DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 496 TM 820 509

AUTHOR Loadman, William E.; Cook, Desmond
TITLE Developing and Assessing Instrumentation to Reflect Perceptions and Attitudes Toward Proposal Development and Funding. Draft.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (66th, New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Measures; Educational Finance; Educational Research; *Educational Researchers; Experience; *Financial Support; Grantsmanship; Measurement Techniques; Peer Evaluation; Program Attitudes; *Proposal Writing; Sex Differences
IDENTIFIERS American Educational Research Association

ABSTRACT

The degree to which perceptions and attitudes about the proposal development and funding process can be assessed was studied. The study tried to determine if educational researchers had different perceptions of proposal writing, based upon the degree of experience in proposal development and peer review activities, as well as the sex of the respondent. The results of the study indicated the proposal development and funding perception scale had reasonable psychometric properties. The scale functioned well to assess perceptions toward the process. Many common statements regarding proposal development and the funding process were consistently identified as myths. However, a large number of statements were identified as truths. Perceptions differed according to sex and who had had peer review panel experience. Further research into these attitudes and perceptions is recommended. (DWH)

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 496 TM 820 509

AUTHOR Loadman, William E.; Cook, Desmond
TITLE Developing and Assessing Instrumentation to Reflect Perceptions and Attitudes Toward Proposal Development and Funding. Draft.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (66th, New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Measures; Educational Finance; Educational Research; *Educational Researchers; Experience; *Financial Support; Grantsmanship; Measurement Techniques; Peer Evaluation; Program Attitudes; *Proposal Writing; Sex Differences
IDENTIFIERS American Educational Research Association

ABSTRACT

The degree to which perceptions and attitudes about the proposal development and funding process can be assessed was studied. The study tried to determine if educational researchers had different perceptions of proposal writing, based upon the degree of experience in proposal development and peer review activities, as well as the sex of the respondent. The results of the study indicated the proposal development and funding perception scale had reasonable psychometric properties. The scale functioned well to assess perceptions toward the process. Many common statements regarding proposal development and the funding process were consistently identified as myths. However, a large number of statements were identified as truths. Perceptions differed according to sex and who had had peer review panel experience. Further research into these attitudes and perceptions is recommended. (DWH)

DEVELOPING AND ASSESSING INSTRUMENTATION TO REFLECT PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT AND FUNDING

William E. Loadman, Ph.D.
Desmond Cook, Ph.D.

American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting

March 1982
New York

Draft- Not to be quoted or used without the permission of the authors.

DEVELOPING AND ASSESSING INSTRUMENTATION TO REFLECT PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT AND FUNDING

Introduction

The process of developing proposals to secure funds to conduct various research and/or development ideas is truly not a recent phenomenon. Columbus in presenting his plans to Queen Isabella and her "hocking" of the crown jewels to support the effort in return for presumed benefits would be one of many examples from the past. This phenomenon, however, has become more than an isolated instance in contemporary American society. A whole new industry has evolved whose purpose is to present the art and science of proposal development to persons interested in securing some of the largess said to exist in private and public coffers. Further, some agencies, both profit and non-profit in widely diverse sectors of society, have developed a dependency upon the continuing receipt of funds by winning grants and contracts through the proposal development and submission process.

The process of proposal development is a relatively recent phenomenon in education. While no real benchmark exists, it seems likely that the funds provided under the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 could be a milestone. While this act focused upon university level research efforts, successive legislation resulted in public schools and other private profit and non-profit educationally linked agencies becoming participants in the development of proposals and the receipt of resulting contracts and grants.

Both outside and inside of educational agencies, the increasing emphasis on "winning" proposals has led to the development of the "grantsmanship game" (Kravas and Orlich, 1978). It is not uncommon to find that institutions are actually ranked like football teams, and with the same dubious inter-

The research reported herein was supported by a small grant from the Research and Field Service Committee, College of Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 43221.

pretation, on the total amount or percent of institutional funding obtained from "outside sources." Such reports only serve to highlight the "game" or competitive nature of proposal development.

