An Investigation of the Demographics and Processes of Research Funding in U.S. Academic Anthropology

Report

by Laura Heath-Stout

Stanford University
lheathst@stanford.edu

project commissioned by the Wenner-Gren Foundation
with support from the Social Science Research Council

submitted January 23, 2024

Table of Contents

Introduction

Academic anthropological research is largely dependent on funding from governmental agencies and foundations. Unfortunately, funding and research opportunities may be distributed inequitably due to the effects of systemic racism, sexism, heterosexism, classism, and ableism. This project investigates the demographics of anthropologist grantees and the equity of grantmaking processes in order to propose actions that granting agencies may take to distribute funding more fairly.

During the 2020–2021 academic year, representatives of the major funders of archaeological research in the United States held a series of meetings with the leaders of the Society of Black Archaeologists and the Indigenous Archaeology Collective to discuss how to improve the inclusivity and equity of their granting practices. One result of these conversations was this project, which was commissioned by the Wenner-Gren Foundation with support from the Social Science Research Council.

Previous Research

Although anthropology's reflexive turn took place several decades ago, and many anthropologists across subfields are aware of and thoughtful about how their identities shape their work, there are relatively few cases of scholars using surveys to quantitatively explore disciplinary demographics. In sociocultural anthropology, in particular, there seems to be no tradition of quantitative studies of equity concerns.

Archaeology's subdisciplinary demographics and knowledge production have more often been quantitatively investigated. Most commonly, these studies focus on the demographics of journal authors (e.g., Gero 1985; Beaudry and White 1994; Ford and Hundt 1994; Hutson 2002; Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2004; Rautman 2012; Bardolph 2014, 2018; Bardolph and Vanderwarker 2016; Tushingham, Fulkerson, and Hill 2017; Fulkerson and Tushingham 2019; Gamble 2020; Gamble et al. 2020; Heath-Stout 2020b; Tushingham and Fulkerson 2020). Generally, these focus on published authors; because researchers do not have access to internal records of the journals, they cannot examine the equity of peer review processes or acceptance rates. In the rare cases in which journal staff have examined these records of rejected articles, they have proven that—at least at *American Antiquity* (Rautman 2012; Gamble 2020), *Antiquity* (Hanscam and Witcher 2023), and the *Journal of Field Archaeology* (Heath-Stout 2020a)—gender discrepancies among published authors are attributable not to inequitable review processes, but to gender imbalances among the authors who submit manuscripts in the first place. With the exception of my own study, which used a survey to ascertain the identities of authors (Heath-Stout 2019a, pt. 2; 2020b), these studies focus exclusively on gender, since that can be (debatably) predicted based on first names.

In some cases, the gender demographics of recipients of archaeological research grants have also been investigated. John Yellen (1994), Program Director for Archaeology at the National Science Foundation, demonstrated that in fiscal year 1989, men had more success than women in receiving senior grants, while dissertation grants were more equitable (Yellen 1994: tables 1–2). In their proposals for senior grants, women requested less money than men, and were less likely to apply for funding for fieldwork (Yellen 1994: table 9). Furthermore, there seemed to be sexist bias among male *ad hoc* reviewers. Unfortunately, this gender disparity among applicants and recipients of senior grants seems to still be in place three decades later, as Goldstein and colleagues (2018) recently revealed. Their interviews with post-Ph.D. women archaeologists illuminated how a variety of factors prevented women from applying for grants: these included underrepresentation of women in institutions that support grant-writing, hidden labor falling to women and taking time away from grant-writing, family responsibilities limiting women's fieldwork, and women's tendency to conduct

smaller projects. This is in line with larger findings about NSF grant-making across all disciplines: although women are as likely as men to be successful, they are less likely to submit proposals (RissleR et al. 2020). Catherine Jalbert and I have built on this research to demonstrate that among NSF Archaeology grant recipients, there are statistically significant correlations between the gender of the principal investigator and the region(s) under study (Heath-Stout and Jalbert 2023). To my knowledge, there have been no systematic studies of race, class, disability, or sexual orientation issues in archaeological research funding before the study presented here.

More recently, biological anthropologists have conducted quantitative research on the demographics and inequities of their discipline. Notably, Clancy, Nelson, and colleagues (Clancy et al. 2014; 2017; Nelson et al. 2017) have been leaders in the study of sexual harassment across the field sciences. Studies of the American Association of Biological Anthropologists' (AABA's; formerly the American Association of Physical Anthropologists) membership have shown increasing numbers of women over time and also stubborn inequities in the field (Turner et al. 2018). Unfortunately, the organization and the subfield remain overwhelmingly white, despite a decade of diversity initiatives (Antón, Malhi, and Fuentes 2018; Fuentes 2020). To my knowledge, there are no studies of the demographics of grant recipients in biological anthropology.

The literature reviewed here is largely focused on the United States, although there has also been scholarly conversation about inequities and common practices within anthropology in Canada (Handly 1995; Jalbert 2019; Overholtzer and Jalbert 2021), Europe (European Association of Social Anthropologists Association et al. 2020), Australia (Bowman and Ulm 2009), and globally (McGrath, Acciaioli, and Millard 2018). Similarly, this project is focused on the United States. This is a strategic choice: conducting a more global survey would be a much larger project in terms of dissemination and translation. I disseminated this survey through U.S.-based organizations and examine the demographics of funding from U.S.-based agencies, while acknowledging that anthropology is a global discipline, U.S.-based organizations include members from around the world, and some U.S.-based funders provide funding to researchers of a variety of nationalities.

All of this research demonstrates that quantitative studies of demographic imbalances in anthropology can be fruitful. The relative lack of studies of grant-making, specifically (Yellen 1994; Goldstein et al. 2018), leaves ample space for a study of this type.

Research Questions

This research project addresses two sets of research questions:

1. What are the demographics of anthropology research grant applicants and recipients? How do they compare between different subfields, funding agencies, and types of grants? How do they compare to the demographics of anthropology, academia, and society more broadly?
2. What factors affect anthropologists' decisions about whether to apply for funding, where to apply, and how to frame their research? How are these processes shaped by identity and structures of oppression?

Methods

This study used an anonymous survey to collect data from anthropologists from across the four subdisciplines and from various career stages about how they approach funding their research. To recruit participants, we first asked a variety of anthropological professional organizations to distribute the recruitment text to all members. We chose to focus on anthropology and archaeology professional organizations based in the United States in order to reach a variety of scholars while keeping the scope of the project manageable through the focus on the United States. The link

included in the recruitment letter took the participant to a consent form providing more information about the study and confidentiality concerns. We collected 920 responses via professional organization recruitment.

Once the survey had begun, we received feedback from anthropologists who were not current members of professional organizations. Some had left organizations in protest after the associations mishandled issues such as enforcing sexual harassment policies and making public statements about repatriation. Others had allowed their memberships to lapse during the pandemic due to financial concerns or lack of in-person conferences to attend. We wanted to include the perspectives of these people, so we modified the survey to include anyone who had been a member of any of the organizations at any time in the past five years. The survey was then advertised via Twitter and Facebook. Some 237 responses were collected via social media recruitment.

The survey was open from August 18, 2021 until October 21, 2021, and received a total of 1157 responses.

The survey had three sections: Demographics, Your Research, and Experiences with Funding. The Demographics section asked questions about the applicant's identities: gender, race, sexual orientation, disability, class background (as measured by parents' education level), education level, and current institutional affiliation. The Your Research section asked respondents to identify their subfield affiliation, methods they generally use, and geographic research foci. The Experiences with Funding section was designed to gather data about the researcher's process of decision-making about and application for funding. In each section, there were some questions that will or will not appear depending on the respondent's answers to previous questions, as they only apply to particular applicants.

The survey results were analyzed using basic statistical analyses. Most of the questions asked about categorical variables, so Chi-Squared Tests were used to evaluate whether various characteristics of applicants and grant are related; the results are presented below. Open-ended answers were coded and analyzed using qualitative methods in NVivo software.

The Institutional Review Board of the University of Massachusetts Boston determined that this project was exempt from full-board review on July 28, 2021 (study number 2021137).

Professional Organizations Included in Recruitment

American Anthropological Association[1]
American Association of Biological Anthropologists (formerly known as the American Association of Physical Anthropologists)
American Board of Forensic Anthropologists
American Society of Primatologists
Archaeological Institute of America
Register of Professional Archaeologists
Society for American Archaeology
Society for Applied Anthropology
Society for Historical Archaeology
Society of Forensic Anthropologists

[1] Once we coordinated with AAA leadership to distribute the survey, we contacted leaders of each of the many AAA sections and asked them to ask their members to fill out the survey.

Summary of Results

Demographics

- The respondents were primarily cisgender women (58.7%, see tables 1.02–04).
- The majority were heterosexual (78.76%, see table 1.05).
- The majority were from the United States (86.12%, see table 1.06).
- Of the people from the U.S., 87.19% were white (table 1.10)
- Of those from other countries, 29.49% identified as being from a marginalized or minoritized group (table 1.08).
- Some survey respondents expressed resistance to answering questions about their gender, sexual orientation, and especially their race. In some cases, these responses communicated both legitimate concerns about privacy and the impossibility of capturing the complexity of identity in multiple choice questions. However, in some cases, written-in responses suggested a concerning reluctance to engage with power imbalances; this resistance makes it more difficult to transform the discipline (see comments below tables 1.02, 1.05, 1.09, and 1.10).
- A majority (63.43%) held Ph.D.s, but respondents ranged from current undergraduate students through Ph.D.s, with a handful (1.16%) of respondents holding professional degrees other than a Ph.D. (table 1.11).
- Approximately one in four respondents (25.67%) had been first-generation bachelors recipients, and 14.27% had at least one parent with a Ph.D. (tables 1.12–13).
- Approximately one in four respondents (24.78%) had a disability (table 1.14).
- Respondents ranged from a few under the age of 23 (0.54%) to 11.96% in their sixties. The majority (52.68%) were in their thirties or forties (table 1.15).
- A majority were affiliated with research universities (43.43% public, 12.78% private), with smaller numbers affiliated with 4-year colleges (7.86% public, 7.06% private) and community colleges (1.43%). 8.67% were affiliated with government agencies, 8.49% with non-profits, and 11.44% with for-profit businesses (table 1.16).
- Among academics, respondents included students ranging from undergraduates through Ph.D. candidates, and all kinds of faculty and staff. The largest groups were tenured faculty (29.55%), tenure-track faculty (15.41%), and doctoral students and candidates (23.95%). This suggests that our strategy of recruiting through professional organizations favored those with stable academic positions over contingent academics, undergraduate and master's students, and anthropologists working outside academia.

Your Research

- The most common subfields were sociocultural anthropology (37.78%, table 1.18) and archaeology (65.56%, table 1.23). Biological anthropology was less common (15.22%, table 1.20) and linguistics was least common (6.65%, table 1.26). Many respondents (22.64%) conduct research in multiple subfields. This suggests that archaeologists were oversampled, perhaps because the fragmentation of the profession into a variety of professional organizations meant that many archaeologists belong to multiple organizations and were sent multiple recruitment emails. These reminders made archaeologists more likely to reply.
- Among sociocultural anthropologists, especially common methods included participant observation (82.44%), individual interviews (81.97%), archival research (66.04%),

community engaged research (57.14%, group interviews (54.10%), and oral history (53.86%) (table 1.19).

- Among biological anthropologists, especially common methods included bioarchaeology (56.47%, human skeletal biology (54.12%), and biocultural anthropology (32.35%) (table 1.21). Most biological anthropologists worked in the field (68.24%) and/or lab (59.41%) (table 1.22).
- Among archaeologists, especially common methods included excavation (87.87%), laboratory analysis of artifacts/specimens (84.74%), collections-based research (79.43%), archival research (75.34%), and public archaeology (71.80%) (table 1.24). Most archaeologists worked in the field (76.50%) and/or lab (64.34%). Since many worked in both the field and the lab, and many conducted digital research from offices or libraries, it seems that the field/lab binary commonly discussed since Gero's (1985) germinal work on gender in archaeology no longer adequately describes the contexts in which archaeologists work (table 1.25).
- Among linguists, the most common methods were interviews (79.22%), archival research (61.04%), and digital/online research (50.65%) (table 1.27). The most common theoretical paradigms were semiotics, pragmatics, metapragmatics (58.8%) and critical discourse analysis (42.65%) (table 1.28).
- A small majority (50.32%) of respondents were members of the Society for American Archaeology, and many were members of the American Anthropological Association (43.80%), Register of Professional Archaeologists (26.08%), or Society for Historical Archaeology (18.92%) (table 1.29). Given that the AAA is by far the largest organization, this suggests much higher response rates from the SAA, RPA, and SHA. Since these three organizations have overlapping memberships, as noted above, some of these respondents may have received several invitations to the survey.
- A majority of respondents (68.58%) study sites located in the U.S. or Canada, and the second most popular region was Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean (21.77%) (table 1.31).

Experience with Funding

- Approximately 3 out of 4 respondents (76.20%) had applied to at least one of the funding agencies listed for funding (table 1.32).
- The most popular sources to apply to were the National Science Foundation (76.90%, mostly for dissertation research, post-Ph.D. research, or graduate school tuition and expenses) and the Wenner-Gren Foundation (64.57%, mostly for dissertation research and post-Ph.D. research) (table 1.33). The many "other" and write-in answers suggest a wide variety of funders that anthropologists apply to (Q38).
- Among the respondents who had received funding from one or more of the agencies, the National Science Foundation and Wenner-Gren Foundation were most common (table 1.34).
- The factors that most influenced applicants' choices about where to apply were "fit between your research and what the agency funds" (average rating of 4.51 on a 1–5 scale), "eligibility requirements for applications" (4.32), "amount of funding available" (3.67), and "encouragement from a mentor or colleague" (3.4). The least influential choices were "requirement for a program or course" (1.77), "advertisement or outreach by granting agency" (1.8), "services additional to funding provided by the granting agency" (2.1), and

"previous rejections from other granting agencies" (2.22). "Previous positive experience with granting agency" (2.71), "amount of work required to apply" (2.58), and "prestige of granting agency" (2.49) were moderately influential (table 1.35).

- The support that applicants found most useful were "reading successful proposals from colleagues" (average of 4.26 on a 1–5 scale) and "feedback from a mentor or colleague" (4.19). The other forms of support were less highly rated, but still had an average of more than 3 out of 5: these were "meeting or conversation with granting agency staff," "informational material on the granting agency's website," "workshop or information session provided by granting agency," and "grant-writing course or workshop provided by your university" (table 1.36).
- Those who have not applied for funding from any of these agencies were asked why. The most common reasons were "My job or other responsibilities do not give me sufficient time and/or support to conduct research that would need funding from these agencies" (42.02%) and "My research is funded by my employer" (33.07%). Some respondents checked "I am too early in my anthropology education or career to need funding" (16.34%). Others checked "I believe that these agencies would not fund the kind of research I conduct" (22.96%), or "I feel too intimidated to apply" (22.96%) (table 1.37).

Intersectional Results

- There were a variety of statistically-significant correlations between different forms of identity (tables 2.01–2.02). In most cases, privileged identities in one category correlated with privileged identities in another, and marginalized identities in one category correlated with marginalized categories in another:
    - GENDER × SEXUAL ORIENTATION: Cisgender men were more likely than cisgender women to be heterosexual. Among people of other genders, the vast majority were non-heterosexual.
    - GENDER × RACE (U.S.): Cisgender men and cisgender women were more likely than people of other genders to be white.
    - GENDER × DISABILITY: Cisgender men and cisgender women were more likely than people of other genders to be non-disabled.
    - SEXUAL ORIENTATION × RACE (U.S.): White people were more likely than nonwhite people to be heterosexual.
    - SEXUAL ORIENTATION × EDUCATION: Heterosexual people were more likely than non-heterosexual people to hold a Ph.D.
    - SEXUAL ORIENTATION × PARENTS' EDUCATION: Heterosexual people were more likely than non-heterosexual people to have at least one parent with a bachelor's degree, and to have at least one parent with a Ph.D.
    - SEXUAL ORIENTATION × DISABILITY: Heterosexual people are more likely than non-heterosexual people to be non-disabled.
    - RACE (U.S.) × EDUCATION: White people were more likely than non-white people to hold a Ph.D.
    - RACE (U.S.) × PARENTS' EDUCATION: White people were more likely than non-white people to have parents with higher educational attainment, including bachelors' degrees, master's and professional degrees, and Ph.D.s.
    - RACE (U.S.) × DISABILITY: White people were more likely than non-white people to be non-disabled.

    - MINORITIZATION (NON-U.S.) × PARENTS' EDUCATION: Non-minoritized people were more likely than minoritized people to have parents with higher educational attainment, including bachelor's degrees, master's and professional degrees, and Ph.D.s.
    - NATIONALITY × PARENTS' EDUCATION: People from the U.S. were more likely than people from other countries to have parents with bachelor's, master's, or professional degrees, but people were equally likely to have parents with Ph.D.s across nationalities.
    - EDUCATION × PARENTS' EDUCATION: People who had at least one parent with at least a bachelor's were more likely than people with no parents with a bachelor's to hold a Ph.D. Also, people who had at least one parent with Ph.D. were more likely than people whose parents did not have Ph.D.s to have a Ph.D. themselves.
    - EDUCATION × DISABILITY: Non-disabled people were more likely than disabled people to hold a Ph.D.
    - In other cases, the correlation was more complicated: Cisgender men were more likely than cisgender women to have either parents without bachelor's degrees or parents with Ph.D.'s; cisgender women were more likely than cisgender men to have parents with bachelor's degrees or non-Ph.D. graduate degrees. People of other genders were disproportionately most likely to have parents without bachelor's degrees.
    - There were some intersections that did not have statistically significant disproportions: Minoritization (among non-U.S. respondents) had no statistically significant relationship with gender, sexual orientation, education, or disability. Nationality had no statistically significant relationship with gender, sexual orientation, education, or disability. Gender had no statistically significant relationship with education. Parents' education had no statistically significant relationship with disability.
- There were some significant disparities between the demographics of sociocultural, biological, and archaeological subfields (table 2.03):
    - GENDER: Archaeology had the lowest percent of cisgender women while biological had the highest.
    - SEXUAL ORIENTATION: Archaeology had the lowest percent of non-heterosexual people, while sociocultural had the highest.
    - RACE/ETHNICITY (U.S.): Among people from the U.S., archaeologists were more likely than sociocultural or biological anthropologists to be white.
    - MINORITIZATION (NON-U.S.): Among people from other countries, sociocultural anthropologists were more likely than archaeologists to be minoritized.
    - NATIONALITY: Sociocultural anthropologists were most likely and archaeologists were least likely to be from a country other than the U.S.
    - EDUCATION: Sociocultural anthropology had a higher percentage of Ph.D. holders than either biological anthropology or archaeology.
    - PARENTS' EDUCATION: Archaeologists were more likely than sociocultural and biological anthropologists to have been first-generation bachelor's degree recipients. Biological anthropologists were more likely than archaeologists and sociocultural anthropologists to have at least one parent with a master's or professional degree, but less likely to have at least one parent with a Ph.D.

- Among biological anthropologists, there were no identifiable differences in the demographics of lab and field researchers (table 2.04).
- Among archaeologists, cisgender men and heterosexual people were more likely to work in the field, while cisgender women and non-heterosexual people were more likely to work in the lab (table 2.05).
- Cisgender and heterosexual people were more likely than non-cisgender and non-heterosexual people to conduct community-based research, but there was no racial disparity (table 2.06).
- There were some significant correlations between identity and professional affiliation: (table 2.07–08)
    - The public sector and other sectors had higher percentages of cisgender men than the academic sector.
    - Respondents in the academic sector had parents with higher levels of educational attainment than respondents in the public sector or other sectors.
    - Research universities had higher percentages of cisgender men than four-year colleges.
    - Research universities had higher percentages of non-U.S. respondents than four-year colleges.
    - All public-sector non-heterosexual respondents worked for the federal government rather than state or local governments.
- Among academics, there were significant correlations between identity and rank (tables 2.09–10). Faculty and staff were significantly more likely than students to be cisgender, heterosexual, white, from the U.S., non-disabled, and having parents with high educational attainment. Tenured faculty were significantly more likely than tenure-track faculty to be men, cisgender, heterosexual, and white.
- The professional organizations had differing demographics (table 2.11).
    - GENDER: Across all professional organizations, respondents were majority women, but the Register for Professional Archaeologists (RPA) had the highest percentage of cisgender men, and the American Association of Biological Anthropology (AABA) had the lowest.
    - SEXUALITY: Across all professional organizations, respondents were majority heterosexual, but the Society for Applied Anthropology (SAA [Applied]) had the highest percentage of non-heterosexual respondents, and the American Board of Forensic Anthropologists (ABFA) had the lowest, although the ABFA sample is very small.
    - RACE: Across all professional organizations, respondents were majority white and from the U.S., but the American Anthropological Association (AAA) had the highest percentage of non-white people from the U.S. and the Society for Forensic Anthropology (SFA) had the lowest.
    - PARENTS' EDUCATION: None of the ABFA or SFA members who responded had a parent with a Ph.D. (although both samples are very small), while 16% of AAA members and 16% of Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) members had at least one parent with a Ph.D. AAA, RPA, SAA (Archaeology), and SAA (Applied) had the highest percentages of first-generation college students.
    - All organizations except ABFA (which has a small sample) were majority-non-disabled.

- There were notable differences in the demographics of applicants to the different funding agencies (see table 2.12).
- Most granting agencies seemed to be equitable in their review and grantmaking processes, with recipients demographically matching the applicant pool. There were some exceptions: (table 2.13):
    - Cisgender women applicants to the Ford Foundation were more likely to be successful than cisgender men applicants.
    - Cisgender men applicants to both the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Geographic Society were more likely to be successful than cisgender women applicants.
    - White applicants to the National Endowment for the Humanities, National Geographic Society, and National Science Foundation were more likely to be successful than non-white applicants.
    - Applicants with parents with Ph.D.s who applied to the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton were more likely to receive fellowships than those who did not have parents with Ph.D.s.

Dynamics of the Granting System

- Although more than ¾ of respondents had applied for funding from at least one of the funding agencies listed, the extensive lists of other funders listed in write-ins (Q38) suggest that anthropologists tend to be resourceful in their funding applications, applying to a wide variety of foundations whenever they can find a program that might fit their research. More research is needed to understand just how much anthropological research is being funded by sources other than the most common anthropology- and archaeology-focused foundations.
- Fit and eligibility were the most important factors in determining where respondents would apply for funding (Table 1.35). For those who had not applied for funding from any of these funders, lack of time and support in their jobs was the most common factor in that decision (Table 1.37).
- The most helpful resources for applicants seem to be access to expertise about the specific grant opportunities: this took the form of reading successful proposals, mentorship, and even (in the case of one write-in) serving as a reviewer (Table 1.36). Conversely, those who had not applied to any of the listed funders cited factors such as not knowing about these funding opportunities and not having mentors teach them to write grants (Table 1.37).
- Many respondents who were not Ph.D. candidates or research university faculty expressed feelings of exclusion from grantmaking. Some expressed frustration that many research grants only accept applications from Ph.D. students and holders of Ph.D.s, excluding master's students and professionals who do not hold Ph.D.s. Another noted that funding for dissertation research is generally separate from funding that actually pays graduate student researchers: thus, even if a Ph.D. candidate holds dissertation grants from multiple agencies, they may find themselves unable to pay their rent. This leaves Ph.D. students in the difficult situation of needing to find both fellowships to live on and research grants to pay for travel, equipment, analyses, etc. Similarly, some CRM archaeologists, government employees, and teaching-focused faculty members lack the workplace support to apply for grants, reinforcing a status quo in which only those with long-term affiliations at prestigious research universities are able to obtain funding.

- Although most respondents said that at least some of the feedback they have received from peer reviewers has been helpful, many had also or only had negative experiences with receiving feedback on their proposals. Vague and brief reports are common, and some had received hostile or hateful comments as well. Some blamed granting agencies for failing to solicit constructive feedback or for passing along hostile feedback to authors, while others placed responsibility on the shoulders of the reviewers themselves. Others had never had access to reviewer comments, making it difficult to revise and resubmit grant proposals. Men had more positive experiences than women, and non-first-generation scholars had more positive experiences than those who had been first generation college students, suggesting that systemic oppression shapes the feedback that marginalized people receive, and the circumstances in which they work while they receive it. (Q36)
- Most respondents' grant application strategies fell into one of three categories: "apply for everything," "apply strategically," or "avoid having to apply." Applying strategically was most common overall and was more common among older respondents. (Q39)
- Much of the advice respondents shared for early career anthropologists depended on the strategies they followed themselves (see above). Other common themes in the advice included acknowledgments of the inequity of the system and exhortations to persist despite that inequity.

Profiles of Black and Indigenous Respondents

- Because this research was commissioned as the result of collaborations between the Wenner-Gren Foundation, the Society of Black Archaeologists, and the Indigenous Archaeology Collective, I include a section specifically examining the experiences of Black and Indigenous respondents.
- There were 40 respondents (3.46%) who checked the "Black, African American, and/or Afro-Latinx" box and 23 respondents (1.99%) who checked the "American Indian, Native American, First Nations, and/or Alaskan Native" box in the Race and Ethnicity question (Q4; only visible to those from the United States).
- Black respondents were statistically significantly more likely than non-Black respondents to be:
    - disabled
    - under the age of 40
    - affiliated with a university or college
    - students
    - sociocultural anthropologists
    - members of the AAA
    - members of the SHA
    - non-NSF applicants
- Indigenous respondents were statistically significantly more likely than non-Indigenous respondents to be:
    - non-Ph.D. holders
    - members of the RPA
- Indigenous respondents were particularly concerned about proposal assessment by funding agencies, with many experiencing racism from reviewers and granting agency staff. Many felt that their proposals had been reviewed by people who were not qualified to assess Indigenous archaeology projects.

- Black respondents were particularly focused on access to mentorship, feedback, and examples of successful proposals as important elements of successful application processes.
- Responses to open-ended questions by Black and Indigenous respondents tended to convey even more frustration with the status quo of anthropological research funding than the general population's responses.

Suggestions for Funding Agencies to Improve Diversity and Equity

This section includes a number of suggestions for funding agency staff; I acknowledge, however, that not all of these ideas will be workable for all agencies, especially because government employees are limited by a variety of regulations.

Most funding agencies have equitable practices of reviewing applications and awarding grants. However, the survey results suggest that the National Endowment for the Humanities, National Geographic Society, National Science Foundation, and Institute for Advanced Study may have grantmaking practices that give preference to some anthropology and archaeology applicants over others based on gender, race, and/or class (table 2.13). I encourage the staff at these organizations to examine their own internal data to determine if this is the case beyond the scope of this survey; if it is, I encourage them to modify their practices to ensure that all applicants have an equal chance at funding, regardless of their identities.

In the review process, funders should attempt to identify reviewers who are committed to providing thoughtful and constructive feedback. It may be helpful to ask senior and well-established reviewers to sign their reviews, or to assign marginalized applicants' proposals to at least some reviewers who share the applicant's marginalized identities. When reviewers give vague, brief, or hostile feedback, they should not be asked to review again, and rude or hateful comments should not be forwarded to applicants. With this exception, however, all applicants should have the opportunity to read and learn from the comments that reviewers have written. Furthermore, funding agency staff should be transparent with applicants about the decision-making process, as many respondents found it frustrating to receive a rejection letter with uniformly positive reviews attached: this mysterious situation makes it difficult to move forward in seeking funding.

Eligibility and the fit between their research and what an organization funds were the primary factors affecting how respondents choose where to apply for funding. Therefore, I encourage funders to examine whether their eligibility guidelines can be expanded to include more marginalized people. I also suggest ensuring that the information they disseminate about funding opportunities accurately reflects the breadth of the types of research they fund, so that all applicants can make educated choices about fit. This information should be disseminated in ways that target organized communities of marginalized scholars in order to make sure that it is made available to potential grantees who might not otherwise encounter it. Some funders may even be interested in expanding or modifying the types of research that they fund in order to encourage a more diverse applicant pool.

Funders should consider modifying the guidelines about what kinds of expenses can be covered by grants, as well. These should include course buyouts to allow scholars at teaching-intensive colleges and universities to have time to conduct research; childcare and eldercare; expenses for children and co-parents to travel to field sites; and salaries for graduate students so that they can focus on research rather than having to work other jobs to pay for living expenses when not in the field. Allowing grantees who have teaching-intensive positions to spread the funding out over more time would make it more possible for them to conduct research despite limited time during the semester.

Earmarking some funding for scholars from minority-serving institutions (Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges and Institutions, and Hispanic Serving Institutions) would ensure that students at these colleges have opportunities to work with faculty who conduct research, building pathways into research careers for these students.

Many respondents recommended providing clear and easy-to-read websites that make explicit what the eligibility requirements, proposal guidelines, and metrics for judging proposals are. Several also recommended publishing successful proposal examples, evaluation rubrics, success rates, and the demographics of grantees on such a website. Respondents reported that the most helpful supports in applying for funding are reading successful proposals and having a colleague or mentor comment on draft proposals or applications. Accordingly, I suggest that funding agencies make a selection of recent successful proposals available to applicants. With the recipients' approval, these could be made available on funder websites or, as the Wenner-Gren Foundation has done, on repositories like the Digital Archaeological Record (Wenner-Gren Foundation and the Center for Digital Antiquity n.d.). For more privacy, agencies could add a note to their website saying that example successful proposals will be made available upon request.

Although funders cannot change their applicants' access to mentorship through their institutions, they can potentially make mentorship available to applicants. I suggest that funders ask recent grant recipients if they would be willing to mentor a small number of applicants through the process, allow applicants to sign up for this mentorship in advance, and then match mentors with mentees based on their specializations or interests. Clear and explicit guidelines about how much and what kinds of work mentors are expected to provide would help ensure that all participants in such a program have reasonable expectations.

Suggestions of Actions Anthropologists in Various Positions can take to Improve Diversity and Equity in Anthropological Research Funding

This table includes both suggestions from survey respondents and suggestions based on the results of the analysis presented in this report.

Position	Suggested Actions
All Anthropologists	• Share your successful and unsuccessful proposals and any feedback you receive with colleagues interested in applying for the same grants. • Form relationships with colleagues and mentors/mentees to provide each other constructive feedback on grant proposals. • Advocate for any of these suggestions with people in your networks who hold relevant positions to implement them.
Mentors of Graduate Students and Early Career Researchers	• Proactively help mentees plan ahead to apply to grants for their research. • Provide constructive and respectful feedback on mentees' proposal drafts. • Share your stories of success and failure in funding applications with mentees to demystify the process. • Include mentees in the process of writing grant applications for projects in which they will participate.

Administrators of Departments/Programs	• Ensure that your program offers a proposal-writing course and encourage/require graduate students to take that course. • Create and circulate a list of which faculty, students, and recent alumni/ae have received funding from or been reviewers for which funders, so that prospective applicants can reach out to them for support. • Gather a library of successful proposals by faculty, students, and alumni/ae, and make it available to students and faculty. • Invite funding agency staff and/or colleagues who have served as reviewers to present professional development workshops for students and faculty. • Raise funds and provide small seed grants for pilot projects that can form the basis for larger grant-funded projects by faculty and students. • Ensure that mentorship is fully recognized and valued in tenure and promotion criteria.
Professional Organization Staff and Leadership	• Invite funding agency staff, colleagues who have served as reviewers, and/or colleagues who have been particularly successful in obtaining funding to present professional development workshops at conferences. Workshop participation should be included in conference registration: build the cost into the conference budget or fund-raise as necessary. Do not schedule these workshops for the days before or after the main conference, as this requires attendees to pay for extra days of travel and arrange coverage for childcare, eldercare, teaching, and/or other obligations. • Create and circulate a list of members who have received funding from or been reviewers for particular funders and are willing to talk to prospective applicants. • Gather a library of successful proposals by members and make it available to members. • Raise funds and provide small seed grants for pilot projects that can form the basis for larger grant-funded projects. • Create mentorship programs where students and early-career researchers can be paired with more senior researchers who are willing to provide advice and feedback on draft proposals.
Reviewers	• Provide respectful and constructive feedback on proposals. • Think carefully about whether you are qualified to review a particular proposal, especially if its political or theoretical framing is very different from yours: if not, suggest another reviewer. • Talk openly with your students, mentees, and colleagues about the process of reviewing and what reviewers look for in proposals.
Funding Agency Staff	• See above

Acknowledgments

This project was funded by the Social Science Research Council and the Wenner-Gren Foundation, who hired me as an independent contractor to complete it. Simultaneously, I held a Hunt Postdoctoral fellowship from the Wenner-Gren Foundation, supporting my work on my book project, during the 2021–2022 academic year. The support of the foundation and particularly Danilyn Rutherford, Kathryn Derfler, and other Wenner-Gren staff has been invaluable.

This project was commissioned after the staff from a variety of research funders had a series of meetings with leaders of the Society of Black Archaeologists (Justin Dunnavant and Ayana Omilade Flewellen) and the Indigenous Archaeology Collective (Sara Gonzalez and Ora Marek-Martinez). These meetings focused on improving the equity of grantmaking processes in archaeology, and diversifying the research and researchers who receive funding. The funding organizations represented at these meetings included the Wenner-Gren Foundation, the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment from the Humanities, the National Geographic Society, the Explorers Club, Fulbright, the Leakey Foundation, the Social Sciences Research Council, and the Institute for Field Research. I am grateful to all of these individuals and organizations for their hard work to make our discipline more just and equitable.

I would like to thank Danilyn Rutherford, Sara Gonzalez, Ora Marek-Martinez, Justin Dunnavant, Ayana Omilade Flewellen, Chip Colwell, Sean Tallman, Chris Schmitt, Summerson Carr, Michael Lempert, Nicholas Harkness, Rihan Yeh, and a variety of staff at major funding organizations who provided essential feedback on early drafts of the survey and of this report.

I am grateful to the staff at ten different professional organizations who distributed the survey to their memberships: the American Anthropological Association, the American Association of Biological Anthropologists (formerly American Association of Physical Anthropologists), the American Board of Forensic Anthropologists, the American Society of Primatologists, the Archaeological Institute of America, the Register of Professional Archaeologists, the Society for American Archaeology, the Society for Applied Anthropology, the Society for Historical Archaeology, and the Society of Forensic Anthropologists.

This work has been supported by my mentors at the University of Massachusetts Boston (2021–2022), Stephen Silliman and Nedra Lee. I thank them as well as David Carballo, Cati Connell, Mary Beaudry, Jeff Fleisher, and Barbara Voss for their mentorship.

The Institutional Review Board of the University of Massachusetts Boston determined that this project was exempt from full-board review on July 28, 2021 (study number 2021137).

Any errors are my own.

Researcher Biography

Since 2016, I have used quantitative and qualitative methods to examine how sexism, racism, heterosexism, classism, and ableism shape the demographics and knowledge production of archaeology. I received my Ph.D. in Anthropology (Anthropological Archaeology track) from Boston University in 2019; my dissertation was titled "Diversity, Identity, and Oppression in the Production of Archaeological Knowledge" (Heath-Stout 2019a). Sections of this and related work have been published in *American Antiquity* (Heath-Stout 2020b), *Advances in Archaeological Practice* (Heath-Stout and Hannigan 2020), the *Journal of Field Archaeology* (Heath-Stout 2020a; Heath-Stout and Jalbert 2023), the *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* (Heath-Stout 2022), and the *American Journal of Archaeology* (Heath-Stout et al. 2023). My book project, *Identity, Oppression, and Diversity in Archaeology: Career Arcs* is under contract for publication in the Routledge Archaeology of Gender and Sexuality series and is likely to be released in 2024 or 2025. I have experience in more traditional archaeological work as well: my M.A. thesis work focused on ceramics from Tlaxcala, Mexico, and

has been published in the *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* (Heath-Stout 2019b). I am currently a postdoctoral fellow at the Stanford Archaeology Center and have conducted archaeological fieldwork in Mexico, Belize, Ecuador, Spain, and the United States.

Contact: lheathst@stanford.edu; lheath@bu.edu

Website: www.lauraheathstout.com

Results Part 1: Quantitative Results: Question-by-Question Results

Table 1.01: Q01: Do you consent to participate in the survey?

Answer choice	*n*	%
Yes	1154	99.74%
No	3	0.26%
Total answers	**1157**	
Skipped question	0	

COMMENT:
Respondents who answered "no" were not taken to the rest of the survey.

Table 1.02: Q02: Gender (check all that apply)

Answer choice	*n*	%
Agender	11	0.97%
Genderfluid	7	0.62%
Genderqueer	12	1.06%
Man	399	35.28%
Nonbinary	24	2.12%
Woman	699	61.80%
Other (please specify)	9	0.8%
Total answers	**1131**	
Skipped question	26	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

1. Cisman
2. Gender non-conforming
3. human being
4. human being
5. Male. "Man" is a gender specific term but not a gender descriptor
6. other
7. sex: female
8. there are only TWO genders
9. Trans

COMMENT:
We chose to separate this question from Q03 in order to count people's gender identities fully regardless of whether they are cisgender or transgender. The intersections between Q02 and Q03 answers can be found below.

Some of these write-in answers give a view into complexities of gender identity that could not be easily summarized in the multiple-choice question (2, 6), while others suggested a rejection of the separation between Q02 and Q03 (1, 9). Still others suggested rejection of the framing of the question altogether, although with varying motives: answers 3 and 4 seem to imply that gender is unimportant, while 6 and 7 critique the language choices of the question and 8 espouses transphobia.

Table 1.03: Q03: Are you transgender?

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Yes	11	0.98%
No	1116	99.02%
Total answers	**1127**	
Skipped question	30	

Table 1.04: Simplified Gender (Q02 & Q03)

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Cisgender Men	390	33.7%
Cisgender Women	679	58.7%
People of Other Genders	56	4.8%
Skipped Q2 and/or Q3	32	2.8%
Total	**1157**	

Table 1.05: Q04: Sexual orientation (check all that apply)

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Bisexual and/or pansexual	137	12.28%
Gay, lesbian, and/or homosexual	55	4.93%
Queer	74	6.63%
Straight and/or heterosexual	879	78.76%
Other (please specify)	22	1.97%
Total answers	**1116**	
Skipped question	41	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

1. Ace
2. Asexual
3. Asexual
4. Asexual
5. Asexual
6. Asexual
7. Asexual
8. Asexuality spectrum
9. Believes sexuality is fluid and may change over my lifetime, so still exploring could also be an option here for some of us?
10. Biromantic/asexual
11. gynephile
12. NA
13. normal
14. Not an appropriate question.
15. not really into it much these days
16. other
17. Polygamous
18. prefer not to respond
19. prefer not to say
20. Questioning

21. Two Spirit
22. WHY does this matter?

COMMENT:
The failure to include asexual as an option was an unintentional oversight.

As with gender, we see some resistance to the question in these answers, especially 13, 14, and 22. Similarly, write-in responses 11, 12, 15, and 17 may have been intended to be flippant or resistant in tone, although it is difficult to say. Other answers remind us that sexual orientation is fluid and complicated enough to be difficult to measure by survey (9, 20) and may be considered a private matter (18, 19).

Table 1.06: Q05: Are you from the United States?

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Yes	974	86.12%
No	157	13.88%
Total answers	**1131**	
Skipped question	26	

Table 1.07: Q06: Nationality
Question only visible to those who answered "no" to Q05 (Are you from the United States?).

Answer choice	*n*	%	Answer choice (cont.)	*n*	%
North America	*47*	*31.54%*	*Asia*	*18*	*12.08%*
Canada	38	25.50%	India	12	8.05%
United States	9	6.04%	Japan	1	0.67%
			Korea South	2	1.34%
Europe	*32*	*21.48%*	Nepal	1	0.67%
Andorra	1	0.67%	Pakistan	1	0.67%
Bulgaria	2	1.34%	Singapore	1	0.67%
France	2	1.34%			
Germany	3	2.01%	*Central America/Caribbean*	*10*	*6.71%*
Iceland	1	0.67%	Costa Rica	1	0.67%
Italy	3	2.01%	Guatemala	2	1.34%
Netherlands	4	2.68%	Honduras	1	0.67%
Russian Federation	1	0.67%	Mexico	6	4.03%
Serbia	1	0.67%			
Slovakia	1	0.67%	*Africa*	*7*	*4.70%*
Spain	3	2.01%	Egypt	1	0.67%
Sweden	3	2.01%	Kenya	1	0.67%
Switzerland	1	0.67%	Madagascar	3	2.01%
United Kingdom	6	4.03%	Nigeria	2	1.34%
South America	*19*	*12.75%*	*Oceania and Pacific*	*7*	*4.70%*
Bolivia	3	2.01%	Australia	5	3.36%
Brazil	5	3.36%	New Zealand	2	1.34%
Chile	2	1.34%			
Colombia	2	1.34%	*Middle East*	*5*	*3.36%*
Ecuador	2	1.34%	Iran	2	1.34%
Peru	5	3.36%	Israel	1	0.67%
			Lebanon	1	0.67%
			Turkey	1	0.67%
			Other (please specify)	*2*	*1.34%*
Total answers	**149**				
Skipped question	1008				

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

1. Multiple
2. PuertoRican/Cuban

COMMENT:

Because the question was only visible to those who answered that they were not from the United States, the nine respondents who answered that they were from the United States suggest that there was some respondent error.

Table 1.08: Q07: Are you a member of a group historically marginalized or minoritized in your country?
Question only visible to those who answered "no" to Q05 (Are you from the United States?).

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Yes	46	29.49%
No	110	70.51%
Total answers	**156**	
Skipped question	1001	

COMMENT:
This question and Q08 were designed to be a counterpart to Q09, with U.S. respondents being asked their race or ethnicity using categories based on the U.S. census, but those from other countries being given the opportunity to provide information about their minoritized identities in a more culturally specific and relevant way.

Table 1.09: Q08: If "yes," please explain why you answered "yes."
Question only visible to those who answered "no" to Q05 (Are you from the United States?).

Q06 Answer choice	**Q08 Write-in answer**
North America	
Canada	Asian
Canada	Asian
Canada	Canadian of Japanese descent
Canada	Gay, poly, caregiver to someone with multiple disabilities, Irish/Italian
Canada	Jewish
Canada	rural poor
United States	[left blank]
United States	as an immigrant, Middle Eastern, and by religious faith
United States	because I am Puerto Rican and we are a minority
United States	Puerto Ricans in the USA are minoritized
United States	Too complex for a brief answer
Europe	
Andorra	[left blank]
France	Mother is multiracial and father is white. I have white priviledge but am multiracial. No sense of belonging to a specific minority group aside from multiracial/mixed heritage.
Italy	I am a first generation immigrant. So the most discriminatory experiences I have encountered were not in the country I am a citizen of, but in the US
Italy	Italy is very heteronormative. Queer people have historically been marginalized and excluded from positions of authority.
Netherlands	I am Black and a member of the African Diaspora.
Netherlands	Part of the underclass
Netherlands	Partial foreign/Black background
Russian Federation	I am a member of the Tatar ethnoreligious minority group

Slovakia	gay rights including same-sex marriage are not recognized by state; members of LGBTQIA+ community are considered a cultural and moral threat by the catholic and protestant churches
Spain	linguistic minority
South America	
Bolivia	I am an Aymara Indigenous person
Bolivia	indigenous people
Brazil	Woman
Peru	Part quechua
Asia	
India	because Christianity is a marginalized minority group. I am a member of seventh day adventist minority christian group in our country
India	Caste-based and gender-based marginalised groups
India	I am a member of several marginalized groups
India	I am from former untouchables group of India and Nepal
India	I am of a tribe, the Khasi tribe, and tribal populations in India have always been seen as backward and incapable of reaching a certain level of intellectual or occupational success. The tribes do not fall under the predominant caste system in India and so are basically deemed outcasts. However, the tribal population in India has been protected and compensated by the Government and the states of North-East India, specifically Meghalaya, where I am from, falls under the fifth and sixth schedule of rule under the Constitution of India. Tribes have a special status in India to help them rise up to par with the rest of the Indian populations; a sort of move to ensure equal opportunity to the marginalized populations, however this act of consideration has proven to be a burden on the people of North-East, especially when we have to move out of our region to pursue higher education and live in cities outside our states where we are just a tiny pin prick in number. There have been many instances of harassment, rape and murder of North-Eastern tribal students in cities they go to pursue their studies, instances of racial abuse in various forms have been an age old tale told and retold in different ways, the special category of "Scheduled Tribe" is like a beacon that portrays backwardness and inability to cope or that students are purely underserving to compete in big Universities with the students who fall under "General" category and this causes contempt, envy, hatred even. Overall, it is a convoluted situation that cannot be solved easily.
India	I'm an Indian Muslim
India	not upper caste
Japan	I feel so but I'm not officially identified a such, I believe.
Korea South	queer woman
Pakistan	[left blank]
Central America/Caribbean	

Mexico	I am woman
Mexico	immigrated to the US as a child and have grown up here.
Mexico	Mexican, with a distinct name and accent.
Africa	
Madagascar	Women in my country a treated inequality compared to men. We are underrepresented in many fields.
Nigeria	I belong to Ebira ethnic group in Nigeria. One of the minorities that is not represented in the central government in most areas but Wenner Gren denied me the opportunity of bringing my tribe to limelight when I was refused PhD dissertation Fellowship on the basis of my topic being more of forensic anthropology as it's no longer part of what we call ANTHROPOLOGY
Nigeria	The indigenous peoples of Biafra -the Igbo people have been marginalised for decades in Nigeria and is seeking for self determination.
Middle East	
Iran	I'm an international Iranian student
Lebanon	Although Muslims a majority, the state was dominated by Maronite Christians
Other (please specify)	
PuertoRican/Cuban	lesbian and independentista
Multiple	immigrant religious minority

COMMENT:
This question was meant to give a sense of the prevalence of anthropologists being targeted by racial, ethnic, cultural, and religious discrimination without projecting U.S.-based racial categorizations onto other cultures. The references to sexuality and gender in the responses suggest that the question should have made that clearer in its wording. Nonetheless, the write-in answers are illuminating, suggesting that a variety of non-U.S. anthropologists in the sample may be marginalized within the U.S. based on factors that go beyond their foreign nationalities.

Table 1.10: Q09: Race/Ethnicity (check all that apply)
Question only visible to those who answered "yes" to Q05 (Are you from the United States?).

