International Journal of Library and Information Technology (IJLIT), Vol.2 No.1, March 2022. Pg.52 - 62

GRANT WINNING RESEARCH PROPOSAL: THE PITFALLS PLAGUING RESEARCHERS

KUMOLU-JOHNSON, BABATUNDE OLADIPUPO
Department of Business Administration, Lagos State University, Ojo, Lagos, Nigeria
E-mail: babatunde.kumolu-johnson@lasu.edu.ng

&

DUROWOJU, STELLA TOYOSI (PhD)
Department of Business Administration, Lagos State University, Ojo, Lagos, Nigeria

Abstract
The facts bear out that the odds are against most scientific researchers and scholars especially those just starting out in their attempts to win funding for their research projects through their grant proposals. In this study, the researcher takes a close look at some of the proposal related problems and pitfalls that have historically challenged scholarly grant seekers. The intellectual
prowess and specialized training of academics can sometimes be their downfall, when it comes to persuading government agencies and foundations to fund their well conceived, but unconvincingly presented projects. This study adopted explanatory research. Findings from this study reveals that the ability to communicate idea in ways that are contextually relevant is of necessity for possible grant winning proposal and it recommends editorial assistant for drafting, reviewing and evaluating the research proposal and it processes for possible grant.

Keywords: *Basic Components; Grant Proposal; Proposal Pitfalls.*

Introduction

Grant proposal writing is a survival skill that can heighten job security and professional opportunities in times of economic upheaval (Ellen, 2016). For many career paths, including academia, think tanks, small nonprofit organizations, writing grant proposals can be anything along the spectrum from an occasional annoyance to an all-consuming, overtime inducing preoccupation (Lemanski, 2014). Resea**r**ch proposal is an important subject and part of the requirements for writing a research project in most Tertiary Institutions before actually starting the research. A research proposal is a statement or planning document of intent which shows how a study would be carried out or executed (Olayinka & Owuni, 2006). The main goal of a grant winning research proposal is to produce a document that will stand out and favourably compete with many others that were submitted for support to donor or funding agencies or organizations. This will then mean that such a research proposal must be carefully presented to entail having an effective title, developing an effective summary, articulating the study objective / hypothesis, writing a good introduction, choosing appropriate experimental design/methods, planning for expected/ unexpected results and developing a realistitic budget. In addition to the fact that funding agencies have their own interest, priorities and dictates, the standards of a good proposal constitute the dilemma of researchers who are faced with the task of proposing a study (Bamiro et al., 2003).

The task of writing a proposal can be thought-provoking, onerous, time consuming, even tedious, but what it should never be is scary. According to Olasupo (2009) in grant writing proposal, the applicants must first be cleared with the following important issues: what is the donor agency looking for? who qualifies to apply for the grant, and how it will take to access get the grant. There is no single format for research proposals, this is because every research project is different. Different disciplines, donor organizations and academic institutions have different formats and requirements. There are, however, several key components which must be included in every research proposal. The specific research problem will dictate what other sections are required.

Statement of the Problem

There is no dearth of books and articles that offer advice to scientists, academic scholars, and others on how to write grant proposals to secure funding for their important research projects, but the task of writing them continues to be, for many, a recurring and slightly irritating exercise (Fieler, 2015; Lemanski, 2014). However, those reasons do not include the lack of an incentive to write winning proposals. According to UNESCO (2015) those who studied the grant world's statistics several decades back documented that about 50% to 60% of all grant proposals received by National Institutes of Health (NIH) in the early 1970s were funded, but that by the mid- to late-1980s, that award rate had fallen to 37%. A decade after that, during the mid- to late-1990s, other investigators estimated the success rates nationally and across all fields has fallen to 30% to 40%. For the current generation of grant seekers, signs are that the competition had only intensified and there is no sign of this trend abating. Johnson-Sheehan (2008) in his textbook on proposal writing, pointed out that securing funding is becoming increasingly difficult as grants from government and private sources become more competitive. The odds of securing the necessary funds to continue vital research that are facing the average academic researcher seem daunting (Olasupo, 2009; Kracier, 1997).