Even though the development of proposals is a highly labor intensive process, involving much time and money, there appears to be relatively little research upon which a substantial foundation can be built for the conduct of the process. While there is without question some reality with regard to the process in terms of the effort needed to think through an idea creatively and to develop it for eventual judgment, there has also emerged what at best can be called a mythology regarding the grantsmanship process.

Kravas and Orlich (1978) and White (1979) allude to this mythology. The former writers set forth some nine different myths and then proceed to debunk them. White cites, for instance, the myth surrounding the role of "our Man" in the Washington scene and its influence on proposal awards. She notes that the importance of the role was probably generated by the person in order to impress the people back home.

In view of the time and effort educational researchers allocate to the proposal development and funding process as well as the level of understanding and myths and realities which apparently exist regarding the process, it seemed logical and reasonable to explore the dimensions of this social phenomenon. Being consistent with the nature of the problem being studied, a small grant proposal was developed and eventually funded to initiate work on various aspects of the proposal development process. The study had two major objectives. First, to establish the degree to which perceptions and attitudes about the proposal development and funding process could be assessed. Second, to determine if there were differential responses by educational researcher perceptions based upon: (a) the degree of experience

in proposal development and peer review activities; and (b) the sex of the responder. The latter variable was included in view of the increased interest in encouraging women to become more highly involved in Research and Development. Essentially, the study was designed to establish that varying perceptions do exist and to create instrumentation to assess them.

METHODOLOGY

Instrument Development

This study began by reviewing the literature for statements and comments regarding proposal development and funding activities. In addition the authors discussed these concepts with a wide variety of professionals. The basis for statement selection and/or creation was its being a focus of controversy or dispute in the arena of "grantsmanship." Statements reflecting common procedural practices in developing and submitting a proposal were not included. For example, a statement reflecting controversy might be "Keep the proposal at a level of generality so that no firm commitment is made on details." A procedural statement might be "Be sure to secure all needed signatures." The aim was to generate a set of statements about which persons experienced in proposal development would not necessarily agree with each other. Initial development and selection of such statements was therefore a somewhat subjective process but yet derived from proposal development documents wherein various authors had noted such controversial issues.

From these sources 65 item statements were generated. Through the use of professionals knowledgeable in the area of proposal development and funding, the items were logically sorted into five mutually exclusive categories. The categories were created on the basis of items having conceptual similarity. As a result of this categorization and initial pilot testing of the instrument, 14 additional items were generated and placed into the existing categories. After another pilot test, seven more items

were developed for the instrument resulting in a total of 86 items.

Each item consisted of a brief statement followed by a strongly agree to strongly disagree five point continuum. The task of the person completing the questionnaire is to read the statement and then endorse the response alternative which most closely reflects the feeling toward the statement.

An effort was then made to look at the internal consistency of the instrument as well as to examine the fit between the rational and possible empirical factors. A total of 69 subjects were used in this procedure. The empirical factors were generated using factor analysis procedures followed by a Promax rotation of five factors. Weak and nonfunctioning items were eliminated using the rationally created five factors and the empirically created five factors as a guide. In the final scale 54 items distributed across 5 factors were retained. Based on the existing data, estimates of internal consistency for each resulting subscale ranged from .73 to .91 with a median value of .85. It was felt that the items and factors had reasonable scaling properties and a decision was made to use the instrument in the survey study.

Sampling and Data Collection

The question of interest required the identification of a population of individuals: (a) possessing direct experience or familiarity with proposal development; and (b) representing different types of agencies likely to submit proposals or to fund them so that a variety of perspectives would be represented. After consideration of several population sources, a decision was made to utilize one which was likely to provide a representative sample meeting the conditions noted above. The source selected was the 1979 Biographical Membership Directory of the American Educational Research Association (AERA).