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
American Indian, Native American, First Nations, and/or Alaskan Native	23	2.38%
Biracial and/or Multiracial	36	3.72%
Black, African American, and/or Afro-Latinx	40	4.13%
East or Southeast Asian	27	2.79%
Hispanic and/or Latinx	57	5.89%
Middle Eastern and/or North African	9	0.93%
Native Hawaiian and/or Pacific Islander	3	0.31%
South or Central Asian	14	1.45%
White and/or Caucasian	844	87.19%
Other (please specify)	23	2.38%
Total answers	**968**	
Skipped question	189	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

1. Arab American
2. Armenian
3. Baltic-Slavic
4. Caribbean-American
5. ethnically Irish (DNA and 10 generations)
6. European American
7. French/Mediterranean
8. Greek
9. Human
10. Human
11. Human
12. Human being
13. Human. Why are you conflating race with ethnicity?
14. I CAN'T BELIEVE YOU ARE USING "cAUCASIAN", rejected by AAA! I am Eastern European Jewish ancestry married for 50 years to So Asian.
15. I'm white (part of the American project) but my roots are Serbian/Slavic and Irish
16. Jewish
17. Jewish
18. Jewish
19. mixed
20. mixed white hispanic
21. Native American/Italian
22. Sigh. Gender. Sexual orientaation. Now "race," which, as I told students for years, is a social construct rather than a biological trait. Even if it's legitimate to know these things, will you also solicit information about social class? If not, then you should reflect upon why gender/sexual-orientation/race are material but social class somehow is not. This is the only major country in the world that sticks its head in the sand when the question of class arises. So, if the next screen concerns class, fine. If not, I'm disappointed at the outset.
23. Undecided

COMMENT:
Once again, as with gender and sexual orientation these write-in answers both remind us that these categories are complicated and show resistance to the prompt. I was unsurprised that the race question specifically elicited this degree of resistance, as there was a similar effect in my dissertation study (Heath-Stout 2019a: chapter 7). In the dissertation, I argue that white archaeologists resist acknowledging their whiteness because of what DiAngelo (2018) calls "white fragility." She argues that white people are often able to avoid conversations about race, so I and others who fall into this category are uncomfortable discussing it and are tempted to resist invitations to do so.[2] Furthermore, we tend to think of white people as falling into a "good-bad binary," with white liberals and progressives positioning ourselves as good and outright bigots as bad. This binarist thinking means that when our racist microaggressions (or even simply our whiteness) are pointed out directly, we are inclined to react as if we have been accused of being hateful white supremacist radicals. We cling to our identities other than "white" (e.g., "European American") or reject the idea of race altogether (e.g., "human") in order to avoid addressing our complicity in white supremacist systems.

However, this is complicated by the fact that whiteness is, indeed, a social construct, and many European ethnic minorities have only recently or partially been assimilated into whiteness. For example, the three respondents who wrote in "Jewish" did not indicate that they are, for example, Ethiopian Jews, Mizrahi Jews, biracial people with one Jewish parent and one parent of color, or people of color who have converted to Judaism. They are likely white Ashkenazi Jews who are today generally seen as white in U.S. society (Brodkin 1998), but who resist being lumped into whiteness because of a desire to avoid assimilation into a Christian hegemonic system and/or an awareness of how past and present anti-Semitism threatens Jewish people's safety and social positions in the American racial hierarchy.

In some cases (e.g., 14, 22), respondents use their anthropological expertise to resist the question, a tactic that I also saw in my dissertation research. As I wrote in my dissertation,

> The appeals to… the common knowledge in anthropology that biological race does not truly exist are all refusals to confront the social realities of racism. Of course I agree that there are no inherent biological differences between people of different races, and that race is a social construct. However, as a social scientist, I am interested in understanding social constructs! Being socially constructed does not mean that race and racism do not deeply affect people's lives, and specifically relevant to this research, their career trajectories and research. By focusing on the biological irrelevance of race, these respondents use their anthropological expertise to deflect the question of how their socially-constructed racial identities may have affected their lives. This dismissal of the social is ironic given that all of my respondents are social scientists, with an interest in understanding how societies and cultural ideas are constructed and affect people's lives (Heath-Stout 2019a: 223).

I would like to add here that I agree with critiques of "Caucasian" as a euphemism for "white." I included it in the survey wording in order to avoid having lots of write-ins saying "Caucasian," which I would then need to explain here.

[2] Following McGregor (2022: xv), I wish to note that I use "we" when discussing white people in order to combat this tendency to distance myself from the harms of white supremacy, but do not mean to suggest that I expect that all readers of this report are white as well.

Table 1.11: Q10: What is your highest level of education?

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Less than high school completion	0	0.00%
High school completion, GED, or equivalent	0	0.00%
Some college	4	0.36%
Associate degree	3	0.27%
Bachelor's degree	42	3.75%
Master's degree	327	29.17%
Ph.D. or D.Phil.	711	63.43%
Professional degree other than Ph.D. or D.Phil. (M.D., J.D., etc.)	21	1.87%
Other (please specify)	13	1.16%
Total answers	1121	
Skipped question	36	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

1. 2 master's, anth and public administration
2. 2 years of graduate school
3. A masters and three years of PhD
4. ABD status in PhD
5. Currently obtaining Master's
6. I
7. I'm a PhD candidate
8. in progress to PhD
9. JD, PhD
10. ph.d. In progress
11. Phd ABD
12. PhD Candidate
13. Some Master's classes, unfinished

COMMENT:

The write-in answers suggest that an option of "Some graduate school" would have been useful to acknowledge that some respondents have been educated past their highest degree but have not yet attained the next degree.

Table 1.12: Q11: What is the highest level of education obtained by your parents? Choose up to two parents. Parent 1:

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Less than high school completion	62	5.53%
High school completion, GED, or equivalent	147	13.10%
Some college	92	8.20%
Associate degree	37	3.30%
Bachelor's degree	270	24.06%
Master's degree	254	22.64%
Ph.D. or D.Phil.	140	12.48%
Professional degree other than Ph.D. or D.Phil. (M.D., J.D., etc.)	111	9.89%
Other (please specify)	9	0.80%
Total answers	**1122**	
Skipped question	35	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

- EDD
- illiterate
- Left high school in the 12th grade without graduation because of family obligations.
- MBA. Unclear if Professional or Master's.
- MFA
- No educated
- None. No formal education
- Seminary training for the protestant church
- Undergraduate degree at a polytechnical institute

Table 1.13: Q12: Parent 2:

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Less than high school completion	52	4.66%
High school completion, GED, or equivalent	194	17.38%
Some college	163	14.61%
Associate degree	70	6.27%
Bachelor's degree	288	25.81%
Master's degree	210	18.82%
Ph.D. or D.Phil.	40	3.58%
Professional degree other than Ph.D. or D.Phil. (M.D., J.D., etc.)	63	5.65%
Other (please specify)	36	3.23%
Total answers	**1116**	
Skipped question	41	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

- 3 year nursing degree, RN
- ABD finished doctoral coursework
- BA and Graduate Certificate
- Bachelor's, some graduate credits but no graduate degree
- Bachelor's and additional education, but in the Filippine educational system
- courses beyond college to obtain teaching license
- Deceased
- Father was a pharmacist
- Father, no information known
- Graduate pf a postsecondary institution, which issued license to teach in high schools
- High School plus Business College
- Hospital-based nursing diploma
- I don't believe that my mother completed high school, but she had a secretarial degree. My father was orphaned at age 11 and didn't finish grade school
- Joined the U.S. Navy at 16, worked his way up in the Engine Room. Received a medical discharge in 1945 as a Chief Petty Officer.
- MBA. Unclear if Professional or Master's.
- Mother was an RN
- N/A
- No educated
- Nursing Degree not four year college
- Nursing license
- Nursing School
- Physical Therapy professional (not sure of exact degree)
- Physician Assistants license (before an MS was required))
- post-Master's study (Harvard)
- RN (x3)
- Secretarial School
- Some college, but eventually received associates

- Teaching certificate after BA
- Technical certificate
- Technical certification aeronautics
- Technical school in another country
- Technical/trade school
- unknown
- unknown (raised by single parent)

COMMENT:
These write-in answers suggest that it would have been useful to include "Technical and/or trade school" as an option on all the education questions, and to ask a question about where the education had taken place, since so many respondents felt it important to note when their immigrant parents had been educated in their home nations.

Table 1.14: Q13: Do you have any disabilities (including physical, sensory, developmental, mental health, intellectual, and learning disabilities, as well as chronic health conditions)?

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Yes	276	24.78%
No	838	75.22%
Total answers	**1114**	
Skipped question	43	

Table 1.15: Q14: Age

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
22 and under	6	0.54%
23–29	137	12.23%
30–39	356	31.79%
40–49	234	20.89%
50–59	143	12.77%
60–69	134	11.96%
70 and older	110	9.82%
Total answers	**1120**	
Skipped question	47	

Table 1.16: Q15: Current Affiliation (check all that apply)

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Public research university	486	43.43%
Private research university	143	12.78%
Public 4-year college	88	7.86%
Private 4-year college	79	7.06%
Public 2-year college/community college	16	1.43%
U.S. federal government agency	48	4.29%
U.S. state or local government agency	38	3.40%
Non-U.S. government agency	11	0.98%
Non-profit organization	95	8.49%
For-profit business	128	11.44%
Other (please specify)	103	9.20%
Total answers	**1119**	
Skipped question	38	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

1. adjunct
2. adjunct major university
3. As needed government contractor with a private firm.
4. But I am Emeritus
5. contractor
6. CRM
7. CRM
8. Currently between projects
9. Emeritus
10. Emeritus
11. Foreign Public University
12. Foreign university
13. Hospital Network
14. I work for the City of Alexandria, Virginia
15. Independent education leadership consultant
16. Independent research organization
17. independent scholar (x2)
18. Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia
19. International private university (pakistan
20. International University in non-US country
21. Medical School
22. Museum (x5)
23. Museum (Smithsonian)
24. NHS in UK
25. No formal affiliation
26. Non-profit research institute
27. Non-US university
28. None (x2)
29. Not employed
30. Organization state funded program hosted at a private college
31. private art school

32. Private Consultant
33. Private High School
34. Private Medical School
35. Private Practice retired
36. Private research university - Graduate Student
37. Public 4-year regional comprehensive university
38. Public Primarily Undergraduate University (PUI-HSI)
39. Public Research Institution
40. recently laid off from private 4-year college (unaffiliated?)
41. Recently retired from a public 4-year, regional comprehensive
42. Regional public 4-year University, not research, offers some masters programs
43. research institute
44. Research Institute abroad
45. Retire. Am doing independent consulting in cultural resources (archaeology). I also do select projects as a task manager for natural/cultural resource NEPA, SEQR, and CEQR documents.
46. Retired
47. Retired
48. Retired
49. Retired
50. Retired
51. Retired
52. Retired
53. Retired
54. Retired
55. Retired
56. Retired
57. Retired
58. Retired
59. Retired
60. Retired
61. Retired
62. Retired
63. Retired
64. Retired
65. Retired
66. Retired (Emerita) from Public 4-year + Master's college
67. Retired from a 4-year college
68. Retired from a private research university
69. retired from a private university
70. Retired from community college
71. Retired from private 4-year college
72. retired from public research university
73. Retired from US Federal government agency
74. retired professor
75. Retired, but associated with a museum
76. Retired, previously Federal Government
77. Retired, public universirits

78. Retired, state agency
79. Retired,state university
80. retired; museum of private research university
81. School of Medicine (not part of a university)
82. Searching for job after PhD
83. Self employed consultant
84. sole proprietor
85. Student
86. The Field Museum & BRIT
87. thinking to exit from academics
88. Tribal
89. Tribal Government
90. Tribal government
91. Tribal Preservation Department
92. UN consultant
93. Unemployed
94. Unemployed
95. Unemployed
96. Unemployed
97. Unemployed

COMMENT:
Many of these write-ins either gave more specific information about their affiliation (e.g., "CRM" as opposed to simply checking the "For-profit business" box) or pre-empted the next question, which asked university/college affiliates their status.

Table 1.17: Q16: What is your current status at your college or university?
Question only visible to those who answered "Public research university," "Private research university," "Public 4-year college," "Private 4-year college," and/or "Public 2-year college/community college" to Q15 (Current Affiliation).

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Undergraduate student	7	0.89%
Master's Student	20	2.55%
Doctoral student or candidate	188	23.95%
Postdoctoral fellow	43	5.48%
Adjunct or part-time faculty	36	4.59%
Full-time non-tenure-track faculty	50	6.37%
Tenure-track faculty	121	15.41%
Tenured faculty	232	29.55%
Staff	28	3.57%
Other (please specify)	60	7.64%
Total answers	**785**	
Skipped question	372	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:
1. "Research Collaborator" (Visiting Scholar)
2. 75% teaching stream, Limited term

3. Academic Staff
4. adjunct research faculty
5. Affiliate
6. Affiliate Researcher
7. Affiliated Faculty
8. affiliated researcher
9. Contract Staff
10. Emerita/us
11. Emerita/us
12. Emerita/us
13. Emerita/us
14. Emerita/us
15. Emerita/us
16. Emerita/us
17. Emerita/us
18. Emerita/us
19. Emerita/us
20. Emerita/us
21. Emerita/us
22. Emerita/us
23. Emerita/us
24. Emerita/us
25. Emerita/us
26. Emerita/us
27. Emerita/us
28. Emerita/us
29. Emerita/us
30. Emerita/us
31. Emerita/us
32. Emerita/us
33. Emerita/us
34. Emerita/us
35. Emerita/us
36. Emerita faculty at 1 university, visiting scholar at 1 university, adjunct faculty at 1 university
37. Emeritus at one university and adjunct Full at another
38. Part-time non-tenure track with long-term contract
39. Prof Emerita and Research Professor
40. Recalled, retired
41. Research Associate
42. Research Associate Research Faculty)
43. Research faculty (volunteer)
44. research fellow
45. Retired
46. Retired
47. Retired
48. Retired
49. Retired
50. Retired

51. Retired
52. Retired
53. Retired
54. Retired
55. Retired
56. Retired
57. Retired
58. Senior Associate at CIFOR, Visiting Scholar Cornell
59. Tenured with a named endowed chair
60. Unpaid Research Associate

COMMENT:
The proliferation of "emerita/us" and "retired" answers makes clear that this question should have included these as options.

Table 1.18: Q17: Do you conduct sociocultural anthropological research?

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Yes	422	37.78%
No	695	62.22%
Total answers	**1117**	
Skipped question	40	

Table 1.19: Q18: What methods have you used in your research? (check all that apply)
Question only visible to those who answered "yes" to Q17 (Do you conduct sociocultural anthropological research?).

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Archival research	282	66.04%
Autoethnography	109	25.53%
Community engaged research, participatory action research, collaborative research, or similar	244	57.14%
Content analysis	179	41.92%
Digital ethnography	122	28.57%
Experimental designs	40	9.37%
Individual interviews (structured, semi-structured, unstructured)	350	81.97%
Group interviews (structured, semi-structured, unstructured)	231	54.10%
Mapping and other graphic techniques	168	39.34%
Oral history	230	53.86%
Participant observation	352	82.44%
Surveys	188	44.03%
Videography, photography, and other visual methods	173	40.52%
Other (please specify)	22	5.15%
Total answers	**427**	
Skipped question	730	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:
1. administrative data analysis

2. agent-based modeling; computational methods
3. Analysis of documents and websites (= digital ethnog??)
4. Applied application of social science to business (organizational) issues.
5. archaeological
6. archaeology
7. cognitive anthropology methods, statistical analyses
8. discourse analysis
9. Drone photogrammetry, satellite remote sensing
10. Ethnographic object analysis
11. hearsay ethnography, photo elicitation
12. I've also used ethnographic data from my advisor's research (i.e., I didn't do the interviews)
13. Mapping and interviews in future.
14. material culture analysis
15. material culture research
16. Multi sited ethnography
17. Multi sited ethnography
18. Policy analysis
19. Self-reporting (diary)
20. Some of these are planned future dissertation research
21. the use of community engaged research, but long before it was deemed as such and it was not a conscious choice but unfolded spontaneously
22. What is meant by digital ethnography?

Table 1.20: Q19: Do you conduct biological anthropological research?

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Yes	170	15.22%
No	947	84.78%
Total answers	**1117**	
Skipped question	40	

Table 1.21: Q20: What methods have you used in your research? (check all that apply)
Question only visible to those who answered "yes" to Q19 (Do you conduct biological anthropological research?).

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Behavioral ecology	41	24.12%
Bioarchaeology	96	56.47%
Biocultural anthropology	55	32.35%
Bioinformatics	15	8.82%
Biomedical anthropology	36	21.18%
Community engaged research, participatory action research, collaborative research, or similar	46	27.06%
Forensic anthropology	52	30.59%
Genetics and/or genomics	40	23.53%
Human biology	46	27.06%
Human skeletal biology	75	44.12%
Neuroscience/cognition	9	5.29%
Paleoanthropology	28	16.47%
Primatology	32	18.82%
Wildlife conservation	20	11.76%
Other (please specify)	14	8.24%
Total answers	**170**	
Skipped question	987	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

1. Anthropometry, human growth
2. botanical
3. Comparative anatomy
4. dental anthropology
5. endocrinology, nutritional ecology
6. Historical archaeology
7. Linguistics
8. None
9. Paleodiet
10. Paleomicrobiology
11. socioendocrinology
12. stable isotopes
13. Substance abuse and treatment
14. zooarchaeological

Table 1.22: Q21: In which context(s) do you conduct most of your research?
Question only visible to those who answered "yes" to Q19 (Do you conduct biological anthropological research?).

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Lab	101	59.41%
Field	116	68.24%
Museum	42	24.71%
Zoo/captive animal facility	10	5.88%
Other (please specify)	14	8.24%
Total answers	**170**	
Skipped question	987	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

1. applied
2. archives, data bases, observational, dialogues
3. Demographic analysis
4. Digital
5. existing data (computational)
6. Hospital
7. Hospital
8. I collect plants, prehistoric animal and human remains in the field but bring them back to the lab to study and/or to send to another lab to study
9. It's mostly computational and I work remotely.
10. Lab for now. Covid has impeded my ability to do fieldwork even though that is my preference
11. None
12. Secondary data analysis of existing datasets (field, lab, clinical research)
13. transdisciplinary collaboration
14. With a little bith of zoo/captive facility & field work every other year.

Table 1.23: Q22: Do you conduct archaeological research?

Answer choice	**n**	**%**
Yes	731	65.56%
No	384	34.44%
Total answers	**1115**	
Skipped question	42	

Table 1.24: Q23: What methods have you used in your research? (check all that apply)
Question only visible to those who answered "yes" to Q22 (Do you conduct archaeological research?).

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Archival research	553	75.34%
Collections-based research	583	79.43%
Digital imaging and/or analysis	437	59.54%
Excavation	645	87.87%
Laboratory analysis of artifacts/specimens	622	84.74%
Public archaeology, community archaeology, and/or collaborative archaeological research	527	71.80%
Survey	491	66.89%
Other (please specify)	54	7.36%
Total answers	**734**	
Skipped question	423	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

- Active coordination with Tribal and amateur collectors
- botanical field and herbarium research
- conservation
- cultural resource management (x2)
- Drone photogrammetry, satellite remote sensing
- earth science research
- Education research including interviews, surveys, focus groups, and observations in educational settings.
- epigraphic and textual sources
- ethnoarchaeology (x2)
- Ethnoarchaeology, experimental archaeology
- ethnoarchaeology/interviews and focal follows
- ethnographic comparison, oral histories, religious studies, linguistics
- ethnographic interviews
- Ethnographic interviews /ethnoarchaeology
- ethnographic research (x3)
- Experimental (x4)
- Geoarcaheological field and lab research
- Geophysical (x5)
- Geophysics, computational methods, GNSS, UAV
- Geospatial Analysis (x2)
- gpr
- GPR, drone imagery, architectural history survey
- historic preservation research
- Indigenous, community based participatory research
- interviews
- Interviews and mapping postponed by pandemic

- Interviews with living descendents.
- LiDAR, Geophysical research
- LiDAR, Remote Sensing,
- Mapping (GIS, Total Station, Plane Table, GPS)
- Not any longer in what is considered "traditional" archaeology
- oral histories/ ethnographies
- oral history
- Oral history and defendant conversations
- Oral history, community-based research
- oral interview
- Statistical/computational analysis
- surface recordation
- Survey
- Tribal collaboration
- Tribal Consultation and Collaboration
- underwater and remote-sensing

COMMENT:
The proliferation of references to ethnography, ethnoarchaeology, interviews, and oral histories suggests that these should have been included as archaeological methods. Digital methods such as LiDAR and GIS should also ideally have been included.

Table 1.25: Q24: In which context(s) do you conduct most of your research?
Question only visible to those who answered "yes" to Q22 (Do you conduct archaeological research?).

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Lab	471	64.34%
Field	560	76.50%
Museum	193	26.37%
Other (please specify)	88	12.02%
Total answers	**732**	
Skipped question	425	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

1. ArcGIS & Online: Newspaper Archives, Earthexplorer, BLM GLO records, Historic USGS Quads (TopoView), Digital Metsker Maps, Digital Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, LiDAR, National Archives, Oregon State Library, University of Oregon Online Collections, Ancestry.com, JSTOR, and other online sources.
2. Archives (x7)
3. At this point, mostly library/documentary research
4. Classroom setting teaching students research techiniques
5. collectors' data
6. community
7. Compliance
8. Computational

9. Computational modeling
10. computer//pdfs.
11. CRM
12. Curation Facilities
13. Data repositories
14. desktop
15. desktop / office
16. Digital/archival sources
17. Digitally via computer
18. Electronic
19. Ethnoarchaeological
20. Field and in my office/lab
21. Field, lab, and museum
22. From home via internet - accessing reports and artifact inventories
23. government compliance archaeology
24. Historic research (since I am a lecturer and have no lab access or research funds)
25. Home
26. home (computer-based GIS & library research)
27. Home office
28. home office
29. home office (digital archives), other archives
30. home/office
31. I conduct no research exclusively in field, lab or office. Most of my research involved all three.
32. I do archaeological education research, so my work in conducted in my office. At my institution, I do not have an archaeology lab or the means to conduct field work.
33. I don't understand this question. Maybe Office?
34. I have worked in all dimensions early in my career and use the point of view (historical) in my applied practice.
35. In my office or at home
36. in the past, I have conducted research in the field and lab
37. Libraries & in the descendent community
38. Libraries (x5)
39. library/archive (x5)
40. Lit reviews, visual analysis of maps & imagery, request (may set stricter standards than SHPO's min requirements if appropriate) and review archaeological & historic structures/architecture surveys, consult with Tribes, THPOs, CLGs, and SHPOs. Other as appropriate.
41. Local historical society
42. Museum
43. Non-profit research organization repository
44. Nonprofit educational and research organization
45. Office (x12)
46. Office (online archival info)
47. Office (online archival searches)
48. Office computer searches
49. Office/Internet
50. Office/research

51. on campus (working from maps that are accessible in reports)
52. online databases
53. online digital data
54. Phase IA and due diligence, on-line research using LOC, NYPL, USGS ESRI Historic Topographic, and other resources.
55. pre-pandemic: fieldwork; now: archival
56. public events that share archaeological findings
57. public institution
58. public venues
59. reporting and project management
60. Research/sensitivity assessments
61. School
62. state office
63. Tribal Preservation Department

COMMENT:
These answers suggest that the field/lab binary often discussed in feminist equity critiques dating back to Gero's (1985) formative work no longer adequately describes the settings in which archaeological research takes place, which increasingly include offices (including high-tech digital archaeology work). Demographically, the respondents who wrote in some variation on using digital methods and/or primarily working in an office were very similar to archaeologists as a group.

Table 1.26: Q25: Do you conduct linguistic research?

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Yes	74	6.65%
No	1039	93.35%
Total answers	**1113**	
Skipped question	44	

Table 1.27: Q26: What methods have you used in your research? (check all that apply)
Question only visible to those who answered "yes" to Q25 (Do you conduct linguistic research?).

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Archival research	47	61.04%
Autoethnography	20	25.97%
Community engaged research, participatory action research, collaborative research, or similar	32	41.56%
Formal linguistic analysis (phonology and phonetics, morphology and syntax, lexicography)	17	22.08%
Variational analysis (sociophonetics, register and code-shifting, experimental prompts and stimulus, such as reading exercises, minimal pairs, etc.)	14	18.18%
Instrumental analysis (videography for gesture and paralinguistics, acoustic analysis)	14	18.18%
Interviews (individual, group, structured, semi-structured, unstructured)	61	79.22%
Digital/online research (online archives, corpus data, participant observation)	39	50.65%
Other (please specify)	15	19.48%
Total answers	**77**	
Skipped question	1080	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

- cognitive anthropology methods including natural decision modeling
- collecting, transcribing, and translating oral traditions
- discourse analysis
- Discourse analysis (Wortham and Reyes 2015)
- ethnographic research
- most of my ling anth work is participant observation based (looking at indexicality, therefore within a literature in ling anth)
- Neuroscience
- Participant Observatio; digitally assisted discourse analysis
- participant observation
- participant observation, ethnosemantics, pragmatics
- photography/film
- Talk to fluent speakers and language instructors
- The linguistic aspects of client behavioral responses and cognition of situations
- thirty-year language change
- typographic and analysis

Table 1.28: Q27: What theoretical paradigms have guided your research? (check all that apply)
Question only visible to those who answered "yes" to Q25 (Do you conduct linguistic research?).

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Conversation analysis	26	38.24%
Critical discourse analysis	29	42.65%
Dialogicality	15	22.06%
Semiotics, pragmatics, metapragmatics	40	58.82%
Speech act theory and implicature	16	23.53%
Other (please specify)	20	29.41%
Total answers	**68**	
Skipped question	1089	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

- Atheoretical
- classroom analysis
- Computer science/Information theory
- cultural models research, ethnographic decision modeling thru intensive interviewing, key words-phrases-underlying generating paradigms
- discourse analysis, but not CDA (critical discourse analysis)
- Ethnography of speaking (x2)
- ethnoscience
- frame semantics
- human ecology, environmental anthropology, human evolution
- Language ideology
- linguistic documentation in collaboration with linguists
- Linguistic laws such as Menzerath's Law and Zipf's Law of Abbreviation
- linguistic prehistory
- linguistic terms for certain natural phenomenon
- narrative analysis
- performance studies, ethnopoetics, endangered languages
- raciolinguistics
- sociolinguistics
- These are all technical terms that apply to academic research. I use the "theory" most appropriate to the problem and the client's need.

Table 1.29: Q28: Which of the following professional organizations are you currently a member of? (check all that apply)

"None of the above" answer added when we opened the survey to non-members and began recruiting through social media.

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
American Anthropological Association	477	43.80%
American Association of Physical Anthropologists	103	9.46%
American Board of Forensic Anthropology	11	1.01%
American Society of Primatologists	24	2.20%
Archaeological Institute of America	111	10.19%
Register of Professional Archaeologists	284	26.08%
Society for American Archaeology	548	50.32%
Society for Applied Anthropology	75	6.89%
Society for Historical Archaeology	206	18.92%
Society of Forensic Anthropologists	8	0.73%
None of the Above	45	4.13%
Total answers	**1089**	
Skipped question	68	

COMMENT:

The relatively low engagement from AAA members may have been caused by the fact that unlike the other organizations, the AAA advertised the survey relatively subtly by posting it in the Communities forums rather than sending an all-member email about it. The message therefore may have been overlooked by many members. We were more successful at recruiting AAA members through social media than through the original call (see below), but AAA members are still less represented than would be ideal given the large size of the association.

Table 1.30: Q29: Which of the following professional organizations have you been a member of at any time between 2016 and the present? (check all that apply)

Question added when we opened the survey to non-members and began recruiting through social media.

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
American Anthropological Association	301	70.99%
American Association of Physical Anthropologists	52	12.26%
American Board of Forensic Anthropology	5	1.18%
American Society of Primatologists	3	0.71%
Archaeological Institute of America	53	12.50%
Register of Professional Archaeologists	49	11.56%
Society for American Archaeology	167	39.39%
Society for Applied Anthropology	74	17.45%
Society for Historical Archaeology	63	14.86%
Society of Forensic Anthropologists	0	0.00%
Total answers	**424**	
Skipped question	733	

Table 1.31: Q30: Where is/are your site(s) of study located? (check all that apply)

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
U.S. and/or Canada	753	68.58%
Mexico, Central America, and/or the Caribbean	239	21.77%
South America	130	11.84%
Europe	159	14.48%
Asia	151	13.75%
Africa	113	10.29%
Middle East	79	7.19%
Australia and/or the Pacific	41	3.73%
Antarctica	2	0.18%
Other (please specify)	24	2.19%
Total answers	**1098**	
Skipped question	59	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

- Caribbean
- Caucasus (x3)
- cross-cultural/comparative accross global sites
- Eurasia
- global (x3)
- Greenland, politically Europe, geographically North America
- I visit museums & university collections around the world, which in 2019 (the last time I could travel) included Japan and South Africa, in addition to several US-based museums
- India
- Indian Ocean
- Low Earth Orbit
- Not applicable
- Not geographically bound
- Oceania
- Retired
- South and Central Asia
- South asia (x2)
- South East Asia
- Specifically the "Stans Region"
- Working as digital learning designer at NHS UK

Table 1.32: Q31: Have you applied for funding from at least one of these sources?

- American Association of University Women
- American Philosophical Society
- Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (Stanford)
- Dumbarton Oaks
- Explorers Club
- Ford Foundation
- Fulbright Hays
- Fulbright IIE
- Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton)
- Leakey Foundation
- National Endowment for the Humanities
- National Geographic Society
- National Science Foundation
- Point Foundation
- School for Advanced Research
- Social Science Research Council
- Wenner-Gren Foundation
- Non-U.S. government agency
- Individual Donor(s)

Answer choice	***n***	**%**
Yes, I have applied to one or more of these sources	842	76.20%
No, I have never applied for funding from any of these sources	263	23.80%
Total answers	**1105**	
Skipped question	52	

Table 1.33: Q32: To which of the following agencies or individuals have you applied for which kinds of support for your work? (please check all that apply)
Question only visible to those who answered "yes" to Q31 (Have you applied for funding from at least one of these sources?).

	Grad school tuition/ expenses	Dissertation research	Dissertation writing	Postdoc	Post-Ph.D. research	Post-Ph.D. writing	Conference/ publication	Total
AAUW	36	32	65	15	9	9	2	125
APS	4	58	5	8	39	7	3	107
CASBS	1	0	0	8	0	14	0	22
DO	8	5	29	10	10	17	5	65
EC	4	48	3	1	13	2	1	68
Ford	40	27	25	9	17	7	5	98
FH	12	99	6	10	20	8	1	133
FIIE	16	93	7	9	38	7	1	148
IAS	1	1	1	6	6	20	0	34
LF	2	22	2	0	31	2	1	46
NEH	6	12	5	16	127	62	18	209
NGS	4	72	3	3	145	7	3	211
NSF	143	370	26	23	271	22	17	586
Point	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	5
SAR	2	6	21	14	7	39	30	103
SSRC	22	147	19	6	30	8	6	195
WG	18	339	18	24	152	49	48	492
Other								171
Total								**762**
Skipped								395

Key:

AAUW: American Association of University Women
APS: American Philosophical Society
CASBS: Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (Stanford)
DO: Dumbarton Oaks
EC: Explorers Club
Ford: Ford Foundation
FH: Fulbright Hays
FIIE: Fulbright IIE
IAS: Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton)
LF: Leakey Foundation
NEH: National Endowment for the Humanities
NGS: National Geographic Society
NSF: National Science Foundation
Point: Point Foundation
SAR: School for Advanced Research
SSRC: Social Science Research Council
WG: Wenner-Gren Foundation

Table 1.34: Q33: From which of the following agencies or individuals have you received which kinds of support for your work? (please check all that apply)
Question only visible to those who answered "yes" to Q31 (Have you applied for funding from at least one of these sources?).

	Grad school tuition/expenses	Dissertation research	Dissertation writing	Postdoc	Post-Ph.D. research	Post-Ph.D. writing	Conference/ publication	Total
AAUW	4	2	2	1	0	3	1	15
APS	1	13	13	0	25	2	0	38
CASBS	1	0	0	1	0	5	1	8
DO	4	1	1	0	5	7	4	23
EC	1	9	9	0	5	0	0	15
Ford	11	3	3	2	10	2	4	28
FH	5	46	46	4	14	6	1	67
FIIE	12	48	48	0	27	9	1	88
IAS	0	1	1	0	1	3	0	5
LF	1	6	6	0	18	1	1	24
NEH	2	3	3	4	56	28	14	90
NGS	1	23	23	1	84	4	2	107
NSF	68	191	191	13	166	12	14	356
Point	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
SAR	0	3	3	1	2	12	18	35
SSRC	7	43	43	1	12	1	4	61
WG	4	113	113	4	67	17	34	202
Other								143
Total								**570**
Skipped								587

Key:
AAUW: American Association of University Women
APS: American Philosophical Society
CASBS: Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (Stanford)
DO: Dumbarton Oaks
EC: Explorers Club
Ford: Ford Foundation
FH: Fulbright Hays
FIIE: Fulbright IIE
IAS: Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton)
LF: Leakey Foundation
NEH: National Endowment for the Humanities
NGS: National Geographic Society
NSF: National Science Foundation
Point: Point Foundation
SAR: School for Advanced Research
SSRC: Social Science Research Council
WG: Wenner-Gren Foundation

Table 1.35: Q34. What factors have influenced your choices about which funding to apply to? Please rank each factor on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (most important)

Question only visible to those who answered "yes" to Q31 (Have you applied for funding from at least one of these sources?).

Factor	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Avg.
Fit between your research and what the agency funds	7	11	59	202	498	777	4.51
Eligibility requirements for applications	16	19	91	216	423	765	4.32
Amount of funding available	43	71	188	255	209	766	3.67
Encouragement from a mentor or colleague	105	72	172	237	174	760	3.4
Previous positive experience with granting agency	233	91	171	174	83	752	2.71
Amount of work required to apply	183	168	230	132	41	754	2.58
Prestige of granting agency	256	107	203	143	47	756	2.49
Previous rejections from other granting agencies	294	134	205	85	27	745	2.22
Services additional to funding provided by the granting agency (e.g., workshops, networking opportunities, access to equipment)	332	152	139	83	33	739	2.1
Advertisement or outreach by granting agency	391	180	114	47	12	744	1.8
Requirement for a program or course	465	99	92	39	42	737	1.77
Other (please specify)						34	
Total answers							**785**
Skipped							372

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

- A grant advisor at my university was available to help navigate the fulbright application process and proofread the draft application.
- Academic advisor support
- acceptance of international students
- backchannel information from people who had served as reviewers for the agency in the past
- career advancement (was told early on in grad school that in order to be competitive on job market I should have a funded dissertation grant)
- Connection to a program officer or some other person at the agency/foundation
- Cost of living in the city where I did my phd; ability to NOT teach and thus reasearch full time
- Do not want to apply
- For my dissertation, I applied for almost every research funding opportunity that I was eligible for and knew about. Post-PhD, I am more selective, tailoring applications to appropriate venues based on my current need for funding and the likelihood the agency would fund the project.
- granting history of organization
- Grants were not necessary at my teaching college to get tenure, and I honestly just don't have the time

- I am still applying for dissertation funding but it's extremely distressing that these grants don't pay us for our actual labor
- I applied to any that were a fit. There were not many that fit with my research. Even less that would fit my research and support dissertation writing. There were no postdoc programs.
- I have applied to National Humanities Center and received funding and was rejected
- I received minimal support, information or advising about grand opportunities
- I serve at the client's request.
- I was somewhat constrained by the geographic focus of my ethnographic work, which limited the number of dissertation fieldwork grants I was eligible to apply for.
- In grad school and in search of postdoc positions, I applied for anything I could conceivably write an app for.
- Internal grants through my university
- Invitation
- It is my understanding that grant applications from these agencies are intensely competitive and that preference is given to applicants whose principal investigators hold PhDs. None of our organization's employees have PhDs so we do not feel it is worthwhile to apply to these agencies, and we focus instead on private donors and other grantors that are less likely to require PIs to hold PhDs.
- It was a co-PI grant application, so the other PI's opinions.
- knowledge about its existence, there are several grants I didn't even know about until I was no longer eligible
- My application to programs, the few that I've applied to, is almost entirely based on the fact that I have a family, teach a 4/4 load, am required to do research, but also have 12 MA students who's committees I chair. Choosing any reason besides time for the above is for those in privileged positions. Either in the nonprofit world or in academia. So the closest choice, amount of work required to apply, seems to imply which applications are barriers based on their length etc. Nothing here reflects the decisions I have to make.
- Negative or positive attitude of the program officer
- Personal connections to private donors
- previous experience reviewing for agency
- previous negative experience with granting agency
- Reputation of the types of projects each agency tends to fund
- Support from my university for application to that agency
- The amount of money is crucial—only NSF had a large enough pool of money to pay for artifact curation after excavation. In general, agencies will not pay for artifact curation costs, which can be ca $10-20K
- to elaborate on funding, I applied for the fellowships because I needed financial stability as I am my sole provider of income and cannot rely on my parents to supplement my income or help me financially.
- Wyoming Archaeological Society
- You take what you can get.

Table 1.36: Q35: What kinds of support have you found most useful during funding application processes? Please rank each type of support on a scale from 1 (not at all useful) to 5 (most useful), or mark kinds of support you did not use or have access to with "N/A" (Question only visible to those who answered "yes" to Q31.)

Type of Support	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total	Avg.
Reading successful proposals from colleagues	26	22	70	193	367	98	776	4.26
Feedback from a mentor or colleague	26	42	76	192	369	68	773	4.19
Meeting or conversation with granting agency staff (in person or virtually)	50	74	116	130	220	183	773	3.67
Informational material on the granting agency's website	37	82	179	230	195	44	767	3.64
Workshop or information session provided by granting agency	81	121	154	138	124	152	770	3.17
Grant-writing course or workshop provided by your university	117	104	130	154	132	130	767	3.13
Other (please specify)							23	
Total answers							**786**	
Skipped							371	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

- Andrew W. Mellon; Arab Council for the Social Science
- budget preparation
- Do not want to apply
- Grant-writing workshops at the meetings run by granting agencies' representatives
- I have been a reviewer for federal and local governmental programs
- I have received minimal feedback or advising
- I'm an obsessive reviser and just keep revising and revising before submitting.
- Incentives from my university
- It's who you know. That is all
- Many of my grants were before there were websites!
- My grant was for running a Elementary school field camp
- NSF has the worst website for figuring out funding
- peer reviewer feedback from previous submissions
- peer support
- Reviewing proposals
- Seminar from PhD Program
- Serving as a panelist was helpful
- specific focus of funding agency
- Strong support from University's pre-award grants office
- Suggestions from colleagues and encouragement from Program officers
- teaching my students how to write grants has helped me write better grants. Also, being a reviewer of grant applications has helped me as well.
- This survey is useless
- university office of external funding—for budeting

Table 1.37: Q37: What factors have influenced your decision not to apply for funding from these agencies? (check all that apply)

Question only visible to those who answered "no" to Q31 (Have you applied for funding from at least one of these sources?).

Answer choice	*n*	%
I am too early in my anthropology education or career to need funding.	42	16.34%
My research is funded by my employer.	85	33.07%
My job or other responsibilities do not give me sufficient time and/or support to conduct research that would need funding from these agencies.	108	42.02%
I believe that these agencies would not fund the kind of research I conduct.	68	26.46%
I feel too intimidated to apply.	59	22.96%
I have received funding from agencies not listed here.	0	0.00%
Other (please specify)	58	22.57%
Total answers	**257**	
Skipped question	900	

WRITE-IN ANSWERS:

- ALL THESE GRANT FUNDING REQUIRES TO HAVE A PHD, OR BE A PHD STUDENT which I think is very frustrating. it limits you and basically force you to either get a masters and PHD or change careers. thats why I created my own non-profit research organization so I can do independent research on anthropology (digital anthropology) and be able to freely do my research with out the need of enrolling at a school to get any masters degree or phd. but I feel like I being excluded just like this Wenner Gren Foundation every single grant required you to be either and PhD STUDENT or graduated already. and thats why a lot anthropologist are dropping out of the field.
- As a "teaching faculty" we are not given any support financially, load wise, nor are we encouraged to do so. At times professors have received grants only for the institution to absorb the funds.
- As a federal ag3ncy archaeologist I was not eligible for any of the entities. As a (semi-) retired archaeologist I have muddled through. Applying for grants is time consuming, stressful, onerous and seldom rewarding without a huge support machine helping.
- As a student, I worked on projects funded with grant money obtained by others. The projects were wonderful. During my professional career I worked at a university and for CRM and A&E firms. Time to dedicate to even a short-term personal research project was virtually non-existent.
- Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, CRM companies, United States Geological Survey
- CRM based work does not qualify
- Cumbersome process, burocratic
- Current position is not in my field. Was in school prior with support from the advisor
- Delays to my degree timeline related to the pandemic.
- Employer policies regarding those organizations
- Funding not necessary
- Funding obtained from USAID
- Got a smaller lab based grant that I think is sufficient for my research
- Hard to get funding without having a PhD

- I also personally find my research
- I am a writer and conduct only literature research
- I am faculty in a medical school. funding from NIH
- I am from the US but based in the UK - I apply for UK and EU funding primarily, though am in the process of applying for a joint NSF grant
- I am in a University that has been performing in a declining slope with ascending years, I have qualified for India's University Grants Commision's National Eligibility Test for Lectureship in Anthropology, scoring meritorious marks that has allowed me to pursue PhD. under it's Junior Research Fellowship award and yet, I do not know how to go about applying for these other fundings. That makes me feel inferior and undeserving to even try, but this is an eye opener for me, because I'm too afraid to try and give myself more. Maybe it is high time that I try to apply for funding, at least to see where I stand. Thank you.
- I conduct public health and related social research. Most of the listed agencies do not fund that kind of research (it is typically federal agencies or international organizations).
- I do not have a PhD
- I don't know how to write a grant proposal—my advisor never taught me.
- I feel that my research lacks the financial need for funding as all my data has been free and accessible
- I have been employed, full time or part time, throughout my education.
- I have not had enough support as a first gen, black student to navigate applying for funding.
- I have spent much of my academic life as a contigent faculty, where I often feel I do not have institutional support to apply for grants, nor the job stability
- I picked small regional grants for pilot work and am planning to apply to larger things now that I've "proven" my research area
- I receive contracts from organizations/companies to do my work.
- I received some small-scale funding for my M.A. research from the university I attended.
- I self-fund some of my research
- I was not aware of these funders
- I was not given any guidance by my advisors on how to find or apply to these grants; and their online instructions (when I found them) were often very intimidating and difficult to understand
- I work in CRM; my work is funded by clients/agencies
- I work under contracts obtained from various governmental entities.
- I would apply to any, but have been fortunate to only need smaller grants available through universities, non-profits, friend's groups, or from funding acquired through private donations.
- I'm retired, so feel I would not be eligible.
- I've had to work full-time during my PhD, limiting my time to apply for funding.
- I've received awards from paper competitions to use towards research. Also a lot of analysis and digital scanning I have done was on campus where they don't charge students as long as equipment stays in campus.
- Local funders
- Many entities require too much paperwork
- Most will not fund a PI without a PhD

- Much of my research is funded through grants from the state historical society
- My current masters funding comes from TAing and a large scholarship from my department
- My mostly lab-based dissertation project didn't require a lot of external funding. I received some internal university and departmental funding.
- My only research project so far has been funded by a $4,000 scholarship from my University.
- My research to this point hasn't required that level of funding; most of the resources were already available.
- My university provided grants from other donors (Andrew W. Mellon)
- Not aware this fundings exist
- not enough support from academic advisors
- Not famous enough for fancy grants, not wasteful enough to depend on them, and would rather develop local public/private partnerships
- Others in my department have applied, but at my currently place of employment, I haven't been included in the application. Previous employer included me as a participant in NEH and local grant programs.
- People higher up at my institution do the applying for funding from these kinds of organizations. I personally have gone for and received smaller amounts for funding from the Department of Defense Legacy Resource Management Program and The Conservation Fund (part of settlement money from a dispute with Dominion Power in Virginia).
- Received some internal fellowship funding from my university
- Self Funded
- Small institution grants are more applicable.
- The constraints of funding cycles don't coordinate with my availability to conduct my international research (I can only travel in winter-not summer). Also applications are huge time commitment with a low probablity of success.
- Use local and state funding sources
- While the agencies would fund my research, what I need funding for, such as hourly wages, I believe is not fundable. The non-profit with which I'm affiliated does not provide an hourly wage so all the work I do is gratis.

Q38: From which agencies or organizations not listed on this survey have you received funding?

Answers to this question and write-in answers to Q32 and Q33 included references to the following organizations. This report is accompanied by a spreadsheet of these organizations with further information about each, for use by anthropologists seeking funding sources.

