is a disconnect somewhere and the cause needs to be assessed.

Life University has broad and specific missions, goals, and objectives related to the conduct of research and scholarly activity. The institution recognized that a change was needed regarding how these activities were carried out; however, this represented a significant shift in culture for the institution and expectations of faculty. It was expected that clarity would be brought to the issue of what faculty know about this shift, how faculty feel about it, and the likelihood that they will engage.

Knowing the answers to these questions may assist in bringing about the development and implementation of a program of change to support faculty during this transition, ease their concern, and allow a smoother transition to the new model. A successful transition is expected to bring with it a faculty that is more engaged in research and scholarly pursuits. This engagement is expected to improve the reputation of the institution and the knowledge base of the faculty.

Such a shift is expected to also bring with it outside funding for the purpose of conducting research. This funding will assist in supplementing faculty income for those who are willing to engage and thereby affect morale throughout the institution.

Lastly, questions have arisen amongst the faculty regarding the role of service activities within the framework of research and scholarly activities. The institution will need to address these issues and make decisions regarding whether or not service activities constitute some aspect of scholarly activity, the weight given to such service activities and the role they will play in the promotion and ranking process.

Literature Review

While the struggle facing the faculty of Life University is somewhat unfamiliar and acute for them, it is not unique. Issues of participation in scholarship and how it is defined and compensated are ongoing and contentious issues within academia.

In a Report to the Provost and Faculty Senate of Kansas State University on the characteristics of exemplary faculty at Kansas State, Bloomquist and Wilkinson (n.d.) report that the most common factor amongst exemplary faculty was the extent to which their teaching, research and service activities were intertwined. The authors concluded that this commonality was striking. Their interviews with faculty revealed a feeling that in some cases research and teaching became so intertwined that they appeared to be the same activity. Faculty were also of the opinion that their experience conducting and participating in the research process helped them communicate more effectively with students, especially more subtle information, and that they could tie course material into their research. Faculty interviewed also reported that the classroom helped to fuel and clarify research ideas. The authors point out that faculty view teaching and research as scholarship. This issue is significant as there has been a move among universities to better define scholarship and broaden its definition to include teaching and service related activities.

According to Heeney, Gould, and DeSpain (2000) there has been an implied assumption that teaching, research, and service are of equal importance. The authors point out that prior to World War II, a precarious balance was maintained between these three areas, but that after the War research began to receive more attention than teaching or service. Heeney et al. (2000) review several authors and state that there was an overemphasis placed on research to the exclusion of the other two areas. According to the authors there has been a renewed call in recent years for the promotion and tenure process to give equal weight to all three areas of scholarship.

Heeney and her colleagues (2000) surveyed 70 Deans of Colleges of Education in an effort to determine how they viewed service activities in relation to the promotion and tenure process. They state:

Service is viewed by Deans of Colleges of Education as being less important than publications by the Deans. The combination of the data that shows that the highest ranked items are considered publications and the lowest ranked items are considered service leads to the idea that activities relating to publications are viewed more favorably in the promotion and tenure process than activities leading to service. (p.5)

The authors went on to report that their data showed that while Deans did not view service as important and that it did not matter what kind of service was engaged in, it was necessary for the process of promotion and tenure. Despite the efforts noted to bring service activities into the promotion and tenure process, their conclusion was that service continued to be viewed as a less important form of scholarship than traditional research.

Defining scholarship poses another communication hurdle between faculty and administrators in the determination of whether or not faculty are fulfilling their obligations to engage in research, teaching and service. DeSpain, Heeney, and Livingston (1999) address this issue in their survey of 73 Deans of Colleges of Education to determine how nontraditional scholarly activities were treated in considering promotion and tenure. The study also asked Deans to weigh the emphasis that should be placed on these activities. According to the Deans' responses the greatest emphasis is placed on presentations at national or international conferences, serving as an editor of a professional journal, and receiving a grant/contract with an external peer review. DeSpain et al. (1999) conclude that the Dean's responses indicate that nontraditional activities are viewed as "not very important to somewhat important" (p. 6) in the promotion process. The authors observed that there is a great deal of inconsistency within the institutions on this issue and that "A large number of institutions have not yet determined how to deal with scholarly productivity in nontraditional activities" (p. 7). As a result, the authors call for the creation of another category titled "Professional Enhancement" (p. 7) to help identify faculty achievement.