Operating within the budget constraints of the project plus the desire to secure a sufficient number for subsequent analysis, a decision was made to select a systematic random sample of approximately 400 persons. Operationally, this involved the identification of one person per page of the 418 page directory. The specific person identified was the bottom name on the left column of the two column page. In the event the person was from a foreign country, the individual at the bottom of the right hand column was selected. Under this process, a total of 418 persons located in the several states of the United States were identified and coded with an identification number.

Selected demographic variables of sex, position held, participation in AERA, and state location were obtained from each person by referencing information provided in the directory. Criteria were established for classification of persons with regard to position. In addition to divisional membership, the total number of divisions listed was also determined. Several persons did not provide sufficient information to provide full demographic data collection for the sample. In such cases, the data item was coded as "Unknown."

To determine the degree to which there was nonrespondent bias, the group of persons responding to the survey form were compared to the systematic sampling frame on several of the demographic variables. The target sample contained 418 persons and the respondent group utilized for this analysis consisted of 231 persons. The comparisons between the original target sample and the respondent group is presented in Table 1. The value of the relevant Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test is presented in the column at the right side of the table. Inspection of the table reveals that there were no significant differences between the target sample distribution and actual responding group distribution according to the Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test value with alpha equal to or less than .05. The variables tested in these

analyses were sex, position, divisional membership in AERA, and the number of divisional membership the individual AERA member claimed. In general, these results were interpreted to indicate that there was not a sufficient degree of response bias to influence any subsequent analysis or interpretation and that the group responding were representative of the target sample.

Data Analysis

Using the responses to the instrument and the available demographic data, a series of statistical analyses were conducted. These analyses included descriptive statistics, estimates of internal consistency of the instrument, discriminant function analyses, factor analysis and multivariate analyses of variance.

A variable of "respondent proposal experience and background" was created by tabulating responses to four informational items dealing with participation in proposal development, direction or participation in a funded project, membership in peer review panels reviewing proposals, and the conduct of training sessions or workshops in proposal development. Analysis by involving proposal developers with and without peer panel review experience was done on the basis that persons participating in this process, and being witness to reasons for proposal selections and rejection, would perhaps be more sensitive to nuances of controversial points than would be individuals who had not participated in the review process. The number and percent of respondents indicating Yes and No responses to these items is summarized in Table 2.

Almost 85 percent of the respondents had participated in proposal development activities and had been involved in project work. In contrast, less than 1 out of 2 persons had been involved in peer panels reviewing proposals submitted for funding. Only about 1 out of 5 had conducted training or workshop sessions on proposal development. Some respondents had

indicated they accomplished all of the tasks while only a few indicated they had done little or no real work in proposal development. The results, showing a large degree of proposal and project participation, suggested that the respondents had sufficient experience with proposal development activities to offer valid judgments to the individual items on the survey.

RESULTS

Discrimination by factor scores

The responses of the 231 subjects to the 54 items were subjected to a factor analysis and subsequently five factors were rotated with a promax solution. A comparison between the original factor analysis and the factor analysis based on the 231 subjects showed reasonable similarity but they were not completely equivalent. As a result, five factor scores were generated for each subject based upon the new factor analysis. The internal consistency of each of the five factors was estimated and ranged from .49 to .86. These five new variables were then subjected to two discriminant function analyses using sex, and proposal development and peer review experience/proposal development and nonpeer review experience as criterion variables. Significant discriminant functions were obtained in each of the two analyses. Based on the scores of the discriminant functions an attempt was made to accurately classify the individuals. The classification results were only slightly better than chance for each of the two functions. A decision was made therefore to abandon this line of analysis and revert to using the items themselves.

Discriminant by items

A stepwise addition discriminant function analysis using the 54 items as predictor variables was used and again the two analyses (sex and proposal development and peer review experience), resulted in significant functions.