- Aga Khan Trust for Culture
- Agence nationale de la recherche (France)
- America West Airlines Education Foundation
- American Anthropological Association
- American Association of Biological Anthropologists
- American Association of State and Local History
- American Association of University Women
- American Battlefield Protection Program
- American Center of Research
- American Council of Learned Societies
- American Council on Education

- American Institute for Sri Lanka Studies
- American Institute of Indian Studies
- American Institute of Maghreb Studies
- American Institute of Pakistan Studies
- American Research Institute in Turkey
- American Research Institute of the South Caucasus
- American Scandinavian Foundation
- American School of Classical Studies in Athens
- American Schools of Overseas Research
- American Society of Mammalogists
- American Society of Primatologists
- American Women in Science
- Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
- Animal Behavior Society
- Antiquities Endowment Fund
- Arab Council for the Social Sciences
- Archaeological Institute of America
- Archaeology Southwest
- Arts and Humanities Research Council
- Association for Tropical Biology and Conservation
- Association of Commonwealth Universities
- Australian National Maritime Museum
- Australian Research Council
- Baden-Württemberg Ministry of Science, Research, and Art
- Bank One Arizona
- Blackwater Pirates
- Blum Center for Poverty Alleviation
- Bogliasco Foundation
- British Academy
- British Council
- Bruno Foundation
- Bureau of Indian Affairs
- Bureau of Land Management
- Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
- Bureau of Reclamation
- Canada Council
- Canadian provincial governments
- Carnegie Foundation
- Center for Advanced Spatial Technologies
- Center for Engaged Scholarship
- Center for Khmer Studies
- Centers for Disease Control
- Charlotte Newcombe Foundation
- Chesapeake Bay Trust
- Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation
- Christensen Fund
- Colonial Williamsburg
- Community Foundation for Southern Arizona
- Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnologica
- Conservation International
- Cora DuBois Charitable Trust
- Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa
- Council of American Overseas Research Centers
- Council of European Studies
- Council on Library and Information Resources
- County governments
- Craford Trust
- Crane-Rogers Foundation
- Curtis and Mary Brennan Foundation
- Cushwa Center for Hispanic Research
- Dreyfus Foundation
- Early American Industries Association
- Earthwatch
- Environmental Protection Agency
- Esherick-Ye Foundation
- European Research Council
- Field Museum
- Firebird Foundation
- First Nations Development institute
- Florida Education Fund
- Ford Foundation

- Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship
- Forensic Science Foundation
- Forest Service
- Foundation for Exploration and Research on Cultural Origins
- Foundation for Research into the Origins of Man
- Foundation for the Advancement of Mesoamerican Studies
- FP7 Europe
- Fulbright
- Fyssen Foundation
- Gates Foundation
- Geological Society of America
- Georg Eckert Institut
- German Academic Exchange Service
- German Archaeological Institute
- German Research Foundation
- Getty Foundation
- Gilman Scholars
- Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation
- Graham Foundation for the Advanced Study in the Fine Arts
- Grand Challenges Canada
- Greenwall Foundation
- Guam Preservation Trust
- Harvard University
- Heinz Charitable Trust
- Hellman Foundation
- Hewlett Foundation
- Hispanic Scholarship Fund
- Humboldt Foundation
- Husky Oil
- IBM
- IDEAWILD
- Illinois Association for Advancement of Archaeology
- INLAKS Foundation
- Institute for Field Research
- Institute for Global Conflict and Cooperation
- Institute of Museum and Library Services
- Inter-University Program for Latino Research
- internal
- International Arid Lands Consortium
- International Primatological Society
- International Science Council
- Israel Ministry of Science
- Israel Science Foundation
- Jacob Javits Foundations
- Jacobs Foundation
- James Marston Fitch Foundation
- Japan Foundation
- John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation
- Joseph and Mary Cacioppo Foundation
- Jostens Foundation
- Keck Foundation
- Killam Foundation
- Kinder Morgan Foundation
- Korea Foundation
- Kroger Foundation
- Lambda Alpha National Anthropology Society
- Landes Foundation
- Leifur Eiriksson Foundation
- Leverhulme Foundation
- Lewis and Clark
- Lilly Foundation
- local archaeological and historical societies
- Loeb Classical Library Foundation
- Luce Foundation
- Margot Marsh Biodiversity Foundation
- Maritime Heritage Program
- Max Planck
- McNair Scholars program
- Mitacs Canada
- Modern Endangered Archives Program
- Museo del Banco Central, Ecuador
- Nacey Maggioncalda Foundation
- National Aeronautics and Space Administration
- National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis

- National Council for Research on Women
- National Endowment for the Arts
- National Endowment for the Humanities
- National Heritage Area
- National Humanities Center
- National Institute of Justice
- National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism
- National Institute on Drug Abuse
- National Institutes of Health
- National Institutes of Mental Health
- National Multiple Sclerosis Society
- National Museum of Denmark
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
- National Park Service
- National Resource Conservation Service
- National Security Education Program
- National Wildlife Federation
- Native nations
- Natural Hazards Center
- Negaunee Foundation
- NERRS Science Collaborative
- Network for African Academies
- Newberry Library
- Northern Scientific Research Program
- Ontario Archaeological Society
- Ontario Graduate Scholarship
- Paris Conference on Arts and Humanities
- Paso del Norte Health Foundation
- Pendleton Memorial Fund
- PEO
- Pierre Elliot Trudeau Foundation
- Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology
- Primate Action Fund
- Primate Conservation Inc.
- private donors
- Project on Governance of Non Profit Organizations
- Puerto Rican government
- Quaternary Research Center
- Queen Elizabeth Scholarships
- Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study
- Redd Center for Western Study
- Reed Foundation
- Register of Professional Archaeologists
- Research Institute for the Study of Man
- Research Program on Migration and Health (PIMSA)
- Resources Legacy Fund
- Reynolds Foundation
- Richard Greenleaf Grant
- Robert H. N. Ho Family Foundation
- Rochester Museum and Science Center
- Rockefeller Foundation
- Rotary International
- Royal Anthropological Institute
- Rust Family Foundation
- Ruth Hindman Foundation
- Ryoichi Sasakawa Young Leaders Fellowship Fund
- Save America's Treasures
- Schmidt Foundation
- Science Museum of Virginia
- Selley Foundation
- Sigma Xi
- Silk Road Foundation
- Sloan Foundation
- Smithsonian
- Social Security Administration
- Social Studies and Humanities Research Center (Canada)
- Society for American Archaeology
- Society for Antiquities
- Society for California Archaeology
- Society for Economic Anthropology
- Society for Ethnobiology
- Society for Historical Archaeology

- Society for the Anthropology of Lowland South America
- Society of Africanist Archaeologists
- Spencer Foundation
- SRI Foundation
- Stapley Educational Trust
- state agencies
- State Department
- State Historic Preservation Offices
- Stigler Fund
- Stocker Foundation
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
- Swida
- Swiss Bank
- Synchronicity Earth
- T.T. Wentworth Museum
- Tang Center
- Taraknath Das Foundation
- Templeton Foundation
- Thor Thors Foundation
- Tinker Foundation
- Tucson Electric Power Company
- U.S. Army
- U.S. Department of Agriculture
- U.S. Department of Commerce
- U.S. Department of Defense
- U.S. Department of Education
- U.S. Department of Energy
- U.S. Department of Labor
- U.S. Department of the Interior
- U.S. Department of Transportation
- U.S. Embassy El Salvador
- U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum
- UNESCO
- United States Institute for Peace
- Veterans' Administration
- Walter and Julia Absolon Foundation
- Wellcome Trust
- Wells Fargo Foundation
- Whiting Foundation
- Wildlife Conservation Trust
- Woodrow Wilson Foundation
- WW Grainger

Results Part 2: Quantitative Results: Intersectional Analysis

Table 2.01: Intersectional Demographics of Respondents

		Gender (Q2, Q3)			Sexuality (Q4)		Nationality, Race/Ethnicity (55, Q7, Q9)			
		Cisgender men	Cisgender women	People of other genders	Heterosexual	Non-heterosexual	U.S. white	U.S. non-white	Non-U.S. non-minoritized	Non-U.S. minoritized
Gender (Q2, Q3)	Cisgender men				334 (85%)	59 (15%)	271 (69%)	67 (17%)	40 (10%)	15 (4%)
	Cisgender women				525 (77%)	155 (23%)	477 (70%)	117 (17%)	64 (9%)	22 (3%)
	People of other genders				9 (11%)	75 (89%)	30 (36%)	39 (46%)	6 (7%)	9 (11%)
Sexuality (Q4)	Heterosexual	334 (38%)	525 (60%)	9 (1%)			620 (71%)	140 (16%)	80 (9%)	28 (3%)
	Non-heterosexual	59 (20%)	155 (54%)	75 (26%)			158 (55%)	83 (29%)	30 (10%)	18 (16%)
Nationality, Race/Ethnicity (Q5, Q7, Q9)	U.S. white	271 (35%)	477 (61%)	30 (4%)	620 (80%)	158 (20%)				
	U.S. non-white	67 (30%)	117 (52%)	39 (17%)	140 (63%)	83 (32%)				
	Non-U.S. non-minoritized	40 (36%)	64 (58%)	6 (5%)	80 (73%)	30 (27%)				
	Non-U.S. minoritized	15 (33%)	22 (48%)	9 (20%)	28 (61%)	18 (39%)				
Highest Level of Education (Q10)	<Bachelor's	1 (14%)	5 (71%)	1 (14%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)
	Bachelor's	9 (21%)	31 (74%)	2 (5%)	20 (48%)	22 (52%)	27 (64%)	12 (29%)	1 (2%)	2 (5%)
	Master's/Professional	124 (36%)	201 (58%)	23 (7%)	241 (69%)	107 (31%)	225 (65%)	71 (20%)	41 (12%)	11 (3%)
	Ph.D./D.Phil.	250 (35%)	427 (60%)	34 (5%)	587 (83%)	124 (17%)	512 (72%)	103 (14%)	64 (9%)	32 (5%)
Parents' Education (Q11, Q12)	0 parents w/bachelor's	126 (39%)	154 (48%)	43 (13%)	223 (69%)	100 (31%)	181 (56%)	82 (25%)	35 (11%)	25 (8%)
	1+ parent w/ bachelor's	88 (33%)	168 (63%)	12 (4%)	212 (79%)	56 (21%)	197 (74%)	38 (14%)	28 (10%)	5 (2%)
	1+ parent w/ master's/prof	120 (30%)	262 (65%)	24 (6%)	297 (73%)	109 (27%)	287 (71%)	78 (19%)	30 (7%)	11 (3%)
	1+ parent with Ph.D.	59 (37%)	96 (60%)	5 (3%)	136 (85%)	24 (15%)	113 (71%)	25 (16%)	17 (11%)	5 (3%)
Disability (Q13)	Disabled	83 (30%)	162 (59%)	31 (11%)	166 (60%)	110 (40%)	180 (65%)	61 (22%)	22 (8%)	13 (5%)
	Non-disabled	606 (36%)	1016 (61%)	54 (3%)	1376 (82%)	300 (18%)	1188 (71%)	256 (15%)	172 (10%)	60 (4%)

		Highest Level of Education (Q10)				Parents' Education (Q11, Q12)				Disability (Q13)	
		<Bachelor's	Bachelor's	Master's or Professional	PhD/DPhil	0 parents w/ bachelors	1+ parent w/ bachelors	1+ parent w/ master's/prof	1+ parent w/ Ph.D.	Disabled	Non-disabled
Gender (Q2, Q3)	Cisgender men	1 (0%)	9 (2%)	124 (32%)	250 (65%)	126 (32%)	88 (22%)	120 (31%)	59 (15%)	83 (12%)	606 (88%)
	Cisgender women	5 (1%)	31 (5%)	201 (30%)	427 (64%)	154 (23%)	168 (25%)	262 (39%)	96 (14%)	162 (14%)	1016 (86%)
	People of other genders	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	23 (38%)	34 (57%)	43 (51%)	12 (14%)	24 (29%)	5 (6%)	31 (36%)	54 (64%)
Sexuality (Q4)	Heterosexual	4 (0%)	20 (2%)	241 (28%)	587 (69%)	223 (26%)	212 (24%)	297 (34%)	136 (16%)	166 (11%)	1376 (89%)
	Non-heterosexual	3 (1%)	22 (9%)	107 (42%)	124 (48%)	100 (35%)	56 (19%)	109 (38%)	24 (8%)	110 (27%)	300 (73%)
Nationality, Race/Ethnicity (Q5, Q7, Q9)	U.S. white	3 (0%)	27 (4%)	225 (29%)	512 (67%)	181 (23%)	197 (25%)	287 (37%)	113 (15%)	180 (13%)	1188 (87%)
	U.S. non-white	3 (2%)	12 (6%)	71 (38%)	103 (54%)	82 (37%)	38 (17%)	78 (35%)	25 (11%)	61 (19%)	256 (81%)
	Non-U.S. non-minoritized	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	41 (38%)	64 (60%)	35 (32%)	28 (25%)	30 (27%)	17 (15%)	22 (11%)	172 (89%)
	Non-U.S. minoritized	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	11 (24%)	32 (71%)	25 (54%)	5 (11%)	11 (24%)	5 (11%)	13 (18%)	60 (82%)
Highest Level of Education (Q10)	<Bachelor's					3 (43%)	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	6 (86%)
	Bachelor's					18 (43%)	4 (10%)	17 (40%)	3 (7%)	20 (49%)	21 (51%)
	Master's/Professional					98 (28%)	93 (27%)	130 (37%)	27 (8%)	109 (32%)	236 (68%)
	Ph.D./D.Phil.					163 (23%)	168 (24%)	250 (35%)	130 (18%)	141 (20%)	565 (80%)
Parents' Education (Q11, Q12)	0 parents w/bachelor's	3 (1%)	18 (6%)	98 (35%)	163 (58%)					81 (28%)	205 (72%)
	1+ parent w/ bachelor's	3 (1%)	4 (1%)	93 (35%)	168 (63%)					54 (20%)	212 (80%)
	1+ parent w/ master's/prof	1 (0%)	17 (4%)	130 (33%)	250 (63%)					101 (25%)	302 (75%)
	1+ parent with PhD.	0 (0%)	3 (2%)	27 (17%)	130 (81%)					40 (25%)	119 (75%)
Disability (Q13)	Disabled	1 (0%)	20 (7%)	109 (40%)	141 (52%)	81 (29%)	54 (20%)	101 (37%)	40 (14%)		
	Non-disabled	6 (2%)	21 (3%)	2376 (29%)	565 (68%)	205 (24%)	212 (25%)	302 (36%)	119 (14%)		

Table 2.02: Results of Statistical Tests of Correlations between Identities

This table shows the p values resulting from χ^2 tests comparing the distributions of different intersectional identities. Statistically significant results ($p < 0.05$) are highlighted in blue.

Sexual Orientation	Race (U.S)	Minoritization (non-U.S.)	Nationality	Education	Parents' Education	Disability	
0.0021	1.2615×10^{-11}	0.8238	0.3919	0.5088	7.2245×10^{-11}	7.0254×10^{-9}	Gender
	1.9152×10^{-7}	0.1434	0.0724	2.1149×10^{-9}	0.0005	1.0650×10^{-16}	Sexual Orientation
				0.0016	0.0003	0.0053	Race (U.S.)
				0.1874	0.0427	0.1628	Minoritization (non-U.S.)
				0.7794	0.0093	0.6029	Nationality
					0.0098	1.3531×10^{-6}	Education
						0.9042	Parents' Education

STATISTICALLY-SIGNIFICANT RESULTS:

- GENDER × SEXUAL ORIENTATION: Cisgender men were more likely than cisgender women to be heterosexual. Among people of other genders, the vast majority were non-heterosexual.
- GENDER × RACE (U.S.): Cisgender men and cisgender women were more likely than people of other genders to be white.
- GENDER × PARENTS' EDUCATION: Cisgender men were more likely than cisgender women to have either parents without bachelor's degrees or parents with Ph.D.'s; cisgender women were more likely than cisgender men to have parents with bachelors' degrees or non-Ph.D. graduate degrees. People of other genders were disproportionately most likely to have parents without bachelors' degrees.
- GENDER × DISABILITY: Cisgender men and cisgender women were more likely than people of other genders to be non-disabled.
- SEXUAL ORIENTATION × RACE (U.S.): White people were more likely than nonwhite people to be heterosexual.
- SEXUAL ORIENTATION × EDUCATION: Heterosexual people were more likely than non-heterosexual people to hold a Ph.D.
- SEXUAL ORIENTATION × PARENTS' EDUCATION: Heterosexual people were more likely than non-heterosexual people to have at least one parent with a bachelor's degree, and to have at least one parent with a Ph.D.
- SEXUAL ORIENTATION × DISABILITY: Heterosexual people are more likely than non-heterosexual people to be non-disabled.
- RACE (U.S.) × EDUCATION: White people were more likely than non-white people to hold a Ph.D.

- RACE (U.S.) × PARENTS' EDUCATION: White people were more likely than non-white people to have parents with higher educational attainment, including bachelors' degrees, master's and professional degrees, and Ph.D.s.
- RACE (U.S.) × DISABILITY: White people were more likely than non-white people to be non-disabled.
- MINORITIZATION (NON-U.S.) × PARENTS' EDUCATION: Non-minoritized people were more likely than minoritized people to have parents with higher educational attainment, including bachelor's degrees, master's and professional degrees, and Ph.D.s.
- NATIONALITY × PARENTS' EDUCATION: People from the U.S. were more likely than people from other countries to have parents with bachelors, masters, or professional degrees, but people were equally likely to have parents with Ph.D.s across nationalities.
- EDUCATION × PARENTS' EDUCATION: People who had at least one parent with at least a bachelors were more likely than people with no parents with a bachelors to hold a Ph.D. Also, people who had at least one parent with Ph.D. were more likely than people whose parents did not have Ph.D.s to have a Ph.D. themselves; this effect was also statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 1.1095 \times 10^{-6}$).
- EDUCATION × DISABILITY: Non-disabled people were more likely than disabled people to hold a Ph.D.

Table 2.03: Demographics by Subfield of Anthropology

	Sociocultural		**Biological**		**Archaeology**		**Linguistic**	
	n	**%**	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**
Gender (Q2, Q3)								
Cisgender men	137	32%	47	28%	287	39%	25	34%
Cisgender women	255	60%	112	66%	411	56%	41	55%
People of other genders	30	7%	11	6%	33	5%	8	11%
Sexuality (Q4)								
Heterosexual	311	74%	124	73%	579	79%	60	81%
Non-Heterosexual	111	26%	46	27%	152	21%	14	19%
Nationality, Race/Ethnicity (Q5, Q7, Q9)								
U.S. white	245	58%	119	70%	556	76%	37	50%
U.S. non-white	90	21%	28	16%	113	15%	23	31%
Non-U.S. non-minoritized	56	13%	14	8%	52	7%	8	11%
Non-U.S. minoritized	31	7%	9	5%	10	1%	6	8%
Highest Level of Education (Q10)								
<Bachelor's	2	<1%	0	0%	3	<1%	0	0%
Bachelor's	10	2%	12	7%	25	3%	1	1%
Master's or Professional	103	25%	56	33%	253	35%	20	27%
Ph.D./D.Phil.	302	72%	101	60%	439	61%	52	71%
Parents' Education (Q11, Q12)								
0 parents w/ bachelors	112	27%	37	22%	194	27%	28	38%
1+ parent w/ bachelors	101	24%	37	22%	177	24%	10	14%
1+ parent w/ master's/prof	143	34%	72	42%	260	36%	24	32%
1+ parent w/ Ph.D.	66	16%	24	1%	100	14%	12	16%
Disability (Q13)								
Disabled	103	25%	52	31%	176	24%	17	23%
Non-disabled	317	75%	114	69%	551	76%	57	77%
Age (Q14)								
22 and under	2	<1%	1	1%	2	<1%	1	1%
23–29	33	8%	37	22%	89	12%	5	7%
30–39	134	32%	55	32%	236	32%	21	28%
40–49	85	20%	35	21%	143	20%	15	20%
50–59	60	14%	17	10%	98	13%	8	11%
60–69	58	14%	11	6%	88	12%	9	12%
70 and over	48	11%	14	8%	74	10%	15	20%

	Sociocultural		Biological		Archaeology		Linguistic	
	n	**%**	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**
Current Affiliation (Q15)								
Public research university	188	48%	71	49%	245	39%	31	49%
Private research university	64	16%	17	12%	70	11%	10	16%
Public 4-year college	24	6%	11	8%	45	7%	4	6%
Private 4-year college	32	8%	9	6%	37	6%	4	6%
Public 2-year college/community college	5	1%	2	1%	7	1%	1	2%
U.S. federal government agency	7	2%	0	0%	31	5%	0	0%
U.S. state or local government agency	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Non-U.S. government agency	2	1%	2	1%	3	0%	0	0%
Non-profit organization	21	5%	10	7%	40	6%	4	6%
For-profit business	16	4%	11	8%	97	15%	0	0%
Other (please specify)	31	8%	11	8%	52	8%	9	14%
Academic Status (Q16)								
Undergraduate student	2	1%	0	0%	3	1%	0	0%
Master's Student	4	1%	6	5%	16	4%	0	0%
Doctoral student or candidate	83	27%	36	30%	109	25%	13	25%
Postdoctoral fellow	18	6%	8	7%	27	6%	2	4%
Adjunct or part-time faculty	16	5%	8	7%	24	6%	3	6%
Full-time non-tenure-track faculty	19	6%	6	5%	32	7%	3	6%
Tenure-track faculty	53	17%	20	17%	68	16%	8	15%
Tenured faculty	111	36%	32	26%	132	31%	21	40%
Staff	2	1%	5	4%	20	5%	2	4%

RESULTS OF STATISTICAL TESTS OF CORRELATIONS BETWEEN IDENTITIES AND SUBFIELDS

In order to conduct χ^2 tests, categorical variables must be mutually exclusive; thus, these tests were calculated to compare those who conduct only sociocultural anthropology, those who conduct only biological anthropology, and those who conduct only archaeology, with those conducting research in multiple subfields excluded. The sample of respondents who conduct only linguistic anthropology is too small to be included in χ^2 tests.

GENDER: Archaeology had the lowest percent of cisgender women while biological had the highest; this disparity is statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0012$). The sample of respondents who are of other genders were too small to be included in the χ^2 test.

SEXUAL ORIENTATION: Archaeology has the lowest percent of non-heterosexual people, while sociocultural had the highest; this disparity is statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0031$).

RACE/ETHNICITY (U.S.): Among people from the U.S., archaeologists were more likely than sociocultural or biological anthropologists to be white; this disparity is statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0103$).

MINORITIZATION (NON-U.S.): Among people from other countries, sociocultural anthropologists were more likely than archaeologists to be minoritized; this disparity is statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 1.9538 \times 10^{-5}$) (there were too few non-U.S. biological anthropologists for that subfield to be included in this χ^2 test).

NATIONALITY: Sociocultural anthropologists were most likely and archaeologists were least likely to be from a country other than the U.S.; this disparity was statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 4.1107 \times 10^{-10}$).

EDUCATION: Sociocultural anthropology had a higher percentage of Ph.D. holders than either biological anthropology or archaeology; this disparity was statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0004$).

PARENTS' EDUCATION: Archaeologists were more likely than sociocultural and biological anthropologists to have been first-generation bachelor's degree recipients. Biological anthropologists were more likely than archaeologists and sociocultural anthropologists to have at least one parent with a master's or professional degree, but less likely to have at least one parent with a Ph.D. These disparities were statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0381$).

DISABILITY: Biological anthropologists were the most likely to be disabled, and archaeologists were the least, but this difference was not statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.5864$).

AGE: Biological anthropologists were younger than sociocultural anthropologists or archaeologists; this disparity was statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 1.404 \times 10^{-14}$).

AFFILIATION (ACADEMIC VS. NON-ACADEMIC): Although majorities of respondents in all subfields were affiliated with institutions of higher education, archaeologists were more likely than sociocultural anthropologists or biological anthropologists to have non-academic affiliations (χ^2 test yielded $p = 1.844 \times 10^{-11}$).

AFFILIATION (PUBLIC VS. PRIVATE ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS): Among those with academic affiliations, a majority in all subfields were at public institutions. About 1 in 3 sociocultural anthropologist academics were affiliated to private institutions, compared to 1 in 4 biological anthropologists and archaeologists, but this disparity was not statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.4405$).

AFFILIATION (RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES VS. 2- AND 4-YEAR COLLEGES): Among those with academic affiliations, across subfields, about 1 in 6 respondents were at 2- or 4-year colleges, while the majority were at research universities. A slightly higher percentage of archaeologists were at private universities, but this difference was not statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.5865$).

ACADEMIC STATUS (STUDENTS VS. NON-STUDENTS): Across subfields, about 25–33% of respondents were students; differences in percentages between subfields were not statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.6414$).

ACADEMIC STATUS (CONTINGENT VS. TENURE-TRACK LABOR): Across subfields, about half of respondents were contingent laborers (doctoral students/candidates, postdoctoral fellows, adjuncts/part-time faculty, full-time non-tenure-track faculty, and/or staff). Although sociocultural anthropologists were majority tenured or tenure-track faculty and the other subdisciplines were majority contingent laborers, this disparity was not statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.2549$).

Table 2.04: Demographics by Context of Research (Biological Anthropology)

	Context of Biological Anthropological Research (Q21)											
	Lab		Field		Museum		Zoo		Other		Multiple	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Gender (Q2, Q3)												
Cisgender men	7	15%	17	36%	2	4%	1	2%	1	2%	19	40%
Cisgender women	16	14%	23	21%	10	9%	1	1%	4	4%	58	52%
People of other genders	3	27%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	64%
Sexuality (Q4)												
Heterosexual	18	15%	31	25%	9	7%	2	2%	4	3%	60	48%
Non-heterosexual	8	17%	10	22%	3	7%	0	0%	1	2%	24	52%
Nationality, Race (Q5, Q7, Q9)												
U.S. white	19	16%	27	23%	9	8%	1	1%	4	3%	59	50%
U.S. non-white	5	18%	4	14%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	15	54%
Non-U.S. non-minoritized	2	14%	5	36%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	50%
Non-U.S. minoritized	0	0%	5	56%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	3	33%
Parents' Education (Q11, Q12)	7	19%	10	27%	1	3%	0	0%	2	5%	17	46%
0 parents w/bachelor's	6	16%	9	24%	3	8%	0	0%	2	5%	17	46%
1+ parent w/ bachelor's	9	13%	16	22%	6	8%	2	3%	1	1%	38	53%
1+ parent w/ master's/prof	4	17%	6	25%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	12	50%
1+ parent with PhD	7	19%	10	27%	1	3%	0	0%	2	5%	17	46%
Disability (Q13)												
Disabled	11	21%	11	21%	5	10%	1	2%	2	4%	22	42%
Non-disabled	14	12%	30	26%	7	6%	1	1%	2	2%	60	53%

COMMENT: Because there were so few respondents who did not conduct research in multiple contexts, it was difficult to compare contexts. However, a χ^2 test comparing cisgender men and cisgender women working in the lab and the field showed no significant disparities ($p = 0.3424$), as did a test comparing heterosexual and non-heterosexual people working in the lab and the field ($p = 0.4609$).

Table 2.05: Demographics by Context of Research (Archaeology)

	Context of Archaeological Research (Q24)									
	Lab		Field		Museum		Other		Multiple	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Gender (Q2, Q3)										
Cisgender men	19	7%	77	27%	11	4%	8	3%	171	60%
Cisgender women	49	12%	70	17%	15	4%	23	6%	255	62%
People of other genders	5	15%	6	18%	0	0%	3	9%	20	59%
Sexuality (Q4)										
Heterosexual	50	9%	126	22%	20	3%	27	5%	356	61%
Non-heterosexual	23	15%	27	18%	6	4%	7	5%	90	59%
Nationality, Race (Q5, Q7, Q9)										
U.S. white	55	10%	116	21%	19	3%	25	4%	341	61%
U.S. non-white	11	10%	27	24%	5	4%	7	6%	64	56%
Non-U.S. non-minoritized	5	10%	9	17%	2	4%	1	2%	35	67%
Non-U.S. minoritized	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	1	10%	6	60%
Parents' Education (Q11, Q12)										
0 parents w/bachelor's	16	8%	42	22%	8	4%	14	7%	115	59%
1+ parent w/ bachelor's	23	13%	35	20%	3	2%	5	3%	113	63%
1+ parent w/ master's/prof	26	10%	50	19%	13	5%	12	5%	158	61%
1+ parent with PhD	8	8%	26	26%	2	2%	3	3%	60	61%
Disability (Q13)										
Disabled	13	7%	37	21%	6	3%	11	6%	110	62%
Non-disabled	60	11%	115	21%	20	4%	22	4%	333	61%

RESULTS OF STATISTICAL TESTS OF CORRELATIONS BETWEEN IDENTITIES AND CONTEXTS OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH

- GENDER: Cisgender men were more likely to work in the field, while cisgender women were more likely to work in the lab, and both were equally likely to work in museums; this disparity is statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0035$). The sample of respondents who are of other genders were too small to be included in the χ^2 test.
- SEXUAL ORIENTATION: Heterosexual people were more likely to work in the field, while non-heterosexual people were more likely to work in the lab; this disparity is statistically significant (χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0189$).
- RACE/ETHNICITY (U.S.): There were no statistically significant differences in context of work with regard to race.
- MINORITIZATION (NON-U.S.): The sample was too small to test.
- NATIONALITY: The sample was too small to test.
- PARENTS' EDUCATION: There were no statistically significant differences in context of work with regard to parental education.
- DISABILITY: There were no statistically significant differences in context of work with regard to disability.

Table 2.06: Demographics of Community-Based Researchers

This table shows how many people of different identities claimed to use "community engaged research, participatory action research, collaborative research, or similar" (sociocultural anthropology, Q18; biological anthropology, Q20; linguistic anthropology, Q24), and/or "public archaeology, community archaeology, and/or collaborative archaeological research" (archaeology, Q23).

	Conducts Community-Based Research?				**Statistical Tests**
	yes		no		
	n	%	*n*	%	
Gender (Q2, Q3)					There was no statistically significant difference between cisgender men and cisgender women ($p = 0.0781$). Cisgender men and cisgender women were significantly more likely than people of other genders ($p = 6.1786 \times 10^{-5}$)
Cisgender men	264	67%	129	33%	
Cisgender women	415	61%	265	39%	
People of other genders	35	42%	49	58%	
Sexuality (Q4)					Heterosexual people were significantly more likely than non-heterosexual people ($p = 0.0320$).
Heterosexual	551	63%	317	37%	
Non-heterosexual	163	56%	126	44%	
Nationality, Race (Q5, Q7, Q9)					There was no statistically significant difference between U.S. white and non-white people ($p = 0.2626$) or between non-U.S. minoritized and non-minoritized people ($p = 0.7075$) People from the U.S. were significantly more likely than people from other countries ($p = 0.0460$).
U.S. white	496	64%	282	36%	
U.S. non-white	133	60%	90	40%	
Non-U.S. non-minoritized	61	55%	49	45%	
Non-U.S. minoritized	24	52%	22	48%	
Parents' Education (Q11, Q12)					There was no statistically significant difference with regard to parents' education ($p = 0.0653$).
0 parents w/bachelor's	191	59%	132	41%	
1+ parent w/ bachelor's	178	66%	90	34%	
1+ parent w/ master's/prof.	257	63%	149	37%	
1+ parent with PhD	88	55%	72	45%	
Disability (Q13)					There was no statistically significant difference with regard to disability ($p = 0.1568$).
Disabled	189	68%	87	32%	
Non-disabled	520	62%	318	38%	

Table 2.07: Demographics by Affiliation

	Gender (Q2, Q3)			Sexuality (Q4)		Nationality, Race/Ethnicity (Q5, Q7, Q9)				Parents' Education (Q11, Q12)				Disability (Q13)	
	cisgender men	Cisgender women	People of other genders	Heterosexual	Non-heterosexual	U.S. white	U.S. non-white	Non-U.S. non-minoritized	Non-U.S. minoritized	0 parents w/ bachelors	1+ parent w/ bachelors	1+ parent w/ master's/prof	1+ parent w/ Ph.D.	Disabled	Non-disabled
Academic Sector	*218*	*444*	*39*	*527*	*174*	*459*	*120*	*84*	*38*	*167*	*163*	*252*	*119*	*168*	*1056*
	(31%)	*(63%)*	*(6%)*	*(75%)*	*(25%)*	*(65%)*	*(18%)*	*(12%)*	*(5%)*	*(24%)*	*(23%)*	*(36%)*	*(17%)*	*(14%)*	*(86%)*
Public research university	141	261	23	323	102	273	70	57	25	100	96	151	78	98	648
	(33%)	(61%)	(5%)	(76%)	(24%)	(64%)	(16%)	(13%)	(6%)	(24%)	(23%)	(36%)	(18%)	(13%)	(87%)
Private research university	41	79	9	88	41	76	26	18	9	28	26	49	26	36	184
	(32%)	(61%)	(7%)	(68%)	(32%)	(59%)	(20%)	(14%)	(7%)	(22%)	(20%)	(38%)	(20%)	(16%)	(84%)
Public 4-year college	18	45	2	51	14	47	12	2	4	25	15	20	5	19	90
	(28%)	(69%)	(3%)	(78%)	(22%)	(72%)	(18%)	(3%)	(6%)	(38%)	(23%)	(31%)	(8%)	(17%)	(83%)
Private 4-year college	15	51	5	54	17	53	11	7	0	12	21	29	9	14	114
	(21%)	(72%)	(7%)	(76%)	(24%)	(75%)	(5%)	(10%)	(0%)	(17%)	(30%)	(41%)	(13%)	(11%)	(89%)
Public 2-Year College/Community College	3	8	0	11	0	10	1	0	0	2	5	3	1	1	20
	(27%)	(73%)	(0%)	(100%)	(0%)	(91%)	(9%)	(0%)	(0%)	(18%)	(45%)	(27%)	(9%)	(5%)	(95%)
Public Sector	*33*	*35*	*2*	*56*	*14*	*56*	*11*	*1*	*2*	*20*	*12*	*29*	*9*	*14*	*110*
	(47%)	*(50%)*	*(3%)*	*(80%)*	*(20%)*	*(80%)*	*(16%)*	*(1%)*	*(3%)*	*(29%)*	*(17%)*	*(41%)*	*(13%)*	*(11%)*	*(89%)*
U.S. federal government agency	17	19	1	25	12	28	8	1	0	11	7	16	3	6	60
	(46%)	(51%)	(3%)	(68%)	(32%)	(76%)	(22%)	(3%)	(0%)	(30%)	(19%)	(43%)	(8%)	(9%)	(91%)
U.S. state or local government agency	15	14	0	29	0	26	3	0	0	8	5	10	6	6	46
	(52%)	(48%)	(0%)	(100%)	(0%)	(90%)	(10%)	(0%)	(0%)	(28%)	(17%)	(34%)	(21%)	(12%)	(88%)
Non-U.S. government agency	1	2	1	2	2	2	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	2	4
	(25%)	(50%)	(25%)	(50%)	(50%)	(50%)	(0%)	(0%)	(50%)	(25%)	(0%)	(75%)	(0%)	(33%)	(67%)
Other Sectors	*96*	*142*	*11*	*205*	*44*	*196*	*39*	*12*	*2*	*75*	*65*	*90*	*19*	*56*	*384*
	(39%)	*(57%)*	*(4%)*	*(82%)*	*(18%)*	*(79%)*	*(16%)*	*(5%)*	*(1%)*	*(30%)*	*(26%)*	*(36%)*	*(8%)*	*(13%)*	*(87%)*
Non-profit organization	29	33	2	58	6	51	9	3	1	19	14	26	5	13	102
	(45%)	(52%)	(3%)	(91%)	(9%)	(80%)	(14%)	(5%)	(2%)	(30%)	(22%)	(41%)	(8%)	(11%)	(89%)
For-profit business	43	56	5	82	22	85	18	1	0	26	30	37	11	23	162
	(41%)	(54%)	(5%)	(79%)	(21%)	(82%)	(17%)	(1%)	(0%)	(25%)	(29%)	(36%)	(11%)	(12%)	(88%)
Other	24	53	4	65	16	60	12	8	1	30	21	27	3	20	120
	(30%)	(65%)	(5%)	(80%)	(20%)	(74%)	(15%)	(10%)	(1%)	(37%)	(26%)	(33%)	(4%)	(14%)	(86%)
Multiple Affiliations	39	53	7	70	29	64	22	11	2	25	27	35	12	36	124
	(39%)	(54%)	(7%)	(71%)	(29%)	(65%)	(22%)	(11%)	(2%)	(25%)	(27%)	(35%)	(12%)	(23%)	(78%)

Table 2.08: Results of Statistical Tests of Correlations between Affiliations and Identities

This table shows the p values resulting from χ^2 tests comparing the distributions of people of different identities across different affiliations. Statistically significant results ($p < 0.05$) are highlighted in blue. Tests for which the sample was too small are grayed out.

	Identities Compared							
Affiliations Compared	Cisgender men vs. cisgender women	Cisgender men vs. cisgender women vs. respondents of other genders	Heterosexual respondents vs. non-heterosexual respondents	U.S. white respondents vs. U.S. non-white respondents	non-U.S. non-minoritized respondents vs. non-U.S. minoritized respondents	U.S. respondents vs. non-U.S. respondents	Respondents w/ 0 parents w/bachelor's vs. respondents w/ 1+ parents w/ bachelor's vs. respondents w/ 1+ parent w/ master's/prof.	Disabled respondents vs. non-disabled respondents
Academic sector vs. public sector vs. other sectors	0.0096		0.0587	0.3302		9.0961×10^{-10}	0.0100	0.6870
Public university/college vs. private university/college	0.7795	0.5535	0.2701	0.8401	0.7863	0.9843	0.4763	0.9188
Research university vs. 4-year college	0.0447		0.4677	0.4882		0.0056	0.0978	0.9833
U.S. federal government vs. U.S. state/local government	0.7182		0.0007	0.2043				0.6623

Table 2.09: Demographics by Academic Rank

Rank (Q16)	Gender (Q2, Q3)			Sexuality (Q4)		Nationality, Race/Ethnicity (Q5, Q7, Q9)				Parents' Education (Q11, Q12)				Disability (Q13)	
	Cisgender men	Cisgender women	People of other genders	Heterosexual	non-heterosexual	U.S. white	U.S. non-white	Non-U.S. non-minoritized	Non-U.S. minoritized	0 parents w/ bachelors	1+ parent w/ bachelors	1+ parent w/ master's/prof	1+ parent w/ Ph.D.	Disabled	Non-disabled
Undergraduate student	2 (29%)	4 (57%)	1 (14%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	5 (71%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	12 (92%)
Master's Student	4 (20%)	16 (80%)	0 (0%)	6 (30%)	14 (70%)	11 (55%)	7 (35%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	11 (55%)	2 (10%)	6 (30%)	1 (5%)	11 (38%)	18 (62%)
Doctoral student or candidate	58 (31%)	110 (59%)	20 (11%)	107 (57%)	81 (43%)	90 (48%)	43 (23%)	43 (23%)	12 (6%)	51 (27%)	46 (24%)	70 (37%)	21 (11%)	71 (24%)	226 (76%)
Postdoctoral fellow	9 (21%)	31 (72%)	3 (7%)	29 (67%)	14 (33%)	28 (65%)	6 (14%)	8 (19%)	1 (2%)	6 (14%)	11 (26%)	23 (53%)	3 (7%)	9 (12%)	68 (88%)
Adjunct or part-time faculty	14 (39%)	20 (56%)	2 (6%)	30 (83%)	6 (17%)	26 (72%)	4 (11%)	4 (11%)	2 (6%)	10 (28%)	9 (25%)	11 (31%)	6 (17%)	10 (16%)	52 (84%)
Full-time non-tenure-track faculty	12 (24%)	37 (74%)	1 (2%)	39 (78%)	11 (22%)	38 (76%)	6 (12%)	5 (10%)	1 (2%)	9 (18%)	14 (28%)	16 (32%)	11 (22%)	9 (10%)	82 (90%)
Tenure-track faculty	29 (24%)	85 (70%)	7 (6%)	92 (76%)	29 (24%)	78 (64%)	31 (26%)	6 (5%)	6 (5%)	25 (21%)	21 (17%)	48 (40%)	27 (22%)	24 (11%)	194 (89%)
Tenured faculty	90 (39%)	131 (56%)	11 (5%)	201 (87%)	31 (13%)	168 (72%)	30 (13%)	22 (9%)	12 (5%)	49 (21%)	59 (25%)	79 (34%)	45 (19%)	41 (10%)	378 (90%)
Staff	8 (29%)	20 (71%)	11 (5%)	18 (64%)	10 (36%)	24 (86%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	7 (25%)	9 (32%)	9 (32%)	3 (11%)	12 (27%)	32 (73%)

Table 2.10: Results of Statistical Tests of Correlations between Academic Ranks and Identities

This table shows the p values resulting from χ^2 tests comparing the distributions of people of different identities across different affiliations. Statistically significant results ($p < 0.05$) are highlighted in blue. Tests for which the sample was too small are grayed out.

Identities Compared

Ranks Compared	Cisgender men vs. cisgender women	Cisgender men vs. cisgender women vs. respondents of other genders	Heterosexual respondents vs. non-heterosexual respondents	U.S. white respondents vs. U.S. non-white respondents	non-U.S. non-minoritized respondents vs. non-U.S. minoritized respondents	U.S. respondents vs. non-U.S. respondents	Respondents w/ 0 parents w/bachelors vs. respondents w/ 1+ parents w/ bachelors vs. respondents w/ 1+ parent w/ master's/prof. [illegible]	Disabled respondents vs. non-disabled respondents
Students vs. faculty/staff	0.9315	0.0357	2.6660×10^{-14}	9.1019×10^{-5}	0.2787	2.0280×10^{-5}	0.0126	5.6901×10^{-8}
Part-time faculty vs. full-time faculty	0.3327		0.7243	0.4450		0.6180	0.6720	0.1537
Contingent faculty vs. Tenure-track and tenured tenure-track faculty	0.1559	0.3574	0.0806	0.2451	0.1044	0.3615	0.5633	0.4080
vs. Tenured faculty	0.0056	0.0200	0.0118	0.0052		0.2095	0.1297	0.6282

Table 2.11: Demographics by Professional Organization Membership

	AAA		**AABA**		**ABFA**		**ASP**		**AIA**		**RPA**		**SAA (Arch.)**		**SAA (Appl.)**		**SHA**		**SFA**	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Gender (Q2, Q3)																				
Cisgender men	159	33%	19	18%	5	45%	7	29%	37	33%	120	42%	221	40%	19	25%	82	40%	3	38%
Cisgender women	292	61%	77	75%	6	55%	17	71%	69	62%	158	56%	306	56%	49	65%	114	55%	5	63%
People of other genders	26	5%	7	7%	0	0%	0	0%	5	5%	6	2%	21	4%	7	9%	10	5%	0	0%
Sexuality (Q4)																				
Heterosexual	355	74%	75	73%	10	91%	20	83%	92	83%	241	85%	439	80%	51	68%	165	80%	7	88%
Non-heterosexual	122	26%	28	27%	1	9%	4	17%	19	17%	43	15%	109	20%	24	32%	41	20%	1	13%
Nationality, Race (Q5, Q7, Q9)																				
U.S. white	296	62%	76	74%	8	73%	14	58%	80	72%	236	83%	432	79%	52	69%	160	78%	7	88%
U.S. non-white	96	20%	19	18%	2	18%	2	8%	21	19%	38	13%	69	13%	16	21%	37	18%	0	0%
Non-U.S. non-minoritized	50	10%	7	7%	1	9%	5	21%	9	8%	9	3%	39	7%	4	5%	6	3%	1	13%
Non-U.S. minoritized	35	7%	1	1%	0	0%	3	13%	1	1%	1	0%	8	1%	3	4%	3	1%	0	0%
Highest Level of Education (Q10)																				
<Bachelor's	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	1	0%	2	0%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%
Bachelor's	10	2%	5	5%	1	9%	4	17%	2	2%	0	0%	18	3%	2	3%	7	3%	0	0%
Master's/Professional	90	19%	25	24%	3	27%	9	38%	38	34%	121	43%	169	31%	13	17%	73	35%	4	50%
Ph.D./D.Phil.	369	77%	72	70%	7	64%	10	42%	71	64%	159	56%	352	64%	59	79%	122	59%	4	50%
Parents' Education (Q11, Q12)																				
0 parents w/bachelor's	119	25%	20	19%	5	45%	3	13%	25	23%	75	26%	141	26%	19	25%	61	30%	0	0%
1+ parent w/ bachelor's	106	22%	23	22%	1	9%	6	25%	26	23%	83	29%	138	25%	18	24%	55	27%	3	38%
1+ parent w/ master's/prof	177	37%	47	46%	5	45%	12	50%	42	38%	90	32%	192	35%	29	39%	65	32%	5	63%
1+ parent with PhD	75	16%	13	13%	0	0%	3	13%	18	16%	36	13%	77	14%	9	12%	25	12%	0	0%
Disability (Q13)																				
Disabled	109	23%	35	34%	6	55%	4	17%	23	21%	59	21%	120	22%	22	29%	56	27%	0	0%
Non-disabled	365	77%	65	63%	5	45%	19	79%	87	78%	224	79%	426	78%	52	69%	149	72%	7	88%
Total respondents	477		103		11		24		111		284		548		75		206		8	

Table 2.12: Demographics by Granting Agency

	American Association of University Women				American Philosophical Society				Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (Stanford)				Dumbarton Oaks			
	Applicants		Recipients		Applicants		Recipients		Applicants		Recipients		Applicants		Recipients	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Gender (Q2, Q3)																
Cisgender men	0	0%	1	7%	34	32%	13	34%	6	27%	3	38%	19	29%	7	30%
Cisgender women	120	96%	13	87%	68	64%	21	55%	15	68%	5	63%	45	69%	16	70%
People of other genders	5	4%	1	7%	5	5%	4	11%	1	5%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
Sexuality (Q4)																
Heterosexual	98	78%	12	80%	80	75%	29	76%	18	82%	6	75%	55	85%	21	91%
Non-heterosexual	27	22%	3	20%	27	25%	9	24%	4	18%	2	25%	10	15%	2	9%
Nationality, Race (Q5, Q7, Q9)																
U.S. white	88	70%	9	60%	71	66%	26	68%	13	59%	4	50%	48	74%	19	83%
U.S. non-white	23	18%	4	27%	22	21%	6	16%	6	27%	3	38%	5	8%	1	4%
Non-U.S. non-minoritized	10	8%	1	7%	9	8%	4	11%	1	5%	0	0%	9	14%	2	9%
Non-U.S. minoritized	4	3%	1	7%	5	5%	2	5%	2	9%	1	13%	3	5%	1	4%
Highest Level of Education (Q10)																
<Bachelor's	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Bachelor's	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Master's/Professional	15	12%	2	13%	31	29%	6	16%	0	0%	0	0%	14	22%	3	13%
Ph.D./D.Phil.	108	86%	13	87%	74	69%	32	84%	22	100%	8	100%	51	78%	20	87%
Parents' Education (Q11, Q12)																
0 parents w/bachelor's	17	14%	2	13%	21	20%	11	29%	4	18%	2	25%	12	18%	4	17%
1+ parent w/ bachelor's	32	26%	4	27%	23	21%	6	16%	3	14%	1	13%	15	23%	7	30%
1+ parent w/ master's/prof	46	37%	6	40%	44	41%	13	34%	9	41%	2	25%	25	38%	9	39%
1+ parent with PhD	30	24%	3	20%	19	18%	8	21%	6	27%	3	38%	13	20%	3	13%
Disability (Q13)																
Disabled	34	27%	5	33%	25	23%	10	26%	4	18%	0	0%	8	12%	3	13%
Non-disabled	89	71%	8	53%	82	77%	28	74%	17	77%	7	88%	56	86%	20	87%
Total respondents	125		15		107		38		22		8		65		23	

	Explorers' Club				Ford Foundation				Fulbright-Hays				Fulbright IIE			
	Applicants		Recipients		Applicants		Recipients		Applicants		Recipients		Applicants		Recipients	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Gender (Q2, Q3)																
Cisgender men	23	34%	6	40%	28	29%	13	46%	40	30%	23	34%	39	26%	28	32%
Cisgender women	43	63%	9	60%	63	64%	15	54%	84	63%	38	57%	101	68%	56	64%
People of other genders	2	3%	0	0%	7	7%	0	0%	9	7%	6	9%	8	5%	4	5%
Sexuality (Q4)																
Heterosexual	57	84%	13	87%	72	73%	23	82%	107	80%	57	85%	116	78%	71	81%
non-heterosexual	11	16%	2	13%	26	27%	5	18%	26	20%	10	15%	32	22%	17	19%
Nationality, Race (Q5, Q7, Q9)																
U.S. white	51	75%	13	87%	38	39%	13	46%	103	77%	54	81%	120	81%	69	78%
U.S. non-white	9	13%	1	7%	51	52%	12	43%	22	17%	10	15%	19	13%	13	15%
Non-U.S. non-minoritized	7	10%	1	7%	3	3%	1	4%	6	5%	3	4%	5	3%	4	5%
Non-U.S. minoritized	1	1%	0	0%	6	6%	2	7%	2	2%	0	0%	4	3%	2	2%
Highest Level of Education (Q10)																
<Bachelor's	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Bachelor's	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%
Master's/Professional	21	31%	5	33%	26	27%	2	7%	12	9%	6	9%	20	14%	13	15%
PhD/DPhil	47	69%	10	67%	70	71%	26	93%	120	90%	61	91%	125	84%	74	84%
Parents' Education (Q11, Q12)																
0 parents w/bachelor's	17	25%	5	33%	28	29%	10	36%	25	19%	10	15%	26	18%	12	14%
1+ parent w/ bachelor's	11	16%	3	20%	18	18%	3	11%	29	22%	16	24%	33	22%	17	19%
1+ parent w/ master's/prof	31	46%	5	33%	33	34%	9	32%	45	34%	22	33%	57	39%	33	38%
1+ parent with PhD	9	13%	2	13%	19	19%	6	21%	34	26%	19	28%	32	22%	26	30%
Disability (Q13)																
Disabled	19	28%	5	33%	26	27%	5	18%	21	16%	10	15%	21	14%	10	11%
Non-disabled	47	69%	10	67%	71	72%	22	79%	111	83%	56	84%	127	86%	78	89%
Total respondents	68		15		98		28		133		67		148		88	

	Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton)				Leakey Foundation				National Endowment for the Humanities				National Geographic Society			
	Applicants		Recipients		Applicants		Recipients		Applicants		Recipients		Applicants		Recipients	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Gender (Q2, Q3)																
Cisgender men	10	29%	1	20%	13	28%	7	29%	84	40%	44	49%	80	38%	49	46%
Cisgender women	21	62%	4	80%	33	72%	17	71%	115	55%	44	49%	122	58%	57	53%
People of other genders	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	10	5%	2	2%	9	4%	1	1%
Sexuality (Q4)																
Heterosexual	27	79%	5	100%	40	87%	22	92%	177	85%	77	86%	178	84%	93	87%
non-heterosexual	7	21%	0	0%	6	13%	2	8%	32	15%	13	14%	33	16%	14	13%
Nationality, Race (Q5, Q7, Q9)																
U.S. white	23	68%	4	80%	32	70%	17	71%	159	76%	78	87%	163	77%	85	79%
U.S. non-white	4	12%	1	20%	7	15%	4	17%	34	16%	6	7%	19	9%	5	5%
Non-U.S. non-minoritized	3	9%	0	0%	7	15%	3	13%	12	6%	3	3%	26	12%	16	15%
Non-U.S. minoritized	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	2%	3	3%	3	1%	1	1%
Highest Level of Education (Q10)																
<Bachelor's	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Bachelor's	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%
Master's/Professional	0	0%	0	0%	6	13%	1	4%	0	0%	5	6%	40	19%	8	7%
PhD/DPhil	33	97%	5	100%	39	85%	23	96%	192	92%	85	94%	169	80%	99	93%
Parents' Education (Q11, Q12)																
0 parents w/bachelor's	3	9%	1	20%	7	15%	4	17%	48	23%	17	19%	47	22%	25	23%
1+ parent w/ bachelor's	8	24%	1	20%	10	22%	4	17%	48	23%	25	28%	49	23%	24	22%
1+ parent w/ master's/prof	15	44%	1	20%	18	39%	8	33%	74	35%	32	36%	74	35%	35	33%
1+ parent with PhD	8	24%	2	40%	11	24%	8	33%	39	19%	16	18%	41	19%	23	21%
Disability (Q13)																
Disabled	6	18%	1	20%	10	22%	7	29%	42	20%	15	17%	42	20%	18	17%
non-disabled	28	82%	4	80%	35	76%	17	71%	165	79%	74	82%	166	79%	88	82%
Total respondents	34		5		46		24		209		90		211		107	

	National Science Foundation				Point Foundation				School for Advanced Research				Social Science Research Council				Wenner-Gren Foundation			
	Applicants		Recipients		Applicants		Recipients		Applicants		Recipients		Applicants		Recipients		Applicants		Recipients	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Gender (Q2, Q3)																				
Cisgender men	204	35%	128	36%	2	40%	2	100%	27	26%	10	29%	59	30%	20	33%	150	30%	69	34%
Cisgender women	349	60%	214	60%	1	20%	0	0%	72	70%	24	69%	122	63%	34	56%	310	63%	119	59%
People of other genders	33	6%	14	4%	2	40%	0	0%	4	4%	1	3%	14	7%	7	11%	32	7%	14	7%
Sexuality (Q4)																				
Heterosexual	450	77%	283	79%	1	20%	0	0%	80	78%	31	89%	142	73%	42	69%	376	76%	161	80%
non-heterosexual	136	23%	73	21%	4	80%	2	100%	23	22%	4	11%	53	27%	19	31%	116	24%	41	20%
Nationality, Race (Q5, Q7, Q9)																				
U.S. white	437	75%	280	79%	2	40%	1	50%	77	75%	25	71%	116	59%	31	51%	334	68%	140	69%
U.S. non-white	94	16%	49	14%	3	60%	1	50%	12	12%	6	17%	34	17%	11	18%	76	15%	30	15%
Non-U.S. non-minoritized	39	7%	20	6%	0	0%	0	0%	9	9%	2	6%	29	15%	14	23%	57	12%	21	10%
Non-U.S. minoritized	16	3%	7	2%	0	0%	0	0%	5	5%	2	6%	16	8%	5	8%	25	5%	11	5%
Highest Level of Education (Q10)																				
<Bachelor's	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Bachelor's	11	2%	7	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	4	1%	1	0%
Master's/Professional	103	18%	48	13%	1	20%	0	0%	8	8%	1	3%	34	17%	16	26%	84	17%	17	8%
PhD/DPhil	464	79%	296	83%	4	80%	2	100%	95	92%	34	97%	155	79%	44	72%	400	81%	181	90%
Parents' Education (Q11, Q12)																				
0 parents w/bachelor's	121	21%	78	22%	1	20%	0	0%	14	14%	9	26%	41	21%	17	28%	112	23%	42	21%
1+ parent w/ bachelor's	135	23%	79	22%	2	40%	1	50%	23	22%	8	23%	43	22%	14	23%	111	23%	48	24%
1+ parent w/ master's/prof	226	39%	140	39%	2	40%	1	50%	43	42%	10	29%	72	37%	17	28%	184	37%	77	38%
1+ parent with PhD	104	18%	59	17%	0	0%	0	0%	23	22%	8	23%	39	20%	13	21%	85	17%	35	17%
Disability (Q13)																				
Disabled	134	23%	77	22%	2	40%	0	0%	20	19%	5	14%	43	22%	10	16%	113	23%	39	19%
non-disabled	447	76%	277	78%	3	60%	2	100%	82	80%	29	83%	151	77%	51	84%	377	77%	162	80%
Total respondents	586		356		5		2		103		35		195		61		492		202	

Table 2.13: Results of Statistical Tests about Bias in Review Processes

This table shows the *p* values resulting from χ^2 tests comparing the identities of successful and unsuccessful applicants to each agency.