The issue of the role of service was also studied by Holland (1997) where she urged institutions to ensure that their stated missions and academic priorities were consistent with their actions in regards to supporting service related activities. Holland is somewhat critical of institutional rhetoric concerning the degree to which they actually sustain and develop service related activities as an integral part of the institution. Holland reviewed the work of several authors who advocated the broadening of scholarly activities based on "deliberate selection of academic priorities" (p. 1). Holland discusses other authors in her paper who promote the idea of greater institutional variety regarding scholarship and an improved responsiveness to societal needs through the tailoring of faculty priorities.

Holland (1997) discusses the importance of the institution being true to itself and being selective regarding the range of academic activities it wishes to engage in. She encourages institutions to establish clear missions and goals in these areas and to integrate the scholarly elements of service into teaching and research.

She also urges institutions to incorporate these types of activities in a distinctive way. She goes so far as to advocate that these distinctions must go down to every level of the institution so that each unit of the institution is deciding how its area can best participate in service consistent with its mission and the missions of its various branches.

Holland (1997) developed a matrix to assess the levels of commitment to service within an institution or within a particular unit of an institution. The matrix provides a mechanism to sort rhetoric from reality in terms of whether or not service is actually institutionalized or merely being given lip service.

Despite the push in the literature encouraging institutions to broaden what is included as scholarly activity to include service and teaching, institutions do not appear to be responding. In a paper that examined the relative value of teaching and research, Fairweather (1997) compared faculty pay to determine if the monetary value of teaching had increased during a five-year period following this push within academia. His research showed that the more time faculty spent on teaching, the less money they made and that faculty who spent the least amount of time in the classroom made the most money. The more time spent on research as opposed to teaching, the higher the pay and the greater the publishing productivity, the higher the average pay. In fact, the strongest correlate of

faculty pay was career publications. Teaching was either unrelated or negatively related to salary.

Considering that Life's largest program is its Doctor of Chiropractic program a look at the literature on research and scholarship within chiropractic educational programs is warranted. In a commentary by Flanagan and Giordano (2002) on the role of the institution in developing clinicians and researchers, they review the demography of faculty involved in research at chiropractic institutions. Their survey of 15 North American chiropractic colleges revealed that only 5% of full time faculty who hold the DC degree were actively involved in research. In addition, the survey revealed that only 10% of Ph.D and 25% of DC/Ph.D faculty were engaged in research. The authors suggest that chiropractic programs have failed to produce opportunities for faculty as researchers, and they advocate for greater institutional and professional support of research within the schools and the profession.

The issues of institutional support for the conduct of scholarship and the role of research, service, and scholarly activity embodied by the institution's mission play a key role in empowering faculty and encouraging a commitment on the part of faculty to engage in the work of the institution. Henkin and Machiori (2003) discuss empowerment and commitment of faculty relative to a survey exploring empowerment and organizational commitment of chiropractic college faculty. They contend that committed faculty will identify with the mission, values, and goals of the institution and will want to maintain membership in it. Their paper implies that if faculty feels that the institution is promoting empowerment and there is evidence that this is actually happening then faculty will be more inclined to take risks and engage in behavior that is supportive of the institution. In a related paper Marchiori and Henkin (2003) state: "The chiropractic profession depends on a motivated faculty for continuous quality improvement and innovation in areas of curriculum, scholarship and practice" (p. 17). Interestingly, the authors report that the most significant empowering factor was where the faculty was assigned. Those involved in administration or research reported greater levels of empowerment. Of further interest, and related to the issue of chiropractic faculty's engagement in research activities is that of the 609 respondents to their survey less than 3% of faculty were assigned to research tasks while over half of the respondents were assigned to the area of patient care within teaching clinics.