Using the discriminant function weights from the Proposal Development Experience Analyses, an attempt was made to classify the subjects based on 19 significant items. The percent of correct classifications for this analysis was 72%. On the analysis using the 19 items, those persons with peer review panel experience scored higher (tended to disagree more) than those without the peer panel review experience on 10 of the items. This trend was reversed for the remaining 9 items. While there are mean differences between groups on each item there is a tendency for both groups to be in the same general position on the continuum (i.e., if one group agrees with an item the other group also tends to be in the agree range) (See Table 3). The group without peer panel review experience disagreed with 3 of the 19 items, agreed with 9 of the 19 items and was in the neutral range on 7 of the items. The peer review panel experience group disagreed with the same three items, agreed on six of the same items and was in the neutral range on the remaining 10 items. Based on the existing information, the scale appears to successfully discriminate between the two groups about three-fourths of the time. This suggests that the perceptions of those persons having peer review panel experience and those that do not are somewhat different with respect to their responses on this instrument. No data is available at this time for cross validation purposes.

A similar analysis was conducted using sex as the criterion variable. This stepwise procedure resulted in the inclusion of 24 of the 54 items. The results reveal that while there is some overlap among the items between the two analyses the two discriminant functions are very unique (See table 3). The percent of correct classification based upon the discriminant function with sex as the criterion variable was 75%. Ten of the items were more strongly endorsed by males and 13 items were more strongly endorsed by females. In

this analysis, both sexes were in the same direction on 16 of the items with 8 items essentially around the neutral position. As in the case of peer panel experience, a function can be developed which discriminates between sexes about three fourths of the time. This suggests that males and females respond somewhat differently to the items in the instrument.

DISCUSSION

Substantial meaning to the interpretation of the results can be derived by going back to the content of the individual items. The perceived feelings of those responding offers some indication of how professionals view the proposal development and funding process. This agreement allows for the establishment of some "myths and truths" regarding the proposal development and funding process. There are also differences which exist among these professionals as to how they perceive the process. The 54 items and the accompanying mean and standard deviation for the total group as well as the means for the various subgroups based upon the discriminant function analyses are presented in Table 4.

Using the means obtained from all respondents the items were separated into three categories: (a) endorsement, (b) nonendorsement, and (c) neutral. The results of this analysis is shown in Tables 5 and 6. An examination of Table 5 displays both endorsed and nonendorsed items on the extremes of the scale. Nonendorsed items were those where the mean item response was greater than 3.5 on the five point scale. Seven of the 54 items were placed in this category. Endorsed items were those with mean values less than 2.0 on the five point scale. Nine items were in this category. The values used to determine cut off scores were arbitrary. If equal cut-off score ranges are used at both ends of the scale then many more endorsed items appear. Table 6 contains 18 items with mean values greater

than 2.0 and less than 2.5. Mean values on the remaining 20 items fell between the values of 2.5 to 3.5 and these represent the neutral category.

The seven items from Table 5 categorized as nonendorsed were interpreted to represent perceived untruths or mythology. It is interesting to note that even with the consistent nonendorsement of each of the statements by the overall group, four of the items contributed to the discrimination among the subgroups. The concept underlying the myths appear to be as follows:

a. there is a stigma associated with not being funded;

b. the granting process is intentionally difficult;

c. small agencies probability of obtaining continued grant support is low;

d. who you know is more important than the quality of the proposal;

e. proposal content should purposely be left vague;

f. proposal development should be done by a single individual; and

g. professional grant writers should be employed to write proposals.

The nine items which received the strongest endorsement were interpreted to represent perceived truths. It is interesting to note that even with the consistent endorsement of each of the statements by the overall group, six of the items contributed to the discrimination among the subgroups. The concepts underlying the "truth" appear to be as follows:

a. know the funding source

b. write clearly and precisely

c. the proposing agency reputation makes a difference

d. the understandability of the proposal is important

e. staff capability is important

f. documentation of costs is essential in budget preparation

g. developing a proposal does not guarantee funding

h. there should be flexibility in budgeting the workscope

i. you cannot miss the deadline for submitting a proposal.