Of course, there are probably many factors that contribute to the competitive nature of funded research, not the least of which may be the availability of funds at any given time (Chapin, 2004). But one thing that experts agree affects who receives those limited funds is the quality of the proposals written (Ellen, 2016; Lemanski, 2014). From their interviews and surveys with government and foundation grant reviewers, Miner and Miner (2012) claim that many grants are rejected because they contain good ideas poorly written; and that refrain has been repeated by a chorus of other authors in the proposal writing and research administration fields. There is no doubt, from surveying the literature on the subject, that some of the shortcomings of researchers' grant proposals stem from insufficient advance planning, strategizing, and relationship building with decision makers at the agency or foundation to which they are appealing for funds (Hesse-Biber, 2016) . However, many a grant proposal is simply not a good read for audience. It is on these pitfalls plaguing researchers that prompted this study.

Objectives of the Study

This study attempted to summarize the common writing issues and drawbacks of grant-seeking researcher identified by various research findings from literature. Also, provide an ideal module of a grant winning proposal.

Literature Review

Grant Proposal Defined

A grant is typically an allotment of funds that an organisation that is tasked with disbursing those funds to awardees it sees as worthy individuals, teams or entities, such as those noted above, to accomplish a specific project (Lemanski, 2014; Yore et al., 2001; Beaufort, 1999). Sometimes grants will include non-monetary aspects as well, such as offering so called 'in-kind' support. For instance, there may be pre-paid lodging for a writer-in-residence post at a prestigious university or think tank. So while enticing, it is not always the large monetary grant that will best support a specific project. Sometimes a smaller grant may yield benefits that may feature a monetary quality, such as lodging, but other benefits may accrue, too (Porter, 2007). There may be prestige associated with a given grant, or perhaps there will be professional networking opportunities linked to a grant, and so forth. Grant awards can be wildly different yet still useful in being tailor-made to the purposes of the project you are proposing to do (Herr, 2012; Mehlenbacher, 1994). In the public sector, there are city, county, state and federal government grants to accomplish small projects such as planting flowers along traffic medians dividing roads, or installing flower baskets along Main Street of a town, or large projects such as developing a space craft that can fly to Mars and bring back data about its potential for habitable life on that famous red planetary neighbour of earth (Johnson-Sheehan, 2008). In short, a grant can be as small or large as the project envisioned by the agency that is offering the funds to prospective experts of all kinds and backgrounds to accomplish specific tasks.

A proposal is a written plan offering to conduct the type of work that is requested by the agency offering the funds, whether that project is flower planting or Mars voyaging, or book writing or documentary film-making. According to Saunders et al., (2012) and Herr (2012), a proposal is a document that essentially does three things. First, states who you are and why you are qualified to plant flowers or build spaceships or write books or make cinematic masterpieces. Second, it outlines your step-by-step plan to get the work done and the time-frame in which you promise to complete the work. Third, it usually requires a detailed budget, listing on a grid or spreadsheet each aspect of the work that you will do along with its associated cost.

Blend of Style and Substance in Grant Proposals

Having a great idea for new research that promises a breakthrough in an area of mankind's knowledge is the first step in such a journey, but that alone will not take the researcher all the way there (Mitroff & Chubin, 1979). Before an organization, be it a government agency or one of many types of philanthropic foundations, will provide the resources required for such a worthy project, it must be persuaded of a project's inherent value and significance as well as its value and significance relative to all other proposals for scant research naira/dollars (Olasupo, 2009). Intellectually, most researchers know these facts, but many of their grant proposals do not reflect it. One reason for this is a mindset prevalent in many, if not all, fields of academia that elevates the importance of one's ideas over the importance of communicating one's ideas in ways that are contextually relevant and compelling (Hesse-Biber, 2016; Porter, 2003). Yore et al., (2004) in the course of studying scientists and their views of science writing, confirmed that many of them are of the opinion that good ideas, good scientific ideas should simply stand on their own regardless of how they are presented. These authors refer to prior studies which had established that most scientists did not explicitly perceive writing as a strategy for constructing understanding. And from the surveys and interviews these three conducted with a sample of Canadian university scientists and engineers, it was clear that most of these academics believed that good science writing is more about good science than it is about good writing.