Applicant Identities Compared

Agency Applied To	Cisgender men applicants vs. cisgender women applicants	Cisgender men applicants vs. cisgender women applicants vs. applicants of other genders	Heterosexual applicants vs. non-heterosexual applicants	U.S. white applicants vs. U.S. non-white applicants	non-U.S. non-minoritized applicants vs. non-U.S. minoritized applicants	U.S. applicants vs. non-U.S. applicants	applicants w/ 0 parents w/bachelor's vs. applicants w/ 1+ parents w/ bachelor's vs. applicants w/ 1+ parent w/ master's/prof. vs. applicants w/ 1+ parent w/ Ph.D.	Disabled applicants vs. non-disabled applicants
American Association of University Women								
American Philosophical Society	0.4577		0.7842	0.4201			0.2082	0.5924
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences								
Dumbarton Oaks	0.9219							
Ford Foundation	0.0309		0.2187	0.2674			0.5597	0.2525
Fulbright-Hays	0.2017		0.1755	0.5526			0.6159	0.8119
Fulbright IIE	0.0767		0.4097	0.3685			0.0276	0.2329
Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton)								
Leakey Foundation	0.8867							
National Endowment for the Humanities	0.0476		0.7622	0.0008			0.4228	0.2857
National Geographic Society	0.0431		0.2999	0.0331		0.3590	0.8024	0.2396
National Science Foundation	0.7389	0.0806	0.0539	0.0305	0.6118	0.0628	0.6102	0.3484
Point Foundation								
School for Advanced Research	0.7296		0.0567					0.3779
Social Science Research Council	0.4059		0.4007	0.5203	0.2683	0.0711	0.2554	0.1900
Wenner-Gren Foundation	0.1195	0.2832	0.1526	0.6965	0.5407	0.6819	0.8368	0.5709

Key:

Color	*p*	Interpretation
		sample was too small to evaluate
	>0.1	the review and granting process does not favor applicants of different identities in this category
	0.05–0.1	the review and granting process may tend to favor applicants of one identity, but the test does not show statistical significance
	<0.05	the review and granting process favors applicants of one identity, and the test shows statistical significance; privileged applicants are favored (i.e. cisgender men over cisgender women, white people over non-white people, applicants with a parent with a Ph.D. over applicants with less-educated parents)
	<0.05	the review and granting process favors applicants of one identity, and the test shows statistical significance; non-privileged applicants are favored (i.e. cisgender women over cisgender men)

Results Part 3: Qualitative Results

Q36: Do you find feedback you have received from funding proposal reviewers helpful and constructive? Why or why not?

STRONG FEELINGS

This question elicited strong feelings from many respondents. The answers were full of stories of feedback received and the emotional responses it elicited. Some of these were positive, with respondents expressing gratitude for the thoughtful comments of reviewers and for grant program directors who passed those comments along or who chose not to pass along abusive comments. Many of the lengthiest responses told stories of frustration and discouragement as a result of cruel, careless, vague, brief, or unfair feedback or a complete lack of feedback other than the acceptance or rejection of the grant. Inconsistency in feedback between reviewers, disparity between positive feedback and a rejection of the proposal, and contradictory feedback received in different rounds of application for revisions of the same proposal elicited particular frustration.

On the other hand, one respondent was surprised that anyone might feel differently than she did, writing that, "of course [she finds feedback helpful]. who doesn't? If the applicant doesn't, that's on them. Unless it's a renegade reviewer -- and they are rare -- the advice should be treated as valuable help *for free.*" Overall, it was clear that feedback from reviewers looms large, and that work by granting agencies to elicit constructive criticism from reviewers and share that with applicants can make a significant difference in grant applicants' experiences of the process.

VARYING DEGREES OF USEFULNESS OF FEEDBACK

Even though 80% of respondents said that feedback was at least sometimes helpful, most respondents did give qualified answers, with many saying that feedback was helpful with some exceptions, unhelpful with some exceptions, or varied. Respondents pointed out a variety of reasons why feedback varied in its qualities.

In some cases, respondents attributed the variation to reviewers themselves, describing some as more open-minded and dedicated to providing constructive criticism and others as mean, cruel, or devoted to gatekeeping in their subfield. Similarly, respondents complained that reviewers often criticized their work for using different methods, paradigms, or theoretical frames than the reviewer preferred, rather than on the merit of those methods, paradigms, or theories for addressing the specific research question.

Many respondents, however, also referenced the conditions under which grants are reviewed, suggesting that between large numbers of proposals to review and many other professional and personal commitments, reviewers are simply too overwhelmed to provide the kind of specific and constructive criticism they might otherwise like to write. This lack of quality attention paid to proposals manifested in brief feedback, criticisms focused on points that were clearly addressed in the proposal, comments focused nearly exclusively on the abstracts of the proposals, and feedback that indicated that the reviewer did not have the specialized knowledge required to understand the proposal fully. Furthermore, many respondents expressed frustration that their proposal would be reviewed by one person, they would revise based on that feedback and resubmit, and then a different reviewer would write the opposite critique in the next round: the lack of availability of the same reviewers from round to round led to inconsistency. All of these are elements of academic life under neoliberal capitalism: as processes of adjunctification advance, full-time faculty are left with ever-growing service burdens that make it difficult for them to do any of

their work to the level of quality that they might wish (Berg and Seeber 2016; Childress 2019; Nishida 2016).

Staff at granting agencies were also mentioned often: some respondents expressed gratitude for their guidance through the process while others criticized them for passing on cruel comments to applicants and still others acknowledged that the funding agencies themselves are overworked and overwhelmed. The National Science Foundation's Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grant program received particular praise as a program through which applicants receive substantial and constructive feedback on their proposals. Overall, respondents praised foundation staff who make themselves available to discuss proposals and reviewer feedback, and who perform processes of quality control on reviewer feedback before forwarding it to applicants.

Finally, many applicants complained that they received no feedback at all, beyond a simple acceptance or rejection, on proposals they had spent hours writing. Indeed, of the 589 respondents to this question, 40 claimed that they had never received reviewer feedback on a grant proposal, and many others noted that they had only received feedback on some of their proposals, depending on the granting agency. Despite the problems with much reviewer feedback, the entire lack of feedback seemed in some ways worse, since it does not give applicants any guidance on how to proceed with their projects.

DIFFERING EXPERIENCES OF REVIEWER FEEDBACK BY IDENTITY OF RESPONDENT

Men were more likely to have overall positive experiences with peer review than women were, with approximately half of cisgender respondents and about one third of cisgender women respondents giving answers indicating that feedback is generally helpful. Although the sample is small, it seems that people other than cisgender men and cisgender women have a particularly difficult experience, with 14 of 35 respondents in this category indicating that reviewer feedback was generally unhelpful. When all responses had been coded as "yes" (feedback is usually or always helpful), "sometimes", or "no" (feedback is rarely or never helpful) and the responses of people of different genders (see table 1.04) were compared, a χ^2 text indicated that this disparity is statistically significant ($p = 0.000817$).

This discrepancy was also visible qualitatively, a number of women respondents indicated having received misogynistic comments from reviewers, characterizing some of these reviewers as "misogynistic and sexist males" or "older angry men who don't want anyone to move into their field." One respondent had received a comment that "women should not do fieldwork" on a grant proposal! Another wrote,

> Unsuccessful (three times) NEH application was denied because one reviewer --and they had only this one, the same one-- said I wasn't qualified because I don't have a Ph.D. in History, and the research involved archival work--this was a clear gatekeeping move from a senior man who wanted to create a subfield he could (and did) dominate.

This sense of territoriality and hostility was especially common in the comments of women describing reviews from older men.

Respondents with at least one parent with at least an undergraduate degree were also statistically significantly more likely to find reviewer feedback helpful than those who had been first generation college students (χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0208$), although there were not comments about classist remarks. It is unclear from these data whether this disparity is the result of classist disparities in the kind of feedback received, different levels of preparedness to write a grant proposal shaping the quality of the proposal submitted and therefore the feedback, a sense of belonging (or lack thereof) in the academy shaping how feedback feels, or other factors.

White people from the U.S. were more likely to find feedback productive than non-white people from the US, but again, the result was not statistically significant (p=0.296). Some anthropologists had, however, received racist feedback from reviewers: one wrote, "I found some thinly veiled racist comments by an NSF panel very discouraging," and a white respondent received comments from a reviewer saying that they would have gotten the grant "if they were BIPOC."

The disparity across identities was also visible between straight and non-straight people, although it did not rise to the level of statistical significance, with a χ^2 test yielding a p of 0.0631, and no one mentioned heterosexist feedback. Similarly, non-disabled people felt more positive about the feedback they had received than disabled people did, but the disparity was not statistically significant (p = 0.527)

FULL RESULTS (ALL ANSWERS, UNEDITED, IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

- ?
- absolutely, especially from NSF, although wish they had been more explicit about encouraging me to reapply; which when I asked, they did encourage it!
- Absolutely. It's always great to get some guidance from folks on the inside.
- Absolutely. They often see gaps that, when filled, make the proposal and proposed research stronger.
- Almost never. Sometimes it seems like they didn't read it, other times they did and didn't understand it, other times they say it would have been accepted if I were BIPOC.
- As with other peer reviews, if the organization (or editor) does not try to interpret or integrate the suggestions they may be so wildly contradictory as to not be helpful. One advantage the editor/Program Officer has over the author is contact with the reviewers for clarification. Editors/POs almost never read the reviews from the point of view of the author to try to figure out how to use the feedback to improve the project.
- At the time of applying as a graduate student, I did not know I could ask for feedback and/or feedback was not granted.
- At times. Sometimes the proposals are clearly sent to reviewers who are predisposed to be hostile (I'm looking at you, NSF). When I get a spread that includes 2 excellents, 1 very good, and 1 reject, it is clear that the reviewer pool is imbalanced.
- Because I received no feedback on my rejected proposal, it wasn't particularly helpful
- Because of they helped me to sharpen my research proposal that is anthropological methods as well as writing skills as a non native English speaker.
- Certainly. For unsuccessful grants it has given an understanding of how close we came to getting funding and pointed to concerns reviewers had.
- Comments are often random; some helpful, some seem boilerplate and even unfair
- Definitely from Wenner-Gren and SSHRC. Others no.
- Definitely. I believe that the most helpful feedback that I received was from students who had received the grants and fellowships that I applied to.
- Depending on the agency, it tends to be a mixed bag. overall I have found their feedback useful, and successfully rewrote a proposal that had been rejected the prior year. But in every round of applications there are invariably reviewers whose comments were very unhelpful.
- depends on organization; in many cases fb indicates that readers did not understand my project (i tend not to stay inside disciplinary boxes , for example working at the intersection of design and anthropology -- anthros who know about design but do not DO design have a

hard time reviewing my work which usually proposes to make something. I'm aware that if I proposed more "middle of the road" projects I'd be more likely to be funded. I'm at the point where I just want to do what I do and it's easier to use my own money since my research doesn't require massive funds. This is possible now that I'm relatively senior, have an ok salary, and a partner who makes good money -- plus my research sites are not too far away. I'd rather spend my time doing the work than trying to get funding to do the work.

- Depends on the agency. Yes, if the feedback can be used to the next proposal and the agency will send out the proposal to the same reviewers in the next app cycle.
- Depends on the granting agency - however, typically the reviews are not always helpful as different reviewers are used in different cycles -
- Depends on the reviewer
- Depends on the reviewer! When it's not useful, it's usually because it's because the reviewer "didn't like" something, but there's either no suggestions for how to fix the issue, or the proposed fix is so radical that it would substantially change the project.
- Depends on the source. All three W-G proposals were funded, which moots feedback, as was the Leakey. NEH feedback was useless, dealing almost entirely with two things: doubts that my institutional affiliation provided sufficient support, a polite way of saying that they didn't like where I was from, and vague, diffuse comments. NSF feedback was somewhat useful. It rarely exhibited the least concern with institutional resources or where I was from--comments almost always were about the projects, their importance, and our ability to complete them.
- Didn’t receive any feedback
- Don't recall any feedback
- Early “pre-review” has been very helpfil
- Feedback falls in two categories: brief positive comments; long negative comments that more often than not could be paraphrased "my theoretical perspective is different from your's" so your proposal sucks
- Feedback from NSF reviewers was cursory at best (one offered advice that revealed they had not read the application thoroughly, asking a Q about language training that was in the application). Feedback from Wenner Gren reviewers in the first round was decent, but the second round were different reviewers who did not understand how the resubmission had been reshaped.
- Feedback from reviewers were helpful because they addressed aspects of the project can could be refined even further.
- Feedback has been mixed, and frankly in my own experience my feedback from NSF (where I successfully received funding after revising a first submission) was much more positive than my experience with Wenner-Gren. The biggest reason to me with this is that peer review in NSF's archaeology DDIG was responsive, targeted to specialists in the region I work in, and reasonable. I had a decent (though not accepted) first draft and the second draft answered my reviewers' concerns, *who then were retained as reviewers the second time*. Meanwhile, my two attempts at Wenner-Gren were much more opaque, with no sense that specialists in my region (or even field of archaeology versus sociocultural anthro) were reviewing my proposal. Further, a second proposal which answers the first attempt's concerns are not seen by the same reviewers - there is no sense of a growing dialogue on how to improve the application and receive funds. Where I felt I learned something from my time working with NSF (and there were reasonable expectations that were followed by all

parties), WG felt like a roll of the dice. There are benefits and pitfalls of having a pure lottery system, but a lottery masquerading as meritocracy is structurally violent and reproduces the class inequalities of our academic world.

- Feedback is not always readily available from all grants. Most just sent a rejection. Feedback is helpful to have when available.
- Feedback is not constructive because reviewers are narrow-minded.
- Feedback is sometimes helpful in rewriting and reconceptualizing the application, but other times, it has been minimal and mostly positive, leaving me unsure as to what to improve in order to be successful in the next application round.
- Feedback was extremely helpful. Every successful grant I have received included at least one round of rigorous feedback.
- Feedback was generally vague--references number and caliber of applications received without specific recommendations for improving my application.
- Few were constructive and others were not.
- For most of my applications, I have received no feedback at all. When I have received it, I have usually found it helpful.
- For my dissertation research grants, feedback on rejection and acceptance was helpful. Not so much for writing or post-dissertation research/work/funding.
- For one proposal, I never received any feedback. For another, it was mixed. Some feedback was useful, while there were a few reviewers that made it very obvious in their comments they had issues with my advisor (who would serve as the PI on the grant). It was also apparent to me a few years later some of the seemingly excessive critiques I received were also to avoid competition with a project they wanted to conduct.
- For some granting agencies yes, the comments were generous and helped me to improve my research. In one instance, not at all because the reviewers seemed to wish me to do an entirely different project because they thought that is what anthropologists "should" study as opposed to engaging with what I was actually proposing.
- For the most part yes. Some negative reviewers reject ideas without providing constructive feedback but that is the minority in my experience. In multiple cases positive and constructive feedback helped me resubmit much improved proposals the second time through the submission process.
- For the most part yes. However, I found that many comments by Wenner-Gren reviewers were not constructive and frankly unfounded as they were either: a) addressed in the proposal; or b) based on an outdated understanding of methodology - i.e. size of samples needed for AMS radiocarbon dating.
- For the most part yes. However, some reviewers had unrealistic expectations about the extent that a dissertation research project can achieve (especially for field research projects).
- For the most part, yes, although sometimes it can be way off base.
- For the most part, yes. Most reviews have been straightforward and helpful. Anthropology is, of course, full of snarky types, but even from them some guidance can be gleaned.
- For the most part, yes. The peer reviewers gave (for the most part) very helpful advice, however the granting agency head was largely critical in contrast with the findings of the peer reviewers.

- For WG, NSF, NEH, YES, absolutely! For EU MSCA, got one ridiculous reviewer that sunk the application by deducting points for things not in the proposal (not omissions) It was a bit nuts.
- Ford foundation not so much all of my reviewers were vague with their feedback. The same for applying for NSF.
- From NSF the funding has been helpful and constructive. Wenner Gren feedback has been all over the place, arbitrary and inconsistent. Resubmissions don't seem to take into account previous feedback at Wenner Gren. Also recent changes in leadership have felt pretty chaotic in the application process with too much guidance, contradictory instructions, and snarky reviewers.
- From peers and colleagues always yes, from federal funding agencies it is rarely provided, limited, or not useful.
- From the people who care -- yes. From those who are tired and in a bad mood, I wish they would stop reviewing.
- Generally helpful
- Generally I only received feedback from proposal reviewers if my proposal was approved for funding (specifically, Wenner-Gren dissertation research grant and Engaged Anthropology grant, and NSF's GRFP). The feedback was generally useful, detailed, and encouraging at that point (having been approved) and occasionally helped me refine the research that I was able to carry out with the funding. I never received feedback on applications/proposals that seemed to have been rejected early in the review process, which would have been extremely helpful for revising or taking the proposal elsewhere. I did receive minimal feedback (mainly a question to clarify the need for something in my budget) during the review process for Wenner-Gren's dissertation fieldwork grant which allowed me to provide a response and the proposal was eventually approved. I don't remember the request for clarification being especially detailed or containing any specific feedback, which certainly caused a lot of stress/panic but did ultimately allow me space to improve and clarify an issue that may have ultimately prevented the proposal from being funded.
- Generally not- reviewers tend to be focused on their work not an applicants work
- Generally speaking, yes. The hardest thing is when you don't receive any feedback for why you weren't funded (e.g. National Geographic) so you have no idea whether you should re-apply or how to fix any problems.
- Generally the feedback is confusing or contradictory.
- Generally yes - only occasionally not useful.
- Generally yes--but mixed
- Generally yes, but sometimes the comments are petty and are meant to reinforce the status and research careers of the reviewers rather than the applicants.
- generally yes, though there are always quibbles
- Generally, although there isn't much from Wenner-Gren.
- Generally, yes, since feedback helps to improve the grant for the next round of submissions, and may bring up a point I had not yet thought of. But, feedback has been unhelpful (i.e., ignored by me) when my methods were questioned (i.e., why are you 3D scanning and not microscribing?) because those are decisions I have made with research team and am not going to change. Of course, bringing up a new test or asking for clarification regarding a specific method is fine, and can be helpful.

- Generally, yes, though there is usually not a great deal of feedback in my experience.
- Generally. I have found that my NSF DDRIG proposals received the most helpful and constructive feedback. The NEH and Wenner-Gren feedback has been less helpful simply because it was less detailed and specific (and seemed more in the service of the reviewer than the applicant).
- Grant reviews have been highly variable, from very useful and constructive to "did they even read it?"
- Have never received feedback
- Have not yet had a chance to apply to major granting agencies as I only just became ABD, so I've only been able to apply to smaller entities that do not provided proposal reviews. I would greatly appreciate the feedback if that had been an option, however, so I could better strategize for future funding applications.
- Helpful, but I have never been rejected for a grant. This is largely because I have only applied for three small grants.
- helps to know expectations
- I am still waiting for feedback from WG. Have not received feedback from any other agencies
- I applied to a NSF GRFP in 2014 and did not find the responses useful - I only got the info from one of three reviewers. While some of their comments were helpful, mostly their position seemed opposed to the quantitative research paradigm I proposed.
- I did not find it helpful or constructive at all. The reviews were positive but provided no feedback. The one negative review said "applicant does not have enough publications," when I was in my first semester of graduate school. I then felt discouraged to apply to national-level funding.
- I did not receive feedback from reviewers.
- I did not receive proposal feedback from the reviewers, but did receive the funding. (NSF)
- I did not see the reviewers' comments for all grants. Only NSF. I found the comments knit-picky and not very helpful.
- I do not always agree with reviewer comments. However, the comments on rejected proposals are always essential for re-thinking the proposal.
- I don't recall ever receiving feedback from reviewers.
- I find it useful as it provides insight into how I can better the proposal moving forward.
- I found it helpful when feedback illuminated the decision-process of reviewers and clearly highlighted gaps or lack of clarity in a proposal. I have also found, based on informal oral feedback, that formal written feedback doesn't always reflect the full reviewer conversations or decisions.
- I found it incredibly helpful. Feedback from reviewers and the granting agency allowed our resubmission to be successful.
- I found the feedback to be unhelpful. Readers comments said my weakness was the area in which I had done the most work (public outreach) which suggested they were looking for something to say rather than meaningfully engaged.
- I had mostly positive experience. Reviewers were critical but supportive in their comments. I recall one reviewer being unnecessarily harsh and giving no ways to improve the project. As the research was eventually supported by multiple granting agencies and I have now

published several articles in major peer-reviewed journals, that reader had not been generous in their readings of a PhD student's research.

- I have been able to read feedback from both my NSF GRFP and the NSF DDRIG proposals. They are in my opinion moderately helpful. I have never received a "reviewer 2" type of review, but if you have submitted a competitive grant, I feel like successful vs. unsuccessful reviews often sounds almost exactly the same. It's also often clear that reviewers have fixated on things of interest to them at the expense of things that may be more important to the project itself (or only read parts of it). Some reviewers clearly read it thoroughly and provide useful and constructive feedback, but most are somewhere in the middle.
- I have been unable to receive feedback on my proposals thus far.
- I have found feedback from funding proposal reviewers, when this was provided, to be really helpful, especially for rethinking my project and reapplying. However, not all granting agencies provided feedback.
- I have found it very useful to understand why a grant was not funded. Even if I disagree, comments provide the best means of revising proposals.
- I have never received feedback from funding proposal reviewers
- I have never received feedback on an unsuccessful proposal. All proposals that were rejected (AAUW, CAORC) offered no feedback.
- I have not received feedback from reviewers in the grants that I have applied for.
- I have not received formal feedback as part of grant processes but I have received feedback from reviewers as part of internal university processes. I have mixed feeling about this feedback. On one hand, getting any feedback is helpful to see how people perceive not just the proposed research but also the structure/form of the grants (which seems to be as important as the topic of research). On the other, feedback tends to pull you in all sorts of directions and as a result can result in a less cohesive proposal if you are trying to please everyone.
- I have only received feedback from NSF reviewers, which was not particularly helpful in my case. (I got the grant on the first try.) Still, I wish more funding agencies would give feedback to applicants. Otherwise, it's impossible to know how to imprave and whether one should reapply.
- I have received a good deal of extremely useful feedback on proposals I have submitted in the past as well as some not very constructive reviews as well. In balance, I would say that I've received considerably more constructive feedback that non-constructive feedback. When I have applied for grants within archaeology/anthropology and nearby fields I think I have mostly received constructive to neutral feedback. As I've veered into interdisciplinary grant programs and grant programs in fields further afield from anthropology/archaeology (like informatics, statistics, etc.) I've more often run into reviews that reject a particular approach or dataset out of hand without deeply engaging with it. With NSF at least I have found program officers to be quite aware of such issues with interdisciplinary and even harsh feedback hasn't always sunk grants that were otherwise a good fit for the program in question and appreciated by disciplinary reviewers. I also think that the way I receive feedback has also changed over the course of my career. When I was first starting out writing grants I took any criticism very hard and very personally. These days I'm more likely to search for the nugget of useful criticism in even the harshest reviews and I don't really take it personally. I am aware that a large part of this is that I'm now in a stable position and

missing a grant in one cycle isn't the disaster it might have seemed it was when I was an early career researcher.

- I have received conflicting comments from reviewers a) for the same submission; b) a resubmission to adjust to reviewers comments was criticized for not being the previous version. I have also received constructive criticism. I have also received mean spirited criticism. (Let them work on the project for a couple of years and come back if it's a success.) That's not helpful for an application for early stage research.
- I have received little feedback from funding proposal reviews. Had I received such feedback, it would have undoubtedly been helpful.
- I have received three reviews. Two reviews were definitely, extremely helpful which helped me better hone and frame the conceptual stake of my research. However, one review was found to be not much helpful, but discouraging. It was quite confusing that the point of this review contradicted the parts of my proposal which was welcomed by the other reviews.
- I have received very, very little feedback
- I have; it helps reframe the study to be more productive
- I haven't really received any.
- I haven't received much, so I can't really say.
- I honestly don't remember any of the feedback I got on either of my major grants
- I love getting reviewer feedback, even if it is not necessarily constructive. Otherwise the app process is a total black box.
- I really appreciated the feedback provided by my NSF reviewers, I found it constructive and specific, providing me with explicit concerns/critiques in addition to reinforcement/praise.
- I submit about 3 to 4 NSF proposals a year, sometimes without my name on the proposal. Some feedback is helpful, some feedback is not helpful. It kind of depends on the review panel.
- I think it has mostly been constructive criticism.
- I was awarded SSRC funding on my first attempt, but still felt the feedback was useful in terms of refining/developing my project - the feedback I got from my first application to Wenner-Gren was relatively helpful, but the second application received was pretty cruel and really seemed to come from a place of not understanding archival/digital methods in archaeology. For context, I was applying during the pandemic and at the time Wenner-Gren were basically not approving fieldwork-based projects
- I was not offered any feedback
- I would find feedback from funding proposal reviewers helpful, however I did not receive any comments from the reviewers the last time I applied for funding.
- I've had excellent and 'less helpful' feedback. Part of this stems from long-held biases from reviewers and granting officers assessing research proposed for the Mediterranean basin.
- If offered in a helpful and constructive manner—I had critical but useful feedback on a Wenner-Gren Dissertation Fieldwork Grant, which led me to resubmit. I also had feedback that was so unnecessarily unkind on an NSF-GRFP that I haven't applied for anything from the NSF since.
- If there is feedback, it is sometimes useful; e.g., from the NSF and the NEH has a pre-proposal feedback option. Wenner-Gren feedback made it clear that people outside my subdiscipline did not like my subdiscipline, and the comments were irrelevant. National Geographic, Dumbarton Oaks, and others do not have feedback.

- In a way. I learned from the documentation I received through FOA request that my PhD Chair was sabotaging my applications and had to change my committee. Granting agency didn't provide that info easily.
- IN case of high stakes grants feedback from colleagues v important
- In general, feedback was valuable. Some reviewers have lacked the background to understand some aspects of my submitted proposals.
- In general, getting feedback is central to my decision to apply, because it helps push my work forward even if I am not funded. It justifies applying multiple times for a grant even if it has a history of bias towards Ivy Leage institutions (I am from a public university). However, there are cases when there's only one substantive comment, which is not enough to gauge general responses to the project.
- In general, yes, but it can be frustrating because you know that the next panel of reviewers will be different people who may have different concerns.
- In general, yes. But it is often pretty curt. Given the volume assigned to reviewers, I understand why. But it can still sting to have someone write something that implies the work isn't good.
- In my early years, there was virtually no such feedback, either positive or negative. Then and on other occasions, when I have been turned down, I was not told why.
- In my experience, comments have rarely been written with an eye to assisting the applicant in improving the application for resubmission. The comments seemed more geared toward justifying the rejection. I totally understand, as reviewers are doing their reviews on top of everything else they have going on, but it would be nice to hear ways it could be improved. My dissertation project was interdisciplinary, so I got a lot of "this seems really interesting, but it's history" from the anthropology funding orgs and "... but she's an anthropologist" from the history funding orgs. This feedback did help me to rewrite with an eye toward being explicitly anthropological and I did then get funding, so I suppose it was helpful in the end.
- In one occasion, not helpful at all. The Wenner-Gren has (or had?) a requirement that one had to reach out to them to inquire about conference funding. As soon as they read two emails from me, in which I explained that participants in the conference were going to discuss archaeometry and how it is practiced in different countries in Latin America, they made the point to send me a letter by post to tell me that I was construing the sort of variety of perspectives that they wanted in a simplistic manner. They did not even bother learning why or how perspectives from all over Latin America could possibly be diverse and make for an interesting theoretical and methodological discussion. It sounded like the Wenner-Gren thought that simply because the participants were from Latin America, they must not have anything interesting to say.
- In some cases an application was rejected but I was allowed to revise and reapply. In those cases, feedback on earlier applications was useful.
- In some cases yes. But most of the time it is not specific.
- In some cases, they are super helpful. In some cases, they seems to be personal comments against people on my committee
- in the case of rejections, the feedback is thin or even non-existent and thus not really helpful
- In the cases when I've been able to revise and resubmit a grant proposal, feedback has been crucial to strengthening my proposal

- It can and should be helpful but often isn't. Some reviewers clearly do not read the proposals fully, just the abstracts.
- It can be frustrating when the reviewers are not the same from round to round. Often I have addressed concerns of one reviewer only to have that criticized by another reviewer. Reviewers should be consistent when possible.
- It can be, though it is sometimes perfunctory or suggests that the reviewers didn't actually read the application carefully
- It depends a lot on a number of factors. Some reviewers offer only minimal feedback and it can be hard to discern exactly what improvements they would like to see. I have also found that due to the delay in receiving feedback it can sometimes be hard to incorporate it into proposals for the next cycle.
- It depends on the agency. The NEH feedback was unhelpful; feedback from NSF and WG are always helpful.
- It depends on the quality of the review and comments provided by the reviewers. I think they can also be useful to find out which factors were most important to the reviewers but at that point you've already applied so there isn't always an opportunity to implement that feedback.
- It depends on the review. Some are thorough, others are not.
- It depends on the reviewer. In one case for the NSF, one of the panel reviewers gave me the same exact review as my previous submission (it was a resubmission) without bothering to comment on changes. That panelist rating (a Very Good) tanked my proposal. I was not thrilled. Particularly when I found out that particular panelist funded his own project/wife that year. Given that my other reviewers (even the other panel review) had given me an excellent rating, it was hard not to feel like the proposal feedback that was literally a couple of sentences cut and pasted from the previous review that had no major critiques or helpful suggestions, was not great. IN previous cases NSF reviewers gave helpful and constructive criticism. I feel like one bad panelist really throws off all that hard work. My overall reviewers clearly put in a lot of work and gave great detailed comments that showed they'd read it. THey made my grant much better. I actually asked the SBE Archaeology director to let me know when the cycle is up for the panel so I can re-apply after that guy is gone. (I was not told who he was, just when the cycle was up, which was helpful).
- It depends on the specific proposal but generally speaking colleagues' feedback is constructive
- It depends on what they say.
- It depends. In general, feedback has helped development of a stronger project.
- It depends. There are reviewers who really take the time to write constructive comments, and others who write something on the order of two sentences that are not useful at all - because they are curt or dismissive. I've found there is a wide variety - not just from my own experience applying, but from reading my students' reviews when they've applied for Wenner-Gren or NSF or other awards.
- It entirely depends on the reviewer. I'd always rather have feedback from reviewers than not, but sometimes the reviewers push their own thoughts/agenda versus giving me something that would be potentially constructive for future iterations of my work. I also have had issues with reviewers highlighting my marginalized identity and my perceived "wokeness" (they legit said I was "woke"), rather than focusing on my research--which is what I'm trying to contribute intellectually to the archaeological community.

- It had depended on the reviewer. I always appreciate feedback because many funding opportunities don't offer it. I always appreciate the opportunity to make my applications stronger and many reviewers have dramatically informed my revision process. However, I have had reviewers leave comments that were in no way constructive and have discouraged me from applying for funding.
- It has been highly variable. I don't remember if the Ford Pre-doc Fellowship provided me with any of the review materials (I don't believe so, but it was seven years ago...). The Wenner-Gren dissertation grant reviewers' feedback all feel along the lines of "not broadly anthropological enough," with one reviewer explicitly calling out my lack of framing my project as "indigenous archaeology." The NSF DDIG reviews, on the other hand, were all very positive and - while noting several potential difficulties in conducting my project as proposed - highlighted its potential to add new knowledge to the world of SW archaeology.
- It has been highly variable. In many cases, the reviews are helpful and push me to improve my grant writing or analytical approaches. In some cases, reviews have been unhelpful to the point that I suspect the reviewers fundamentally disagree with the validity of my subfield (bioarchaeology) - i.e. that there is nothing I could do in their eyes to improve grant proposals.
- It has varied from grant to grant, review cycle to review cycle. For example, the feedback I received on my NSF GRFP was completely useless each time I applied. The feedback I recieved from my NIH F32 application was much more valuable.
- It has varied, but the negative comments (for example, being called a "neophyte practitioner") stuck with me.
- It has varied. Some were very specific and helpful. Others were vague, lazy / hurried, and did not provide useful guidance to help improve the proposal.
- It is usually helpful and constructive, but sometimes it is clear that my research does not fit into their paradigm, and then it is less helpful.
- It is very variable and depends on reviewers. Some are unhelpful and dismissive, others are constructive and really useful.
- It makes clear why or why not the proposal was funded to allow for self-improvement.
- It seems that the most important aspect of a successful grant us how well one dan manipulate the peer- review process.
- It varies a lot provided by agency and reviewer. NSF is definitely the most thorough, the ones that don't give any feedback are totally worthless.
- It varies by agency and whether they allow resubmissions and if those resubmissions require a resubmission statement.
- It varies. In one case, the reviewers seemed to willfully misunderstand what I had proposed. In other cases, it was helpful.
- It varies. I've had highly positive feedback on grants that were not funded. Often, decisions seem to be based on factors out of both my and the reviewers' control, such as grantmaker-internal political concerns.
- It varies. The most useful feedback identifies gaps or lack of clarity in the project description that can be addressed in the resubmission.
- It was useful to read about flaws in the research design or gaps in literature review. However, most of it seemed to be going through the motions because reviewers have to write something.

- It was usually helpful in revising the proposal as needed
- It's a mixed bag, but I've had more positive experiences than negative ones. For example, I had experiences where reviewers clearly had axes to grind and used the NSF review process to do so. In other cases I've had reviews that were very constructive and, following these suggestions, saw a subsequent application get recommended for funding. Most feedback falls between these two on a continuum.
- It's about as useful as peer review feedback. Runs the gamut from pointless, to vicious attacks, to self-serving, to helpful.
- It's definitely been a mixed bag. I think for dissertation-level grants (which I have the most experience with as an ECR), reviewers tended to focus on justifying their decisions to give the grant application a certain score or rating. Feedback was rarely given as "formative", with an eye to helping improve the research. Also, in one instance, I received a fairly unhelpful and unprofessional review that made covertly disparaging (i.e. plausibly deniable but still clearly sexist) remarks about my gender. That was, obviously, neither helpful nor constructive.
- It's extremely helpful but often lacks details that would be useful and help me reapply.
- It's rare that a grant actually gives you feedback. Of the 10+ different grant types/agencies I've applied to, only 2 gave feedback (NSF, for GRFP & DDRIG; & Sigma Xi)
- like most people, sort of. Specific points upon which they were unclear was very helpful, although it is not clear that fixing those problems actually helps when submitting revised proposals since different reviewers get the next round, so those new reviewers are often focused on different aspects of the proposal.
- Many places do not provide feedback. For places that do - Wenner Gren/NSF - some of it is contradictory. And in many cases they specifically discuss why they don't want to fund something, not how to make it better. In particular, comments about organization/structure on Wenner Gren applications are not helpful due to the 5 question format.
- mixed bag; often feels politically motivated
- Mixed bag. Sometimes useful, but mostly setting impossible standards and asking me to a different kind of project.
- Mixed bag. I typically get some extremely positive, some mid range (typically the most helpful) and some extremely negative (these are usually unhelpful)
- mixed bag. Usually helpful, but sometimes odd comments, probably out of context.
- Most of the time Reviewer and Panel Review feedback is constructive and helpful. Occasionally it is superficial or unconstructive, but usually only when it is thin on detail.
- Most recently, I did not get feedback from funding proposal reviewers from the granting agency itself. Decades ago, my dissertation advisor did not even pass them on to me because he thought they were unnecessarily cruel and unconstructive
- most reviewers provide some useful feedback, and reviewers who identify specific weaknesses and offer constructive suggestions have strengthened my research
- most seem to recognize I am not at a Research 1 university and do not believe I can achieve the research goals from my position at a public liberal arts college
- Mostly constructive -- reviewers see problems or issues that I failed to see; in my experience I've been able to correct those and produced a successful (second) proposal.
- Mostly constructive, although few agencies provide feedback. Worse feedback was from my own institution!

- Mostly helpful, though ad hoc reviews are often incomplete and overly critical without concrete recommendations.
- Mostly helpful. External feedback is usually valuable.
- Mostly yes. Sometimes the feedback is too general and does not provide specifics for improvement.
- Mostly yes. Unhelpful feedback was asking for information that was very clearly provided in the application, suggesting the reviewer didn't read it carefully (e.g., it would be the first sentence in a section, and so hard to miss).
- Mostly, I have found it useful and I think the feedback has definitely strengthened subsequent proposal drafts. As is frequently the case, reviewers may diverge remarkably in their assessment of a proposal, making it more difficult to gauge the value of the assessment. In addition, far too frequently I have found that reviewers have not carefully read a proposal and ask for additions when what is requested is explicitly stated in the proposal already. Less often, a reviewer has difficulty setting aside their own bias or positionality and evaluates the proposal less in terms of its strength/merits and more in terms of whether or not it conforms to the reviewer's position.
- Mostly, when the feedback is specific and recommendations are offered.
- Mostly. But for one NSF proposal waa totally off base. Said geophysical survey not possible in eastern NA!!
- My field is full of misogynistic and vicious males.
- n.a.
- N.A.
- N/A
- N/A
- N/A
- na
- NA
- Never got any.
- Never received feedback from proposal reviewers. Would have been helpful to get feedback supporting the "sorry you lose!" decision
- No
- No
- no
- No - by and large, especially for the Wenner Gren and the American Institute of India Studies, the feedback received has sounded like the reviewers do not really want to be there or giving feedback on these proposals. Feedback I have received has included comments on what kind of person I must be to pursue the research topic I am pursuing, rather than on the research topic itself. It is also a little surprising to me that reviewers comment on a topic as if they were commenting on it for themselves i.e., what would they do if this was their topic, rather than evaluating what has been submitted as someone else doing it.
- No because they generally haven't supplied constructive comments, but only reasons for not giving the requested funding.
- No feed back during the review; only after proposal funded and decisions re funding and not reviewable.

- no feed back.
- no feedback from 1 and contradictory feedback from other, but the questions helped me know what my proposal didn't make clear.
- No feedback given
- No- they are positive but still didn't get it.
- no--very limited.
- No, and sometimes it is not provided.
- No, feedback is all too often coded in disciplinary politics without real substance.
- No, I have yet to receive detailed feedback from any of the agencies' reviewers.
- No, I wasn't given any.
- No, in my limited experience, the feedback has been very specific, as if the reviewer became aggravated that I didn't cite a particular article or body of literature and gave me comments on that rather than the strength of my proposal.
- No, most provided no feedback, or the feedback was unhelpful
- No, multiple reviewers are often entirely contradictory. Even doing my very best to address reviewers' comments over the course of 10 years, I've still never received a major grant.
- No, not really. Most of my reviews claimed that the research was too niche, even though I'm studying a movement that includes thousands of people and a very large industry. I felt like a lot of reviews had very superficial understandings of my project and the rejection came from reasons they weren't really saying (like the fact that its a U.S. project).
- No, not really. When they are supplied, even when the grant is successful, they are often extremely brief.
- No, the agency was apparently in flux.
- No, the National Geographic Society never bothered to give me any feedback and the NSF only sent feedback to my dissertation chair. In neither case was I (the applicant) actually given any direct feedback.
- No, the Wenner Gren foundation basically said that they wouldn't fund my research because they didn't believe my PhD advisor had sufficient expertise in that area (what they didn't know is she is FROM that area). It was not constructive at all, as they basically said that this was innovative and exciting research, but that they didn't respect my advisor (maybe she was a young woman?).
- No, they are often not specific and are meant to divert from the main topics and questions, instead of actually diving deeper into them.
- No, they are typically unqualified to review.
- No! Often too brief, off base, or contradictory.
- No. In one case I got no feedback at all. In another case, the feedback was not detailed enough to be helpful. It seemed in that case that the opinion of a specific person acting as a gatekeeper to funding weighed disproportionately.
- No. too general.
- No. About 80% of comments are not applicable due to word count confinements, or do not pertain to my research question.
- No. Did not receive such feedback.
- No. Every cycle I applied feedback and it did not garner positive results.
- No. Feedback discounted proposed approach based on it being different from usual.

- No. I have received feedback that is incongruous with my submissions, indicating that reviewers did not read my proposal and that their feedback was not reviewed. I have consistently received feedback that is clearly biased in terms of individual interests, is not consistent with more inclusive research methodologies and the prioritizing of Indigenous communities in archaeological research, and is inconsistent with broad understandings within my subfield. This indicates to me that often reviewers do not have subject matter expertise in my area and that there is little to no training and oversight for reviewers.
- No. I have received minimal feedback or no feedback.
- No. I know the (presumably unpaid) job of reviewers is to cull applications to a small subset. The feedback seems kind of arbitrary, like another reviewer could have a completely different impression.
- No. In most cases the rationale given for why the proposal was rejected seemed arbitrary. The research questions, methods, and significance were usually praised, but the proposal was then dismissed on other grounds (e.g. Mongolia is a niche research area).
- No. It has racist feedback
- No. It is often clear that reviewers are over-extended and looking for even minor reasons to reject applications. It also is not possible for applicants to push back again misinformed or inaccurate reviews. For example, when applying for the Wenner-Gren dissertation funding years ago, I had a reviewer who insisted that isotopic analyses of diet in human remains require "300–400 samples"; I have never once seen a study with a sample size of this magnitude, but it was impossible to counter this claim as an applicant.
- No. It is short, vague, and difficult to understand when it is anonymous and you don't know where or why the reviewer is making those comments.
- No. It is so competitive that I get good reviews, but no funding.
- No. It's usually not provided. When it has been, the information has been irrelevant or paternalistic (such as when a reviewer had personal research goals that he thought I should be pursuing rather than my own).
- No. Most feedback was from people whose work was not closely related. The feedback was general and very difficult to respond to.
- No. Much of the feedback I received suggested the reviewers did not even try to understand my proposal or provide productive feedback, but rather used the review as a way to demonstrate their own knowledge and superiority instead of providing constructive criticism that could have helped me improve future applications.
- No. One reviewer basically suggested a completely different project than the one I actually was doing and the others didn't provide substantial feedback that I can recall.
- No. One reviewer left no comments; one left one-word and one-sentence comments about how compelling the project was; and the final reviewer left a paragraph with vague comments about me "not seeming to understand research methods" and needing to have more publications for my current standing (at the time, I was an MA student with two review articles published in major journals relevant to my field).
- No. Tends to be vague if any at all. Most of the time rejection does not include feedback.
- No. The rejection letter from Ford Foundation was belittling.
- No. They are often incomplete, political, and not useful. Since I am also evaluating the source chosen by the client (my role is technical not the consumer of the project result). I do

advise on the appropriateness of the source to the project. Editorial review of project RFPs and proposals is a part of the service I provided my client.