In addition to the nine "truths" listed above, there are an additional 18 endorsed statements which can be found in table 6. A summary phrase attempting to capture the concept of the items is included in the table. Space does not permit the presentation of these concepts. Of the total of 20 items categorized into the neutral category, 14 items contributed to the discrimination among subgroups. This further supports the scaling properties of the instrument.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, it appears that the proposal development and funding perception scale has reasonable psychometric properties and functions reasonably well to assess perceptions toward the process. Further, a number of commonly heard statements regarding the proposal development and funding process can be consistently identfied as myths and a large number of statements were identified as having consensual validity or truths. Finally, there appear to be differing perceptions between males and females and between those who have had peer review panel experience and those who have not. Continued investigation into these attitudes and perceptions appears to be not only warranted but essential in view of the role proposal development plays in professional and organizational activities.

REFERENCES

Kravas, C. and Orlich, D. "Winning the Grantsmanship Game", Phi Delta Kappan, April 1978.

White, Virginia. Grants: How to Find out About Them and What to do Next, Capitol Publishing, Washington, DC, 1975.

Table 1 - Comparison on Selected Demographics of Respondent Group to Total Group Receiving Survey Form

Variable	Total (N=418)	Respondents (N=231)	Chi-Square
Sex			1.14 (NS)
Male	242	140	
Female	163	86	
Unknown	13	5	
Position			5.51 (NS)
University Dept.	166	90	
University Nondept.	26	19	
Government Agency	12	5	
Local Agency	37	26	
Business	22	14	
Student	14	9	
Unknown	133	63	
Other	8	4	
Division Member			11.75 (NS)
Administration	62	29	
Curriculum	94	47	
Instruction	118	52	
Measurement	111	58	
Counseling	83	33	
History	10	7	
Social Context	76	31	
Evaluation	126	66	
Professions	1	0	
Number of Divisional Affiliation			9.55 (NS)
0	72	53	
1	165	93	
2	81	47	
3	54	24	
4	25	13	
5 or more	21	4	

Note: Demographis obtained from 1979 AERA Biographical Directory

55% Return Rate

Table 2 Frequency and Percent of Respondent Group Indicating Proposal Development Experiences

Experience	Frequency				Percent			
	Yes	No	No Response	Total	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Participation in Proposal Development	195	32	4	231	84	14	2	100
Participation in Project Effort	197	30	4	231	85	13	2	100
Participation in Peer Review Panel	94	133	4	231	41	58	2	100
Conducted Proposal Workshops	39	185	7	231	17	80	3	100

TABLE 3

SUMMARY TABLE OF
MEAN ITEM SCORES FOR PEER PANEL EXPERIENCE AND SEX
ORDERED BY WILK'S LAMDA

ITEM	WILK'S LAMDA	PEER EXPERIENCE (N=63)	NO PEER EXPERIENCE (N=80)
- 52	.967	3.87	3.51
+ 35	.930	1.87	2.16
- 19	.910	2.46	2.17
+ 21	.892	3.05	3.26
- 33	.861	2.62	2.34
+ 8	.843	2.96	3.08
- 1	.824	2.90	2.68
- 30	.807	2.71	2.40
- 39	.797	3.89	3.68
- 15	.785	1.63	1.54
+ 49	.775	2.95	3.15
+ 36	.764	2.71	2.93
+ 37	.756	1.78	1.79
- 53	.745	1.69	1.63
- 54	.740	2.43	2.24
+ 44	.730	2.89	2.98
+ 11	.723	2.08	2.09
- 50	.717	4.36	4.23
+ 16	.709	3.00	3.04