Ellen (2016) in his analysis of the proposal review process at the National Science Foundation (NSF), draw our attention to the fact that many scientists have a cognitive style of inquiry identified by some studies as low differentiator. The low differentiator basically assigns little or no weight to the personal characteristics and proclivities of a scientific investigator involved in any particular experiment or research activity. High differentiators, on the other hand, allow for some measure of subjectivity or personal impact on the part of the scientist doing the research. For this notion of cognitive styles, Ellen draws on Gordon and Morse (1969) who characterized the fundamental difference between the two types of scientific mindsets this way: In interacting with people the high differentiator perceives and reacts to each as a unique individual possessing a combination of capabilities and inabilities. The low differentiator perceives people as being more or less alike and thus tends to suppress or ignore individual capabilities.

Is it possible that some researchers (at least those who are low differentiators) carry this mindset over to their grant proposal writing? And if they do, does that cause them to ignore the human element in the proposal reviewing process and hence minimize the importance of audience analysis when doing their grant writing? Do they tend to forget, as Kaplan (2012) and Mehlenbacher (1994) have pointed out, that proposals are submitted and funded as part of a complex social process, and not done, successfully, in an intellectual vacuum in isolation? The facts show that for research grant proposals to be successful they must artfully blend rhetorical elements i.e., persuasion strategies, a winsome style with good science. Porter (2007) indicated that success in grant writing is a matter of style and format as much as content.

Academic Writing	Grant Writing
Scholarly pursuit: *Individual passion*	**Sponsor goals:** *Service attitude*
Past oriented: *Work that has been done*	**Future oriented:** *Work that should be done*
Theme-centered: *Theory and thesis*	**Project-centered:** *Objectives and activities*
Expository rhetoric: *Explaining to reader*	**Persuasive rhetoric:** *"Selling" the reader*
Impersonal tone: *Objective, dispassionate*	**Personal tone:** *Conveys excitement*
Individualistic: *Primarily a solo activity*	**Team-focused:** *Feedback needed*
Few length constraints: *Verbosity rewarded*	**Strict length constraints:** *Brevity rewarded*
Specialized terminology: *"Insider jargon"*	**Accessible language:** *Easily understood*

Figure 1: Academic writing versus grant writing: contrasting perspectives. Table reprinted from Porter (2007)

Challenges Confronted By Academics on Proposal Writing

Although, it probably goes without saying that no one likes to be told they do not write well, especially highly educated person who are justly proud of their intellectual achievements (Koppelman & Holloway, 2012; Porter, 2003), nevertheless Porter (2003) said it and not surprisingly, this study is not going to state the matter in those terms. But what can be safely said is that grant proposal writing is a much different genre than those to which researchers are accustomed and which they have spent many years mastering.

Several authors have explored the contrasts between academic grant proposal writing and business writing. Johnson-Sheehan (2008) points out the fact that grant proposals are, in effect, business proposals, hence they constitute a genre that reasonably falls under the category of business writing. Beaufort (1999) made a longitudinal, ethnographic study of four professional writers at a non-profit research agency that had made the transition from graduate school to the business workplace. Koppetman and Holloway (2012) characterized Beaufort investigation as one that examined advanced levels of writing literacy in one professional setting. In an attempt to get at the essence of the findings of several other researchers who had also studied workplace writing since the issue became popular in the mid-1980s, Chapin (2004) describes with a broad brush the underlying difference between the writing style of academia and the writing style of what she calls the real world: To briefly summarize, in the workplace the purpose for writing is to take action rather than to leisurely reflect on thought processes or on artistic expression (the latter are qualities usually valued by English teachers), and this difference is reflected in the content, form, and tone of much business communication.

According to UNESCO-IPDC (2015) in many interviews conducted with a couple of executives (who both held Ph.D.s) at the non-profit that employed writers for what was studied, one of the respondents made this frank assertion about the proposal genre: Federal proposal writing is unlike anything that any of us have been trained in. Both of these and many of the other respondents indicated that learning and adopting the writing conventions of the workplace, even the public sector workplace after leaving their college or university was not easy (Fieler, 2015; Miner & Miner, 2012; Beaufort, 1999).