Since such a large population of faculty in chiropractic institutions are assigned to direct patient care within teaching clinics, it becomes important to address what effect this has on the faculty's ability to engage in research and scholarly activity when their primary role is as a clinician. Sheffield, Wipf, and Buchwald (1998) conducted a study of medical clinician educators to determine the time devoted to scholarship. In their study the average workweek was 58.7 hours and the average time spent on scholarship was 7.6 hours or 13%. The authors point out that according to school policy 20% of their time is required to be spent on scholarship. The authors conclude that these clinician educators had little protected time for scholarship and that institutions should ensure that clinician educators have adequate time, resources, and guidance to achieve scholarly goals.

Materials and Methods

The goal of this study was to gather objective data regarding faculty attitudes and knowledge towards the conduct of research and scholarly activity in order to develop a plan for increasing productivity. Faculties were surveyed regarding their attitudes in the following areas:

1. Knowledge of the support areas for research and scholarly activity.
2. Attitudes towards research and scholarly activity.
3. Likelihood that they would participate in research and scholarly endeavors.
4. Attitudes towards tying promotion, rank, and tenure to these activities.

It was expected faculty would report they were mostly unaware of how to engage in the research process and of the cultural shift in the area of research and scholarly activity. Further assumptions were that this lack of awareness is limiting the faculty's involvement in the process and that once these issues can be objectively identified, brought out into the open, and addressed; faculty will embrace the changes and will engage in the process.

The population for this study was the faculty of Life University who were surveyed during a quarterly meeting. There are approximately 120 full and part time faculty employed by Life University, and 88 faculty members completed and returned the survey.

The respondents from the College of Arts and Sciences included faculty from the: Business, General Education, Natural Sciences, Nutrition, and Sport Health Science Departments. Respondents from the College of Chiropractic included faculty from the Divisions of: Basic Sciences, Clinical Science, Chiropractic Sciences, and Clinics. The surveys were distributed and collected by faculty from the Office of Sponsored Research and Scholarly Activity and from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness Planning and Research.

The survey instrument was one page front and back and was personally handed back to the volunteers who had passed them out. There were a total of 13 questions on the survey instrument. The questions were designed to better understand faculty knowledge and awareness levels about the Office of Sponsored Research and Scholarly Activity as this is the central administrative unit at Life University for these types of activities. Questions were also asked about faculty's familiarity with the research and scholarly goals of the institution as a whole and research related goals within their College. A question about their engagement in the conduct of research and scholarly activity during the past year was asked along with a question about their desire to engage. Two questions were asked about their knowledge and awareness of the steps to take if they wanted to engage in a research project and their level of interest in getting a grant or funding. The remaining questions revolved around their feelings concerning the conduct of research and scholarly activities and its relationship to promotion, rank, and tenure decisions. An area for comments was provided on the back of the form. The questions used a Likert scale for responses.

Results

The responses from 88 faculty of Life University were used for comparison in this study (See Table 1). All surveys were handed out in person during a faculty development day and were returned the same day upon completion for a return rate of 100%. All questions used a Likert scale asking subjects to express agreement or disagreement on a five-point scale.

It was expected that faculty would report they were mostly unaware of how to engage in the research process and that they were unaware of the cultural shift in the area of research and scholarly activity. Further assumptions were that this lack of awareness is limiting the faculty's involvement in the process and that once these issues can be objectively identified, brought out into the open and addressed; faculty will embrace the changes and will engage in the process.

The data tended to support the hypothesis that faculty were mostly unaware of how to engage in the research process. Only 22% of faculty indicated they knew what steps to take if they wanted to engage in such activity. Despite not knowing how to pursue such work 68% of the faculty indicated they were interested in pursuing a project.

Perhaps the most telling finding was that only 28% of faculty were familiar with the research related goals and objectives of the University and that only 26% were familiar with the research related goals of their respective colleges. Despite this finding the majority of faculty are still interested in pursuing projects.

Only 33% of faculty were aware of the function of the Office of Sponsored Research and Scholarly Activity and only 13% had visited the OSRSA website. These data shed some light on why faculty are not familiar with the process and indicate an area where OSRSA may need to focus some of its attention.

A surprising finding was that 59% of the faculty indicated they felt that research and scholarship should be considered in promotion, rank and tenure decisions; however the same percentage indicated that they would pursue a project regardless of such consideration.

The majority of the faculty (74%) were of the opinion that, in addition to research, service activities should be included in promotion, rank, and tenure decisions.