PERCENT CORRECT CLASSIFICATION 72.03%

ITEM	WILK'S LAMDA	MALES (N=140)	FEMALES (N=86)
+ 45	.955	2.73	3.17
- 19	.915	2.53	2.22
+ 36	.888	2.61	3.00
+ 1	.871	2.16	3.00
- 42	.854	2.63	2.43
+ 7	.841	3.01	3.28
- 6	.822	2.79	2.52
+ 18	.813	2.40	2.59
- 20	.800	1.99	1.77
+ 48	.791	1.80	1.88
- 15	.783	1.59	1.55
+ 31	.713	2.00	2.24
+ 8	.766	3.06	3.07
- 11	.759	2.05	2.16
- 51	.754	4.26	4.19
+ 52	.749	3.61	3.73
- 26	.743	2.04	1.99
- 33	.738	2.59	2.43
+ 5	.733	3.29	3.39
- 23	.727	3.74	3.71
+ 47	.721	2.21	2.43
- 50	.717	4.29	4.14
0 24	.713	1.84	1.84
+ 39	.709	3.70	3.73

PERCENT CORRECT CLASSIFICATION 75%

Scale values for each item
1= strongly agree
2= agree
3= undecided
4= disagree
5= strongly disagree

± in front of item number indicates direction of difference between groups
0 = no difference

TABLE 4
ITEMS MEANS FOR TOTAL GROUP, ITEMS DISCRIMINATING
PEER AND NON-PEER GROUPS, AND MALE AND FEMALE GROUPS

1=Strongly Agree 5= Strongly Disagree

Item	Total (N=231) Mean	S.D.	Peer Panel Yes (N = 63)	No (N = 80)	Sex Male (N = 140)	Female (N = 86)
1. Projects resulting in short run results will be most likely funded.	2.76	1.03	2.90	2.68	2.61	3.00
2. The proposal writer should be aware of his/her funding source (i.e., types of grants funded in the past, priorities, etc.).	1.34	0.50	-	-	-	-
3. Proposal writing forces you to completely analyze problems.	2.45	1.17	-	-	-	-
4. Projects yielding results seen over a long period of time are not frequently funded.	2.89	0.97	-	-	-	-
5. Money provided through granting agencies seldom goes to the areas where the problems are the greatest.	3.35	0.98	-	-	3.29	3.40
6. Grants, i.e., approved, require tremendous report making and filing of forms with the funding agency.	2.70	1.15	-	-	2.79	2.52
7. Proposal writing is considered an esoteric art.	3.11	1.11	-	-	3.01	3.28
8. To receive funding, one needs to become one of the "inner circle."	3.06	1.14	2.97	3.08	3.06	3.07
9. Who you know is important.	2.23	0.99	-	-	-	-
10. Proposals in general are often not done in a professional manner.	2.96	1.05	-	-	-	-
11. The number of previously approved grants you have received influences future grants.	2.09	0.77	2.08	2.09	2.05	2.16
12. The most productive programs, names, contacts and a track record can make a buck for you.	2.20	1.01	-	-	-	-
13. The more logically the methodology is presented, the better the chances of the proposal being accepted.	2.035	0.92	-	-	-	-