- No. they seem to not understand my research. Further, they seem to be stuck on an institutional bias.
- no. usually they don't give me feedback
- No. When I applied to Wenner-Gren they said $20k was far too much money to be asking for a 1-year research trip halfway across the world - during which time I was not allowed to work (due to university and visa restrictions). I did not find it helpful to be told that asking for the bare minimum needed to survive during my dissertation research was too much. Not sorry that I think food is not a luxury.
- Not always, sometimes the feedback is glib and focused on minor issues like spelling or lacks concrete advice on how to improve the proposal.
- Not at all useful. The reviewers are often different each time for repeat submissions, and seem to want my proposal to be what they would do, rather than the strongest version of what I am proposing to do.
- Not at all. When I did get feedback it almost felt personal.
- Not exactly. With Wenner Gren, it was clear that one person who reviewed my proposal worked in a different culture area and exemplified regional bias in their review comments.
- Not helpful because not constructive. No critical comments were made
- Not helpful or constructive AT ALL. The reviewer (who is most likely white) used literature by a scholar of color (which I cited in my application) against me without a proper understanding of the literature. The reviewer's comment was racist.
- Not helpful when reviewers insist that doing things THEIR way and citing all THEIR research in your proposal is the only way to get funded.
- Not helpful. Often negative and unfair. Usually based on university affiliation rather than quality of research.
- Not particularly helpful and constructive. Often the feedback was somewhat vague (i.e., "the work is not anthropological enough") which left me wondering how to improve my work for the future. I ended up applying to grants that were not disciplinary bound and have garnered much more funding that way so I suppose the feedback from anthropological grant reviewers did end up being helpful, though perhaps not in the way they intended!
- Not particularly helpful.
- Not really
- Not really
- Not really, as the reviewers would change they would all want different things or would want to see things previous reviewers asked that I take out
- Not really; depends on the agency. For Wenner Gren, it only told me about what that agency likes (for example, they don't like multisited ethnography) not about the strengths of my project on its own merit. NSF was somewhat better (and their preferences are clearer at the start!). Fulbright I had to learn back-channel why I didn't get the grant, and it was for reasons beyond my own control (age and the amount of time I'd spent in the country).
- Not really. Competition is so keen that the final selection among well qualified applications seems almost arbitrary
- Not really. For instance, when my proposal was rejected by SSHRC it seemed like the reviewers were suggesting funding, but then it wasn't funded and I am not sure why. When

my proposal was rejected by Wenner-Gren they basically said we don't understand why you are including a mixed methods approach as part of your ethnographic fieldwork even though I explained in detail why it was required. I felt like what they really meant was you don't look like a traditional ethnographer to us because your participant collaborators have a say in your research design.

- Not really. I got positive reviews but my proposal (NSF) was not discussed. This was very confusing to me and I had no clear idea on what to improve
- Not really. In some cases the reviewers misunderstood the research question or method. In other cases, the reviewers misunderstood my background qualifications. Whether these were personal grudges or not is not for me to say, but I expected the others on the review committee to disregard misunderstandings and they didn't. Ultimately, I feel the misunderstandings led the group in the wrong direction.
- Not really. It told me the good parts of my proposal but failed to identify why it didn't succeed in getting funding.
- Not really. One application to Wenner-Gren was rejected because a reviewer thought my research was unethical because of one word they misinterpreted. Reviewers often focus on grades, alleged "prestige" of a school, or other esoteric factors instead of focusing on constructive feedback. This system is inequitable in many ways.
- not really. reapplication based on comments did not result in successful applications and often the feedback is demoralizing
- Not really. Reviewer priorities are so disparate now that it's impossible to please all of them.
- not really. With the Wenner Gren they always change so when you revise the proposal to respond to the issues raised by the reviewers you almost certainly find a complete different set of concerns by the new pool of reviewers
- Not usually. Often the feedback from different reviewers is contradictory.
- Not very helpful. They usually do not appear to understand the proposal.
- Not very helpful. Cryptic and too short.
- Nothing
- NSF - yes, I have had both successful and unsuccessful proposals at NSF. The reviews are generally very helpful and program managers have been generous to provide helpful one on one advice. An excellent and mostly transparent review process incorporating several reviews. National Geographic - no. Reviews are not provided. The archaeology grants program has largely been dismantled. Wenner-Gren - No. I have had two unsuccessful proposals at Wenner-Gren and feel that applying there is a waste of time. Two-stage application process. In first stage, little to no feedback on decisions is provided. Only a single reviewer is used at that stage. If the single reviewer is biased, the proposal is rejected.
- NSF DDRIG reviews were helpful and detailed in their critiques. However, I only received this feedback because my application was declined late in the review cycle, after other applications in my field were declined. I do not think that most DDRIG applicants get feedback on declined funding proposals. (They should, because as stated, the feedback I received was helpful for improving the broader research)
- NSF: of the 21 fundable proposals that year, only 18 were funded; the reviewer feedback was constructive and helpful. We took their advice, and the following year, our vastly improved proposal was deemed 'unfundable'. John Yellen of NSF told us that he shouldn't have sent it to one of the reviewers. My co-PI (also a woman) was so discouraged we didn't try a third time.

- Occasionally. But mostly not - I work in an area where most of my work is sent to older angry men who don't want anyone to. move into their field.
- Occasionally. Reviews that occur in the context of panels (which large numbers of applications) seem to be the least useful, while proposals to programs (like NSF Archaeology) where proposals are sent for peer review on a one-off basis are most useful.
- Occasionally. Sometimes the feedback is limited.
- of course. who doesn't? If the applicant doesn't, that's on them. Unless it's a renegade reviewer -- and they are rare -- the advice should be treated as valuable help *for free*
- often but other times it was not helpful and/or contradictory
- Often it is helpful. But sometimes it is mean, rude, or even outright sexist. A reviewer once said that women shouldn't be doing fieldwork.
- Often reviewers do not have the competence to review the proposal.
- Often the reviewers are different from round 1 to round 2 and this becomes problematic because you spend so much time addressing reviewer's 1 concerns and reviewer 2 either disagrees or addresses something that you had a in previous proposal that you had to remove
- Often, the reviewers are uninformed. For example, several on my first NSF (a cooperative science grant) wrongly claimed geophysical survey could not work in humid tropical environments. But because the co-PI was a Brazilian geophysicist, it seems the agency recognized the problem in the reviews. Also, an elder colleague working on Brazilian archaeology at another university strongly supported the application.
- Often, yes. It varies - it's been some of the most and least helpful feedback I've received.
- Often. I had one experience with a reviewer from Wenner-Gren who was unwilling to engage with the project on its own terms and ranked the proposal poorly for not taking a conceptual/critical approach that the reviewer favored: this is always disappointing.
- Oftentimes feedback can be impersonal and not well matched with some of the literature presented. Our field is wide and diverse. I often feel reviewers are selected from a limited thought collective. Engagement with program officer is often more helpful especially if the plan is to resubmit the proposal.
- Once I stopped being a "young thing" of female appearance, reviews got increasingly hostile/ignorant. Especially true of my North American work. I often found it easier just to work on materials in my lab without release time or funding.
- Over the years that has changed. In 1975 and 1989 there was strong anti-female bias in some reviews (NSF); that was not noted in the 90s or 2000s.
- Partly: the missions and capacities of these groups change from year to year, sometimes review panels seem stuck in the past
- Rarely—often it is quite brief and vague
- Rarely. Many reviewers don't read the requirements of the particular program for which they are doing reviewers. Hence, they say stupid stuff just to say something. Often reviews are excellent but funding not granted for reasons not given.
- Rarely/never. Feedback is usually so limited as to be almost meaningless.
- reviewer feedback is not often helpful. It typically sounds like cherrypicked problem-finding or willful misrepresentation of the contents of the proposal. I wonder if many granting agencies should be better training and better paying (or paying in general) their reviewers to incentivize higher quality review. Reviews are not often constructive

- Reviewer#2 misidentified me as a "student" when I was applying for a postdoc after doctorate posted; questioned whether I was competent in methods I had demonstrably taught (and had identified multiple mentors for); and complained that my narrative lacked "poetry" -- this just didn't seem like serious feedback but the score tanked my proposal. If that review had scored like the other two, it most likely would have been funded. Years previous, in a case of sex-based discrimination, I was refused access codes to the NSF training class in my graduate program, so I have no training in the "poetry" of NSF proposals. I am generally recognized as a really good grant writer amongst colleagues, though. Regardless, my career pretty much ground to a halt at that point with no clear path forward, and now as an adjunct I am not qualified to be a PI for most grants, so there is no path forward. It is too bad, as it was a really good research project that would have brought new insights into a part of the world that is very hard to study (complex political situation on the ground), would have created training opportunities for students, and of course I might (or might not) have had an actual career.
- Seldom helpful
- So far no, because I have received none.
- Some are helpful if they actually provide comments on the proposed work. Those that criticize the methodology or theory used are not helpful and are poor reviews.
- Some constructive feedback has been useful. Other feedback seems designed to tear down and not build up.
- Some feedback was useful by encouraging improved methodology. Other feedback was problematic because it either was not directed at the actual research in question or contradicted other reviewer feedback.
- Some has been helpful, some has been pretty useless. Its kind of a mixed bag.
- Some have been really constructive and have helped me make my project stronger; Others have tried too hard to shape my work to their vision and that has not been successful
- Some have been very helpful, providing questions to encourage deeper thinking as well as resources like useful citations. However, others have suggested that the phenomenon I am describing is fictive, have questioned whether or not I am fit to be a scholar, and have stated that I don't have a place in the academy. These comments served nothing but to be a cruel gatekeeping mechanism. It made me question whether or not a queer woman of color had any place in the academy at all.
- some helpful, some not, reviewer bias and prejudicial reviews are always a problem. (NSF, NEH specifically)
- Some is helpful - when it is substantive, but if it focuses on different use of language, I don't find that useful at all (such as the difference between i.e. and e.g.).
- Some is useful, particularly if it relates to management of the grant; some is not useful and represents more of the reviewers' biases.
- Some of it was very helpful and some of it was not. I was scored low on my language skills because I did not have much experience in the local language of the region I studied. However, I could only study that language in country as it is not taught anywhere and there are no learning materials available.
- Some of the feedback was useful, while others ranged from unuseful to unfair. In general, I have been appreciative of the feedback received and believed it has be useful in professional development.

- Some reviewer comments were helpful, but on reapplication new reviewers seemed to focus on different aspects of proposal. This was more glaring on small grants with short applications where upon receiving feedback that the broader impacts were clear, but methods were not descriptive enough, the next reviewer batch would ding me for insufficient broader impacts. Some feedback, while constructive, seemed to ask for approaches that were simply not feasible within the budget and time constraints for doctoral research.
- Some reviewers are extraordinary and helpful but I have also encountered reviews that blatantly racist and sexist which are not discarded by the granting agency.
- Some reviewers did not have the expertise in the field that they were reviewing: museum people reviewing archeological collections based projects -- did not understand laws involved with archeological collections
- Some reviewers provide good, detailed reasons for liking or not liking different elements of a proposal, as well as making intelligent, helpful suggestions for how a proposal might be improved. Unfortunately, many reviewers just pass perfunctory judgments -- positive or negative -- without accompanying reasons. These lack credibility; hence, they are of little value in terms of making the next proposal better.
- Some times, especially if the reviewer demonstrates they have read the proposal with care and their comments reflect an understanding of what the proposed project is attempting to accomplish.
- Some times, when there are some flaws in the proposal. Otherwise, they are not that helpful.
- Some. But some reviewers clearly have no clue or expertise in the research being proposed. e.g. having historians review archaeology proposals.
- sometimes
- Sometimes
- Sometimes
- Sometimes - how useful the feedback was depended on how much time reviewers took in writing the feedback. Some reviewers gave few useful suggestions. Either their suggestions were not pieces I could change in my research or they had fundamental issues or mistrust about biocultural methodology. Other reviewers concentrated on how to improve my research, which was useful.
- Sometimes but not always. Reviewers tend to contradict one another so it can be difficult to figure out how to edit the proposal. I submitted my successful Wenner-Gren application 3 times. I made what I thought were the requested revisions the second time but then received the opposite reviews. The third time I essentially ignored the specifics of the reviews (while still trying to adhere to the "spirit" of the feedback) and modeled the proposal after a similar project that was successful and my grant in turn was successful. For the NSF, I found reviews confounding. I got positive reviews but was turned down due to already having Wenner-Gren funding. The reviewers of the most recent NSF I submitted wrote very little in response, mostly doubting our ability to carry out the grant. While the reviewers stated that the interdisciplinary project was interesting, engaging, and important, they doubted our ability to contribute or be able to do the work. One reviewer stated, "The team and institution are well positioned to engage with the local community but we are not given much information regarding their ability to conduct the proposed activities (i.e., to do the science)." even though they had received our CVs and a clear list of all the resources

available to us. Only one review of the four was actually helpful for thinking through revisions.

- Sometimes feedback is helpful but it varies considerably. For example, I applied twice to the NSF for dissertation research funding and both times I was ranked just below the funded group. The first time I was given constructive and specific feedback on what to do to improve my application. I followed that for the second round, but received from one reviewer in that round entirely different feedback - they asked me to relate my research project to a distinct set of literature and concepts that seemed to come from left field. The other reviewers in that round ranked me highly and gave me feedback based on what I proposed, noting that I had amended my project to meet the initial comments. I was quite frustrated that the reviews were inconsistent within and between rounds, and that this seemed to impact the funding decision. This experience has made me very hesitant to apply to NSF for funding post-diss, which is not great career-wise because it is such a prominent funder and highly encouraged at my current institution.
- sometimes helpful -- provides suggestions to improve proposal
- Sometimes it has been useful, when concrete and relevant feedback is given.
- Sometimes it is, sometimes it focuses on things where they simply do not believe what I say (re: information available on specimens, content of publications not yet in press)
- Sometimes it is. Recently, I received feedback requiring me to change the entire scope of the project, which is not helpful when it is my dissertation project.
- Sometimes it's helpful or sometimes not; it's not helpful when two reviewers' comments essentially cancel each other out.
- Sometimes my reviewers offered really great advice on how to improve the proposal. But when it came to the NSF (DDRI archaeology), I was met with a mix of reviews and ultimately John Yellen decided that me being a Native woman would preclude me from being an objective scientists. Both times I applied it seemed as if he went out of his way to find more reviewers who would give me poor reviews so he wouldn't be able to give me money. NSF reviewers seem to not understand that Native people can also be Native scientists. I am not sure if this survey will help or my story will, but the NSF is a nightmare if you are an Indigenous woman.
- sometimes no feedback at all after rejections, and feedback sometimes slim and not helpful. I have been particularly struck by lack of good feedback from Wenner-Gren during my 2x application.
- Sometimes reviews highlight areas for improvement, but in general I find that they tend to recommend funding, whether the project is ultimately funded or not - and this is evident in my own reviewing - there are far more deserving projects than can be funded at any one time.
- Sometimes the feedback is constructive. The problem is that you have 1 or 2 reviewers that think your project has merit and then the others see no merit. It is then difficult to tease out what part of the project has merit, what doesn't, and how to improve it. It feels like a crapshoot.
- Sometimes the reviews are very helpful. Sometimes it just shows bias or ignorance on the part of the reviewer.
- Sometimes these comments can be helpful in reformulating the proposal but would be more helpful if they were more specific in terms of suggestions

- Sometimes they have been helpful to improve the research questions or methods or framework. Sometimes they have been actively not helpful in that they want a different project and demean the work because it does not fit.
- Sometimes yes, other times no. At Wenner-Gren, my reviewers simply objected to the idea that what I was proposing to do was "anthropology" or "worthwhile." NSF reviews have been more helpful, but not as helpful as brainstorming with other colleagues and just revising the proposal narrative according to my own logic.
- sometimes yes, sometimes no
- Sometimes yes, sometimes no. Depends on the level of detail given.
- Sometimes yes, sometimes no. Highly dependent on reviewers
- Sometimes—but sometimes it seems arbitrary. I have often gotten more critical feedback on funded proposals than unfounded.
- Sometimes, but depends on if there are ways suggested for improvement.
- Sometimes, but it often reflects the biases of the reviewers as well as reviewers who don't fully read proposals.
- Sometimes, depending on the reviews.
- Sometimes, depends on whether or not reviewers have read the proposal carefully
- Sometimes, when there is a clear opportunity to revise before the funding agency changes its requirements
- Sometimes; but often not. Sometimes get contradictory comments; often reviewers push a favored theory or technique even when it's not a good match for the specific project objectives; or I have often gotten requirements to make changes that are not realistic for the amount of funding available and the project time allowed by the grant.
- sometimes; mostly not because they are often contradictory
- Sometimes; often feedback is contradictory between reviewers.
- sometimes; some reviewers can be helpful, others do not understand the project involved
- sometimes; sometimes it's just crazy
- Sometimes! It really depends on the review.
- Sometimes. Specific comments pro and against are useful. General comments less so.
- Sometimes. The feedback is useful when it provides specific information about ways the application could be improved for a resubmission to that agency or another one.
- Sometimes. Each reviewer differs and is more or less generous with the feedback they are willing to offer. I imagine this is sometimes an issue of time and sometimes an issue of enthusiasm about (or opposition to) the project itself. Some reviewers are really incredible though and deserve recognition for the efforts they put in offering constructive criticisms and encouragement, even when the outcome will ultimately be a rejection.
- Sometimes. For the NSF, I went through two panels. On one, reviewers had factually wrong information in their critiques. I do not believe this was the anthropology panel. My Wenner Gren critiques had clear information about how to improve the grant. I could almost create a checklist. That was helpful, though I did not reapply because I had secured funding elsewhere. The Ford Foundation feedback was the least helpful because it did not address specific points in my proposal.
- Sometimes. I have received very useful feedback in the past as well as comments that were abrupt and even rude.

- Sometimes. I received helpful feedback from 1 out of 3 reviewers at NSF. I received hostile and unhelpful feedback from Wenner Gren - partially related to interdisciplinary nature of research.
- Sometimes. In some cases they missed the point and in others they made me think more about how to revise.
- Sometimes. In some instances, feedback was quite superficial.
- Sometimes. It depends on how detailed the feedback is and whether the reviewers offer suggestions for improvement.
- Sometimes. It lets you know what you need to change to be more competitive, but can also be contradictory or vague.
- Sometimes. Occasionally rude.
- Sometimes. Often it feels like reviewers have not fully or closely read applications since they misapprehend elements or miss things that have been mentioned.
- Sometimes. Often the funding decision does not seem to fit the available comments. It would be much more useful if more agencies provided the ability for reviewers to upload marked-up copies of the proposal. I would also find this useful from a reviewer perspective as giving detailed feedback via generic textbox is cumbersome.
- Sometimes. On occasion the feedback provides very specific advice on strengths and (most helpful) weaknesses . . . how to make a proposal stronger in the future. However, at times the comments seem to come from left field, which makes me wonder who the person is, did they understand the proposal, and why (often very particular piece of) information is deemed missing and should be there. The evaluator seems unsuitable as a reader for my particular proposal, which also makes me think: "Do I need to make this more generic?" or "Is this simply the wrong granting institution?"
- Sometimes. Reviewers can give useful feedback, whether encouraging or critical, but sometimes reviewers seem to totally misunderstand projects and it can be frustrating to read comments and don't seem to match up with the proposal itself.
- Sometimes. Some reviewers are thoughtful and helpful. They have clearly read and understood the proposal and provide constructive feedback meant to improve the proposal. Other times reviewers have provided reviewers that are incredible rude and unprofessional. It is clear the reviewer either did not read the proposal or did not care enough to write helpful comments. Comments occasionally sent to me have had sexist undertones.
- Sometimes. Sometimes it's clear they didn't really read the grant. Sometimes they're too general. Other times they give useful, targeted advice.
- Sometimes. Unfortunately, though, the reviewers seem to disagree amongst themselves about what is strong and what needs work on a given proposal.
- Sometimes. We often got excellent feedback, with no critical comments to respond to, but still didn't get funding, so that can be frustrating.
- Sometimes. When it is detailed and clear, yes. But I have received positive feedback only on multiple grants I did not receive...this is not helpful.
- Sometimes. When the proposal has clear deficits, yes. In some cases, when the committee recommends the proposal for funding, but it fall just below the funding line due to the limited availability of funds, the comments are difficult to implement because you worry about changing a solid proposal too much. Some agencies do not provide feedback, which I find to be rude. It makes it very difficult for early career researchers to move forward from

the grant application experience in a productive way. For ECRs the grant proposal process is part of their development as researchers because of the opportunity to see how scholars beyond your mentor, department, and friends view your research.

- Somewhat constructive but we had some contradictory review comments that were not particularly useful.
- Somewhat--although my revised application for the Wenner-Gren scored even lower than my first attempt, so that was frustrating.
- Somewhat. But not the extent that peer reviews of manuscripts can be generative. My funding rejections have largely had a message of "there's potential, but you haven't impressed us to the extent that others have"
- Somewhat. Helped me understand their priorities plus gaps in my application.
- Somewhat. Often seems biased based on gender "M is overly ambitious; M seems to want to do a lot of fieldwork and is clearly qualified but I doubt she will get it done; M seems to know the answers before she starts'.
- Somewhat. The feedback was limited, and didn't actually shape the project in any way. It often seemed the reviewer were not actually paying much attention to the project, but just trying to get their task done.
- Somtimes - sometimes not. It can both be spot on and completely off
- Sort of helpful - Though sometimes I feel that it doesn't matter how you improve an application - they are going to reject it anyway
- Specific feedback can be helpful - but because of the review process (i.e., different panels reviewing each cycle) even addressing specific reviewer concerns does not necessarily lead to a successful proposal next time around.
- Specifically regarding Wenner Gren: I applied as many times as I was eligible. Each time I resubmitted I tried to address the reviewers' comments, and each time my score got worse and the comments just became about something else. It was never clear that responding to comments actually made the application objectively better; in fact, I suspect it did the opposite. Comments were often less about the study design or impacts than about citations reviewers wanted to see or assurances they wanted that some kind of pitfall they imagined might happen had already been forefended in the design. And so I was in an arms race with reviewers' individual imaginations of topical relevance or ethnographic calamity. If they could think of something circumstantial or structural that might make the research unsuccessful, they'd demand I address it, giving me less and less space to explain my actual ideas. In the end, I never got the funding and none of the issues reviewers imagined ever hampered my then largely self-funded research.
- Sure, though sometimes maddening, as well. But, always INstructive (if not always CONstructive).
- That depends. If the feedback shows the reviewer read in detail and points out exactly what should be addressed and suggests how to do so, then it helps. Reviews that seem to be based on impressions or personal opinions are very unhelpful.
- The feedback for all of these grants that I saw I and my colleagues receive seemed generally arbitrary - yes there are some absolute minimum criteria for a grant needing to be clearly and concisely written, but often the criteria that reviewers use to decide (citing the appropriate literature, framing the argument in a particular war) are often simply the luck of the draw. This is incredibly discouraging for something that has such a tremendous impact on graduate careers and one's ability to complete research

- The feedback from reviewers is incredibly helpful when it is framed in a constructive manner, which is typically the case. Sometimes reviewer feedback is not constructive or even seems disconnected from the proposal, but when this has happened to me, it has been just one reviewer out of three or four and has been balanced by the constructive feedback of the other reviewers.
- The feedback from reviewers was constructive, although it was, at times, contradictory, which is to be expected. What was most useful though, was the feedback from the program officer. Even though the PO comments were very general, the PO gave me the tools to interpret the reviewers' comments and focus on the parts of the reviewers' comments that really mattered in my repeat submission.
- The feedback I have received has largely been helpful because it has focused on ways that I could improve my work or my writing, rather than a litany of what the reviewer did not like about the proposal.
- The feedback I received was positive without indicating the reasons why funding was denied
- The feedback is great, but in the end for NSF politics play a greater role than quality of proposals. I have applied over 5 times for funding post dissertation and have been rejected. It is not uncommong to get excellent reviews from the outside reviewers and then get lackluster support from the NSF panel. In the end, it is the panel's vote that matters, not the outside reviewers. The panels are rarely inclusive or diverse. It is often ivy league or R1 researchers from elite colleges mostly men or sometimes white women.
- The Ford Foundation was most useful, because it was specific, supportive, and the reviewers had clearly put time into reading and commenting. NSF was least helpful, because it was clear that some reviewers had agendas beyond the content of the application and that the reading was not careful.
- The most useful feedback I have received has been from reviewers who pick apart the logic of the proposal, point out ways that what I am studying relates to work in other world areas, and raise questions about the methods I am thinking of using and their relations to my research questions.
- The most useful thing in retrospect has been serving as a reviewer, and considering colleagues' feedback on review panels.
- The nature of my research is not trendy and is taboo
- The only feedback I received was from the NSF proposal. I did three iterations, and consulted with the director, John Yellen, about how to interpret the feedback. Other grants were just accepted or denied without feedback.
- The only time I got feedback was from NSF reviewers. It was helpful.
- The reviewers suggest the size of my institution was a factor
- The reviews were riddled with grammatical errors that made it impossible to know what they were talking about. For some, it was as if they'd read the proposal within two minutes, like asking me to cite people I was already citing, suggesting a literature I'd said the study was within. The reviews on the whole were laughable - and, of my cohort, I was the luckiest one.
- There's generally very little feedback given; reviews seem often to be surprisingly brief and/or vague.
- This depends on the grant agency/staff/leadership and varies widely. NSF has provided both incredibly helpful and unhelpful feedback to me in the past, ranging from detailed and specific to vague and unactionable. However, I found that their DDRI reviews are generally helpful and constructive. SSRC does not provide detailed reviews, therefore they are

unhelpful. Wenner-Gren's feedback depends on the reviewer. I have had very generous and helpful feedback and un-constructive, biased feedback on the same proposal. I have also found the Wenner-Gren feedback on the same project is not consistent between application cycles and one grumpy reviewer can completely upend the chances of a student receiving funding, even if they received high scores from the other reviewers.

- This has been a mixed bag. Specifically, with Fulbright IEE, the academic reviewers comments were extremely helpful and positive but, then, seemed out of sync with the decisions made at other parts of the process. With Wenner Gren, the reviewers' comments have sometimes been very bizarre and inappropriate. One wrote an extremely negative review because didn't include in my bibliography materials that could only be found at a private archive in another part of the world than I work. The, then, program director then wrote on the basis of how strongly negative that review was and my lack of knowledge of these materials was the basis for rejecting the application. The other two reviews were positive and highly recommended funding. The Fulbright IIE application has an element of politics. The final rejection being that, irrespective of the unanimous academic reviews to fund, the then priorities of the host countries did not match those of the proposal. With respect to Wenner Gren, I was (am still am) disappointed with the decision, since reviewers' review criteria should not be based on materials that are only found in such closed or restrictive places.
- too limited.
- Too long ago to remember.
- too vague
- Uneven. Public agencies usually provide reviews. They are uneven but at least something to work with. Private foundations often offer no reviews or feedback, very frustrating.
- Unfortunately, I've received no feedback--SSHRC provides no feedback on graduate award applications.
- Unhelpful because lack of fit between reviewer critique and stated goals/scope of grant. (Not for above-named grants.)
- Unscuccessful (three times) NEH application was denied because one reviewer --and they had only this one, the same one-- said I wasn't qualified because I don't have a Ph.D. in History, and the research involved archival work--this was a clear gatekeeping move from a senior man who wanted to create a subfield he could (and did) dominate.
- Useful when I've actually received it
- Useful-but too complex and at times contradictory
- Useless. They know who they want to support. Any other effort is a waste of time
- Usually
- Usually but it depends on the agency
- Usually helpful yes, but it is confusing when ad-hoc reviewer and panel recommendations are inconsistent with no specific clarification from the panel.
- Usually helpful, but sometimes wishy-washy with expectations and if worth reapplying
- Usually no; it's mostly dealing with different egos, jumping through more hoops to soothe those egos.
- Usually not

- Usually not because oftentimes the feedback from different reviewers contradicts each other. Additionally, sometimes it is clear that a reviewer simply does not like the proposed research and does not provide constructive feedback.
- Usually useful. Sometimes not constructive.
- Usually yes, but sometimes it was directly conflicting with prior feedback so that felt less helpful.
- Usually, if it's provided. Sometimes when proposals are not rated highly enough to be discussed by a panel, the feedback is minimal. But when it's provided, I find it useful.
- Usually, if they make constructive comments that might make a subsequent version better.
- Usually, yes, but at times it does not seem like reviewers closely read the proposal.
- Usually, yes, but both my unsuccessful an successful grant applications are so far in the past that I no longer remember the reviewers. I will say, however, with one granting agency (Heinz), they changed the rules on what they support between the time I applied and they turned down my application. I was very unhappy about that.
- Usually, yes. I found some thinly veiled racist comments by an NSF panel very discouraging.
- Usually; every once in a while you get a wonky review that provides no useful critique
- Variable - some give details, others just give scores
- Variable. In general, though, reviewers have provided substantive, constructive feedback, and resubmits have been successful as a result.
- Varies from great to worthless depending on organization
- Very contextual. Some have been very helpful when they offer real substantive suggestions about hot to improve. Others have been useless when critiques were rude or clearly embedded in prejudice or misconstrual of my research agenda
- Very helpful - they provide direction to improve the grant in writing or ideas
- Very helpful to know the steps and requirements for each stage of application process.
- Very helpful, because it lets me know what to change for the next submission (if it is rejected) or what the reviewers liked
- Very much so. While applications vary, feedback helps aim future proposals.
- Very variable depending on reviewer; many seem not to follow standardized protocols when offering comments
- Very. I have revised based on that feedback and resubmitted to be successful.
- Well I thought so but I did not get the grant so it may have not been as helpful as needed.
- Well, yes an no, sometimes its spot on, and you can fix it. But other times it is idiosyncratic and won't be helpful for the next round if it doesn't go to that reviewer.
- Wenner-Gren provided the only feedback I have ever received on a grant proposal. It was helpful.
- When they do give feedback, which is not often, it rarely is helpful because of conflicting reviewer comments. That is, one reviewer will have liked the proposal and made contradictory remarks to another reviewer who did not like the proposal.
- When they have carefully read and understood the proposal, the feedback is very helpful. When the feedback reflects the reviewer's own interests/agenda and not so much the proposal at hand, the feedback is not useful.
- Whether warranted or not, the feedback I got helped me understand what to change for later resubmissions and whether it was worth it for me to even apply again.

- Yes
- yes
- yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- yes
- Yes
- yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes - feedback provided different insights/perspectives on the proposed project.
- Yes - comments from reviewers are generally helpful in identifying places where proposal needs clarity or strengthening.
- Yes - when specific about how to improve project
- Yes (and no), although it has been some time (since graduate school) since I applied for an NSF or similar agency grant that provided such feedback. Yes and no, because feedback often indicated biases of reviewers (to techniques or questions that are difficult to overcome.
- Yes and no, and it depends on the agency. Generally I have received terrible feedback from Wenner Gren reviewers. The reviews have not been constructive and have merely acted as gatekeeping in the discipline. For example, several Wenner Gren reviews I have received have not pointed to weaknesses in the proposal or offered suggestions to address weaknesses. Rather, they give a low score and state that I should have cited X, Y, or Z scholar -- a scholar who generally has little bearing on the scope or research design of the project I proposed. The reviews I have received from the National Science Foundation have generally been very helpful and constructive, but at least two of my NSF proposals have been sunk because of one or two bad reviewers who do not understand the methods, research design, and theoretical contribution of my project. In these cases, I have received reviews from 3 reviewers who all rated the proposal as "excellent" or "very good" with thorough explanations as to why the proposal is strong, but then I have had one or two reviewers who rate the same proposal as "fair" because I did not cite X, Y, or Z scholar, who again has very little bearing on the scope or design of the project. In my opinion, if I have left out a critical scholar/not cited someone I should have, the reviewer should explain WHY the omission of that citation/scholar is a threat to the validity/potential contribution of the proposed project. Otherwise such practices merely serve as academic gatekeeping that ensure reviewer's own networks and/or the scholarship that THEY know is cited in order to be funded.
- yes and no; some of it were generic we are sorry letter
- Yes and no; they have limitations on submissions and then say you didn't say x, y, and z - well OF COURSE NOT there isn't room :/ Feedback was useful but clearly subjective based on the reviewer's preferences
- Yes and No.
- Yes and no. As with peer reviews of manuscripts, grant reviews that help focus the research proposal are useful, and reviews that comment on how a student/ECR isn't capable of the proposed research are not.

- Yes and no. Feedback can be helpful, especially if the granting agencies provide this during the submission process (ie, give comments and allow you to edit and respond before the final decisions are made), but I've also received contradictory comments from reviewers suggesting the opposite revisions.
- Yes and no. I have had proposals rejected that received excellent reviews. There is just not enough funding to go around, so even excellent proposals may not get funded. It's just hard to know what to do to improve one's chances in the next round if the feedback is all "this is an excellent proposal and deserves funding". Speaking specifically about NSF.
- Yes and no. Most were helpful, or at least constructive, though one was particularly critical (to the point of being nasty). But one of their points was something other, more helpful reviewers pointed out, and I made sure to deal with it when I reapplied.
- Yes and no. Some feedback can be helpful and constructive.
- Yes and no. Some if it was constructive and showed where I needed to make changes. But I also had to write a plan to discuss my pandemic plans, which I laid out in detail. The reviewers, seemingly not understanding the situation in my country, said the plan was not feasible. I have since been able to complete that research in-person while research was impossible in the US. A colleague who successfully got the same grant had a pandemic plan that was clearly impossible and was unable to do any research on the grant until last month.
- Yes and no. The comments I got from Wenner-Gren was helpful in that it helps to conceptualize another project, but I feel like the reviewer misunderstood what I was trying to do and was imposing their epistemic views on my project
- yes because it helps me improve
- Yes for some, no for others. I think the reason I was able to successfully get my NSF grant was actually because the reviewers gave clear, helpful comments with concrete suggestions for improving my project; and also because comments came from four different reviewers, so I could see what issues overlapped and were important, and which issues were specific to individual reviewers and thus weren't as important. Wenner-Gren comments were unhelpful and rude, and it was hard to figure out how to use them to improve my project. Also, because it's only one person, it was hard to justify overhauling my project over just one person's professional opinion-- like, would whoever reviews my resubmission have a different theoretical orientation and hate a totally different thing about my project?
- Yes for sure, it helped me re-apply to revisit my proposal writing practice
- Yes for the ones that provide reasons for funding or not funding. No for others.
- Yes from NSF, less so from other sources.
- Yes I do find it useful for it helps in polishing my methodology and frame simple and effective objectives in the next step
- Yes I found it useful, although often feedback is not offered
- yes in general it is helpful
- Yes it is very helpful.
- yes like any review so same problems: some reviewers can be territorial with personal/unhelpful comments
- Yes mostly except one that seemed personal, like I was treading on intellectual territory. Otherwise critiques were constructive and suggestions useful.
- yes overall

- Yes very helpful but it does not always mean when you make those changes you will get the funding anyway.
- Yes very helpful.
- Yes- showed me where my research question was not being clearly interpreted
- Yes- somewhat brutal of course. But interesting to see how they interpret the call for proposals, which always helps in re-applying.
- Yes--especially when program officers accept and comment on drafts/letters of intent.
- Yes--peer review is invaluable
- Yes, It helped my focus on research topics, enlarged by research bibliography and improved by research writing.
- Yes, absolutely, although sometimes it is superfluous.
- Yes, although what they could say was limited, in general the info assured me I was on the right track in terms of proposal structure and detail.
- Yes, because it allows me to know where I can make improv.
- Yes, because it indicates where shortcomings in the application might be and what to try work on for future applications.
- Yes, because it usually provides concrete suggestions for improvement if the reviewers are consistent. If they are not consistent, however, (as occasionally happens) it provides little assistance on how to make the proposal more responsive.
- Yes, because proposals rarely are funded the first time around and it's good to know how to improve chances for future submissions.
- Yes, but a good help might be (if possible) the chance to send a kind of concept paragraph or text to obtain useful feedback previous to write the full proposal. In the end, is to ensure the best way to use the funds
- Yes, but I was awarded funds on the first try.
- yes, but it can hurt your feelings.
- Yes, certain institutions will allow you to see reviewer comments which help to make the application stronger in the future.
- Yes, critical feedback has allowed me to improve my approach and method and positive feedback has helped me know what areas of my writing to leave alone.
- Yes, extremely. To understanding the reaction of my peers.
- Yes, feedbacks are usually useful to see what's missing in the statement.
- Yes, for the most part.
- Yes, from most reviewers. One or two wrote comments that were very brief because they were completely dismissive.
- Yes, generally it helps.
- Yes, generally. Most reviewers provide specific comments and suggestions for improvement
- Yes, generally. Particularly for methodology as the reviewers are able to bring their experience to bear to ensure the methods/timeline are more realistic. Reviewer comments on theory are less helpful and have potential for bias.
- yes, gives a sense of how readers interpret project
- Yes, helped me with refining my goals and my budget

- Yes, helpful, if sometimes also biased, obnoxious, and infuriating. It often identifies actual opportunities to improve the project and even when it doesn't, it helps to know how a proposal reads to reviewers.
- yes, helps refine understanding of funding source priorities
- Yes, helps to point out weaknesses
- yes, helps to refine the proposal
- Yes, I find that some reviews were very helpful and constructive. This is particularly true when they state what they like, or fatal flaws. Some were not helpful--sometimes the reviewer clearly did not read the full proposal, or got their comment very wrong (e.g., saying I cited certain papers that I did not, and vice versa; saying that I excluded broader impacts when half of the proposal was broader impacts). In other cases they insisted that their misunderstanding of a concept was correct. In those cases I think that reviewers' comments should be vetted and excluded if they are way off base. I realize that this is time-intensive, but with a lot on the line and very long wait times until the next submission deadline, it would be a good investment and help ensure fair assessment.
- Yes, I have found reviewer feedback to be very helpful because it has helped me to better understand what the expectations are for the particular granting agency and how my research design could be improved.
- Yes, I have used reviewer comments to improve projects and secure funding on resubmissions.
- Yes, I have. But, I haven't often found funders giving me feedback.
- Yes, I normally do. Most reviewers do seem to try to be constructive, thoughtful, and helpful. I try to see it as similar to the peer review process and that reviews are there to make the work better.
- Yes, if it's clear they read and understood the proposal. The feedback helps to improve the grant and provides a deeper understanding about the intentions of the funding agency
- Yes, in a limited way. Usually criticism is aimed at the research question rather than the quality of the proposed research. I find it difficult to get funding for non-standard research questions
- Yes, in general. Most reviewers did a good job of pointing at weak points in my argument
- Yes, in the few situations it was provided I was able to turn that feedback into a successful application
- Yes, it gives a lot of information on what direction to move in and how to craft grant language
- Yes, it has been quite specific and actionable.
- Yes, it helped immensely in finding out what exactly they were looking for in my application.
- Yes, it helped me hone the focus of my research efforts and I was able to complete my thesis without outside funding
- Yes, it helped me identify what was in my head but not clear enough on the page, and also what wasn't thought through enough that required more work before starting research.
- YEs, it helped to focus research on more current academic interests
- Yes, it helps guide each project.
- Yes, it helps me to see what they value most about my research and what they aspect they are more likely to fund.

- Yes, it is very helpful to see what were perceived as the strength and weaknesses of my application so that I know what to work on for future applications at this agency.
- Yes, it let me know what to do different (or the same) for upcoming applications
- Yes, it was useful.
- Yes, much of it. Some reviews reflect politics more than the actual research being proposed. Most reviewers seem to be fair.
- Yes, often, but no, sometimes reviewers wrote absolute lies, which I had not ability to contradict.
- Yes, pointed to problems in research design that I revised after rejected.
- Yes, responses from reviewers were constructive and we are reworking our application.
- Yes, reviewer comments are always helpful.
- Yes, reviews and comments from program managers, when provided, helped improve next applications even when the original proposal was successful.
- Yes, sometimes so. Varies by reviewer
- Yes, specifically from the Wenner-Gren! Concrete feedback about specific points in the application.
- yes, suggestions resulted in success at resubmission
- Yes, the feedback from reviewers has been helpful. Some program officers are more helpful than others - NEH's will provide feedback on drafts and talk about them prior to submission, which is amazing. NSF's program officers are a mixed bag, and archaeology in particular is in desperate need of new blood.
- Yes, the feedback is usually helpful. Sometimes they see things you can't, but other times they have their own ideas that differ from yours.
- Yes, the feedback was validating and useful.
- Yes, the reviews were very helpful and cogent.
- Yes, the Wenner Gren feedback was very useful and helped me think about where to strengthen my application.
- Yes, they are, even though some are too brief and not explanatory enough of the decision taken.
- Yes, they can be very helpful. However, as funding cycles change so do reviewers so the target sometimes moves with resubmissions
- Yes, they helped clarify what the agency is looking for and application tips.
- Yes, they helped me identify weakness in my proposed research.
- Yes, those panelists are making the decisions...
- Yes, through revise and resubmit my recent submissions were all successful based on working with the reviewer feedback and the grant agency administrators - at least for NSF. For Wenner Gren it felt like there was less guidance and Fulbright there is no feedback
- Yes, typically feedback from reviewers strengths proposals
- Yes, usually. Sometimes have received very nasty and unhelpful reviews that indicated the reviewer did not actually read the proposal.
- Yes, very helpful
- Yes, very helpful when reapplying for a project not funded after the first submission.
- Yes, very helpful, generally speaking, though there are occasionally reviewers whose critiques are superficial or off base

- Yes, very useful because they were generally from scholars associated with the institution or foundation, or people who have had success applying to them.
- Yes, very. Sometimes I get feedback that seems "all over the place" but I can generally distill it down to a few fundamental issues reviewers had that I can address. And I've gotten some incredibly thorough and helpful reviews sometimes too.
- Yes, very. They provide a direction for re-submission.
- Yes, when available, which is primarily from NSF. Useful because it came from researchers in my field area.
- Yes, when it has been made available. Comments have helped me think about how to better present my research.
- Yes, when it is constructive feedback, the comments are critical to helping to guide me in addressing issues when revising the proposal. The challenge for me with the NEH is that the reviewers comments were critical about the sustainabiility of my proposed Digital Arts and Humanities project. The challenge is that no one can promise that any digital project will be sustainable beyond 5 years or so, and I didn't feel there was any way for me to overcome these critiques and therefore, decided it was not worth my time to reapply. I suppose this meant the critiques were valuable in helping me to give up.
- Yes, when it is provided. It allows me to better understand what a granting agency is looking for in the context of my work, as opposed to their vague overall statements on their webpage.
- Yes, when it was provided. Helped me to improve the proposal so it was awarded the 2nd time.
- Yes; always results in a tronger proposal.
- Yes; feedback made for a stronger proposal
- Yes; have incorporated suggestions
- Yes; they have introduced me to literatures with unexpected connections to my project and have helped me clarify my research questions.
- Yes! Because otherwise I don't know why I wasn't chosen. Was my application not strong enough, did my team not qualify, was I even close?
- Yes! But often it is short, and there are many agencies that do not provide any feedback which is very frustrating!
- Yes! Critical for revisions if rejected. Offers a different perspective than what might be available from colleagues.
- Yes! Feedback has been useful in addressing issues I had not considered!
- Yes! I got feedback on my NSF DDRI that helped me think about possible issues with my data that none of my committee members had brought up before.
- Yes! They have highlighted areas for adjustment and directed me to new avenues. I have also received feedback that is not helpful and feels angry and based on personal beliefs, rather than on the work proposed.
- Yes! This has been especially important for agencies who permit revisions and resubmission. It has benefited the granting of two NSF senior research grants.
- yes.
- Yes.
- Yes. It helped me see how others would read my work.
- Yes. Always helps refine future grant applications

- Yes. Feedback from the program officer at NSF led to my successful proposal.
- Yes. Fixing identified problems usually leads to funding
- Yes. Helps clarify problems and promise of the proposal; often reveals issues, concepts, literatures that would further the project
- Yes. I realize my proposal may have flaws and I happy to receive feedback
- Yes. Learning "how" to write a grant is like throwing things at the wall to see what sticks. If one has a good mentor, it's possible to get guidance prior to submission, and also do a "post mortem" to see how to improve after. Our system already privileges those who have access to (and can pay for) "good" mentoring, and good funding proposal reviews can help bridge that gap. Good feedback has the potential to help address the lack of diversity within anthropology.
- Yes. Always good to know how and where readers the proposal convincing ... or not!
- Yes. Generally the feedback is detailed and useful, especially if unsuccessful as it can help to reformulate and reapply.
- Yes. However, cultural anthropology is such a diverse discipline that it is often the case that the reviewers come from many different backgrounds and the reviews are all over the map and impossible to fully respond to.
- Yes. I have found reviewers very generous with their feedback.
- Yes. I have used feedback to strengthen future applications to other agencies.
- Yes. I use the reviews to revise my proposals for future competitions
- Yes. It almost always takes at least two times trying to get anything funded from these and other agencies so receiving reviewer comments is helpful. What is problematic is if you resubmit the grant based on one set of comments and then it is sent to an entirely different group of people.
- Yes. It helped fine tune the research proposal and fielwork.
- Yes. It helps me reorient my writing.
- Yes. It is a peer review. Where constructive, detailed, it is a form of collaborative knowledge production.
- Yes. It is an opportunity to hear how your research is perceived by others
- Yes. It is useful. It is constructive. It shows that real people have taken time to thoroughly adjudicate my work.
- Yes. It makes me understand how should I write and how precise should be my application.
- Yes. It makes the second submission more likely to be funded.
- Yes. It pointed out areas where we were not explaining ourselves well enough.
- Yes. It's so frustrating to resubmit and then not have the same reviewers but new reviewers who have different concerns.
- Yes. Most of the feedback (where available) has been constructive and has been useful for revising proposals, etc.
- yes. mostly constructive and improved the proposals.
- Yes. Reviewer critiques have generally helped me to see flaws in proposed study design, which in turn has helped me to redesign/revise for a successful resubmission, or in other cases abandon the idea completely.
- Yes. They actually believed in me. But, after getting PhD research money has been impossible as I took a job abroad. I'm trapped.

- Yes. They help improve research.
- Yes. They were useful for me to expand/confirm my thoughts on what was lacking and what was strong in my research design.
- Yes. To some extent it was from NSF.
- Yes/no/maybe. Typically I only received external reviews of applications, which I find hit or miss, and generally less than helpful in helping me to better frame the application.

Q39: How would you describe your strategy for funding your research?