The data additionally revealed a significant percentage (average of 18%) of faculty who answered "neutral" to each of the questions. This may indicate a level of apathy amongst the faculty that was not expected. Further, 18 faculty elected not to identify what college or program they are connected with.

Overall the data supported the hypothesis that faculty were unsure of how to engage in the research process while it shed significant light on the willingness of the faculty to pursue such projects and some of the obstacles standing in the way.

Discussion

The obstacles facing Life University in its attempts to engage faculty in research and scholarship are not unique, though its history as a solitary purpose chiropractic educational institution and the track record within the chiropractic profession for supporting research, might lead one to assume the situation would be worse than it actually is.

Clearly, the faculty of Life University is committed to engaging in scholarship and research because they seem to feel it is part of their responsibility to do so and not solely because they might derive benefit in terms of promotion rank and tenure.

Despite their desire and sense of responsibility to work in this manner, the faculty clearly indicated they are not aware of the necessary steps to be taken within the institution to get a project going, and they are not aware of the role of the central administrative unit responsible for promoting and supporting such activity. This provides evidence of a significant communication disconnect on the campus related to this issue.

Further evidence of a communication breakdown is evident in the overwhelming majority of faculty's lack of knowledge regarding the research related goals of the University and their respective Colleges.

The significant number of faculty who elected to give a 'neutral' response to questions where such an answer really was not appropriate should be considered thoroughly regarding its meaning – as it could be revealing of a significant percentage of faculty who are apathetic to the topic in general.

Conclusion

Research and scholarship is clearly a significant priority of the institution, therefore it is important that the institution confront the issues revealed by this survey. Primarily, it is recommended that a comprehensive educational process be undertaken to assist faculty's awareness of the functions of the OSRSA. Beyond fostering a general awareness of the functions of OSRSA, it is important that a very clear description of the actual steps necessary for faculty to engage in research and scholarship be produced and distributed.

It is recommended that the President, Provost, and Deans working with the OSRSA embark upon an educational campaign to assist faculty's awareness of the goals and objectives of the University and its Colleges related to research. This will go a long way towards guiding faculty as they contemplate the types of activities and projects they want to engage in.

Those faculty members who are already engaging in research and scholarship should be recognized in some formal manner by the institution in an effort to show the value placed on such behavior by the university culture.

It is recommended that the institution attempt to flesh out why so many faculty are neutral when it comes to the topics addressed by this survey. Lastly, it is important to

explore why a significant number of faculty elected not to identify what college or program they are connected with. Perhaps the use of small focus groups or additional anonymous surveys might be useful in this regard. The use of an outside facilitator may also be of some benefit to accomplish this task.

Acknowledgments

I want to express my appreciation to the staff of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness Planning and Research (OIEPR) for their help in developing the survey instrument, getting it into a scannable form and then processing the results. I would also like to thank the faculty for taking the time to complete the survey and returning the results.

References

- Bloomquist, L. & Wilkinson, A. (n.d.). K-State exemplary faculty: What makes them exemplary? Report to the Provost and Faculty Senate of Kansas State University [Electronic version]. Retrieved January 10, 2005, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ksu.edu/provost/academic/reports/exempfac.pdf>
- DeSpain, B., Heeney, M., & Livingston, M. (1999). The evolution of “publish or perish”: What counts as “other”. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision*, 16E (4), 1-7.
- Fairweather, J. (1997). The relative value of teaching and research. *The NEA Almanac of Higher Education*, 43-62.
- Flanagan, J. & Giordano, J. (2002, March/April). The role of the institution in developing the next generation chiropractor, clinician and researcher. *The Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics*. 25(3), 193-196.
- Heeney, M., Gould, M., & DeSpain, B. (2000). How deans of colleges of education view service: The tenure and promotion process. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision*, 17E(4), 1-9.
- Henkin, A. & Marchiori, D. (2003, June). Empowerment and organizational commitment of chiropractic faculty. *The Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics*. 26(5), 275-281.
- Holland, B. (1997, Fall). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 30-41.
- Life University.(2005).*Life University mission/purpose statements*. [Electronic Version]. Retrieved February 2, 2005, from the World Wide Web: http://www.life.edu/life_univ/mission_purpose.html

Marchiori, D. & Henkin, A. (2003, January). Empowerment of chiropractic faculty: A profile in context. *The Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics*, 26(1), 17-24.