ITEMS MEANS FOR TOTAL GROUP, ITEMS DISCRIMINATING PEER AND NON-PEER GROUPS, AND MALE AND FEMALE GROUPS

1=Strongly Agree 5= Strongly Disagree

Item	Total (N=231) Mean	Total (N=231) S.D.	Peer Panel Yes (N = 63)	Peer Panel No (N = 80)	Sex Male (N = 140)	Sex Female (N = 86)
14. Grantsmanship appears to be intentionally difficult to limit those attempting to acquire funding.	3.53	0.99	-	-	-	-
15. Being able to write in a clear, precise manner is essential.	1.56	0.73	1.63	1.54	1.59	1.55
16. Grants are for universities, research centers, and special agencies.	3.03	1.23	3.00	3.04	-	-
17. The reputation of the agency you represent influences the chances of obtaining a grant.	1.91	0.67	-	-	-	-
18. Proposal writing and grant implementation promote good communications, management skills, and new ideas.	2.47	1.02	-	-	2.40	2.59
19. It is difficult for an individual working alone to secure a grant.	2.40	1.13	2.46	2.18	2.52	2.22
20. A proposal should be written so that someone unfamiliar with the area can understand what you are going to do.	1.91	0.91	-	-	1.99	1.77
21. The size of your agency is proportional to the size of funding you receive.	3.18	1.00	3.05	3.26	-	-
22. Familiarity with the grants process and involvement in this forces a person to become more knowledgeable about our political, economic, and governmental system.	2.42	1.00	-	-	-	-
23. If a small agency receives a grant, it will be a long time before they receive another one.	3.74	0.69	-	-	3.74	3.70
24. Resumes of staff members and others working on the project should be included in the proposal.	1.84	0.76	-	-	1.84	1.84
25. Accurate recordkeeping is essential in order to prepare a realistic budget regarding indirect costs, salaries, supplies, etc.	1.77	0.80	-	-	-	-

ITEMS MEANS FOR TOTAL GROUP, ITEMS DISCRIMINATING PEER AND NON-PEER GROUPS, AND MALE AND FEMALE GROUPS

1=Strongly Agree 5= Strongly Disagree

Item	Total (N=231) Mean	S.D.	Peer Panel Yes (N = 63)	No (N = 80)	Sex Male (N = 140)	Female (N = 86)
26. Persons seeking grant support should be sure to research other possible "supporting" funds for the proposal.	2.01	0.84	-	-	2.04	1.99
27. If the agency writing the proposal can provide matching funds, the grant is more likely to be approved.	2.35	0.98	-	-	-	-
28. A good proposal will not be considered without an adequate evaluation procedure to go with it.	2.26	1.14	-	-	-	-
29. To be successful in the grants area one must learn to play the game well.	2.12	0.80	-	-	-	-
30. There is too much competition for grants and not enough money.	2.60	1.13	2.71	2.4	-	-
31. You must realize that when you have written a proposal you have made a commitment.	2.10	0.97	-	-	2.00	2.24
32. "Popular" or "high visibility" projects are the ones most likely to be funded.	2.25	0.96	-	-	-	-
33. Politics is a major factor in the allocation of grant monies.	2.51	1.06	2.62	2.34	2.54	2.40
34. Persons submitting proposals must be risk takers with strong egos.	2.65	1.049	-	-	-	-
35. Letters from agencies, the community or sources related to or affected by the grant you are writing should be obtained and included in the proposal that is submitted.	2.06	0.87	1.87	2.16	-	-
36. If the grant can make it past the peer review stage, it has a good chance of being funded.	2.75	0.94	2.71	2.92	2.61	3.00
37. An individual or agency cannot "count" on having a proposal approved and funded.	1.88	0.92	1.78	1.79	-	-

ITEMS MEANS FOR TOTAL GROUP, ITEMS DISCRIMINATING PEER AND NON-PEER GROUPS, AND MALE AND FEMALE GROUPS

1=Strongly Agree 5= Strongly Disagree

Item	Total (N=231) Mean	S.D.	Peer Panel Yes (N = 63)	No (N = 80)	Sex Male (N = 140)	Female (N = 86)
38. It is critical to develop a file of charitable funds that might finance your grant.	2.61	0.91	-	-	-	-
39. It is more important to know someone in the funding agency, than it is to have a good idea and a well written proposal.	3.71	1.04	3.89	3.69	3.70	3.73
40. The reputation of a proposal writer counts more than a well written proposal when funding decisions are made.	3.36	1.09	-	-	-	-
41. A proposal should stress your ability to meet the funding agencies needs.	2.11	0.86	-	-	-	-
42. An organization must develop a grantsmanship agency strategy in order to survive in today's world.	2.55	1.03	-	-	2.63	2.43
43. Proposal initiators should contact a funding agency so that the agency feels they have been stroked or consulted.	2.87	1.08	-	-	-	-
44. Proposal initiators should seek or solicit collaboration from political power holders in the community when originating a proposal.	2.92	1.03	2.89	2.98	-	-
45. When in the vicinity of a funding agency, dropping in to say "hello" helps to get future proposals funded.	2.90	1.03	-	-	2.73	3.17
46. Proposals should be left purposely vague as to detail in order to avoid unnecessary commitment.	4.19	0.76	-	-	-	-
47. Studying the legislative history of a program facilitates proposal development.	2.29	0.89	-	-	2.21	2.43
48. Proposal developers should know where they can "give" on their budgets and work scope in case the funding agency wants to fund at less than requested budget.	1.83	0.65	-	-	1.80	1.88