Most of the responses to this question fit into three rough categories: applying aggressively, applying strategically, and finding ways to avoid having to apply for funding at all. Applying strategically was the most common approach, and finding ways to do research without applying for funding was the least.

I found few statistically significant correlations between researcher identities and which strategies they espoused. The one identity that does correlate significantly with strategy is age group, with younger scholars applying more aggressively and older scholars applying more strategically or finding inexpensive research projects (χ^2 test yielded $p = 3.312 \times 10^{-6}$). It is unclear whether this disparity is due to a lack of understanding of the strategic approach by younger scholars that will naturally change as early career researchers age and learn, or if it is due to the desperation of contingently employed scholars.

APPROACH 1: APPLY FOR EVERYTHING

One respondent wrote that they take a "carpet bomb approach—applied for anything and everything appropriate." This was the most common approach articulated, in fact, with many respondents writing phrases like "apply for everything" and "apply continuously" and "apply early and often." This approach has the pro of creating more opportunities for success, but the obvious downside of requiring enormous amounts of work and facing constant rejection.

APPROACH 2: APPLY STRATEGICALLY (MOST COMMON)

Other respondents chose to target their applications much more specifically, spending more time on a smaller number of applications with a higher chance of success. Their criteria varied from person to person, with some prioritizing opportunities with the highest success rates, others prioritizing those that best fit their research questions, and others prioritizing high-budget grants that would cover more research for each successful proposal. Some first designed a project and then sought the funding opportunity that was the best fit while others first chose a funding opportunity and then designed a project to fit it. What these respondents shared was a more strategic and targeted approach.

APPROACH 3: AVOID HAVING TO APPLY (LEAST COMMON)

One respondent wrote that their funding strategy is "don't count on it. Figure out how to design research on the cheap." Another wrote, "Funded research? Ha. My whole career has been working and finding ways to conduct research without external funding." This theme was common, with anthropologists writing about low-budget research, projects that could be done as volunteer work or be self-funded, small internal funding sources, a focus on paid contract archaeology work rather than independent grant-funded research, and even seeking opportunities to be part of larger projects led by colleagues with a history of receiving funding.

FULL RESULTS (ALL ANSWERS, UNEDITED, IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

- "apply early and often"
- (1) doing homework (reading documents online about the funder, applicant qualifications and requirements, etc); (2) consulting local colleagues and support staff, also friends at other institutions; (3) try to find out who makes the decisions and what they care about
- (1) My own key ideas, then look for funders. (2) Collaborate with others, often who have funding niches, and piggy-back.

- 1. Do stuff that is worthwhile but doesn't take too much money. 2. Use institutional funds which are easy to get or-- 3. Have good collaborators to make a bigger, more catchy project.
- 1) Spend a few hours each week looking for grant opportunities that are aligned with my research 2) use a Excel file to list all pertinent grants and the due date for their submission 3) Drawing upon my research design and research goals, begin drafting the application materials well in advance (at least 6 months in advance); freely recycle material from previous applications 4) make sure the application is finished a month in advance. Note when i submitted my application package on the Excel file 5) Note the results of the application (funded, not funded, other). Also note whether i can apply to that fund again 6) Use another Excel sheet to manage the use of the funds keeping track of: what was purchased and when, Which account it is supposed to come from, the resulting balance, and how many other items need to be purchased/can be purchased from that account 7) Depending on the account, make sure I've reserved at least 20% for taxes Rinse and repeat until the project is done
- A combination of NSF DDIG and state-level grants from a SHPO's office
- A combination of PI funding and my own grants. Receiving my own research grants allows me more flexibility.
- A lot of experience writing grants and proposals.
- A this point in my career, I fund the research with a variety of ways including my own funds.
- ACLS: minimal paperwork, trust the researcher
- Active
- Ad hoc. I will apply to grants and funding when I see them and they fit my research, workload, and time schedule.
- After the horrible experience I had in having to fight against institution about exorbitant, unmentioned, and arbitrary indirect costs that the administration wanted to apply to the Federal grant I received I stopped applying for Federal funds and just opt for grants that do not have the indirect cost component.
- Aggressive
- Aim high, but have a back-up plan -- look for places that will fund small pieces of the overall project if getting full project funding is not possible.
- Aiming to fund a project multi-year so I don't have to continually write grants
- All my research is volunteer
- All of my research is done in spare time on the side, so I do not apply for grants often. If I do, the application has to be relatively quick.
- All of the above
- almost nil -- there is no funding for rehabilitation of collections for the sole purpose of care
- Ambitious - apply to as many prestigious/large-amount sources as possible. Find examples of successful proposals. Find and use good mentors who will help guide your work.
- Anything
- Applications for numerous small grants, living expenses funded through assistantships
- Applied to a PhD position that already had funding approved for salary and budget.
- Applied to everything for which research was eligible
- Apply and re-apply until I get funding for my research. Internal seed grants have been critical for gathering pilot data and
- Apply and re-apply, reflecting upon critiques.
- Apply continuously to multiple funders
- Apply early and often, receive feedback from as many sources as possible.
- Apply everywhere I can
- Apply everywhere.

- Apply for all applicable funding based on my research topic, area, and the fact that I am an international student in the US. If unsuccessful in receiving grants and fellowships from funding agencies then hope that my department will provide sufficient financial support - particularly during year-long fieldwork.
- Apply for all awards, all the time.
- apply for all of the big general grants and use the grant writing process as a way to develop research projects. Post-phd I have applied for and received small internal seed grants and I used that to develop fundable large grants
- Apply for all possible funding.
- Apply for all possible grants
- Apply for an many grants as possible and hope I get at least some of them.
- Apply for anything and everything with confidence.
- Apply for anything I qualify for.
- Apply for anything that has elements related to myself or my research and the point at which I am in seeking my doctoral degree
- Apply for anything that I can
- Apply for anything that is available, regardless of how attainable it is (given the highly competitive nature of the grant market)
- Apply for anything that might be relevant. Try to partner with international institutions if possible.
- Apply for as many grants as possible and hope I'm successful.
- Apply for as much as possible. Tailor proposals to the interests of each agency. Not get discouraged by rejection
- Apply for everything
- Apply for everything appropriate until I have enough funds. Revise and resubmit often.
- Apply for everything I can manage and hope I get something.
- Apply for everything I could, save perhaps for one or two (like Wenner-Grenn) with a low likelihood of success relative to the amount of work I would have to put in (and my lack of available mentorship for that grant).
- Apply for everything reasonable
- Apply for everything, hope for the best.
- Apply for everything.
- Apply for everything.
- Apply for everything. Try (and I mean try, I'm not always successful at this) to approach it with very low expectations that I'll be funded.
- Apply for funding big and small.
- Apply for funding when needed, from organizations with a track record of funding that type of research.
- Apply for grants but also try to take advantage of what I can do locally
- apply for grants when my research fits them.
- Apply for lots of things, sometimes multiple times until you get what you need. Apply for both large and small pots of money. I read other successful proposals to learn how to write successful grants.
- Apply for med-carrer or advanced career fellowship
- apply for most of the things I'm eligible for - I'm an F1 student and can't apply for some funding (e.g., NSF GRFP; Fulbright; AAUW)
- apply for my greatest needs and look for fit of program
- Apply for small grants from an agency that continues to fund my research.
- Apply for the funding that seems best suited to my qualifications and goals. Also, apply for research funding that will look impressive on the CV.

- Apply often.
- Apply often.
- Apply to a lot of sources. Use previously successful grants to structure my application
- Apply to all major funding agencies.
- Apply to any and all sources of funding for which I meet the requirements
- Apply to anything I am eligible for and determine fit with the agency
- Apply to anything that even remotely fits if I need money, and anything that's a good fit even if I don't need money right then.
- Apply to as many places as possible.
- Apply to as many sources as possible as many times as possible, keeping in mind the goals of each funding agency. Create an annual list of deadlines and make as many as possible.
- Apply to as many things as possible as frequently as possible.
- Apply to as much as possible as often as possible
- Apply to every granting agency where I satisfy eligibility criteria. Reapply if I don't get enough money.
- Apply to everything and work extra paid jobs to save up
- Apply to everything I can possibly qualify for. Pretty sure that's every grad student's strategy...
- Apply to everything i.e. throw things at the wall and hope something sticks
- Apply to everything that I qualify for
- Apply to everything with even a slim chance of success, based on eligibility
- Apply to everything you are eligible for, have time for feedback on drafts
- Apply to everything.
- Apply to grants that seem like they will be sympathetic to my project and don’t spend too much time obsessing over longshots
- Apply to grants, and worse case I would use my stipend.
- Apply to less prestigious grants that still offer the funding needed to increase chances of receiving a grant.
- apply to one or two grants every year.
- Apply to organizations with clear interest in funding the kind of research I do and follow proposal directions explicitly.
- Apply to the grants with the highest chance of success. This has meant checking the success rate and looking at past recipients, their profiles and their projects. I don't apply to grants that fund mostly Ivy-league scholars, mostly white scholars, or mostly "hot" geopolitical topics and areas. As a multiracial person who has done their education in public universities only and works in an area of the world that the US generally doesn't care about, I don't feel it's worth my time to compete with them. I also avoid residential 1-year scholarships, as I do not want to uproot myself and live separated from my loved ones for a year.
- Apply to what others have applied to. Look for a good fit with my work.
- Apply to whatever I'm eligible for. As an Americanist a lot of grants are available to me.
- Apply wherever eligible
- Apply wherever I have a chance of obtaining it
- Apply wherever qualified
- Apply widely and anticipate rejection.
- apply widely and often
- Apply widely but spend the most time on opportunities very closely tied to your research topic.
- Apply widely but strategically. Do grants have similar application requirements? Similar questions? Will I need to pay a lot out of pocket for mailing materials, printing, and required official transcripts?

- Apply widely, but focus my efforts on the funding that I am most excited about/qualified for
- Apply widely, hope for the best.
- Apply, address feedback, apply again
- Apply. Apply. Apply.
- Applying
- Applying early and constantly for any funding I'm even remotely qualified for, and keeping a list of funding opportunities as I find them with general application deadlines (I'm also technically only starting my PhD this fall, and all my research funding—except one fellowship—has been internal)
- Applying for funding when I need it.
- Applying for grants, small and large
- Applying for grants/fellowships with little support from department.
- Applying for paper/presentation awards and research scholarships mostly.
- Applying to as many grants as possible.
- Applying to everything and praying a lot. I also picked up plenty of part time work to fill gaps in my income.
- Applying to internal and external funding sources.
- Applying to small grants in early stages of my PhD to support fieldwork and pilot studies and then to major grants to support bulk of my dissertation research.
- Applying when I'm ready for the next big project; using internal funds for pilot and follow up work when possible
- As a doctoral student, I applied to every organization I was aware of that funded research. I got support from advisors and other graduate students both in suggesting grants, sharing copies of successful applications, and reading copies of my own applications.
- As a faculty member at a teaching-focused university, I only need enough to keep some pretty small projects going. I could rely on internal funding.
- As a graduate student, I applied to grants that I knew my peers had success with. This meant that amongst my cohort and grad student community in my department there was a collection of successful grant materials that we could share for guidance and known people to ask for advice. I was a beneficiary of other people's success but I was also able to help advise others who eventually earned the same grants that I had. As a new tenure-track faculty, I have yet to find a working strategy for funding research, in part because I'm not as familiar with the programs and funds available to me in this new position and I find it much more intimidating.
- As a nonprofit staffer I generally limit myself to research that I can do using my operating budget. If we're working on an ambitious project, or a funding opportunity falls into my lap, I'll put together an application.
- As a professor, I apply for university funding and keep my costs low.
- As a regionally-focused archaeologist, I am kept busy with continuous, small funding ($25,000/year) to provide undergraduates hands-on experience. I do not have the support to take on large grants (no graduate students).
- As a sociocultural anthropologist, my research funding needs are fairly modest. My strategy is to seek funds from granting agencies that clearly support the kind of research I am undertaking. Almost always, I have already begun funding preliminary research through grants from my own university--my department, my college, and the provost's office. If possible, I will speak with/attend a workshop with granting agents if they are available prior to applying.
- As a specialist, much of my work is funded as a portion of a larger project developed by other (typically more established) researchers
- As a younger scholar, I went to bat for everything I could possibly qualify for, retasking a core proposal text to suit the various agencies. I often had to reapply, but I sometimes got good feedback from program directors.

- As an adjunct I have learned that eligiblity requirements often limit possibilities to persons of my status.
- As I am at an institution that is not an R1, I use mechanisms that are designed for those types of institution and do not compete with high profile R1s
- As noted, I work in CRM-- but we do choose to respond to proposals in areas that fit the research interest of our group at the company and don't try to compete for work just for works sake. (Although we might also compete if we just like the client and think they have a good mission).
- Ask all sort of colleagues, ask at grant office at universities in my state. ask each funding agency I approach for suggestions,
- At a small liberal arts college the teaching is heavy and limits the ability to write research grants. I attend as many info sessions, webinars as possible to help see if my research fits.
- At our university, the students are strongly encouraged to apply to NSF.
- At the beginning of a research project, I seek funding for the research. When it comes to the writing stage, I look for a fellowship for writing up the project.
- At the moment I am fully funded from my postdoctoral fellowship so I am not seeking additional funding.
- At the moment, nonexistent
- At this point in my career I look for funding to work with local groups on questions of environmental importance to citizens and tribes. E.g. exhibits, ethnohistories,. I also collaborate with engineers and biophysical scientists on projects and we apply to government agencies to do strategic research for our region.
- Attempt to frame my work in ways that will fit into the paradigm of the funders
- Avoiding applications, figuring out how I can do my research on my own without funding (camping at research site, creating friendships and collaboration).
- Balancing the amount of money offered versus the amount of effort to put towards completing the grant.
- based on need and fit with research
- Basically, I looked for grants that would be given specifically for the kinds of research that I'm conducting. Smaller grants are also typically less competitive so it is a bit easier to receive one?
- basically, I've given up. most of my research is currently funded by field school students because as an adjunct I cannot apply for larger grants through my institution. I'm basically stuck because without the funding I can't get a permanent job.
- beg, plead
- Begin with smaller grants for exploratory research. Then build on these results to apply for a major grant/grants. Important also to apply to multiple sources for funding.
- By submitting applications directly to funders that fit best for each project
- Card counting at blackjack.
- careful, ensuring a strong tack record
- Carpet bomb approach--applied for anything and everything appropriate.
- Cast a broad net and apply widely and frequently
- Catch as catch can. I am not paid to research but only to teach. Thus, I fit seeking funding into free time
- Cautiously optimistic
- Chasing opportunities as they arise, not very strategic.
- Clear answerable questions and apply often and repeat after rejection for as many times as necessary.
- Clearly delineate the problem/research question and contextualize it in a thorough literature review. If you can get some of the work done absent grant funding, do it--it's often an easier ask for $$ to

complete something that's clearly valuable and partially done than to argue for an entirely new project.
- Clearly describe a practical project that will appeal to current trends and research priorities
- Client/Project based
- Clients fund my projects.
- Collaborate with others. Know your analytical limits and find those who will make your study more precise and accurate.
- Collaboration with a multidisciplinary team. I am.often the only.social scientist
- Collaborative--working with teams.
- Collaborative. A way to bring partners together for a focus project, but the research isn't always the primary output I'm interested, more so the collaboration between the end users and stakeholders.
- Combination of federal and private foundation sources
- Community-based, and collaboration with non-profit land conservancies
- Consider levels of funding available, fit with your research, look beyond "standard" sources, develop a strong record of success, timeliness, take all reviewers seriously and attend to comments
- constantly keep an eye out for opportunities, including in unexpected/left-field places (ie think outside the box); network network network; get and follow advice from successful colleagues as well as university research admin and grant agency staff, aim high, and keep at it regardless of the knockbacks (but take heed of the reasons why you get knocked back and modify your approach accordingly, including the agencies you are approaching)
- Consult with my college's Office of Research Programs
- Contract with granting agencies for vouchered expense coverage.
- craetive
- Crafting a research question and then writing the proposal.
- create adequate budgets and scope of works to allow it when the project calls for it.
- Create project, then look for funding fit, apply; reapply if first reviews are encouraging; or move on if not encouraging reviews.
- Creating a detailed document describing why funding is needed and the research project outline.
- CRM employment
- Cultivating private donors, applying to 1 large grant/year, applying to several small grants with short LOIs.
- Cultural Resources Management; my fieldwork, laboratory analysis and report write-ups are funded by clients.
- currently forced by lack of internal institutional funding (even research budget) to apply for external grants!
- Currently I work for a state agency and any research is funded by my employer. I have not sought grants outside of work in the last five+ years. In grad school, one of the biggest hurdles was simply discovering what was available and how to apply. After that, I usually applied for every funding opportunity that fit my research.
- Currently most of my work is funded by a private research endowment. I shoot for small money grants to fund specialty projects not related directly to my dissertation.
- Dedicated time; pertinent research questions that can relate to current issues; realization early in the process that persistence it's absolutely necessary, and willingness to revise and resubmit based on review our comments one available.
- Deliberate, multi-pronged
- Department listserve, google searches, archaeology blogs
- Desparate.

- Develop a do-able problem within the broader context of my research; review funder priorities carefully
- Develop a focused question, get input from other colleagues who work in the region/topic, think about broader impacts in term of activities beyond publications and talks.
- develop a research question/topic that is both driven by my interests and community interests for the community I am working with. Frame the application within current theoretical and methodological trends.
- Develop a strong project, write an outstanding proposal, and hope for fair reviewers.
- Develop an outstanding proposal, then apply to as many funding organizations as possible and hope one or more offer something.
- Develop areas of expertise, link those areas of expertise to current public policy issues and needs, conduct and publish the research as much as possible, attend conferences and present on the research, develop relationships with potential funders, and keep an eye out for multiple sources of funding.
- Developing a project, then finding funding programs that are a good fit for that research. Sometimes this takes some shoehorning, but generally it has been successful. I also find that seeking funding from non-traditional sources for our field — like from the USDA — has been really productive.
- Discussed and approved by Board
- do a lot of groundwork ahead of time. Ensure it's ethical and has buy in from those affected. Talk to a LOT of people who know about the funding sources. Maintain currency in the field! Get creative, and don't be afraid to make phone calls to granting agency staff. Include students.
- do free/low cost research
- Dogged does it.
- Doing what everyone else does in my department, which is apply to NSF and WG
- Draining, overshadowed by concern that time invested will not be rewarded
- Dream up a project that might be viewed as "transformational research." Match the nature of the project to the goals of the foundation. Study previously successful proposals. Discuss with program officer as appropriate. Develop strong research partners as needed. Produce a quality proposal with strong intellectual merit and broader impacts. Cite key sources. Constrain the budget to a reasonable level.
- During grad school (for my PhD in Anthropology) I was not successful in securing any outside funding. My research was completely funded by my teaching assistantships and dissertation grants from my institution. (When I was a Chemistry graduate student 10 years ago, I was successful in securing a number of outside grants including NSF-GRFP. But no luck whatsoever as an Anthropology student)
- During graduate school, I applied to everything that came my way and was marginally relevant. Now, I feel funding is MUCH more restricted and I only really have a chance at the big NSF/NEH grants. Those are intimidating and I never feel ready to start them.
- Earlier in my career I tended to target agencies like Wennergren and NSF because those were the norms in our field. Upon matriculation I've adopted a strategy of relying on smaller grants from local or topic specific organizations as well as grants from the private sector.
- Elevating the ethnographic specificity
- Employer and grants
- Employer funded research professionally and hobby research in off-hours
- Employer provides all funding
- Ensure methodology explicitly links back to research questions (literally say, to answer question x, I will do y). Make sure the research questions specific enough to be answered yet also fit within what is considered "important" by the discipline and academe writ large.
- Entrepreneurial. looking at a range of sources, but all aimed at research design-driven projects.

- even successful applications take time. I self-fund everything for past 40 years.
- Exhaustive and exhausting
- Exploring all possible avenues for funding, both internal and external. Trying to begin with pilot data if possible in order to show feasibility. Writing many applications while striving for quality work (hard to balance quality v. quantity)
- Extensive applications, applying to big and small agencies, re-applying where possible, not losing hope or taking rejections personally.
- Fieldschools, internal university grants during the building phase, then aim for larger outside grants
- Fieldwork, in particular logistics, is so expensive in the past of the world I work in the NSF is the most realistic source for funding and logistic support, so virtually all my efforts is directed there. Then it is a matter of preparing (or revising!) good application.
- Find a client who needs the work done
- Find a funder who currently is supporting research similar to mine.
- Find a funding organization with a good fit
- find a good problem and then look for who may be funding that kind of work.
- Find entities whose funding areas align with my research.
- Find out who is interested in my research and develop a relationship
- Find outside funding targeted for research or reserve "extra" money received for unrelated tasks for research.
- find requirements that I can satisfy without having to drastically alter my research questions
- Find sources with reasonable expectations.
- Find specific and appropriate funding for elements that cannot be subsumed within my regular job. Partner with other groups or agencies on large projects.
- Find the right granting agency (knowing what the agency funds, the amount they can support), otherwise you are wasting your time. Write a clear proposal that is linked to clear questions of high importance to the field (i.e., broad questions of interest to a wide range of the profession), with a clear methodology for arriving at an answer to the proposal's questions.
- Finding a funding agency that aligns with research idea to find best match
- Finding a good fit between the funding source and the proposed research.
- Finding a good pitch.
- Finding existing projects that provide funding, require specialist analysis that I can provide, and align with my research interests.
- Finding funding briefs that fit my research to a T so that the rationale for funding is ironclad.
- Finding odd hours to conduct it during the course of my job
- Finding small grants to support focused parts of research
- Finding support for the time to do research. At a public teaching university, it is really difficult to find the time to do research (i.e., we don't get a lot of sabbaticals and we have heavy teaching loads, and no grad students to assist with research or teaching). If agencies don't cover course buy-outs, we don't have time to do the work we propose to do.
- Finding the funder that best fits my research agenda, and tailoring the research design and approach to check off the desired criteria, while still ethically conducting my research and meeting my goals.
- First build relationships with non-traditional funders (gov't agencies, community partners, NGOs) with shared goals that can partner and provide finding outside of the grant writing process. Then to raise the rest of the funds needed, apply early and often to as many places as you are eligible, this is a numbers game, rejection is the most common outcome.
- First decide overall research objectives, budget and personnel required. If possible do an on-site feasibility assessment to refine project plan. Identify organizations that may fund at least a portion of

the activity. Apply to multiple funding sources, seeking complementary funding to cover all project needs.

- First I approach options through the university. Next, I look for external funding.
- First, have a good problem. Second, demonstrate the ability to identify and acquire data for its solution. Third, demonstrate your research ability. Fourth, ideally, be from a major research university or a "prestigious" liberal-arts college. But some of us can't do anything about that 4th item.
- focus on funding organizations where I think I will be successful
- Focus on funding sources that are familiar with the type of research I do. Most funding sources do not allow for enough writing space to explain every term requested in feedback processes.
- Focus on my objectives and how they are relevant to the broader discipline.
- Focus on public outreach programs
- Focus on specific problems with the convergence of general theory and relevant data. Use one's graduate students to generate ideas, bibliography.
- Focus on specific projects that are interest to the agency
- Focus on specific research goal, closely follow format suggested by funding agency, clear language.
- Focused on timing and project. I make getting the funding my top priority. I have people read my proposals. I read other people's proposals. I teach grant writing.
- Focusing on the most likely sources of funding and apply to those one or two opprotunities
- follow mentors' advice, aim to get just slightly more than I anticipate needing
- following the instructions and having the granting point person read a draft
- For dissertation field research, I spent nearly 6 months between a course the spring before grants were due and continuing conversations and sessions with colleagues the summer before the grants were due preparing for submission. During this time, I wrote and re-wrote drafts, read probably over a dozen funded proposals that I got from personal contacts and my department, had probably near a dozen different individuals read my drafts, and spoke with different program coordinators to ask about my (now more honed) proposal's fit with their programs.
- For fieldwork, I applied for everything I could. Later I learned that that was not the best strategy for students in my PhD program.
- For my independent research, I work on topics that can be done for free. Otherwise, for most of my research I am a technical member of research teams that have funding from a variety of sources (including NSF, NatGeo, and universities).
- For the PhD, I tried to secure funding from external sources, but ended up cobbling together small grants from within my university when nothing came through.
- Formerly employed in CRM
- Formulate a research project first, liaison with descendant community and discuss partnership, then look for a foundation or other source that funds this sort of work
- Formulate clear concise .Have clear sets of deliverables. Design the projects to fit the timelines and requested budget.
- Free time only.
- Frustrating. I first started with re-applying to the same funding agency in hopes that I'd have a better chance after improving my application package. At this point, though, I've given up temporarily. I'm not sure what to do next, so I don't really have a strategy.
- Funded research? Ha. My whole career has been working and finding ways to conduct research without external funding.
- Funding provides time to a researcher, and it should provide all benefit that help me focus on my research.
- Funding research is a constant struggle. In general, my research is grant or institutionally funded, though sometimes I contribute small amounts of personal funds. I constantly consider a wide range

of alternate possible funding sources, including field schools, private donors, and others, though these have generally not been implemented.

- Funding should consider Dessrtation work, Fieldwork, House Rent Allowence
- Furiously applying to any possible source of funding every year to support fieldwork
- Get good at writing grants; get as many fellowships as possible.
- Get whatever you can
- Getting support from colleagues was important. Some of them suggested I apply to certain programs. Personal contact with the heads of foundations, like Wenner-Gren, was important. Some program officers who wanted to get personal with applicants were a problem because I certainly was not going to have personal relationships with such persons but not doing so made tension and problems continuing to get funding there.
- Go big, and then scale back if needed for success.
- Go for everything that applies, keep trying until proposals are funded. The best predictor of getting a grant is the number of times you've applied for the grant.
- Go for smaller pots of money that are directly relevant to your work because they have faster review times, helpful reviewers, and often require much less paperwork on the back end.
- Going after funding that is obtainable at this point in my career.
- Going from a smaller funding opportunity (ex: SSHRC fellowship) to a mid-range opportunity from the same agency (ex: SSHRC Partnership Engage Grant) to a higher-range opportunity (ex: SSHRC Insight Grant). And, as a doctoral candidate, to network as much as possible for credible and capable co-applicants and collaborators who are willing to distribute funding to graduate RAs.
- Good
- Google widely; carefully review requirements. After being unsuccessful receiving funding from big name agencies, I went after a lot of small grants 2k, 5k, 10k, with short applications that allowed me to complete my research.
- GOV"T FUNDED
- Govt budget with supplemental support from park Friends groups
- Grants, and personal finance, collaboration
- Guided by applicability of grant guidelines, nature of funding, and more. I try to apply for what is appropriate.
- Haphazard
- Haphazard
- Haphazard - due to delays related to the pandemic (and lack of understanding of funding timelines), I struggled to decide when/where to apply for funding.
- Haphazard at best. When possible, in addition to my typical responsibilities as a cultural resources specialist with a nonprofit organization, I have applied for grants and funding. However, I am only able to do so irregularly when my workload is low or when I apply on my own using my limited free time.
- Haphazard; I generally find funding to apply for, write up the grant, send it to my advisor, and then the deadline passes before I receive a reply.
- Haphazard. I could have strongly benefitted from advice from advisors, a course/workshop, etc. on how to apply for funding for my research as a graduate student. Since finishing my Ph.D., I have learned about funding applications through trial and error, which has not been successful.
- Haphazard. I've been fortunate in that I don't need a lot of money, and the money I need tends to come my way at the right moment. Applying for big research grants is frustrating due to the extremely high time commitment and the very low success rate, so I tend not to do it.
- Have a project and then look for applicable funding.
- Have not needed since grad school
- Haven't applied in a long time.

- Haven't really done it
- Having a good research question. Justifying its worth. Then writing a convincing proposal.
- Hit and miss
- Hmm. When I was a working archaeologist (in academic and later CRM studies), I relied on grants or contracts from the companies I worked for, or the principal investigators I worked for.
- Homework and Dilligence
- Honestly my research isn't that expensive-- mostly cost of travel. I've been able to skate by on internal funding at my current university, after applying for lots of grants (mostly pretty successfully) in graduate school. At this moment it feels tricky to come up with successful funding proposals for a second project, now that my first book ms is (finally) done; graduate school funding applications feel very different than edging into mid-career from being junior and trying to come up with a new project.
- Honestly, I've been worried to apply for major grants after my frustration with the NSF experience, so I've focused on smaller and internal grants.
- hopeful
- I aim high in conceiving of research and proposing projects, often stretching a bit out of conventional (scope-limited) archaeology awards. That gives me a shot at larger, interdisciplinary funding opportunities, but also increases the scope and (often) competition level for the funding. Even so, the results have been gratifying, even if collaborators and I have to submit multiple times to receive awards. I always talk to program officers before applying and gauge the appropriateness and likely reception of reviewers to proposal ideas in principle before investing too much tome in a proposal.
- I always intend to apply to any and all possible funding sources, but I am very limited in terms of the time I can invest on grant applications (due to obligations to current grants).
- I am 100% on soft money so my strategy is to take a broad approach. I have to say yes to collaborators if asked to help on a grant proposal. I cannot be selective.
- I am an Applied Anthropologist -- What is the practical application of such research? And is this the right match between the client and the source? This is my main focus?
- I am applying to NSF and Wenner Gren and if needed, Fulbright
- I am first applying to several prestigious granting applications with the expectation that I will need to revise and resubmit my proposals. I am applying to more than one, but few enough that I have time to hone my applications. The choice of agencies is in part because my institution will provide additional funds to me if I receive a prestigious award. If these applications are not successful, I will apply to smaller and more specialized organizations (e.g. ones geared toward women researchers or a mission related to my research).
- I am fortunate in getting research funds from my own university that I primarily rely upon to do research.
- I am funded by my college and by the museum I work at for our summer field school.
- I am in a teaching position so my research takes place in collaboration with others in more research-intensive positions. I apply when asked to collaborate
- I am in the stage of my project in which I am doing the bulk of my applying for funding. I have been lucky so far to receive support from my university and from my research director, but am now seeking out funding that seems possible for my project to write applications for and have a few carefully selected mentors help me work on.
- I am nearing retirement and have given up on writing grant proposals. The amount of time it takes for even modest grants isn't worth it when I have a few projects to finish off before retirement
- I am no longer research track, but historically, I went after prestigious and well-known grants that offered manageable (i.e. $20,000 range) sums of money for fieldwork and lab research. I have been

always been interested in write-up fellowships, but never applied for one. Now that I'm a parent, I avoid non-local, in-residence fellowships (not willing to move the family or be separated from them).

- I am not sure I have been as strategic as I could be
- I am still a graduate student so I have not fully developed a strategy for funding my research. However I consider myself as someone who will be resourceful and apply to any and all opportunities I hear about, whether large or small, in order to do the community archaeology work I am building.
- I applied as widely as possible
- I applied broadly -- to six different funding agencies in two rounds each.
- I applied for everything that seemed logical and within my abilities at the time.
- I applied for major grants until I got one of them
- I applied internally and externally for the scant grants available for sociocultural anthro research. I worked extremely hard over several months on my applications, and my committee gave me several rounds of feedback. I read previously successful applications from doctoral students in my department.
- I applied multiple times to every grant over $10k that I was eligible for. Because my research is US-based, I am often excluded or demerited in review processes because anthropology still tends to favor the model of "lone fieldworker abroad" rather than research "at home", which really limited the number of things I could apply for. I also found that there was very little funding to help cover costs associated with lab research at my home institution, even though there was no other way to be paid/get funded for that beyond grants. So generally, my strategy was: apply to everything I am eligible for over $10K, apply to small grants that are very specific to my research area and subfield, and re-apply every cycle if needed.
- I applied to places that were related to my research topic or discipline.
- I applied to those agencies that applicants in my Ph.D. program had been successful with
- I applied to those grants that everyone in my department was expected to apply for. I was not particularly well informed about how to find information about alternate grant sources, which was unfortunate.
- I applied when I believed I had worthwhile research and not just to have it on my CV. I am very careful about how I use the money knowing that the overwhelming amount of funding that I have received are public funds, tax payers' dollars. The incurs responsibility and modesty.
- I apply for both large and small grants and adapt my research plans accordingly.
- I apply for funding from internal and external sources pretty regularly, and know that sometimes it just takes a round or two to get the proposal accepted. You cannot take rejection personally - often reviewers really like the project but simply have to choose between worthy proposals.
- I apply for funding when I have a very specific project in mind that needs funds for it to happen (i.e., a dissertation) or for job purposes (like a fellowship). In other words, my project comes first then I figure out how to pay for it (I do know people who do this in reverse and wait to start research projects until funding is secure).
- I apply for pretty much everything that I am even vaguely eligible for, even if it's a very small grant, and I always ask for the full amount. Basically, apply for everything and see what sticks is my strategy and I spend A LOT of time grant writing but it has worked.
- I apply regularly and revise and resubmit unsuccessful proposals. I try to break down broad research goals into smaller interrelated projects that fit the goals of different funding agencies.
- I apply to agencies that fund what I do/align with my research agenda and goals. I also generally do not apply if the money available is too small. For example, it is not worth my time to apply for a Wenner Gren grant as a faculty member because the amount of time I would need to spend on the application is not worth the $25,000 maximum award. I can find other ways to internally fund my research for $25,000 that do not require the time and effort to submit a Wenner Gren application

(and I am at a regional, public university -- not a private or R1 university who both have far more opportunities for internal funding).

- I apply to all grant agencies, large and small to fund my research and often tailor the way I approach a question to fit within a funding line.
- I apply to everything that I am eligible for and is within the scope of my research. Whether it's $20k or $500, every little bit helps. I set regular schedules around funding deadlines and work with my committee, previous awardees, and successful proposals to make a competitive application.
- I apply to everything that seems pertinent.
- I apply to the majority of sociocultural anthropology and education research grants. Maximize applications for funding.
- I apply to the most appropriate funder for the type of award required and research being undertaken. Where there is more than one choice, I often default to the funder I have experience with either as the lead applicant or as a senior research member.
- I apply to things I'm most likely to get but don't hesitate to reach for prestigious grants
- I apply to those that my supervisors recommend.
- I consider the balance between the amount of time & energy it takes to get funding from an outside organization vs. what I can do with, say, funding from my home institution.
- I contribute to grants for the PI of the project and work on a lot of collaborative projects. Not currently seeking grants for myself.
- I cover the costs myself. If travel is needed, I try to drive and stay with friends.
- I decided to apply early and widely in the PhD program despite some concerns about not having enough training. I cast a wide net and cobble together a range of grants, both large and small.
- I develop a proof-of-concept first with seed funding from my institution, personal funds, or colleagues' funds.
- I develop my questions and then look for appropriate finders.
- I did read successful proposals before writing my application. I also received advice from my dissertation advisor and department faculty.
- I did tons of reading on the historical background on my possible proposal topic before I did anything. From there, I was able to turn my casual observations into a clearly defined subject for inquiry. I did not receive the grant I applied for before this one, and I believe that was caused by my topic being too abstract. By changing how I prepared my application, I was able to secure funding.
- I did what was recommended by my advisor
- I do not have a strategy. I have often applied for funding from agencies that are commonly discussed in my field and by colleagues.
- I do not have one. Either my office funds it or I fund it.
- I do not think that my research is very costly (I tend to research in parts of the United States that are much, much cheaper than where I typically live and work). I prefer to use university-internal funds, as they're an easier application process with a higher chance of success.
- I do research for work during work hours and research personal projects as a hobby after hours
- I don't have a good strategy - very little funding for the kind of work I do.
- I don't have an effective strategy, no one has taught me how to apply or seek external funding
- I don't have one, other than small faculty development funds from my institution
- I don't have one. I've cobbled together small funds and even self-funded because I am very intimidated by the grant application process. It seems like a huge amount of work only to be rejected.
- I don't really have one yet
- I don't really have one-generally based on the types of research I'm doing at the time and what is available.

- I don't write grants unless I absolutely have to because they're typically an enormous waste of time that could otherwise be spent publishing research.
- I don't understand the question. I apply to agencies that fund my research topics and the materials I need.
- I find funding to be nearly impossible, so I have largely given up.
- I find that it is difficult to get the type of archaeology research I want to do funded (specifically work focused on gender and sexuality, historical archaeology, and work that focuses on CBPR) so I cobble together smaller grants generally through the university to fund my work. When I do apply to larger agencies I focus on the science and minimize the aspects like gender research that reviewers tend to find issue with.
- I first seek out funding opportunities that I think fit best with my research. I discuss those opportunities with colleagues, staff in our Office of Sponsored Programs, and staff at the funding agency. Then, I write the grant and request feedback throughout the grant writing process from colleagues.
- I focus on local projects that have low costs and use students paid by my college
- I focus on only one or two bigger "more prestigious" grants and follow those through to completion, while also applying to several smaller sources of funding and internal funding sources.
- I follow the advice of my mentors and colleagues
- I fund it through internal grants or self-fund by teaching summer courses to pay for my research.
- I fund research and don't have to compete for external funds
- I gave up. I left academia. I may try for a writing fellowship down the line to write for a year
- I generally apply to everything that I can, within time constraints. I keep a running list of funding opportunities, due dates, and proposal requirements and try to submit as many proposals as I can.
- I generally have a well designed research idea before I apply for any grants and go for a number of small grants before attempting to apply for anything big.
- I had no secured funding for my Ph.D., so I had to actively apply for grants begining my first year of graduate school. I was able to find TA positions outside of my department for my first few years before I had a dissertation project. I was able to get smaller awards to cover research costs once I has a dissertation project but was still finishing my coursework (NSF subsidized research at the Field Museum and the Archaeometry laboratory at University of Missouri) and then I was successful in getting larger grants to support my dissertation research once I had completed my comprehensive exams (Fulbright Student Research and NSF DDRI which supported my research expenses and some living and travel expenses, while the PEO Scholar award covered my living expenses while I was writing my dissertation). I belive I was successful at getting the larger grants because I was able to start the research with the smaller grants, which allowed me to have some data and refine my research questions to cover feasible and significant work. I also knew from the moment I started graduate school that I would need grants to cover my reseach, so I was proactive in attending workshops and informational sessions regarding large grants.
- I have a research program and then I try to figure out how to fund it. I apply for everything that I can until I have what I need to do the research. Then only apply for things that provide what you need financially.
- I have applied to a number of outside agencies (NEH, NSF) and received pretty consistent rejections. I have basically given up and have concentrated on smaller sources of funding internal to my institution.
- I have been able to fund most of my research on soft money and institutional grants or by teaching a filed school course
- I have funded 90% of my postgraduate research through commercial archaeology. I am currently semi-retired and currently self-funding new research. I will be looking for institutional support for this research.

- I have given up on writing grant proposals because my work requires work on artifacts already excavated that are in repositories or museums. Funding for these type of projects is rare.
- I have just begun.
- I have just tried to rely on my stipend.
- I have largely followed in the footsteps of friends, colleagues, and alumni who have gone before. I also worked with my advisor to decide which societies to prioritize. In future I expect to mostly turn to NSF for funding my research.
- I have mostly given up on securing external funding and conduct focused research projects that can be done in the framework of my tenured research. This is only a strategy I would encourage for a senior scholar.
- I have networked throughout my university to attend grant writing workshops, talks, and webinars with funders. I've built internal and cross-university teams to apply for funding. I have applied for a lot of smaller ~$10,000 grants for pilot research to use that as the start of a project for a larger grant. I apply to what I consider a lot of grants (I applied for 7 grants in 2020, and 2 so far in 2021). I ask for feedback on every grant, and then work to reapply for funding. I'm relatively new at my institution and I'm not tenure stream so extending my contract is possible if I can help bring in some money for my salary. However, I don't have much internal support for that directly. In anthropology it is often the case that one could provide qualitative research components to larger quantitative projects. But this takes networking yourself to get people to include you in their larger grants, which is very hard. I've been trying to do that, but you need senior scholars to want to include you and your research in their projects. There is a lot of support to include graduate students on project, but not much support to include early career scholars. There isn't a lot of money to fund anthropology salaries, so it is harder to be in this institutional space where you need to bring in money for your salary but you do qualitative research that isn't funded at high rates.
- I have no strategy and am pretty bad at it, to be honest!
- I have not applied for funds
- I have not been able to fund my research with grants, unfortunately.
- I have not had very much success and this has been incredibly discouraging. I have applied for well-known grants and received mixed feedback, leading me to believe I should try again, only to be rejected more than once. There seems to be little interest in funding domestic research on my topic.
- I have not received the funding yet, so I am not sure if I am in a right position to reply to this question.
- I have often chosen to pursue research that did not require much funding, in part because of clear biases of reviewers during my efforts in grad school (e.g., not amendable to questions with more humanistic approach, not fully informed about techniques I was to employ and therefore dismissive of project). Thus, I have focused more on relationships with federal agencies that have projects that fit my research and can "pick me up" through cooperative agreements
- I hope to apply for more significant grants in the future but currently focus on smaller grants in order to fund my work. I apply for a large number of smaller grants to increase the likelihood of securing money for research.
- I keep applying and hoping for the best, but generally with few results.
- I look at specific research projects and look far beyond anthropology. It is easier to get research funded than writing. I first do a pilot project with internal grants, the work on a proposal for outside funding, and expect to submit at least twice. The same is true for fellowship applications for writing up books. It usually takes more than once.
- I look at the requirements and then verify if I am available. I also ask colleagues about their experience applying to these agencies. Then I work on the proposal and also ask colleagues to revise it.
- I look for a fit between my project needs, agency goals, and amount of funding needed and amount agency will provide for successful proposals.

- I look for agencies that seem like a good fit for my focus and methods based on previously funded work and advice from colleagues. As I now transition to being a faculty member, I'm looking for grants that are big enough that I can help support undergrad and grad students so they can get exposure to fieldwork
- I look for funding agencies that are a good fit for my research, look for partners who can work with me on that research, talk with the program manager, and apply if I feel confident that we can propose and manage a good program of research.
- I look for grants specifically targeting the kind of research I am trying to do/doing.
- I look for programs and opportunities that fit what I want to do and have the right sized funding capacity for the project.
- I look for programs that appear to be a good fit for my research (mostly through the National Science Foundation) and I also watch all of the announcements for new programs through things like the NSF daily digest. When possible, I talk to colleagues or even people I've never met who have been successful in my targeted program to see if they would be willing to share proposals and most will. I try to stay abreast of bigger developments in the funding agencies and to predict what their priorities are likely to be in a given year due to both internal conversations and external pressure (like governmental funding). To do this, I've found that the grant services folks at my university are amazing at keeping us "in the know" in things like this and I realize that this is a luxury that not everyone has. Most importantly I will never commit to writing a grant proposal for a program I don't know very well without first having a conversation with the program officer or equivalent. This has saved me huge amounts of time when I've been told that a particular project wasn't really what the program was looking for or when they recommended another program instead. The other aspect of my strategy is to apply frequently and reapply when I can. I apply for 1-2 major grants per year and even when the success rates are fairly low, I've been able to have actively funded projects consistently since I first started as an assistant professor. A major factor in this is that I also engage in mostly team research so it's not all up to me and I can keep a lot of irons in the fire without having to manage everything myself.
- I look for the funding that I need, not for the funding that I want.
- I look to smaller regional grants and look outside achaeology (I'm in paleoethnobotany and geoarchaeology) to support my research. My region of the US is literally skipped over in intro arch textbooks (Plateau) so I am still laying the groundwork for bringing the region back into larger dialogue; but soon I'll start shooting for bigger things.
- I mostly fund my own research these days. Funding for humanistic ethnographic research for senior scholars has become extremely difficult to obtain. COVID has made ethnographic research practically undoable, bringing my projects to a halt.
- I only sought grant funds when I was working on my dissertation. Now that I am at a for-profit company, we propose possible research potential if the client is willing to fund it.
- I picked a dissertation project that didn't actually require funding, by using collections already excavated.
- I primarily contribute to others' proposal efforts to obtain funding that includes archaeological research.
- I primarily focus on government based agencies such as the NSF.
- I pursue many small grants instead of larger grants. They tend to be easier to get and have applications that are simple to complete.
- I put together project requirements necessary to keep my employer in compliance with federal preservation laws and submit an annual budget.
- I relied mainly on small grants from my university since I was not able to access larger grants, nor did I have mentors to help me write grants
- I rely on grants to fund my research or I attempt to do it within the budget provided by my salary and small grants.

- I research for funding sources that seem likely to support my type of research and understand its relevance.
- I review grants for NSF/NIJ and have a good understanding of what makes a successful proposal. I have used previous grant examples provided to me by colleagues as exemplars. I plan out the scope and budget before filling in all of the details.
- I run a primarily soft-funded lab with 5 full-time professional staff and dozens of undergraduates. I apply for as many grants and contracts as I can write while still doing the work. Our success rate is close to 50/50 across all funding agencies, so we usually apply for 3-4x the salary dollars we need for a given year in total awards (including overhead, equipment, student wages, travel, etc.).
- I search for a match between what I am interested in studying and the priorities of the funding agency. And then, when rejected, just keep trying.
- I searched and applied for anything I was eligible for and asked advisors and colleagues what they had applied for. It was time consuming and there was not much because my field work was in the US.
- I seek funding sources that are generally aligned with my research objectives, talk informally with program officers to gain feedback on specific aims and research design, and write well organized proposals with clearly defined research questions or hypotheses to test, and select designs that are well suited to address these research questions.
- I seek out smaller in-house grants first and then try to develop larger grant/writing proposals
- I set up alerts, for years spent abut 5 hours a week looking for funding and working on applications.
- I spend a lot of time discussing options with people at my university who support grant writing and those who have received grants
- I spent a lot of time googling for fellowships, grants, and awards I could apply to. I also talked to others in my journal club and in my department, and we created a Google Sheet to keep track of funding sources. I also pay attention to emails from the university for external and internal sources of funding, or social media. Internal funding is generally less competitive and can provide a substantial amount of money (this is how I funded all my research abroad). I also applied to many, many funding sources. Once you have a project description done, it can easily be adapted to other application packages, which reduces the time spent applying.
- I spent two months working on NSF-GRFP application.
- I start with a research question/interest and then seek out where it would likely be supported.
- I started out with detailed spreadsheets, but have devolved into a strategy of "later." My coursework, language learning, and teaching responsibilities leave little time to prepare funding applications. I always seem to be misaligned with the funding cycles.
- I started the process early, went through a ton of drafts, had a multitude of people read it, applied, and hoped for the best. I think funding agencies need to change, when you have R1 professors telling you that "getting your research funded is a crap shoot" - something has got to change.
- I take advantage of smaller grants for small projects and travel related costs at the private universities I have been fortunate to attend then focus most of my grant writing on NSF and Wenner Gren applications.
- I take into account the fit between my proposed research and the funding agency, as well as the amount of time it takes to prepare a proposal and the likelihood of it getting funded.
- I take the effort to get grants and contracts very seriously. Getting money is separate from other skills in academia and needs to be learned.
- I tend to apply for smaller grants and grants to match existing money, rather than large grants. Since my job is very teaching-intensive, I just don't have the time to compete for major grants. I have been able to do fieldwork most summers since 2000 with a small, hardworking crew.
- I tend to choose three each quarter that I will apply for.