Porter (2003) echoes this observation, when he compares the skills involved with writing scholarly journal articles with those required for grant proposals. He notes that habits and behaviours that lead to success in other academic endeavors can be disastrous in grant writing.
Most researchers are also unaccustomed to writing for what is potentially a broader audience, relatively uninitiated to their specialty, to which grant proposals must be targeted, notwithstanding the protocol of peer review to which most proposals are subject (Olasupo, 2009; Chapin, 2004). To shed light on the truth of this, Yore, Hand, and Florence (2004) point out that before having to confront the demands of writing in the grant proposal genre, most researchers have written only for an audience which is characterise as other reasonably well-informed scientists from related disciplinary specialties who hold similar ontological beliefs about reality and epistemological assumptions about science. Now compare that with the type of audience which Porter contends is the targeted group for grant proposals: Grant reviewers are impatient readers. Busy people with limited time, they look for any excuse to stop reading, a diverse group of readers, some of whom may be as highly specialized as the writer, but most will be generalists.

Proposal Pitfalls for Researchers
The available literature on this matter indicates that the reasons many proposals fail can be traced to common, identifiable mistakes researchers make when writing them (Ellen, 2016; Lemanski, 2014; Herr, 2012; Olayinka & Owumi, 2005. These mistakes all appear to stem from one of three main pitfalls to which the writers succumb:
1. failure to know and speak convincingly to one's audience;
2. failure to recognize and adopt a style of writing appropriate to the genre; or
3. failure to give as much due diligence to the communication of one's research concepts as one gives to the concepts themselves.

Failure to Connect with the Audience
As we've said, researchers have been trained primarily to write for their academic peers, but sometimes their peers form only a small segment of their proposal audience. To exacerbate this disadvantage, many of them may be inclined to view their audience as rather homogeneous because they approach the new genre with that low differentiator mindset. Porter (2003) in Ellen (2016) advice would possibly stun some new grant seekers: Assume reviewers are uninformed but very quick to learn. In writing their proposals, researchers are attempting to influence a whole entourage of readers of relatively diverse backgrounds, including real or would-be experts in their own field of endeavor (Herr, 2012; Kracrer, 1997). To do that, they must be careful not to take too many things for granted in terms of the predilections of members of their audience.

Failure to Follow the Rules of the Genre
Mehlenbacher (1994) hints at the persistence academics must apply to learning the nuances of winning grants with their writing. He points to one key finding of 15 different researchers who studied the subject: the importance of viewing proposal writing and research funding as a long-term endeavour, and not as something that can be studied effectively in isolated writing incidents. This pitfall about not knowing the appropriate rules of grant writing could just as easily be looked at in the reverse i.e., not knowing when to break or unlearn the rules researchers have learned when dealing only with scholarly audiences (Johnson-Sheeham, 2008). Porter (2007) was quite blunt about this point. He goes on to assert what other experts of grant seeking continually hammer away at that effective proposal writing does not exhibit hesitation or equivocation. On the contrary, it can be reduced to the very fundamental task of getting (at the start) and holding (until the end) the attention of the reader with a compelling argument.

Failure to Rewrite, Revise, and Edit

In the survey based study of scientists' views of their own brand of writing that Yore, Hand, and Florence (2004) and Herr (2012) conducted, it was noted that none of the respondents used the services of a technical editor, and the reasons cited by the scientists were variations of only two: (a) that editorial services were thought to be too expensive, and (b) that an editor would have to be familiar with their field, otherwise there would be nothing gained. But the literature dealing with the proposal genre is replete with recommendations for ample time to be given to rewriting, revising, and editing all parts of a well-planned writing process and tasks that many researchers either avoid or allow inadequate time for.

Basic Components of a Proposal

According to Kreiser (2019); UNESCO-IPDC (2015); Lemanski (2014); Kaplan (2012), and Miner and Miner (2003) the basic sections of a standard grant proposal include the following:

Cover Letter

The one-page cover letter should be written on the applicant's letterhead and should be signed by the organization's highest official. It should be addressed to the individual at the funding source with whom the organization has dealt, and should refer to earlier discussions. While giving a brief outline of the needs addressed in the proposal, the cover letter should demonstrate a familiarity with the mission of the grant making agency or foundation and emphasize the ways in which this project contributes to these goals (.

Proposal Summary: Outline of Project Goals

The grant proposal summary outlines the proposed project and should appear at the beginning of the proposal. It could be in the form of a cover letter or a separate page, but should definitely be brief—no longer than two or three paragraphs. The summary should be prepared after the grant proposal has been developed in order to encompass all the key points necessary to communicate the objectives of the project. It is this document that becomes the cornerstone of the proposal, and the initial impression it gives will be critical to the success of the venture. In many cases, the summary will be the first part of the proposal package seen by agency or foundation officials and could very possibly be the only part of the package that is carefully reviewed before the decision is made to consider the project any further. When letters of support are written, the summary may be used as justification for the project.