ITEMS MEANS FOR TOTAL GROUP, ITEMS DISCRIMINATING
PEER AND NON-PEER GROUPS, AND MALE AND FEMALE GROUPS

1=Strongly Agree 5= Strongly Disagree

Item	Total (N=231) Mean	Total (N=231) S.D.	Peer Panel Yes (N = 63)	Peer Panel No (N = 80)	Sex Male (N = 140)	Sex Female (N = 86)
49. Using the current language or "buzz" words is necessary to be funded.	3.02	1.19	2.95	3.15	-	-
50. After submitting a proposal, it is a professional blemish not to be funded.	4.23	0.66	4.37	4.23	4.29	4.14
51. More than one person working on a proposal makes the end product confusing.	4.23	0.82	-	-	4.26	4.19
52. Professional grant writers should be used to write proposals.	3.64	0.99	3.87	3.51	3.61	3.73
53. Missing a deadline may mean rejection.	1.68	0.67	1.70	1.63	-	-
54. In the end, salesmanship, based on a sound product, is the key to being funded.	2.23	0.98	2.43	2.24	-	-

Table 5

Items Consistently Endorsed and Not Endorsed by All Respondents

Endorsed (Mean < 2.0)			Nonendorsed (Mean > 3.5)		
Concept	Item	Mean	Concept	Item	Mean
Know funding source	2	1.34	Stigma of not being funded	14	3.53
Write clearly	15[a,b]	1.56	One person effort	23	3.74
Agency reputation	17	1.91	Proposal vagueness	39[a,b]	3.71
Clarity of proposal	20[b]	1.91	Use of professional grant writer	46	4.19
Capability of staff	24[b]	1.84	Who you know more important than quality of proposal	50[a,b]	4.23
Documentation of costs	25	1.77	Small agency receiving a second grant, low probability	51[b]	4.23
No guarantee of funding	37[a]	1.88	Intentional difficulty of grants process	52[a,b]	3.64
Flexibibility in budgeting workscope	48[b]	1.83			
Cannot miss deadline	53[a]	1.68			

[a] Item discriminates on basis of peer review

[b] Item discriminates on basis of sex

Table 6

Additional Items Endorsed by All Respondents and Having a Mean Value Greater Than 2.0 but Less Than 2.5

Concept	Item	Mean
Completely analyze problem	3	2.45
Who you know is important	9	2.23
Track record is important	11[a,b]	2.09
Productivity and program success important	12	2.20
Logical methodology important	13	2.35
Process promotes communication	18[b]	2.49
Difficult to secure funding working alone	19[a,b]	2.40
Learning democratic process	22	2.42
Investigate alternative funding sources	26[b]	2.01
Providing matching funds	27	2.35
Need for evaluation section	28	2.26
Learn process of grantsmanship	29	2.12
Proposal commitment	31[b]	2.10
Visibility of idea	32	2.25
Letter of support essential	35[a]	2.06
Proposal must address agency's need	41	2.11
Know legislative history of funding source	47[b]	2.29
Salesmanship is key to funding	54[a]	2.23

[a]Item discriminates on basis of peer review

[b]Item discriminates on basis of sex