- I think my strategy during my doctoral work was good. I wrote multiple grants and while I was not successful with larger, more prestigious granting agencies I was with smaller ones. I have not applied for postdoctoral grants because I was adjunct faculty and could barely keep my head above water teaching the amount of classes I did in order to pay my bills let alone think about writing grants with all the requirements of the applications.
- I think my strategy has been to try to identify the types of projects that individual funders choose as successful, and I target my applications that way.
- I took a proposal methods course. This course required that we complete an NSF DDRIG proposal. Having to write this proposal for this course forced me to get the work done. I was later able to use some of this work for a Wenner Gren dissertation fieldwork grant which I was awarded on the first attempt.
- I took on full time work in addition to my full time academic career and funded 90% of my research and analysis through my salary
- I tried for funds that fit my research and writing agenda. Having said that, my recollection is that I have been turned down so many times that I can't remember the names of all of the agencies. I was more successful in getting grants later in my career with massive publications than when I was starting out. Fortunately, my institution picked up the slack.
- I tried to establish some field and lab work and some publications so the agency could see that I had a record of successful work.
- I tried to focus on methods and fit in my applications, that is, being clear that I had thought through my research design and that I was well-positioned to conduct the proposed research.
- I try to apply for as many opportunities as possible knowing I will get rejected from most.
- I try to avoid looking for external support because the effort is typically not worth it.
- I try to do a lot of my work with students. My college is happy to fund their work, though usually in relatively small amounts (max $4000). I also get small grants specifically for faculty.
- I try to find a balance between the amount of effort I am putting in with throwing my hat in as many rings as possible. If its easy to modify an existing proposal for another application, its usually worth it.
- I try to find funding that fits my project, rather than trying to create a project to shoe-horn into the funding. I try to focus on collaborations and getting the most "bang for the buck" for the agency by including things like professional development and outcomes that can be used and adapted by others.
- I try to focus on projects that don't require additional outside funding
- I typically apply for many small grants
- I typically do not do research outside of my employer's work.
- I typically get a grant to fund a new project--most of my work involves fieldwork and survey data collection so I can't really run a project without it. I apply to the places most likely to fund the type of work I want to do and I try to find sample proposals when possible.
- I typically use small grants (including internal grants from my university) to start projects. Then, if a project seems promising, I will apply for larger external grants.
- I use a combination of public and private funding from gov't and nonprofits, including leading fee-based educational opportunities (field schools).
- I used my savings for fieldwork and research. I received an external fellowship for the writing stage. My grad program was never transparent about who received money for the writing stage. Honestly, I never would have finished without the external fellowship.
- I used to cast my net extensively - with some success - but have mostly settled for aiming for smaller grants with greater chances of success
- I usually formulate basic ideas and start looking up for grant, and write the whole project according to the requirements.

- I usually scrounge around for smaller grants, many of them from internal sources. At this stage in my career, my devotion to service and teaching over research has made me much less competitive for prestigious grants.
- I was actively discouraged from applying to extramural funding, as the faculty said "You're a Harvard student, you have enough funding," which is what they say to almost everyone and is categorically false. When I did apply for the NSF-GRFP and was denied, I then stuck to intramural grants only from Harvard's Daviid Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, and the graduate school of arts and sciences.
- I was fortunate to have good funding from within my institution, and was encouraged to apply outside as an afterthought. I wish I had been more proactive about finding outside money. I also cast my net widely, trying for grants outside of anthropology that were a stretch, but helped me frame my project better within other fields.
- I will not spend my own resources to conduct research, so I rely on university sources (e.g. start-up and retention packageas) and private and federal funding. I apply reapply as much as possible - I've never failed to ultimately obtain funding that I was allowed to reapply for (and I've rarely obtained funding upon first submission of a new proposal to any agency).
- I wish I had a strategy to share.
- I wish to address a research issue with regard to the site or region. Most of my research has been multidisciplinary particularly with regard to sites with stone or earthen architecture.
- I work for a CRM firm who receives funding through contracts for specific projects. We typically do not dedicate time to applying for grants because of the difficulty in securing them. I have been told "don't bother" on numerous occasions because of the time investment to apply for an unlikely awarding when I should be working on the contract-based work I already have. This seriously limits the quality or scope of work I could potentially be doing for Archaeology.
- I work for an NGO
- I work on collaborative grants with other partners
- I work on collaborative NSF projects primarily, and then use smaller contracts to support smaller projects.
- I work on teams, and usually someone in my group is really good at proposal writing. Also if I hear of some money available, I might investigate…
- I worked closely with my major professor
- I worked on applying to as many granting agencies as I could, but I also considered the scenario where I could not get funded and planned accordingly.
- I write a lot of grants. It's important to target smaller/pilot grants to build towards larger grants.
- I write carefully written and theoretically impactful proposals.
- I'm not an academic so I don't have a lot of time to write grants. My strategy is scrambling and putting together lots of smaller sources instead of one big grant
- I'm not sure I have an actual strategy. I tend to look for funding for fieldwork and will apply to anything that seems feasible.
- I've honestly given up. CRM will do that to you. Even if I find eligible sites there no time for me to actually do any research. My company just leaves that to the one already expert-level researcher we employ...
- I've mostly pursued funding from federal agencies to do work related to cultural resource management, and some smaller local funding sources for public-oriented projects.
- I've never received funding for my research. My strategy has been to work jobs in my research site, to work online in my home country, to skip meals, to sleep on couches.
- Identify any and all possible sources of funding based on eligibility. International graduate students without U.S. citizenship or permanent residency have limited U.S.-funding options if studying at a U.S. institution, especially at the M.A. level. As such, I relied heavily on funders in my home country

and on departmental funding. These generally provided smaller sums, but cobbled together were sufficient.

- Identify the main problem you are addressing and seek out funders whose interests align with your research focus. Then keep trying.
- Identify the research questions and materials/funds needed to complete the research. Cast a wide net for funding opportunities. Pick realistic funding opportunities to apply to based on the fit of your research and the amount of funding offered. Have several people review proposal before submission.
- Identify under-served communities that have a strong interest in the archaeological background of their community and/or settlement. Find public partners with some common interests, even if only economic, and cultivate a willingness to provide resources (typically framed as a need for some percentage of cash on hand for an in-kind match). Find a suitable grant, and apply for funding to expand research.
- Identifying competitive bid projects that appeal to my interests.
- Identifying granting agencies that are most appropriate to my project that set realistic requirements for applications and realistic funding options.
- Identifying RFPs that are the 'best fit' for my research as early as possible. Starting to formulate ideas early.
- If i see a solicitatoin that applies and I qualify I apply
- If I see something for > $10k, I check for my eligibility, and then I assess whether the amount of effort the grant requires before the deadline is feasible.
- If you don't ask, you don't get.
- If you're not studying something that has dominated headlines in the last 5 years, keep it low cost and go it alone.
- In grad school I depended on my PI's funding and secured small funding for a specific portion of my PhD. Now, I am depending on funding from the project I work on. Now, I am completely lost as to what funding I can apply to and for what projects I can work on while I am employed full time on my current project
- In graduate school and as a postdoctoral fellow I applied for everything I possibly could, including the very competitive ones and the ones more relevant to my subfield (and internal university grants). Now as someone on the tenure track, I'm finding I need to play more of a long-game and strategize about when is best to apply for which grant. Right now I have enough start-up funding and external grants to get me through for a couple of years, so I'm prioritizing publications so that when I apply for the larger grants in upcoming years I will be as competitive for them as possible.
- in house
- In recent years I have switched from summer fieldwork to archival and museum collections research, thus allowing me to continue publishing while I have young children at home.
- inadequate
- India conducts NET exams twice a year, any individual who has enrolled in or completed their Masters can attempt the test. Any individual who scores maximum points in the 90th percentile is qualified for the JRF award. Basically, one has to do well in both the specialization paper and the Teaching Aptitude paper. Prior to my success I was teaching 11th and 12th grade Anthropology and I believe that experience helped me succeed in the national exam.
- Institutional funds or out of pocket
- Intermittent and focused
- Internal grants for pilot studies, external for research.
- Invest time in building a really great proposal.
- Is it worth the effort.
- It has been haphazard, at best.

- It has changed a great deal over time. I'm on the fence about how significant it will be for me going forward. I'd like to find more opportunities to fund collaborative/mentoring projects with graduate students.
- It is a cost-benefit analysis of: 1) the fit between my project and the grant, and; 2) the amount of time and energy it will take me to apply.
- It takes time and organization to write the statements and requirements.
- It was critical to obtain a large grant to fund the dissertation research (eg - NSF, Wenner Gren, or Leaky). I applied for at least 5 grants every year at different stages of the PhD in order to try to obtain funds.
- It was good so far, but it was more focused on research to obtain baseline information for further conservation actions. In conservation itself, applicability is a hard point to solve as some funding agencies have their own priorities which sometimes are not very clear in calls for applications.
- It was improved by the way I was rejected and I am to be accepeted.
- It was not systematic. Based on what my peers were doing and what my mentors suggested.
- It's a balance of my having topics in mind and seeing what agencies fund this type of reserach versus seeing what they fund and deciding if I have any research projects I might to do in these areas.
- It's all related to CRM project specific needs. I haven't had time to do outside research.
- It's self sponsorship and it's finishing me financially
- It's harder to get funding due to restrictions and I have to fit my career in order to even apply
- just apply
- Just apply. Keep applying until they tell you to stop. Be sure to talk with the NSF director before applying to NSF.
- Keep applying until I get enough money to do the work
- Keep available funding sources in mind when formulating the project so you don't end up with a proposal that no one will fund.
- Keep trying
- Keep trying even if success rates are low, which is not a great or feasible strategy for those who are adjunct/precariously employed
- Keep trying even with numerous rejections.
- Keep trying. Pay attention to small internal awards at your home institution if they exist, because the exclusionary biases might be less than from major funding organizations.
- Keeping an eye out for opportunities and asking a lot of questions about our internal budget (work for a state gov agency). Also, looking for partners.
- Keeping my office, teaching, and general employment skills sharp.
- kept search for funding somewhat narrow and relied heavily on fellow graduate students and faculty
- Kept track of a variety of funding sources for small amounts and years ahead of research needs. Applying to departmental and University-wide small grants over and over and reusing successful applications for repeat applications. Applying even if some of the application rules are broken by the application as sometimes there are not enough applicants.
- largely internal within university
- Largely self-funded. Relative lack of attention to human rights/environmental crises are the primary driver in my research, and given urgent issues funding is rarely a top priority.
- Last time I applied broadly for funding was for my PhD research. I applied to everything I could only get a fellowship through my university (not an internal grant, though).
- late nights and desperation
- Like a ham sandwich. I don't actively seek them out, but they can help when I'm hungry.
- Limit costs to the greatest extent possible. Find an institution with a history of providing grants for similar research.

- Limited by funding agencies. Heinz ended its Latin American program; all but NSF funds limited amounts, given the costs of archaeological field and lab work.
- Local
- Local grants
- Local/university funding if available, but then probably self-funded
- locate funding sources, make contacts, proceed or not depending upon circumstances
- Look at previous awards made by funder and look for fit.
- Look for agencies that line up with the thrust of the research; break larger collaborative projects into smaller pieces, such that the proposed research closely aligns with specific foci of agencies.
- Look for agencies that support my research topics
- Look for best fit in terms of my mission and the agency's goals, but also being realistic about how some agencies are prestige-oriented and I do not have a prestigious list of affiliations and reference writers. For example, after being rejected for an SSRC grant, I realized that around the years I was applying they only funded people from the fanciest programs (Ivies and the "public Ivies" and "near-Ivies")
- Look for funding for research I or I and my colleagues want to pursue, also attending to program announcements that can fit these or somewhat adjusted goals
- Look for grants that fit the same mission as my research/projects
- Look for programs that align with research interests.
- Look for relevant opportunities, apply for all the options, hope for the best.
- look for smaller, more focused agencies whose interests match my work
- Looking at what the funding request and see if it fits my research interests and goal.
- looking for a good fit between the funder's goals and my own.
- Looking for granting agencies that are a good match for my research.
- Looking for something able to support my (recently finished) dissertation; somewhat floundering now in the pandemic since my collection is located abroad.
- Lots of bureaucratic hoops to jump through.
- Luck
- Luck.
- MA thesis research was self-funded (didn't spend anything except regular living expenses), some projects in undergrad had some funding. I applied to a few internal grants in college and was awarded small grants.
- Majority of funding comes from collaborative endeavors.
- make sure my research is a good fit for the funding organization, integrate educational opportunities for students into my research.
- Make your proposal clear, readable (no field specific words that are "unusual"), to the point, and add in modern day/personal relevance (like why it is important to study today).
- many drafts, apply widely, get feedback from colleagues
- Many small pots of money from less competitive granting agencies with fewer stipulations allow me to complete my work.
- Match my research to what the funding agency looks for. If not funded, work with grad students to have them use data for thesis/dissertation. Fund myself.
- match project outcomes with granting sponsor bias, interest and initiatives
- Matching research with funder interests
- Matching the agency to the research needs; building on the agency's past investments; seeking funding from more interdisciplinary programs
- Minimal. I only apply for funding when I need it. I rarely, if ever, come up with a project just because there is funding available.

- More and more I go for smaller grants both because they take less time to apply for, and because the administrative burden, if awarded, is much less. In addition to writing grants and doing the research if I am successful, I am also working 50+ hrs. a week in my position and I have found that obtaining large grants adds significantly to my workload (there were no compensatory reductions in other areas of my job).
- Mosaic funding: a combination of smaller and especially much more straightforward applications rather than the single 'big one'
- Most important in the long term has been small grants from my own university as well as universities of collaborators, because they were accessible on an annual basis.
- Most of my research has been funded from contributions earmarked for anthropological research at my institution; however, some larger projects were funded by NEH, National Geographic Society, etc.
- Most of my research is funded by clients who need my professional services.
- Most of my research was funded by clients for whom I carried out cultural resources management projects. The rest was largely self-funded.
- Most recently, my strategy is a research agenda that requires minimal funding- local, small-scale, etc...
- Mostly covered by my University, external grants for the experience of applying for bigger grants and for prestige/ lines on CV
- Mostly giving up
- Mostly I have to do bureaucratic work on the job, but I look out for funding that might work for my research interests but is short term enough not to adversely impact the rest of my duties. That means going for smaller amounts and spacing the work out.
- Mostly I need small amounts of money--so I get internal grants from my institution; for larger research projects I have applied for NIH money, which provides salary to support my staff in South Africa--most anthropology grants are too small for that type of research and support.
- mostly self-funded (low cost museum work)
- mostly small grants through my research
- much of my research does not require much funding
- Multiple applications
- multiple attempts
- Multiple small sources for the same project according to stages.
- My agency provides me with a budget. I have to tailor my research to that set budget.
- My current strategy is for obtaining funding is as part of a large, for-profit corporation. We rarely apply for grants or contracts under 500K because under 500K, we will lose money while executing the project. We apply to Federal agencies where we have previous experience, and to whom we are known. We also apply to undertake projects in our areas of expertise.
- My first strategy to is plan inexpensive research! I am also very fortunate to have generous research funds from my home institution now that I'm a tenured faculty member.
- My multiperson team tends to use mosaic funding, where anyone who can get a pocket of money contributes towards all the various research projects we are conducting (survey, archival, technological, etc)
- My organization looks for funding to support efforts not covered by our normal operating budget. We've partnered with other researchers and agencies to seek out funding for similar work across a larger geographic area, honed in on specific sites to go after more directed funds, and tried to think outside the box when looking for funding opportunities.
- My personal strategy has been to only go after funding when absolutely necessary. Knowing how competitive many of these grants are, I chose to complete my most recent project as cheaply as I could to make sure I could complete it.

- My research didn't require a ton of funding and smaller amounts from internal university funds was sufficient.
- My research has been mostly self-sufficient without need of extensive funding.
- My research is not funded.
- My research is supported by my government agency, and it supports either compliance (Section 105/110, NAGPRA) or our Agency's education/outreach mission. We have received program support for institutional planning or funding for internships through IMLS and the American Association for Museums since we are a state agency.
- My research tends to be fairly niche, and it is often difficult to find opportunities that are written broadly enough for my projects to qualify. So I have to go for the most general opportunities - which also tend to be the most competitive. I haven't had tremendous success as a result.
- My strategy for funding my research is mostly by focusing on long-term fellowships to support me financially through stipends and tuition payments, while looking at smaller grants from other agencies and the university to support material needs.
- My strategy has been to go for big grants. I think now I'm going to be going for smaller (less large) grants because the panel review is so arbitrary. I got tired of getting "A-" ranking and no money.
- My strategy has been to piece together funding opportunities in the hopes that research will be fully funded. The pandemic has been harsh on doctoral students and candidates - limiting the ways we can conduct our research while making sure the ticking clock is always on the front of our minds. I consider myself lucky to have gotten dissertation research funding and the ability to (finally) conduct that research on-site.
- My strategy has been to seek seed funding from my university to collect some initial data and then develop a more robust proposal for external funders. I also work at a primarily undergraduate institution so I tend to only apply to funders that recognize the importance of working with undergraduate researchers.
- My strategy is currently under development since my nationality makes me not eligible for some agencies.
- My strategy is generally to apply for everything that I could qualify for, though not so many that I don't have the time to tailor my applications. That is often an area where applicants fall short.
- My strategy is to always gather enough funding that can support not just academic research but conservation oriented research and community outreach, and helps me to give a chance to creative and inspired people who wish to tell a story or craft their own project
- My strategy is to recognize that funding sources are limited to and to apply for everything like a gambler.
- My strategy is to say what I will do. It does not work.
- My strategy is to try to fit funding applications in to my overloaded work schedule with the recognition that I'll have about a 5th of the time to work on these grants as folks from a larger four year university or a SLAC.
- My strategy used to be apply for everything, but these days I have limited time and energy, and I don't have a strategy
- My strategy? Write a proposal outlining my research and apply to the appropriate agencies. The issue isn't with the application per se but the institutions overseeing the finances; at least at the 2-year level. There are so many good researchers wasting away for want of a job in the research arena but have no avenue to do research and, thereby, not publish and getting stuck - catch-22.
- My university provided modest funds and I took advantage of that when I could. I have written grant proposals sporadically as needed; they are very time consuming.
- My university provides research funds which I use.
- N/a
- N/A

- N/A
- n/a
- N/A
- n/a
- NA
- na
- NA
- Nature of project, fit between project and funding agency orientation, realistic budget limitations.
- Need-based and desperate
- need-based, targeting agencies that make the best fit for the research in question
- Needing very little, being a valuable team member with a rare specialty rather than dig director
- Negotiate with collaborators to design a project, write a proposal and budget, submit and wait for a decision.
- Network- driven
- Never stop applying. Try to apply one cycle before you really badly need funding so that you can incorporate feedback into an improved proposal. Always have a "dream" plan A and a less expensive plan B, in case one funding option doesn't come through.
- NHPA required, as well as positive publicity driven (I'm employed by a state agency).
- No real strategy; I applied when I needed support.
- no strategy
- non-existent. temporary part-time lecturers are not eligible to be PIs on most grants.
- None
- None - it is paid for by clients seeking environmental permits, or it is pro bono
- None.
- Not at all well thought out, fairly ad hoc and opportunistic. Making it up as I go.
- not really a strategy ... just try to write a sharp und worthwhile proposal
- Not very proactive. Though I left academia, relatively early in my career (after 7 years teaching) there was little need for grant writing. In spite of that, I received wrote and received two grants.
- Now, nonexistent (I'm not in a position to be funded or competitive for grants). Before, I look to NSF first, and then try to get smaller amounts on a piecemeal basis from elsewhere.
- Obtaining a funded position
- On early applications I put in a tremendous amount of emotional effort and time, to the point of affecting my mental health. Ironically, the time I was finally successful in my grant was when I spent the least cumulative time working on it. My main strategy was to hope that my advisors had time to talk with me, and to spend time 5-7 days per week working on the grant.
- Once a project is conceived, pursue appropriate amount of funding
- Only as needed
- Opportunistic
- Opportunistic
- Opportunistic and then systematic.
- Opportunity
- Our research is generally reactive. Some research is able to be done as mitigation for adverse effects to historic properties.
- Out of necessity. In graduate school, I didn't win a grant, I couldn't do my fieldwork. So, I applied for all the things I was eligible for. This isn't really a strategy so much as it is a routine. In my job now, it's unclear whether I need to win a grant to get tenure. Clarity would be nice, but it's not forthcoming.

- Out of Pocket
- Out of pocket
- Out of pocket.
- Outside the box
- Overwhelming. Applications are very demanding and take a lot of time for a student also managing coursework and exams.
- Partnering with government agencies and private companies who would benefit from the results of my research
- Persistence in applying for funding
- Persistence. Get lots of feedback from colleagues/mentors on proposal drafts. Talk to granting agency staff. However, it is difficult to get funding for collections-based research because many granting agencies don't support it as much as fieldwork.
- Piece meal: Be prepared to look for multiple grants from multiple agencies.
- Piece together small grants
- Piece-meal. There are limited funding opportunities for mid-career researchers or for anthropologists who are part of interdisciplinary research teams.
- Piecemeal
- Piecing together funding to permit the kinds of sustained support effort needed for successful research
- piggybacking on other projects, self-funding and cooperating with tribes.
- Plan a project and seek appropriate funding
- Planning my research as a national conservation and protection program
- Please add Academic Senate small research grants to "Funding sources) I fund myself since retiring
- Practical
- Pragmatic early in career, and too busy in job that was challenging and intellectually satisfying to support additional research not directly job related
- Prepare best set of arguments for funding and then see what holes I can find in them. Get feedback from others. Work collaboratively.
- Primarily project-based with focus on funding source's contribution to larger research goals.
- Private clients, mostly renewable energy companies, fund my cultural resource management projects.
- Private funding
- Proactive with very little direction or encouragement from my faculty advisors, department, or university
- Professionalism. Need, and a proposal for a study that bennefits the agency.
- Profits from Applied Archaeology projects provide most of my funding for research.
- Project based, funded through clients who are required to meet federal and state environmental regulations.
- Project dependent
- Project funded and compliance driven fieldwork
- Project, time and need based. Collaborations often require applying for external funding.
- Pursue funding directly tied to my research area.
- Pursuing both contracts and grants with agencies that support the kind of research I carry out
- Pursuit of contracts with private companies or governmental agencies to support regulatory compliance.
- put 100% energy into one big grant application to one agency only

- Ratio of effort to likely payoff (e.g., I did not apply for a Marie Skłodowska-Curie postdoctoral fellowship in the EU because the application was just too extensive in light of the low acceptance rate).
- Reading successful proposal.
- Reading successful proposals; making project/research flexible, tailoring it to different agencies
- Rely mostly on internal institution funding
- Rely on both intramural and extramural funding sources. Take an intramural award as seed money for a project; develop the project, and ready it for consideration by extramural agencies. Rewrite-rewrite-rewrite.
- Requesting more modest budgets as a pre-tenure researcher
- Research and attention to call
- Research is part of my job for Alexandria, but I also conduct research on my own time for subjects that do not pertain directly to my work for the city.
- Research stems from job position with the NPS
- Return to the agencies that have given me funding in the past. Once successful do it again. I apply multiple times trying to address reviewers comments.
- Revise and resubmit, start early
- sabbaticals
- Scattershot
- Scattershot
- Scouring websites that list open grants and only applying to those that are worth my time to write. There is no sense in spending weeks applying for something I know doesn't fit my research. But I could spit out a couple SOI's quickly to gauge interest.
- scrounging from wherever I can, as much as I can
- Searching out agencies/organizations that support research in my general areas of interest
- Securing one large grant and supplementing it with internal funding.
- see prior answer - CRM archaeology is funded by clients, mostly doing ground-disturbing developments
- See where the money is for my kind of research then go for it.
- Seek a match or near match for the project; speak to a program officer; develop the grant; seek feedback before submission; submit
- Seek agencies/sources that focus on the kind of research I do. Try to find a new angle with subsequent applications, even if the core project remains the same for part of them. Seeks ways of expanding ongoing projects to sometimes meet a grant "call" or category. Stated more specifically, this might mean aiming for a "science" perspective for NSF and a humanities one for NEH, but all for the same project.
- Seek contracts that have potential to generate data of inerest.
- Seek external sources of funding after exhausting university options
- Seek grants that are a good fit to my work. Weigh the time for proposal preparation against the maximum funding available.
- Seek sources that fund the kind of research you want to do; talk to other successful applicants for their advice/suggestions; prepare careful application based on materials provided by granting agency.
- Selective, collaborative
- Self funded
- Self funded
- Self funding
- Self funding for dissertation. Funding from institution for museum.

- self funding, and either donation to my own organization I created. and or associate my self with independent research organizations.
- Self funding, with the occasional small grant.
- self-funding primarily
- Semi targeted shotgun approach. Finding grants that fit my needs and qualifications.
- Series of small grants that together reach desired amount
- Shotgun--anything and everything that might provide funding relevant to my research
- should have applied to more. the length of time to write the applications was overwhelming given my teaching responsibilities
- Since my research has been domestic, it has been relatively inexpensive. Also, I was able to fund my research largely through my affiliated organization, so that I was able to accommodate the lack of external funding I received.
- Sink or swim, I was on my own, no direction.
- Small grants for funding or services.
- Small grants for SHPO's
- Small internal grants over large prestigious grants
- Small topic/area appropriate sources.
- Smaller grants for targeted activities because I don't have the career stability/infrastructural support for a large-scale project.
- So far not great, I have not received any major grants. But I am trying..
- So far, funding from department and sources recommended by advisor. Now that prospectus approved, applying for national grants.
- So far, I have not gotten a Federal grant post dissertation, so I guess it is to keep trying?
- Spaghetti - throw everything you can at the wall and see what sticks. I double up applications whenever possible.
- Speak to colleagues, watch for announcements for new grant opportunities, research agencies interested in funding similar work as my own
- Specific goal-oriented achievable objectives
- Spending any spare moment to submit applications to larger grants that fund archaeological research,then ultimately scraping by on small internal grants stretched over multiple summers.
- Spotty and overly optimistic
- Start early, plan for many, many drafts.
- Starting with a good research question and building a research team from that, then the proposal.
- State and Federal
- state and local funders
- Straightforward!
- Strategic - my current project got funded through my backup route in case the Marie Curie didn't work out.
- Strategic applications when funding is needed for projects I have already started/want to start.
- Strategic applying. I don't just apply everywhere I try to focus my energy on the one's I am most likely to get.
- strategic...with high teaching and service load, I have limited time
- Submit only competitive research grants, and only submit when needed for actual research.
- Synergy - try to get small contributions from a lot of different partners with similar interests.
- systematic and targeted
- Tailoring each application to the respective funding program's purpose. Soliciting feedback from colleagues and mentors.

- Take anything available
- Talk with funding officers. Develop projects with widespread utility or appeal. Look at Naeb.brit.org .
- Talked to mentors, grant officer at my institution, used some online grants catalogs (not very useful).
- target appropriate grants and start work early
- Target proposal to grant agency.
- Targeted and aggressive
- Targeted at those that were the best fit.
- Targeted to agencies who support anthropological and interdisciplinary research. Depending on the project (budget, scope, etc) will look for more specific or more open grant/fellowship opportunities.
- Targeted.
- Targeted. I write grants for specific RFP's.
- The eligibility criteria come first, the Academia is concerned about being open, but since most of the funding comes from the government, it is still very North America-based. These are just a few grant agencies that are willing to support research by non-US or Canada based researchers, even if the questions and the theory these researchers use are Western-oriented
- The less time-consuming the preparation, the better. I have neither the time nor the institutional resources to spend on grant-writing.
- The list of granting agencies are all pretty large and difficult to get funds from. I've had better luck with smaller granting agencies, which is all that I've really needed to keep most of my work going forward. Getting money larger and broader research has been more difficult.
- the most important factor is a good match between funding priorities of granting agency and my project
- Think of a project, write and rewrite a proposal, revise proposal if it is not funded the first time; I submit proposals to the funding agency that is most appropriate for the kind of project I am proposing; I almost always contact someone at the funding agency to talk through my idea before I write the proposal and their feedback on my idea helps shape the proposal I submit to them.
- Think WAY ahead and have a list of institutions and their deadlines, number of letters needed, etc. taped to the computer. Read their requirements carefully. If applying for multiple fellowships in the same year, I rotate my letter-writers so no one is writing 6 letters for me, maybe 3 at the most. Write and rewrite. Rework to fit each institution, be clear as to WHY they should fund you. I have had very good luck: with the exception of my fellowship at the U. of East Anglia, where I was a runner-up but got to go in the end, every fellowship and most grants I've had I've gotten on the first try. Years ago a colleague was reading Academe, an article on how to write a proposal, when she ran across a paragraph demonstrating the ideal application. It was taken from a recent grant proposal I'd written (I wasn't named, but she recognized the topic). So I must be doing something right.
- This is a difficult question to answer; it really depends on my current projects and the stage of my research.
- Thoughtful
- Through contracts.
- Throughout my full-time career, my research was funded by project monies. Now that I am semi-retired I have time to indulge research interests and can pursue them without outside funding.
- Thus far, I have tended to develop my research projects first and then seek out appropriate funding opportunities for each project. This was especially the case with my dissertation and now postdoctoral research. Going forward, I have my eye out for interesting funding opportunities that might be applicable to my research interests and potential future projects.
- Time consuming
- Timing of funding deadline and scope of funding as relates to the stage of my research.
- To apply for funding in a transdisciplinary team

- To fit the interests of the funding organization
- To me, it's really about finding a good fit between what you want to do and what the funding agency wants to fund.
- treat it and respect it like any other research-background research study, analysis, etc.
- Triage.
- Try a lot of different agencies
- try and see what h appens
- Try and try again; Develop networks in CRM
- Try both big and small grants since there are fewer options for funding for international students in the US
- Try hard and apply lots of places
- Try my best o apply and be persistent
- Try to apply often. Big applications (NSF) can be more daunting/time consuming than a series of smaller ones.
- Try to apply to all applicable sources.
- Try to milk departmental and school resources for shorter term/seasonal term research/pilot projects, travel, conferences, etc., and selecting a couple of "higher reputation" grants to apply for.
- Try to use internal funding for a pilot season to demonstrate project feasibility, then use that data to apply for larger external grants
- Try try again
- trying and applying
- Trying desperately to find time to apply. I am at a teaching college
- Trying to build up from small pots of money to a large grant, with follow-on grants afterwards.
- Trying to emphasize how my research can be used in fighting for Indigenous sovereignty and its unique approach in archaeology.
- Trying to find what is available and can fund some time - it's hard to do research without time!
- Trying to need as little money as possible
- Trying to tie my research goals with the funding goals of the funders.
- Two common threads: 1. Specify exactly how archaeological data we propose to collect can address compelling historical questions. 2. Stress how all data collected under the grant will be shared on the freely on web.
- typically commercial clients pay
- Typically seek out smaller grants or grants from State agencies
- Underused—I've most needed support for post-field writing, and I've not found agencies that would support it without my leaving my family to be in residence elsewhere.
- Unfortunately, so far I have mostly funded my own research. For the funding I have received, my strategy has been to apply for smaller grants.
- Until the 2018 Republican tax changes, my research was funding by smaller research grants from my institution and teaching an online course during the winter or summer break. With these things and the ability to take work-based tax deductions, it was feasible to fund my research. I work in Latin America and in places that are low-cost. However, with the changes in the tax code in concert with changes in my university, this strategy is no longer viable.
- Us local sources
- Use internal funding sources to demonstrate proof of concept, and leverage those funds to justify feasibility to external granting agencies.
- Use my own money
- Varied. I have applied for grants that my research is directly and indirectly related to based on the foundation or programme description.

- Very unsuccessful, overall, but landed a prestigious grant that got me through early on.
- We receive government funding (in Europe), funding from our own campus, and from a collaborator's campus.
- Well, I never asked for or sought money unless the research I had in mind actually needed funding. If I needed money, then I tried to find funding sources that (a) support the kind of research I wanted to do, and (b) funded research at the levels needed.
- What others do
- Whatever is available as a fit for eligibility
- When employed, employer funds field research.
- When I get there I will look into grants, perhaps from these sources, perhaps others.
- When I have a project in mind I look around to see what organizations exist that fund such endeavors.
- When needed, align objectives with agency/ies
- Wherever I can get it for the least amount of effort possible
- Word of mouth
- Word of mouth, internet search
- Word of mouth. Reading and working with folks in my field and learning where they get funding. Institutional needs or opportunities for support. For example, I am currently working on a large NSF grant with a multi-site team. Without institutional office of research support to help with the application process, I would not be able to pursue this funding. Likewise, smaller funding sources in the anthro field are often not on the radar of the STEM focused research offices. So finding support and examples of successful anthro grants can be challenging at my institution.
- Work funded, i.e. Cultural Resource Management company
- Work locally, utilize university support (field schools, department and school funding - although this is very limited), work as cheaply as possible. Collaborate with other scholars when specialized skills or equipment is needed. Publish with those scholars in lieu of payment.
- Work with mentors to identify opportunities and revise proposals.
- Working with colleagues and seeing where they're applying, looking for grants that fit what I'm working on, seeing what I have time for.
- Working with others and providing focused research goals
- Write clear proposal and seek a good fit re: funding agencies.
- Write proposals! team science with a multidisciplinary group. When you get funding, conduct the research in a timely fashion, write papers to disseminate findings.

Q40: What advice would you give to students or early-career anthropologists about funding their research?

ADVICE BY APPROACH

Much of the advice provided corresponded to one of the three strategies described above.

Proponents of the aggressive approach wrote things like "apply for everything" and "No one is going to give you money that you don't ask for." They counseled applying not only for discipline-specific funding but for interdisciplinary funding and opportunities in allied disciplines and relevant area studies. This approach leads to lots of rejections: as one respondent wrote, "Accept that you'll kiss a lot of frogs before you meet your prince/princess. In other words, rejection is not the end of the world. Keep going. Keep applying." Another wrote that "it's good practice even if you don't get the money." Persistence was a key theme.

Respondents who suggested a strategic approach had a variety of advice for how to prioritize applications and avoid wasting time. Some advised applying for more smaller pots of funding at first, for example,

> Break your project down into several pieces and go after funding for each piece. For example, archaeological fieldwork will include a dada collection, data anlysis, reporting, and curation component. So, go after funding for each of these elements… Breaking the larger project down into smaller components means you can paply to more grants from different sources and you can cover each piece independently. All of this increases your chances of succeeding for at least part of your research goals.

Others suggested selecting a few larger funding sources to apply to might be more time-efficient. Several emphasized finding a good fit for the research you want to do: for example, one wrote, "Find grants/funding that fit your research goals instead of the other way around. I've seen so many people go for grants that weren't a good fit for the institution just because the money was there; that causes mission creep and creates more problems."

Finally, those who tended to find ways to do research without applying for big grants gave advice related to this approach: develop specializations in local history and low-cost research methods, apply for local and institutional small grants, volunteer your time, and collaborate with others who are good grant-writers as consultants on their larger projects.

ACKNOWLEDGING INEQUITY, BUT PERSISTING

Across all approaches, however, researchers acknowledged that obtaining funding is difficult due to high competition, dwindling resources, and structural inequities. Some suggested that being funded is "just luck," or "a crap shoot," or responded with no advice except "good luck." Others directly acknowledged structural inequities, suggesting that applicants go to prestigious universities to have any hope, and, as one noted, "if you're straight and white, good luck." There were also a variety of cynical or tongue-in-cheek responses that gave a sense of the burnout that many researchers are experiencing: "be born rich!" "find a sugar daddy," "choose another career," "have a trust fund," "give up."

But these dark jokes were outnumbered by many more exhortations to persist, to persevere, to accept that rejection will happen but to not get too discouraged by it. Some specifically referenced how marginalized people may be particularly discouraged by rejection, but should remember that this can be "a 3 to 4-year process of rejection and resubmission. This has become part of the profession." Planning for rejection can ease the sting and make it easier to persist for the long haul.

One key to this perseverance was to build community with colleagues and mentors to support your applications. Many respondents recommended cultivating mentoring relationships with senior scholars who are willing to give constructive feedback on drafts and share their own successful proposals as models. Others suggested building writing groups with peers to help each

other through the process, both with editorial comments and emotional solidarity. Many encouraged researchers to reach out to granting agencies and cultivate relationships with staff members who can provide valuable insight and advice: this, in particular, seems to be part of the hidden curriculum of academia, with many young researchers not realizing that it is acceptable and even expected that applicants can have these conversations with agency staff. Working with professional communities to support you makes the long haul of obtaining funding more possible.

FULL RESULTS (ALL ANSWERS, UNEDITED, IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

- ?
- ???
- "No one is going to give you money that you don't ask for"--apply for everything. If you aren't sure whether you qualify for not, reach out and ask--or, just apply anyway! Don't count yourself out or be the one saying no, give the reviewers the chance to say no to you. Look for funding outside of the NSF/Wenner-Gren/Fulbright sphere, in similar/allied disciplines (history, humanities, etc) and be flexible-- you can probably pitch your research to, for instance, both science-focused AND humanities-focused agencies with a little creativity. Don't be afraid to ask people to look at their successful grant applications, and pay it forward once YOU have successful applications. Never submit a grant application that you haven't had at least one trusted mentor/colleague edit.
- (1) make sure your research and qualifications match the funder's goals and requirements; (2) do your homework, yourself; (3) consult faculty mentors and faculty colleagues, and staff; (4) look at successful applications, if available; (5) don't give up!
- 1. Have a clear research puzzle/question 2. Do not be over-ambitious in tackling too much. 3. Lay out methodology as precisely as possible. 4. Talk with others who have successfully obtained grants from a particular funding agency. 5. If possible, have a peer and a mentor/colleague read your proposal draft and give you feedback before sending it in. 6. Make sure that possible reviewers you list are on board and already familiar with your research ahead of time. 7. Make sure you really have an affiliation in a case like Fulbright rather than hoping you have one.
- 1. Be at a major research university. If you aren't, it will be a hard slog. In that case, probably it's best to do what I never did: collaborate with someone at a major university. 2. In responding to reviews, be polite of course, and be constructive. But don't necessarily be apologetic; argue, in a civil way, in defense of your proposal. Half the people who review proposals don't know what they're talking about, or at least make recommendations or decisions based on nonsubstantive criteria (e.g., "This proposal is by a friend of mine. Fund it." or "This proposal is by the guy who made my life miserable in grad school. Bury it.") "Criteria" like those help explain why half the people who review--most of whom previously received grants from that source--don't know what they're talking about. 3. If your proposal is declined twice, move on. That source never will fund it.
- 1) Break your project down into several pieces and go after funding for each piece. For example, archaeological fieldwork will include a data collection, data analysis, reporting, and curation component. So, go after funding for each of those elements. You can break those elements down even further if you like (e.g. funding just for travel and lodging, money for a small stipend, money for lab analysis). Breaking the larger project down into smaller components means you can apply to more grants from different sources and you can cover each piece independently. All of this increases your chances of succeeding for at least part of your research goals 2) Start keeping track of where you are applying and the results of your efforts. Try and get feedback for grants you do not land 3) always be grinding. recycle pieces from article drafts, other grants, term papers, blog posts, and anything else you can use for your application materials 4) plan to submit at least a month early. plan to write for grants a year in advance
- 1) research the various options in your field; 2) find the best fit but also think outside of the box (especially for internal grants); 3) find successful examples if possible 4) invest time in preparing a

strong application - make a checklist, create multiple drafts, ask for peers or mentors to review it, etc. 5) apply early and often

- 1) Start early, 2) read successful and unsuccesful examples of past grants, and 3) don't just aim for the large grants - smaller ones are just as useful sometimes.
- 1) Work with or for an institution that is structured to provide support - in the case of archaeology (my field) this would primarily be museums situated on land with archaeological sites. 2) Seek connections (research associate positions or employment) with government agencies administering or with ownership of land with active programs focused on new methods or policies for managing their regulatory mandates more effectively.
- Accept that you'll kiss a lot of frogs before you meet your prince/princess. IN other words, rejection is not the end of the world. Keep going. Keep applying. Learn from your mentors and reviewers.
- Aggressively push faculty and mentors to help you find and create good strong applications and then push them for post-research publications, etc. Learn to ask.
- Aim for a balance between novelty and excitement, and low-risk, practical and doable.
- Aim to write a grant every two years.
- All of the above. Plus, pay careful attention to the culture of the foundation - especially to the kind of research it funds and its expectations for proposals. For Wenner-Gren and NSF have very carefully designed and defended hypotheses and test expectations. Make sure methods provide state of art data outcomes. Don't ask for too much money on your first trip out the gate. Have good research collaborators including Indigenous communities as appropriate.
- all of the work you put into the application is worth it if your get the funding so it is in your interests to take it seriously and apply
- Although participation in a professional organization is not necessary it may be helpful in finding scholarships or grants specific to ones research area. Funding options may be limited to particular areas. Find someone who has pursued grants and ask for help. Most are willing to help new professionals.
- Always have a mentor or colleague read your grant proposal and take their advice and comments into consideration.
- Always resubmit.
- Apply
- Apply
- Apply a lot and apply early
- Apply again and again. Unfortunately, funders seem to like simple, fashionable projects that can be understood by a reviewer with no effort.
- Apply and apply often and get debriefs after funding cycle.
- Apply anywhere, and everywhere. Even if there's the slightest chance.
- apply apply apply -- that said, it's time consuming and exhausting and particularly with NSF and gov't grants, the bureaucracy is really over the top. But also, get lots of feedback on your proposal, start early, and reapply if you don't get it the first time.
- Apply as early and as often as possible in your graduate career so that you can start to get feedback on your proposals and research sooner rather than later. It took four years and four application cycles to be successful for the fellowship that ultimately allowed me to complete my doctoral research. Don't pass up smaller funding opportunities (from your home institution or more smaller funding agencies), as these can help you to get started with research earlier in your career.
- apply broadly
- Apply broadly and allow time for drafting, revisions, and wading through peer reviews.
- Apply broadly, seek lots of feedback from trusted advisors, be prepared for a lot of rejections but keep trying. Finally, know your audience. You cannot write the same proposal to every organization.

- Apply diligently and often. Push through rejections, but don't ignore criticism. Our work is not above improvement or reproach. Learn to make research appealing to wider audiences without giving up core focus - this doesn't mean pandering to reviewers. Realize, too, that you can do more or different things with research projects than you plan with one single grant application, and you might even be able to adjust "on the fly" as conditions and findings change. Expect to count the grant application itself as evidence of scholarship, not just the research that would emerge from a successful one (or at least be ready to argue for that is those reviewing you disagree).
- Apply early
- Apply early and apply often. Money begets money
- Apply early and apply often. Pay attention to reviews
- Apply early and apply to any opportunities that you think may be applicable.
- Apply early and often
- Apply early and often, don't get discouraged by rejection, get lots of feedback on proposals, and then be ready to get creative and austere, or change your research agenda
- Apply early and often.
- Apply early and often. Rejection happens, but don't give up. Use feedback to refine your work and move forward.
- Apply early and often. Take a grant-writing course. Have peers and mentors review funding applications
- Apply early, apply often, and apply to anything. Don't get discouraged if unfunded/you are less funded than colleagues. There are multiple factors/priorities at work.
- apply early, get lots of practice, don't take feedback personally
- Apply early, often, and do not be discouraged
- Apply everywhere and often. Don't teach too much, otherwise you won't get enough practice in grant and proposal writing.
- Apply everywhere but tailor each proposal to each agency's specific interests as far as possible without making up anything.
- Apply everywhere.
- Apply everywhere. Learn how to talk about your research in a way that highlights the priorities of each funding agency.
- Apply for all possible funding that you have time for.
- Apply for all the money from all the places.
- Apply for any grants/fellowships. Do not get discouraged with failure.
- Apply for as many grants as possible and focus on the ones from smaller granting agencies- the big ones like NSF and Wenner-Gren are too competitive
- Apply for as many things as you can.
- Apply for as much as possible because most applications fail
- Apply for as much help as possible science is expensive
- Apply for every opportunity you can manage.
- Apply for everything
- apply for everything
- Apply for everything and think outside the conventional box of NSF. Too many younger scholars (often encouraged by advisers) fixate on a big NSF and fail to consider all the little grants scattered throughout the world. I also encourage young scholars to work with existing collections, which cuts the funding needed for dissertation research exponentially. Again, bad advisers fixate on managing an excavation or joining a big project when a student could walk into a museum and work with an exceptional and often un-analyzed series of collections with much more research potential.

- Apply for everything that you can until you start getting money. Then be more selective. Prioritize grants that offer the most money and don't be scared to think big. Grant writing helps you articulate your research program, so it is rarely time wasted.
- Apply for everything that you can without losing your sanity.
- Apply for everything you are eligible and be flexible.
- Apply for everything you are eligible for
- apply for everything you are eligible for, seek out successful grants for that agency before submitting, get feedback from colleagues who have been funded through that agency, and where feasible communicate with program officers before finalizing proposal. Also view rejections and feedback as a means to strengthen proposals and fine-tune projects and then resubmit
- Apply for everything you can.
- Apply for everything, it's good practice even if you don't get the money.
- Apply for everything, start asking questions about the application process early (especially about your university's role in grant applications, like NSF)
- Apply for everything.
- Apply for everything.
- Apply for everything. And if anyone in your university (particularly in your department or program) offers a grant writing course, take it.
- Apply for everything. Find successful models. Get lots of feedback prior to application--build peer support networks for this. Expect to spend substantial amounts of time on your proposals. Be resilient.
- Apply for everything. The worst that happens is they say no.
- Apply for funding and keep applying. Try to reach a balance between your chances of funding and just wasting your time. Be sure to have a clear and well articulated theoretical perspective that is equally linked to the proposed methods and techniques. Ask an intelligent research question and make it clear how you propose to answer it. Proof read the proposal especially for grammar, spelling, and syntax.
- apply for funding external to your specific school - like those described on the page before - so that you are essentially self-funded (usually at a better rate than assistantships)
- apply for lots of grants and fellowships to build a portfolio of success and experience
- Apply for many opportunities. Seek feedback from the reviewers of unsuccessful applications. Seek advice from your peers who have been successful previously.
- Apply for more things than you initially think would or could work out for your proposed research. I encouraged my peers and younger grad students not to reject themselves from grants before a reviewer could look at it, you can only say no to something if its been offered to you first!
- Apply for smaller grants to build your grant experience and CV listings as soon as you can. Even small grant for travel or conferences.
- Apply from early on and often and persist
- Apply now
- Apply often
- Apply often
- Apply often - even before you are ready on the off chance that you are able to get feedback from granting agencies on your application which will strengthen future applications. Ask for feedback from your adviser and colleagues. And, don't internalize rejections - were we (academics) all to produce a CV that only displayed the opportunities we were rejected from, it would be far longer than our actual CVs. The grant market is, unfortunately, highly competitive and there is not enough funding to go around. But once you can get your foot in the door, you may experience a snowball effect, so keep trying! Grant writing is a very specific genre that can be challenging to master.