The summary should include a description of the applicant, a definition of the problem to be solved, a statement of the objectives to be achieved, an outline of the activities and procedures to be used to accomplish those objectives, a description of the evaluation design, plans for the project at the end of the grants, and a statement of what it will cost the funding agency. It may also identify other funding sources or entities participating in the project.

Introduction: Presenting a Credible Applicant

In the introduction, applicants describe their organization and demonstrate that they are qualified to carry out the proposed project—they establish their credibility and make the point that they are a good investment, in no more than a page. Statements made here should be carefully tailored, pointing out that the overall goals and purposes of the applicant are consistent with those of the funding source. This section should provide the following:

- A brief history of the organization, its past and present operations, its goals and mission, its significant accomplishments, any success stories.
- Reference should be made to grants, endorsements, and press coverage the organization has already received (with supporting documentation included in the appendix)
- Qualifications of its professional staff, and a list of its board of directors.
- Indicate whether funds for other parts of the project are being sought elsewhere; such evidence will strengthen the proposal, demonstrating to the reviewing officer that all avenues of support have been thoroughly explored.

- An individual applicant should include a succinct resume relating to the objectives of the proposal (what makes the applicant eligible to undertake the work or project?).

Problem Statement or Needs Assessment

This section lays out the reasons for writing a grant proposal. It should make a clear, concise, and well-supported statement of the problem to be addressed, from the beneficiaries' viewpoint, in no more than two pages. The best way to collect information about the problem is to conduct and document both a formal and informal needs assessment for a program in the target or service area. The information provided should be both factual and directly related to the problem addressed by the proposal. Areas to document are as follows:

- Purpose for developing the proposal.
- Beneficiaries—who are they and how will they benefit.
- Social and economic costs to be affected.
- Nature of the problem (provide as much hard evidence as possible).
- How the applicant or organization came to realize the problem exists, and what is currently being done about the problem.
- Stress what gaps exist in addressing the problem that will be addressed by the proposal.
- Remaining alternatives available when funding has been exhausted. Explain what will happen to the project and the impending implications.
- Most important, the specific manner through which problems might be solved. Review the resources needed, considering how they will be used and to what end.

Project Objectives: Goals and Desired Outcome

Once the needs have been described, proposed solutions have to be outlined, wherever possible in quantitative terms. The population to be served, time frame of the project, and specific anticipated outcomes must be defined. The figures used should be verifiable. If the proposal is funded, the stated objectives will probably be used to evaluate program progress, so they should be realistic. It is important not to confuse objectives with methods or strategies toward those ends. For example, the objective should not be stated as "building a prenatal clinic in Igando," but as "reducing the infant mortality rate in Igando to X percent by a specific date." The concurrent strategy or method of accomplishing the stated objective may include the establishment of mobile clinics that bring services to the community.

Program Methods and Program Design: A Plan of Action

The program design refers to how the project is expected to work and solve the stated problem. Just as the statement of objectives builds upon the problem statement, the description of methods or strategies builds upon the statement of objectives. For each objective, a specific plan of action should be laid out. It should delineate a sequence of justifiable activities, indicating the proposed staffing and timetable for each task. This section should be carefully reviewed to make sure that what is being proposed is realistic in terms of the applicant's resources and time frame. Outline the following: (1).The activities to occur along with the related resources and staff needed to operate the project (inputs); (2). A flow chart of the organizational features of the project: describe how the parts interrelate, where personnel will be needed, and what they are expected to do. Identify the kinds of facilities, transportation, and support services required (throughputs); (3). Explain what will be achieved through 1 and 2 above (outputs), that is, plan for measurable results. Project staff may be required to produce evidence of program performance through an examination of stated objectives during either a site visit by the grantor agency or foundation, and/or grant reviews which may involve peer review committees. (4). It may be useful to devise a diagram of the program design. Such a procedure will help to conceptualize both the scope and detail of the project. (5). carefully consider the pressures of the proposed implementation, that is, the time and money needed to undertake each part of the plan. Wherever possible, justify in the narrative the course of action taken. The most economical method should be used that does not compromise or sacrifice project quality. The financial expenses associated with performance of the project will later become points of negotiation with the government or foundation program staff. If everything is not carefully justified in writing in the proposal, after negotiation with the