Sheffield, J., Wipf, J. & Buchwald, D. (1998, June). Work activities of clinician-educators. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 406-409.

Formatted by Dr. Mary Alice Kritsonis, National Research and Manuscript Editor,
NATIONAL FORUM JOURNALS, Houston, Texas. www.nationalforum.com

Table 1 - Survey Results

Response	Total This Ans	Percent
1 - I have a clear understanding of the function of the Office of Sponsored Research & Scholarly Activity.		
Strongly Agree	10	11%
Agree	19	22%
Neutral	16	18%
Disagree	29	33%
Strongly Disagree	13	15%
No Opinion	1	1%
88 participants responded to this question.		
2 - I have visited the webpages for the OSRSA.		
Strongly Agree	4	5%
Agree	7	8%
Neutral	7	8%
Disagree	41	47%
Strongly Disagree	20	23%
No Opinion	8	9%
87 participants responded to this question.		
3 - I am familiar with the university's research and scholarly goals.		
Strongly Agree	4	5%
Agree	20	23%
Neutral	21	24%
Disagree	29	33%
Strongly Disagree	13	15%
No Opinion	1	1%
88 participants responded to this question.		

4 - I am familiar with the research and scholarly goals of my college.

Strongly Agree	6	7%
Agree	17	19%
Neutral	16	18%
Disagree	34	39%
Strongly Disagree	14	16%
No Opinion	1	1%

88 participants responded to this question.

5 - I have engaged in research and scholarly activities in the past year.

Strongly Agree	15	17%
Agree	22	25%
Neutral	8	9%
Disagree	23	26%
Strongly Disagree	15	17%
No Opinion	4	5%

87 participants responded to this question.

6 - I am interested in engaging in research and scholarly activities.

Strongly Agree	24	27%
Agree	36	41%
Neutral	17	19%
Disagree	4	5%
Strongly Disagree	3	3%
No Opinion	4	5%

88 participants responded to this question.

7 - I am aware of the steps to take if I am interested in pursuing a research project at Life University.

Strongly Agree	7	8%
Agree	12	14%
Neutral	19	22%
Disagree	33	38%
Strongly Disagree	17	19%

88 participants responded to this question.

8 - I am interested in getting a grant or other funding.

Strongly Agree	20	23%
Agree	14	16%
Neutral	25	28%
Disagree	13	15%
Strongly Disagree	9	10%
No Opinion	7	8%

88 participants responded to this question.

9 - I feel that research and scholarly activity should be considered during promotion, rank, and tenure decisions.

Strongly Agree	20	23%
Agree	32	36%
Neutral	16	18%
Disagree	10	11%
Strongly Disagree	8	9%
No Opinion	2	2%

88 participants responded to this question.

10 - I feel that service activities should also be included along with research during promotion, rank and tenure decisions.

Strongly Agree	28	32%
Agree	37	42%
Neutral	8	9%
Disagree	6	7%
Strongly Disagree	7	8%
No Opinion	2	2%

88 participants responded to this question.

11 - I will engage in research & scholarly activities regardless of its relationship to decisions on promotion, rank & tenure

Strongly Agree	17	19%
Agree	35	40%
Neutral	22	25%
Disagree	3	3%
Strongly Disagree	5	6%
No Opinion	6	7%

88 participants responded to this question.

12 - Gaining an increase in promotion, rank & tenure is important to me.

Strongly Agree	37	42%
Agree	27	31%
Neutral	17	19%
Disagree	1	1%
Strongly Disagree	3	3%
No Opinion	3	3%

88 participants responded to this question.

13 - I am a faculty member in CAS:

Business	5	20%
General Education	6	24%
Natural Sciences	6	24%
Nutrition	4	16%
Sport Health Science	4	16%

25 participants responded to this question.

14 - I am a faculty member in COC:

Basic Sciences	6	13%
Clinical Sciences	9	20%
Chiropractic Sciences	15	33%
Clinics	15	33%

45 participants responded to this question.