grantor agencies or foundations, the approved project may resemble less of the original concept. (6). Highlight the innovative features of the proposal which could be considered distinct from other proposals under consideration. (7). whenever possible, use appendixes to provide details, supplementary data, references, and information requiring in-depth analysis. These types of data, although supportive of the proposal, if included in the body of the proposal, could detract from its readability. Appendixes provide the proposal reader with immediate access to details if and when clarification of an idea, sequence, or conclusion is required. Time tables, work plans, schedules, activities, methodologies, legal papers, personal vitae, letters of support, and endorsements are examples of appendixes.

Evaluation: Product and Process Analysis

An evaluation plan should be a consideration at every stage of the proposal's development. Data collected for the problem statement form a comparative basis for determining whether measurable objectives are indeed being met, and whether proposed methods are accomplishing these ends; or whether different parts of the plan need to be fine-tuned to be made more effective and efficient. Among the considerations will be whether evaluation will be done by the organization itself or by outside experts. The organizations will have to decide whether outside experts have the standing in the field and the degree of objectivity that would justify the added expense, or whether the job could be done with sufficient expertise by its own staff, without taking too much time away from the project itself. Required methods of measurement, whether standardized tests, interviews, questionnaires, observation, and so forth, will depend upon the nature and scope of the project. The procedures and schedules for gathering, analyzing, and reporting data will need to be spelled out.

Future Funding

The last narrative part of the proposal explains what will happen to the program once the grant ends. It should describe a plan for continuation beyond the grant period, and outline all other contemplated fund-raising efforts and future plans for applying for additional grants. Projections for operating and maintaining facilities and equipment should also be given. The applicant may discuss maintenance and future program funding if program funds are for construction activity; and may account for other needed expenditures if the program includes purchase of equipment.

Budget Development and Requirements

Although the degree of specificity of any budget will vary depending upon the nature of the project and the requirements of the funding source, a complete, well-thought-out budget serves to reinforce the applicant's credibility and to increase the likelihood of the proposal being funded. The estimated expenses in the budget should build upon the justifications given in the narrative section of the proposal. A well-prepared budget should be reasonable and demonstrate that the funds being asked for will be used wisely. The budget should be as concrete and specific as possible in its estimates. Every effort should be made to be realistic, to estimate costs accurately, and not to underestimate staff time the budget format should be as clear as possible. It should begin with a Budget Summary, which, like the Proposal Summary, is written after the entire budget has been prepared. Each section of the budget should be in outline form, listing line items under major headings and subdivisions. Each of the major components should be subtotaled with a grand total placed at the end. If the funding source provides forms, most of these elements can simply be filled into the appropriate spaces.

In general, budgets are divided into two categories: personnel costs and non-personnel costs. In preparing the budget, the applicant may first review the proposal and make lists of items needed for the project. The personnel section usually includes a breakdown of the following items:

1. salaries (including increases in multiyear projects),
2. fringe benefits such as health insurance and retirement plans, and
3. consultant and contract services.

The items in the non-personnel section will vary widely, but may include

1. space/office rental or leasing costs,
2. utilities,

3. purchase or rental of equipment,
4. training to use new equipment, and
5. photocopying, office supplies.

In learning to develop a convincing budget and determining appropriate format, reviewing other grant proposals is often helpful. The applicant may ask government agencies and foundations for copies of winning grants proposals. Grants seekers may find the following examples of grants budgets helpful:

- How to Prepare a Grant Proposal Budget for a Nonprofit https://www.thebalancesmb.com/the-basics-of-preparing-a-budget-for-a-grant-proposal-2501952
- Grant Space: Examples of Nonprofit Budgets https://grantspace.org/resources/knowledge-base/budget-examples/
- Introduction to Project Budgets https://grantspace.org/training/courses/introduction-to-project-budgets/
- Sample Budget Form (National Endowment for the Humanities) https://www.neh.gov/grants/manage/organizations

In preparing budgets for government grants, the applicant may keep in mind that funding levels of federal assistance programs change yearly. It is useful to review the appropriations and average grants or loans awarded over the past several years to try to project future funding levels.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The intellectual prowess and specialised training of academics can sometimes be their downfall, when it comes to persuading government agencies and foundations to fund their well conceived, but unconvincingly presented projects (Lemanski, 2014). From this study, it was discovered that brilliant idea is not sufficient for grant winning proposal rather such proposal must be worthy project having inherent value and significance relative to all other proposals (Olasupo, 2009). Also, the ability to communicate idea in ways that are contextually relevant is of necessity for possible grant winning proposal (Hesse-Biber, 2016).

This study recommends that researchers seeking for grant should employ the services of technical communicator (editorial assistant) whose role among others is to: (1). interview client organizations to objectively identify and document the proposed activity requiring funding and the strengths, risks, and challenges of the grant seeking organization; (2). draft the proposal document, consistent with all submittal instructions; and (3). review, get results, and evaluate the process.

REFERENCES

Bamiro, O. A., Oladepo, O., Olayinka, A. I., Popoola, I., & Soyibo, A. (2013). *The planning and working of grant-oriented research proposal.* University of Ibadan Press.

Beaufort, A. (1999). *Writing in the real world: Making the transition from school to work.* Teachers College Press.

Chapin, P. G. (2004). *Research projects and research proposals: A guide for scientists seeking funding.* Cambridge University Press.

Ellen, W. G. (2016). *Writing successful grant proposals*. Sense Publishers. Retrieved from https://www.sensepublisher.com/

Fieler, B. (2015). *Turning to a ghostwriter for a personal toast*. The New York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/21/style/toast-whisperers-ghostwriterspersonal-speeches.html?_r=0

Herr, J. (2009). *Grant and proposal writing 101.* San Francisco Chapter of Society for Technical Communication. Retrieved from http://www.stc-sf.org/stcsh-meeting-archive.htm

Hesse-Biber, S. N. (2016). *The practice of qualitative research: Engaging students in the research process.* Sage Publications.

Johnson-Sheehan, R. (2008). *Writing proposals* (2nd ed.). Pearson/Longman.

Kaplan, K. (2012). Funding: Got to get a grant. *Nature, 482*(7385), 429-431.

Koppelman, G. H., & Holloway, J. W. (2012). Successful grant writing. *Paediatr Respir*, *13*(1), 63-67.

Kracier, J. (1997). *The art of grantsmanship*, Department of Physiology, College of Medicine University of Toronto. Retrieved from http://mstp.duke.edu/files/images/Grantsmanship2.pdf

Kreiser, M. (2019). *How to develop and write a grant proposal*. Congressional Research Service. Retrieved from https://crsreports.congress.gov

Lemanski, S. W. (2014). Proposal pitfalls plaguing researcher: Can technical communicators make a difference? *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication, 44(*2), 211-222.

Mehlenbacher, B. (1994). The rhetorical nature of academic research funding. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication, 37*(3), 157-162.

Miner, J. T., & Miner, L. E. (2003). *A guide to proposal planning and writing*. Proposal Planning and Writing (3rd ed.). Greenwood Press. Retrieved from www.oema.us/files/Guide_to_Grant_Writingt.pdf

Olayinka, A. I., & Owumi, B.E. (2005). Preparing a research proposal. In A. I. Olayinka (Eds.), *Methodology of Basic and Applied Research*. University of Ibadan Press.

Olasupo, N. A. (2009). The fundamentals of writing grant winning research proposal. In E. A. Akinade, (Eds), *Writing Grant Research Proposal*. Lagos State University Press.

Porter, R. (2003). Facilitating proposal development: Helping faculty avoid common pitfalls. *The Journal of Research Administration, 34*(1), 28-33.

Porter, R. (2007). Why academics have a hard time writing good grant proposals. *The Journal of Research Administration, 38*(2), 37-43.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research Methods for Business Students* (5th ed.). Pearson
UNESCO. (2015). *Funding*. Retrieved from http://whc.unesco.org/en/funding/

UNESCO-IPDC. (2015). Projects: How to submit a proposal. *UNESCO International Programme for the Development of Projects (IPDC)*. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and information/intergovernmentalprogrammes/ipdc/projects/how-to-submit-a-project-proposal/

Yore, L. D., Hand, B., M. & Florence, M. K. (2004). Scientists' views of science, models of writing, and science writing practices. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41*(4), 338-369.