- Apply often and regularly - pay attention to reviews and more importantly to letter from granting agency
- Apply often and to multiple agencies; check program requirements and adjust proposal as necessary.
- Apply often, and revise when you have the option. Know that there are biases in the funding process; if you're not at an elite university or immediately descended from one, you'll have a tough time getting a fair read--particularly from Wenner-Gren.
- Apply often, apply broadly
- apply often; read successful grants from colleagues/advisors; talk with grant managing offices about how budgeting and grant management works
- Apply often.
- Apply often.
- Apply to a broad range of funding sources at different scales and have as many people as possible read your application prior to submission
- Apply to all entities where you are eligible.
- Apply to any likely source
- Apply to as many as possible & get professional help.
- Apply to as many grants as possible to get practice writing research grants
- Apply to as many grants as possible, even just to get experience writing for different audiences.
- Apply to as many options and possible and don't be afraid to re-apply as much as you're able to. Funding is difficult to come by, it's easy to get discouraged.
- Apply to as many places as possible.
- Apply to as many places as you are eligible for, because getting project funding can take years.
- Apply to as many places as you can
- Apply to as many places as you can, including for small grants, because they can add up.
- Apply to as many programs as you can, and don't be disheartened when you don't get funding from one or another.
- Apply to as much as possible as much as possible. Ask for feedback from an advisor/colleague who is good at getting grants. Always try to have a successful application specific to that grant competition to model your application after.
- Apply to every funding source you can. Do your best to sound like a white man.
- Apply to everything and focus on understanding how to do your research with limited funds.
- apply to everything to get practice writing, even if you don't get grants you might get comments
- Apply to everything you are eligible for. Success rates are low, begin your application early.
- Apply to everything you can in the beginning--it allows you to figure out who is and who isn't interested in your work and whether your work fits their scope. I was desk rejected in a few days from the International Association of Primatology and learned they do not want to fund morphology work!
- Apply to everything you possibly can.
- Apply to everything, and solicit lots of feedback. Read successful proposals whenever possible.
- Apply to everything, even outside of anthropology.
- Apply to everything, talk to people who have won the award, find someone outside of your field to read the application to see if it makes sense, get winning and losing examples of applications, but especially winning examples
- Apply to everything.
- Apply to lots of things and solicit as much feedback as you can on your applications.
- Apply to lots of things but also when you're feeling burned out from applications it's okay to take a break.
- Apply to lots to gain experience, it's a numbers game, don't let rejection get you down.

- apply to many different agencies early in your career to practice grant writing, learn from peer reviewers, and understand how the system works. Then, focus only on agencies that align with your research agenda and goals.
- Apply to several different agencies for different components of the project.
- Apply to small grants first, establish yourself.
- Apply to small, regional organizations as well as large organizations, but don't bank on funding when planning your research. Many museum collections are locally accessible, free or low cost to access, need attention, and are erroneously considered "not desirable enough" to research.
- Apply unti you are successful.
- Apply wherever eligible
- Apply widely and anticipate rejection.
- Apply widely but spend the most time on opportunities very closely tied to your research topic. Also, if you are invited to resubmit, don't forget that you know your project best, so take advice from reviewers thoughtfully but don't abandon what you know your project is really about.
- Apply widely when searching for grad schools, and base your decision as much on funding as the program. Find grant advisors in your undergrad and grad schools who can help find and apply for grants, and continue using them as an alumni if possible. Ask widely and don't be afraid to let professors and others know you are seeking funding. Unfortunately, all of the above take a lot of money (grad school applications), face to face interactions, and networking that favors privileged groups.
- Apply widely when the time-costs are low and when you can reconfigure the same proposal for multiple sources. Look at CVs of early career faculty to see where their funding came from and research those sources.
- Apply widely, apply to support your highest priority work. Remember that you are rewarded for your research and not for institutional grants
- Apply widely. As a graduate student I applied to a variety of NSF sections. Even some that seemed to not be the right fit. I had much better success in sections like STS than I did Cultural Anthropology, with identical applications. And have colleagues read and copy-edit grant applications. As I've now reviewed a lot of dissertation grants, it has become evident that clarity and detail (beyond a good idea) is vital to success.
- Apply widely. Do not be negatively effected by criticism. Take constructive commentary and use it to make a stronger proposal.
- Apply widely. Practice rejections. Get feedback and examples from successful colleagues.
- Apply, and use failure as a learning experience.
- Apply, apply, apply - it is the only way to learn the ropes and the only way to be sure that funding actually comes in
- Apply, it is important, but also network. Also, if you are a POC or woman, at a 4 year public institution, you will have to apply twice or three times as many times.
- Apply. Let them decide if the project is good. Just apply without fear of rejection.
- Apply. Re-use and tweak the same things over and over. Though, make sure you make it applicable.
- Applying broadly worked well for me. If your work is interdisciplinary, write it up as predominately the field the funding agency is interested in with a little side of the other field(s), because even though a lot of people talk about how important it is to break down disciplinary boundaries, at the end of the day these agencies'/organizations' mission is tied to one field.
- appy whatever available
- Ask a family member. Or Find a (relatively) well-off person
- Ask everyone for suggestions.
- Ask for feedback from people outside of your subfield. For many agencies, you may have reviewers who do not specialize in the same area as you. Having non-specialist readers will help identify areas

of your writing that are too technical/jargon heavy or unclear. Keep your audience in mind - remember the reviewers are often reading many of these applications. Make the reading experience easy on them - use things like bold, italics, and tables to illustrate concepts in a strategic way.

- ask for successful grant examples.
- Ask frank questions of those in academics and employed by local, state and federal agencies.
- ask if the institution you are interviewing with has a grants coordinator who seeks grants and helps with applications
- Ask questions of those who have been successful. Research every agency you think is relevant and could support your work. Get your proposals peer-reviewed before submitting if you have willing colleagues.
- Ask their campus Office of Sponsored programs to run workshop on grant and research funding application process.
- Ask your advisors, make connections if you can. Apply multiple times if you need to and can.
- Assuming you've done your homework, applying for grants, especially larger ones is often a matter of numbers of submitted applications; also, the US gov't is lousy at funding most anthropological research, regardless of quality; often anthropologists will undermine their research goal or principles to find gov't funding.
- Avoid Wenner-Gren.
- Basically, laying out a long term plan and figuring out what you need to do early on in your career is the best way to plan to apply to any grants that you will need (although this assumes you already know what you plan to be researching). Looking at it earlier on will give the researcher more time to invest in the grant, not miss any deadlines, and a second chance if revisions are needed and still accepted.
- Be born rich!
- Be clear about research area you have selected
- Be clear about what you wish to do, why you think it is important, how it will contribute to anthropology (or other social sicences, social wellbeing), and how do you propose to do it. Ask mentors and colleagues to read a draft and comment. Then submit to a funding agency and do not be discouraged by rejections.
- Be creative and apply to everything! Non-archaeologists think what we do is fascinating. I had one reviewer comment that a proposal of mine was "enchanting;" think outside the box when looking for funding. Don't put all your eggs in the GRFP and DDRI basket.
- Be deliberate about the timeline for your plan of work. Build funding cycles into your timeline (POW) beginning in your first year.
- Be fastidious and strategic in applying for all possible funds.
- Be persistent
- be persistent, read guidelines carefully, take advantage of institutional expretise in grant prep (sponsored programs and research admin staff), develop mentors and peer-review assistance
- Be persistent. Rewrite, rewrite, rewrite.
- Be persistent. Take constructive criticism.
- Be prepared to be rejected and learn through the process. Reach out the program officer or agency to better understand the review process and receive feedback on your proposal.
- Be prepared to revise significantly all proposals, look widely for possible funding.
- Be selective about where you apply because the low chances of being funded means that too many applications are a drain on time.
- become a members to a large organization or society because they usually have lists of grant funds available.
- Become more aware of the funding landscape and the various options. I would like to know more myself.

- Begin as co-investigator with more mature investigator.
- Begin by seeking small grants that require short and simple applications. Reach out to faculty in the department for leads on suitable funding sources. Identify others doing related research who may be able to incorporate your research into their project.
- Bring down your lofty goals to cogent, explicit, feasible objectives. The number 1 thing I get dinged on is thinking too big without fleshing out the details. Aim smaller, per the scope of the grant too (time frame, amount of money, etc.).
- Build a support network of experts
- Build bridges to funding agencies by doing small projects.
- Build your skills of writing. Proofread your work.
- cast a wide net
- cast a wide net
- Cast a wide net and partner with other researchers/organizations to increase your reach and appeal to granting agencies.
- Cast a wide net, apply for a lot of things to up your chances of getting some money (while also acknowledging that this is something that takes time and energy). Use other successful proposals to learn how to write successful grants, but don't be afraid to make different choices if they don't quite work as templates.
- Cast a wide net.
- Casting a wide net
- Casting a wide net and applying for many grants is a good way to get something. The odds are greater of getting something if you apply for several rather than one funding source. Also, have other people read your work and provide feedback. What may seem clear to us may not be to others. It is mportant to know who the audience is: will the proposal be read by an archaeologist, anthropologist, a social scientist in another field? It is important that the project can be understood by the reviewer, so it is necessary to adjust the "jargon" level and provide definitions when needed. If you know someone whose application was funded, ask if you could see their application package. A really good tip also is to use the first paragraph of the application package/project to explain who you are, what your project is, and what you will do with the funding. It is a great way for the reviewer to know upfront what the application is about.
- check all grants for archaeological research. For CRM you must be able to budget, plan and bid on projects or grant writing. This should be part of archaeological courses. Also learn field methods utilized by CRM companies including Phase I surveys. Learn to use a compass and read maps, use a Mussel color book. Make sure you like to work in the field long hours in remote locations in any weather, away from home for duration of projects.
- Choose a currently "popular" or "hot" topic (whether that be in the discipline itself or the society). Be prepared to look far and wide for grants/granting agencies. Be willing and prepared to apply for small grants and piece together funding.
- Choose a marketable topic to build your career on.
- Choose a supportive mentor.
- Choose a topic that can be easily branded as interdisciplinary or multiregional, to capture a wide variety of funding streams. Choose a topic that can be easily framed with a sensational hook. Consider a topic that might draw the interest of funders/agencies with plentiful STEM money. Consider a different career path, honestly.
- choose another career
- Collaborate with scientists, engineers, and health researchers who have big federal agencies as their funders; but be sure to identify a role and activity within which you are comfortable and can publish.
- Consider expanding your global reach. The EU has wonderful opportunities, many within the ERC. While they may have EU residence requirements, this does no harm to one's career.

- Consider government employment.
- Consider whether the sum of money and the time investment is worth applying for the grant.
- Consult a mentor, Then pick an agency that fits your goals. Consult The agency if you have questions.
- Consult closely with funding agency staff and with peers who have had success with their proposals.
- Create a personal or group funding database if your school doesn't have one already. And don't be afraid to apply to the really small and really big grants. Nothing is too little or too much funding!
- Create more time for research into what grants are best suited and then leave plenty of time for application and editing process
- Create strong professional networks early so that you have a diverse and relatively large group of people to read your drafts. Understand that this often requires reciprocal exchange, which is actually quite good for students, because it teaches you how to review and gives you access to in-process grants in addition to any past successful ones you may come across. For students, if you don't have a grantwriting course at your program, ask for one or for independent studies where you can read literature on grantwriting, as well as practice several drafts of your proposal and read others' proposals.
- CRM can fund interesting archaeological research as well as meet client compliance needs. Find a reputable CRM that cares about the archaeological record and is competent in managing time and resources.
- Cultivate relationships within and beyond the community where you perform research, as you never know who is willing, or financially capable, of donating to your project.
- Day 1: start praying and submitting
- Decolonization of the University and the discipline has a loooong way to go when it comes to funding. So my advice would be to tell them to go study PhD in the North American University, but the irony is that this advice feeds into the loop that sustains North America's privilege.
- Definitely apply for funding! Try to match your target applications to organizations who fund the type of project you want to do. Apply multiple times; it sometimes takes several years of applying before your project gets funded.
- Departmental funding is insufficient. Try as much as you can to secure funding. Start early snd apply multiple times even if you are not selected the first time. Your application with improve with feedback.
- Describe an project that is ambitious but also doable
- Develop a strong project first, prove its feasibility on small-scale and then go after the bigger grants.
- Develop proposal-writing skills (something I never really did)
- Develop the skill of grantwriting.
- develop your boilerplate language early on, circulate your drafts to trusted colleagues and mentors, submit, submit, submit-- don't say no to yourself---
- Develop your ideas, write proposals, seek advice from well-funded colleagues.
- Developing grant writing skills is probably as important as developing publishing skills.
- ditto
- Do match project outcomes with granting sponsor bias, interest and initiatives, always read successful proposals, discuss early on with your Dean about institutional support, matching funds, using your salary to match. Break funding interests into contractual services(hiring), commodities, equipement and travel.. lastly seek out administration and alumni support and finaicial aid for students or other faculty visiting, particpating or assessing your research.
- Do more than me!
- do not be afraid of not receiving funding, apply, apply, and apply
- Do not be intimidated to apply for funding, seek out the support and services you need to be able to prioritize funding opportunities

- Do not count on external funding. Make your fieldwork and dissertation writing plan assuming you will get no money, so that you are not delayed for years as you wait around for money to come through. Look for opportunities within your department and institution.
- Do not count on funding for your research. Find ways to conduct research without depending on it.
- Do not fall into the trap of using polysyllabic nonsense in order to impress a review. State you case, clearly state the methods and theory, and write clearly
- Do not fret not receiving funding the first time. I have had seen proposals not get funded one year and with little changed receive funding the next. To not be funded does not necessarily mean the proposal was poor in its own right or against other proposals that round, as it could just as well be the reviewers that time around did not 'get' what you were going for.
- Do not rely only on large grant funding agencies, seek out small grants (multiple) and private donors, where the competition is less, the application process less onerous, and there are less restrictions on how money is allocated.
- Do not talk yourself out of applying for things.
- do the ground work first. Don't pick a research topic out of interest, collaborate to find a focus and angle that works more broadly. Seek out people who can serve as mentors.
- Do the same--go for it, ask for (and incorporate!) feedback, no matter how uncomfortable it might make you, assume you'll revise and resubmit (likely multiple times), make friends with your institution's grants office staff--they are there to help you and have vast amounts of experience finding and submitting grants. Most importantly, make each proposal as strong as you can and then let it go--decisions have a lot more to do with the priorities/politics of the granting agency than they do with your research or abilities. Reviewers, decision committees, and program officers change all the time--keep at it until you get people who understand and appreciate your work.
- Do your research and talk with the friends or colleagues who've gone through the funding process before. Older faculty, while well-meaning are generally not helpful.
- Do your research beforehand, have peers and more experienced grant writers read your work, try to crack the formula for the particular granting agency and then follow that. It's better to spend more time applying to a smaller number of agencies and opportunities that are a good fit for you than it is to try to apply for everything.
- Don't apply for everything; prioritize funding that is a an exceptionally good fit for you, and when the program manager is truly interested in the project. Don't worry about status, think about fit - there's plenty of time to move up. Most importantly - if your research involves more than just you, identify a good research team as early as possible - this is invaluable for success.
- Don't be afraid to apply, because many people are too intimidated as well, especially for things available only to students
- Don't be afraid to reapply and definitely do not take rejections as a reflection of your merit as a scholar or the quality of your work.
- Don't be discouraged by rejection, especially women. I would like this piece of advice to complemented by actual strategies for avoiding discouragement, and support networks for resubmission and submission.
- Don't be discouraged, the rate of success us low for everyone.
- Don't be discouraged. A proposal's rejection does not mean the research lack merit; only that one or more reviewers values other research topics more highly. Submit proposals elsewhere until successful.
- Don't be elitist about where you seek your funding
- Don't be intimidated by the process and be open to partnership opportunities.
- Don't be intimidated by the process. Seek a mentor familiar with grants. Don't wait until you receive funding to start your work.
- Don't be shy - look for and ask for what you need.

- Don't believe those who say that a good proposal needs to be plain, simplistic, or predictable.
- don't count on it. figure out how to design research on the cheap.
- Don't depend on agency funds
- Don't depend on traditional funding sources; they serve the Academy. Your descendant communities won't be able to generate large grants, but because they actually care about the results of the research, they'll put sweat equity into the project.
- Don't discount the smaller grants if you want to finish your research in a timely manner.
- Don't expect to be funded, that way you'll never be disappointed.
- Don't expect your first round of proposals to be successful. If they are great, but don't be discouraged by initial rejections. Make use of constructive feedback especially if reviewers give you specific ideas on how to change your project for the better.
- Don't get hung up on the specifics of your project because they're going to change anyway. Read examples of previous successful applications. Advocate for course credit for applying to grants/ develop a workshop with peers if possible. It's time-consuming and onerous and frequently feels not worth it (not helpful advice!)
- Don't give up! And ask colleagues that you trust to give you feedback before you submit. If you have time, it's also good not to rush your application, and edit it multiple times before submission.
- Don't give up.
- Don't go after funding just to get funding on your c.v. Think about what actually fits with what you want to accomplish.
- Don't hesitate applying for small grants. While the money may not be everything you want, it builds your experience and CV to increase the odds of success with future proposals.
- don't just dream something up so that you can apply for funding, and then wing it. And not have time to do the project if you get the funding. Instead, start with what needs doing and how to do it, and with what community partners.
- Don't let rejections let you down
- Don't let rejections stop you. You might get funded for one out of five applications if you're lucky, but that's what you have to do to get funded.
- Don't let the "prestige" of a funding agency determine you funding source.
- Don't only seek prestige. Seek money that will get you to where you need to be to do what you want to do to get your dissertation/tenure portfolio done.
- Don't overlook small grants when you're getting started or for small projects, but don't be afraid to go for big ones either-- it's about what fits the project best.
- Don't take rejection personally. Sometimes it comes down to politics that has nothing to do with you.
- Don't try to do it if you're not funded, at least a bit.
- Don't worry about it...
- Don't worry about the prestige of a grant unless you really want to go into a research-focused academic institution. Instead, focus on finding pots of money that give you what you need and come with less requirements (i.e., paperwork) up front and after award. Also, just because you're an anthropologist doesn't mean you have to get a grant with the word "anthropology" in its title. There are many ways to fund your work and most of those opportunities are outside of our discipline.
- Don’t be intimidated by funding descriptions or institutions! Apply for the big name opportunities, but also focus on starting small and local—2-3 small internal grants from your university can be really helpful for demonstrating to funding agencies that you can handle acquiring and using larger research fund awards.
- Don’t count on it. And if you are doing a community-based project, support in kind can e a lifesaver.
- don’t get discouraged and always resubmit

- Don't get discouraged by harsh reviewers; be flexible and throw your proposal into lots of funding "hats" (try lots of agencies)
- Don't limit yourself to strictly anthropological funding agencies.
- Either get a job in cultural resource management or get a PhD to be eligible for grants from agencies that prefer grant applicants' principal investigators to hold PhDs.
- Email potential advisors to ask if they are working on grant applications for projects that will fund students.
- Emphasize how your proposed work applies to more than one dimension - theory, methods, outreach, etc.
- Ensure close review by supervisors. Don't lose hope or take rejections personally.
- Establish the habit of seeking funding early. Have a growth mindset (your applications can always improve—look for ways to improve them), but also know that funding is a numbers game—the more applications you submit, the more likely you are to receive funding.
- Even if they are working on well funded projects, if such a thing exists today, they should take the chance to write grants while in school, and learn the strategies of being responsive to what the funding agency wants. Learn how to argue for your research. This will probably be good in academia, and will also be good outside academia. Also, reach out to the gatekeepers if you are struggling to understand what is needed, and don't worry that that makes you look weaker -- having a good application from you makes their program stronger too.
- Examine successful proposals. Discuss strategy with colleagues who have been successful. Every PhD granting university should offer courses on the major funders, nih, nsf. Neh, etc.
- Exhaust all options.
- Expect rejection, and seek out a mentor who will give you a ton of feedback. This is not something you'll be naturally good at, so you need to be taught how to do it.
- Expect rejection, try again. Don't be afraid to shoot "too high" (ask for too much $, apply to "prestigious" sources, etc).
- Explore full range of funding opportunities including local and professional associations.
- f you possibly can on intramural funds or just on your own (one benefit of lab work), do some of the work firs.t Then apply with a lot of "ammunition" for doing the study. Publish promptly
- Find a good mentor.
- Find a mentor and learn how it all works very early on. I have not had any mentorship and people act as if it is all obvious.
- Find a mentor that will help guide them
- Find a mentor who has been successful, read other successful applications, don't be afraid to talk to the program officer for more information
- Find a mentor who will help guide you through this maze of funding and the grant world.
- Find a network. The big funders are a waste of time since they only want to fund a certain group that will get them media attention. Fund your own research if possible. Too many strings attached for most grants. I've been in this business over 40 years and I know what I am talking about
- Find a real mentor
- Find a reasonable fit for your work and apply and apply again. Get feedback from granting agencies and colleagues who serve on granting committees. Write clearly!
- Find a school located near your research area and located where you want to live and make sure your advisors have a good reputation with other students
- Find a senior colleague who has been successful in securing funding and have them mentor you through the process.
- find a sugar daddy
- Find a trusted (and trust-able) mentor; develop a trusted network of peers in your research domain; read successful proposals; get your mentor and network to review your proposals as many times as is

feasible. Select and develop a project that is timely and is do-able--this might be the hardest thing for young scholars to do.

- Find a winning formula and stick to it.
- Find all the opportunities, apply early and often, and expect to be rejected despite doing all that is asked of you.
- Find an advisor who is invested in your work who will actually give you substantive feedback.
- Find another career
- Find another field - this one is dead!
- Find funding mechanisms appropriate to your institution.
- find good team members to work with and apply for opportunities together or that can complement each other.
- Find granting agencies that are a good fit for your research. Respond to the requirements in the grant application carefully and completely.
- Find grants that have funded your type of work. Don't waste time on general "Anthropological" grant sources such as Wenner-Gren. Very few archaeologists get them, not worth the effort.
- Find grants/funding that fit your research goals instead of the other way around. I've seen so many people go for grants that weren't a good fit for the institution just because the money was there; that causes mission creep and creates more problems.
- Find people with ample big grant experience to help guide you through the process
- Find professors who believe in your work and can be sensitive to your journey. These professors will more than likely work with you as (inevitably) challenges arise that makes applying for grants even more challenging. Find your support. If you can't, be gently with yourself and know that you will find your way somehow.
- Find someone who can offer advice and mentorship on navigating how to find research funding.
- Find someone who has actually won grants to help you write and edit your applications early in your graduate career
- Find someone who has gotten the grant you are applying for (or something similar), and ask if they would share their documents. Find someone who has been successful with the grant writing process, and get their help. Utilize your school's grant-writing office.
- Find someone whose successful grants you can read and have them give you feedback.
- Find successful grant applications and begin your process by performing find-replace in a word processor for all of the specific terms for concepts, locations, language, etc. and fill in your own terms. There is truly no point in re-inventing the wheel, as this work will never see the light of day and there is a formula that works, so you might as well use it directly.
- Find the fit don't make the fit- don't let the process warp your research but rather enrich it
- Find the grant officers or administrators at your institution and talk to them -- get on their radar as someone who wants to apply for funds. Consider as wide a range as possible but be realistic about what you do and what the agencies fund. Remember to present your work in as accessible a way as possible and follow the particular grant's rules/guidelines. Not everyone reading your application will be an expert. Get feedback from mentors you trust (not just the big name in the department). Choose your referees carefully (again, not just the big names but people who can write about what you do). Don't undersell yourself but don't make grandiose claims either.
- find ways to link directly to teaching goals or courses to open up the research to more stakeholders.
- Finding a good mentor is essential - grant writing is a unique genre of writing not everyone is accustomed to, and requires an approach that is completely different from writing research or review papers. Mentors with a positive funding record are essential in helping you navigate the world of proposal writing.
- First, It is always worth the time to apply, even if you are rejected because the reviews will provide you with valuable feedback. Second, always look at past proposal that were successful.

- First, learn how to follow instructions. Failing to notice a tiny detail in the application instructions could make your project ineligible for funding, which would waste all the time you spent on the application. Read, re-read, and re-read the instructions! Second, learn how to write. You have to be able to describe your project and also get complete strangers who have never talked to you interested in it. Clear, simple writing is the way to do this. Third, become familiar with the types of funding available and what those funding organizations are looking for. Each funding organization is so different in how they work, what they fund, etc.
- Firstly, there is a model for any kind of proposals which should be learned early in the professional training. Secondly, as a non-native speaker, it is helpful to spend more time working on the writing style.
- Focus in a specific marketable issue.
- Focus on a specific research goal. Follow the funding agencies format and requirements. Adapt proposal language to funder priorities. Keep the proposal short and to the point, avoid unnecessary jargon, define any buzzwords used.
- follow the instructions, talk to the point person to see if your request will fit the year goals of the funding agency, and have the granting point person read a draft
- Follow the work you want to do, not what you think is trendy. Whether you win the grant or not is not a reflection of the quality of your work. Sitting on a panel you see that there is WAY MORE exciting, interesting, awesome work than there are available funds to support. It feels shitty, but it is true that work that is unfunded is still meaningful and necessary. With that said, find a group of colleagues (friends, fellow grads, faculty who don't suck) who will read your application with you. Work together and support each other in struggle on this. Approach the grant as a genre form and don't be afraid to play madlibs with funded grants as a way of brainstorming. Write for an audience that doesn't know what you're talking about. Reviewers have general knowledge, so their interest in the problems you lay out comes from that. Take the reviewer by the hand and sketch out how your interests exist in relation to other people, places, timelines, etc. Be generous in showing how your work contributes to conversations. Don't tear people down (e.g. the field hasn't done X, So-and-so did Y wrong, ABC scholarship cannot account for 123), otherwise that's a free pass for a reviewer to tear you down too. Don't let asshole reviewers get you down. They suck. You can hate them. But don't hate yourself or your work on their account.
- For students, develop the post-PhD project while you write up. Utilize all available help from peers / mentors/ colleagues who have gotten the funding you want as well as the funding agencies. Address all points in failed proposals for new proposals. Apply again if unsuccessful!!!!
- For students: If your PhD program will support you to delay your fieldwork by a semester, then don't apply to all the funding agencies in the fall of your 3rd year. It will take up 100% of your time and you might receive funding before you are ready for your advancement exams. You also may have to work with a less prestigious agency rather than a more prestigious one that could keep you in the running for R1 jobs after graduation.
- Forget about the big-name grants and look for smaller, local funders and partners who can make small or in-kind contributions to your project.
- Funding is a crap shoot, especially for overseas projects, and work for a company/agency/institution that can provide you a salary and labor so you can pursue your research. Also look to partner with agencies that can offer you non-grant funded support.
- Funding talks, so try to get involved early. Even if you are looking at regional or local funding sources, it all matters. Ask successful grant applicants for sample narratives and see what is getting funded overall.
- Funds are targeted, they are given to glean an outcome from the study. Make sure the research matches your interests, and motivates you to do your best.
- Generate pilot data and write a proposal that is easy for reviewers to understand

- Get a mentor or a job that can teach you how to wrote grants and gain experience of running a team and large project. Studying and doing professional research is different
- Get as much practice as possible writing grants -- and if you don't apply for something, you definitely won't get it.
- Get assistance from a professor or mentor.
- get critical feedback from senior colleagues who have a record of receiving grants/fellowships, go through many many drafts, apply to as many agencies as you can
- Get feedback from peers/mentors, including examples of successful proposals.
- Get feedback from successful applicants; get examples of prior successful applications to read and mimic; apply to a lot of things and be prepared for a lot of rejection.
- Get good at writing grants; get as many fellowships as possible.
- Get help
- Get help/mentoring on this while you are still a graduate student, because there is not a lot of support to learn how to do these things when you're a post-doc!
- Get lots of feedback from people who have experience, especially with the particular agency you are looking to apply. Don't be discouraged by rejections, contact agency, develop a strategy for resubmission.
- Get lots of feedback on your proposals from more experienced mentors, consider attending a workshop
- Get money from wherever you can. Read the book Proposals that Work.
- Get one big one in grad school because people that hire other people care about money then don't waste your time chasing prestige in this way once you're settled.
- Get practice applying to grants early - even if you don't get them, the experience will help you later on. Also, attend grant writing workshops and writing groups and classes whenever available. Assistance from mentors, peers, and professionals is incredibly valuable, and you won't always have access to it.
- Get some big grants early on. Once you've earned that prestige, it is easier to get other grants. If you don't, you'll need to "cobble" money together for the rest of your career. That's not necessarily bad, but it does limit possibilities.
- Get to know faculty who seem supportive and give you good grades. Do lab or research work for them. Then ask them to write recommendations for you. They also will suggest funding.
- Get to know people who were successfully funded! And nurture you own good ideas. Grants need good ideas not just formulas for funding. But the "know-how" of those with experience is really important to apprenticing new scholars toward funding.
- Get your hands on previous examples (NEH is great about this, NSF not so much), take a grant writing course in grad school, and be flexible. The best proposal in the world will not get funded if you do not speak the language and use the grammar (metaphorically) of the agency. I will (and have) write two completely different proposals for the same work that I want to do based on the orientation of the funding agency. Also, ALWAYS (even if successful) request as much review feedback as you can get. Some agencies will not give you written feedback, but program staff will talk to you. Take that opportunity.
- Give up and get a more lucrative career. You are clearly smart enough if you are in an early anthropology career.
- go for it! do not wait
- Go to a highly ranked school and work with someone that gets lots of grants. It goes to the students of those who get grants from highly ranked institutions.
- good luck
- good luck and get started early
- good luck, you will probably strike out.

- Good luck.
- Good work does not have to be expensive work - but if your work is going to be expensive you will have to spend time grant writing
- Graduate school rankings and alleged "prestige" matter even when people say they don't (think hiring patterns). Even SSRC alludes to this on its website for its funding. I'd tell students not to attend a grad program unless it is fully funded, meaning at least 5 years of support (living wage in the city you're in) that includes health insurance. Apply to as many different agencies as possible and get feedback on drafts as early as possible.
- Grant writing improves with practice. Read as many other people's (funded) grants as you can. Cultivate research collaborators outside of your institution to build towards writing post-PhD grants.
- Grants are strangely important, and strangely sometimes the research doesn't matter as much as getting the grant in this economy which is sad and empty but true.
- Great research needs to be "marketed" as such. Otherwise, it's unknown.
- hang in there
- Hard to say these days because I think everything has become much more competitive. I have encouraged one of junior my colleagues to apply to every source that seems relevant to her work and she has had some success.
- Have a back up plan
- Have a good and well thought through research project, avail yourself of advice of principled others, not just money grabbers.
- HAve a mentor who is a succcessful grant writer.
- Have a set out game plan for the proposal and how to track it
- Have a thick skin and stick with it.
- Have a timeline for yourself to get all your materials together
- Have back-up plans in case no funding comes through
- Have faculty or mentors help you find the right funding opportunities, often a Google search will leave you feeling overwhelmed and can lead you to waste time on funding sources that aren't necessarily a good fit.
- Have lots of people read your work. Follow the directions carefully and address everything they ask for. Apply for everything you have the capacity to apply for (the number of apps will depend on the person and their own threshold).
- Have others read your proposals early and often.
- Honestly, I'm not sure! I suppose starting early and applying often is the best advice, but I do feel like there are just really significant structural problems with grant funding as it currently exists in anthropology. So my realest advice would be: it's not you, it's the structures we're forced into. It is okay and normal not to get funding. Your work still matters.
- Honestly, my advice would be to not pursue academic anthropology since there is little funding for how many people apply. Plus, anthropology is having more difficulties than usual remaining relevant to institutions of higher education.
- Hope your advisor and committee members have time to give you feedback on your grants.
- How much rejection can you stand?
- I always tell students that they should not pay for their own dissertation research. It is very important in many ways to seek and receive outside funding. Plan your timeline, and apply early!
- I am a student, so I can't reply
- I am afraid that I do not have any advice, as it is not really an issue for me.
- I am bias toward the idea that the student should first and foremost research the trends in funding on a macro and micro level. The student or early career anthropologist needs to understand the market in terms of his/her own interests and synchronize them with the funding sources interest. Be open to opportunities that may open new avenues for the student's -- topic, problem, career, and/or

financial needs. Serendipity is often a critical element in one's career. Be aware of it and take advantage of it.

- I am early career and looking for advice
- I am early career.
- I am in no place to give any advice. I do know that I have heard about some colleagues exaggerating on their funding proposals.
- I am that student.
- I am too far removed from my academic days to give good advice.
- I could write a lot here... but "apply for everything relevant and don't get your heart set on anything"... ask an answerable question
- I don't have a lot of advice because I feel like so much of it isn't necessarily about the person, but what kinds of topics the agency wants to fund. There's a lot of inequities there.
- I don't have any
- I enjoy the CRM world, and work for a firm where I have the opportunity to conduct academic-level research which is fully funded.
- I found that my department really pushed Fulbright/NSF/Wenner-Gren/SSRC, but I would encourage students to apply for the "smaller" grants that are often less onerous in terms of application materials. Applying to "less prestigious" grants, especially ones from your own institution, can be really useful in terms of a) money and also b) demonstrating to national funding agencies that you have a track record of being awarded funding.
- I guess my biggest advice would be to just forge ahead, come what may. As an early career scholar looking at colleagues and friends who are also a few years out from their PhD, it feels like good projects often don't get funding and good scholars don't always get jobs, so you just have to throw out as many lines as you can and try to find a way not to take rejection personally. Also look for funding from sources that are less prominent in the field or from interdisciplinary sources - I've had more luck with funders interested in my work as applied research than as anthropological research. And, finally, even though I got my PhD from a school that is highly-ranked in Anthropology, it isn't an elite institution and our resources were not those of other schools. I only know that now, as I hear from colleagues who completed PhDs as schools that gave them full funding and preliminary research support. I hustled every semester to find RA and TA positions and applied to dozens of sources to get funding for my MA and PhD research. I only know now that if I'd been at another school I might have been given a multi-year funding package and committed initial research funding. I wish I would have learned this earlier so that I would not have compared myself to others so harshly.
- I have been fortunate to be able to find a position that allows me time to pursue research initiatives that help us to learn more about Alexandria's history and archaeology. But this is a rare situation.
- I have had too little success in applying for funding to offer anyone advice.
- I have loads fo advice that I cannot provide in this format.
- I have no advice since I have never applied for funding, and I have never received advice on how to apply.
- I have not received the funding yet, so I am not sure if I am in a right position to reply to this question.
- I think, students have to ask themselves why they have chosen Anthropology? Or why pursue research? There has to be a passion to discover and enlighten oneself first so that others can be enlightened too. If there is passion in whatever topic or field one chooses, I truly believe that with diligence, hard work and confidence, anything is possible.
- I would actually appreciate more advice, so I'm not sure how best to answer--I supposed it would be to closely read the guidelines for formatting and submission, make sure you have clear connections between your questions and methods, and the ability to clearly communicate the broader impacts of

your work. Seek out mentorship from senior researchers who have been successful in pursuing grants and their feedback on your applications in advance of submission.

- I would advise them to apply to a lot of small grants not just the big ones so they can get going. I was lucky to have ton of data to publish so it did not break me not to get a major field grant (luckily I landed one for my dissertation work).
- I would emphasize that even failing to secure grants is great experience and researchers learn a great deal from the application process alone.
- I would suggest being open to the constructive critiques of reviewers who demonstrate that they are not using their remarks to grind any axes but are genuinely interested in helping you to improve your chances of success in the planned study. I often get so caught up in my research that I can't see its flaws. Reviewers and program directors have helped me to overcome that myopia.
- I would suggest that students read application information carefully to assure that their research is a good fit for the funder, as well as see what projects they have funded in the past.
- I would suggest that they apply as early as they possibly can. This means they have time to incorporate feedback into the next round of applications with enough time to make sure they conduct their research within the timeframe of their program.
- I would tell them that funding is largely directed by what is popular or in vogue at the time and has little to do with whether or not your research is valuable or interesting. But, if they want grant funding, they should incorporate some unique analysis or dating technique to make it stand out.
- I would tell them to quit their programs after their master's degree and get a job in government or perhaps doing data science or user experience in the tech industry, and to go live a happy life.
- I wouldn't presume to
- I'd say contacting different people whose proposals were successful in the past.
- I'd tell them to get used to rejection - and to take all rejections with a grain of salt. Sometimes the project is positively reviewed but you still aren't funded - and there can be a variety of reasons for that. Ultimately the decision is a subjective one. I'd also say that for any rejections, you should maybe skim the reviews when the news is fresh, and take a couple of days to nurse your wounded ego. Then when you are ready, sit down with an open mind and re-read them. Often in that re-read you will see things that you also agree with, and you can use that constructive criticism to help improve your project. Sometimes the criticism includes things you have already thought about but there is really no way to get around - I've often noticed that reviewers tend to ask you to consider things that would be impossible to consider given the parameters of the project. So in those instances, you would need to be clearer in any revisions as to why incorporating certain things is impossible or not reasonable/practical. I would also recommend having as diverse a strategy as possible. It is super time consuming to search out all possible funding sources, so try to find out if your institution has a grants officer who can help you facilitate this part.
- I'm early career and do not feel very good at this. I took grant writing courses in grad school, but I didn't feel that it was really useful going forward. I wish I had more networks, though I have been actively working to cultivate those spaces. It feels like you can't get a big grant (post PhD fieldwork) like NSF, NEH, NIH unless you have someone else on your application team who has received one of those grants before. That is frustrating because grants are a lot of work--as much as a journal article, but once you are rejected there isn't a way for you to account for that work on your CV, and it's much harder to revise and resubmit or even modify it for another funder. I wish I had taken a post-doc role where I could be mentored through this process and had a chance to start building a grant network and a record of success. I feel like that chain is present in a lot of other fields, and it's essential to the development of early career scholars, but that is really missing in much of anthropology. This is such a different field than it was 20 years ago, and vastly different than it was before that. Funders are not interested in research in the old model of the lone ethnographer. There's a lot that's good about that, but there are not a lot of senior scholars who are able to mentor junior scholars through this new process. My advice is it find newly tenured folks who are successful with

grants and do whatever you can to learn from them and collaborate with them on grants whenever possible.

- I'm not qualified to give advice
- I'm not sure I have much advice, since I haven't had a lot of success with external funding as of yet.
- I'm pretty bitter currently. I'd say the chances are slim you'll make it as a career academic researcher. But if you're project somehow anticipates future concerns and hype, it might get funding.
- I'm probably not the right choice to offer good advice on that topic.
- I'm retired; the world is so different, I don't really know. Nevertheless...for any funding agency, follow their guidelines (amount they fund, their mission and you your research fits into it). DO NOT GET DISCOURAGED! If you and your various mentors are confident that your rejected proposal is worthy and the granting agency is an appropriate one, do not be afraid to contact the grants officer and politely ask for advice about what you might do in the future in applying to that organization. And if they say their organization is not appropriate, ask if they could suggest a different one, just to see what they say.
- I'm too-long retired to have specific funding suggestions. For grant writing, I'd say: have a project whose social significance is serious; designed so as to do more than confirm the questions in the proposal; begin with a couple of sentences telling the project, why it matters, etc. and, unfortunately, if you are not a plain vanilla positivist, figure out how to explain your project in those terms.
- I'm also a student, but I wish I could've told myself earlier in my undergraduate career that I shouldn't let being a first gen student make me feel as if I can't achieve. My background was always something I was taught to hide, and getting past the fear of asking for help or daring to have big goals was crucial to me staying enrolled in University.
- If possible, learn the theoretical leanings of potential reviewers of your funding applications and write it in a language that engages that style.
- If there are workshops to help you take them and be a reviewer to understand what works.
- If you are applying for an NSF GRFP, the most important parts of the application are the sections where you talk about yourself. Everyone has a good project, most people just kind of toss off the personal parts, but that's actually where the separation happens. Also, if you get it, put off taking it as long as possible...I learned the hard way that a fellowship is much more useful when you're trying to write.
- if you are not at a larger research university, it is very hard to land a grant, mostly because of time constraints. A heavy teaching load massively interferes with research and grant-writing and on the long makes it very hard to stay competitive in funding cylcles
- If you are veteran don't bother applying.
- If you get an opportunity to participate as a reviewer or review panelist, do it. There's no substitute for seeing the process from the other side of the table.
- If you're straight and white, good luck.
- if you've been declined, get comments and reapply
- Imagine who is likely "in the room" reading proposals. Speak to their interests. Don't cram proposals full of citations for fear of "missing" someone.
- In some cases I clearly submitted applications that were not going to be funded (doomed from the start) so pre-conversations with granting agency staff are really key. I failed to do this because it felt like cheating to some extent, and I was not advised that this is common and acceptable practice. it still seems a bit dirty to me.
- Invest time in developing well crafted proposals, get lots of feedback on them before you submit
- Invest your time/education in a related field that has a good track record of securing federal grants (i.e. GIS, biology, chemistry, remote sensing.
- Investigate what's available and think about best fit; look for innovative ways to support research by joining interdisciplinary teams.

- Ironically I would say apply for everything as an early career scientist. You never know where the funding might take you in your career. You might find the niche you've been looking for.
- It depends on their research topic
- It depends on their situation. If they need to increase their publications, they should try for multiple low time commitment grants and projects that require less funding. To find sources, talk to mentors and colleagues, offices on campus that specialize in this, and look at the acknowledgments in books/articles of related research for funders you may not have heard of.
- It is about selling your project and pitching it in such a way that your project tackles an important and timely problem that is important to solve, and then explains clearly how you will execute the project to address the questios that you posed. It's a simple formula, but one that is often hard to learn. It takes practice and you can expect many rejections.
- It is best to have a day job or be independently wealthy.
- It is good to apply as many as we find to get one or more.
- It is hark word and you may have to apply more than once. Your writing is important and successful applications require attending to the program announcements and writing and rewiring and rewriting to mak eh proposal clear and responsive
- It is important that you utilize your funding in creating the maximum benefit for the local community who support your research objectives without question
- It is important to apply widely to competitive grants in order to get feedback and peer-reviewed validation for the project outside of your university. Grants are also crucial for understanding how to frame your research to varied audiences and pinpoint the most important contributions. Target both grants that are specific and realistic, but also well-known/larger ones even if they seem daunting. Getting them will help you establish yourself and get others in the future. I often think that getting a Fulbright early had a cascading effect on my ability to get funded later.
- It is the lousiest part of your research. Just soldier on.
- It seems to be related to who you're connected to and your own individual identity (female, minority, low income, first gen)
- it will be very spotty
- It's a numbers game and, theoretically, your odds of receiving funding increase with the number of applications you submit. Friends, colleagues, and mentors are crucially important for providing comments and other help on early drafts. Don't be afraid to reach out!
- It's dismal; have backup plans
- It's never personal and that one must as apply as broadly as possible. Of course sometimes it is personal, but for mentorship purposes it's important to keep students' spirits up.
- It's really difficult to get.
- It's sad. Go to an elite R1 and have famous recommenders. Or have a spouse with a well paying job, or a trust fund.
- It's so arbitrary...
- It's tricky because the Javits Fellowship was a life-changer for me, but it's been discontinued. I think federal grants can be very useful, though they require familiarity with CRM and are typically perceived as low status. Still, funding is funding.
- It's very competitive and that rejections are part of the process.
- It’s rare you’ll get one and schools will say there’s funding but in reality you have to under You might not get anything so have money saved or wait til u get money. Getting into debt isn’t worth it
- It’s super important to get funding if you want an academic job
- Just apply, even for small grants. No one will give you a large grant until they see you can get small grants. Re-submit unless they tell you not to. ASK the agency if you are not sure if you qualify---my AAUW postdoc was for tenure-track faculty, but when I asked, they said my non-tenure-track status was ok. Be sure to follow directions and tailor your language for the program--e.g., for

AAUW predocs, you MUST tell them how you have supported women in the past. You MUST ground your research in some kind of anthropological theory or perspective. I have reviewed AAUW predocs for a couple years and that is what makes a high ranking. John Yellen (NSF) told me to be sure that even if your whole research project does not pan out the way you expected, you have still made a contribution to the field.

- Just because you enjoy what you are researching, your research may not be worthy of serious funding. Be as multi-disciplinary as possible. Meet others who can help your research. If you can't obtain a grant(s), do your research regardless.
- Just to hang in there.
- Just try and do your best. It's the first writing that is difficult, but once it is done, it gives you confidence to continue and expend. And even if the fellowship/grant is not approved, it has given you experience to write and formulate ideas and possibly get constructive feedback for your work.
- Keep applying
- Keep applying and don't be afraid to try something outside of the main grants your peers have received
- Keep applying! Take useful feedback and use it to improve your proposals. Shake off the snarky feedback. Read proposals that have been successful. Unfortunately, I'm convinced the networking is the best way to be successful. I don't think that most review processes really assess the merits of the proposals--the same folks from the same professional networks tend to get funded repeatedly. That said, don't be afraid to reach out to and talk with the program officer if you have questions or doubts. Use the resources at your institution (the grants office) to help you navigate the application process, especially building the budget.
- Keep applying.
- Keep applying. Have more than one application out at all times.
- Keep applying. You will always have more rejections than acceptances.
- Keep at it!
- Keep looking reach out to winners
- Keep plugging away and adjust when needed.
- keep reapplying, don't be discouraged my rejection; reapply to the same funding source again and again; ask for feedback.
- Keep trying
- Keep trying and investigate non- traditional resources. Learn to work on research teams and be insistent on value of ethnographies and historical methodologies as vital to scientific questions.
- Keep trying! Read successful grants, attend grant workshops, get feedback from mentors and peers and realize criticisms/edits to your work are not personal they are tools to help you improve and further your chance at being funded
- Keep trying. Be professional and respectful. Don't vent frustrations, but learn from them and use this to improve at the next opportunity.
- Keep trying. Find models of good proposals to guide you.
- Keep your eyes open
- Know the funding programs, get to know the program officers, consider what work is really worth doing.
- Know your research goal and target to achieve the objective goals no matter what obstacles come on the way.
- Learn everything possible about the agency and its programs. Appply multiple times to multiple agencies.
- Learn grant writing and project management!
- Learn how to write a good grant proposal.
- Learn how to write grant proposals effectively

- Learn the genre of grant writing -- it's its own thing! Draft the proposal early, share it with mentors and colleagues, and revise based on feedback. Don't be shy about re-applying, either the next year or in years later with a different project.
- Learn the specific genre that is grant writing and it will serve you your entire career.
- Learn to use the language of 19th century science
- Learn to write clearly and succinctly, without jargon or hyperbole!
- Learn to write grant proposals in grad school then take advantage of learning opportunities for grant-writing as a postdoc or faculty member. This is a skill anyone can learn, and most of us should either for our own work or to train students.
- Learn to write grants- they help structure your thought processes for the project and grant writing is an important skill to have
- Learn writing skills
- Leave the academy. Don't make yourself sick applying for what amounts to poverty wages.
- Let the funders reject you; don't reject yourself first by never even applying.
- Little to none.
- Look a all announcements.
- Look at previous successful applications.
- Look at successful proposals. Say what you need to say to get the funding
- Look at the CVs of colleagues who work in your field (or just ask them) - what programs have funded their research? Then, ask if you can see successful proposals, as well as unsuccessful proposals along with the reviews.
- Look at wide variety of potential sources.
- Look at your local funding sources before the national ones. Small grants add up and can help out with the incidental costs (like conferences) and short trips that may be helpful. Look at your own successful and others' grant applications and literally copy and paste thins into other applications, it cuts down on work and is a better starting point often.
- Look everywhere. Apply widely.
- look for additional sources, a lot of unknown grants don't get applied for. Get someone to read your application and edit it carefully. Follow the guidelines
- Look for as many diverse opportunities as available.
- Look for models of successful grants
- look for someone with success to review your applications.
- Look for ways that your research can branch out to find funding in a roundabout way. It should be relevant to the discipline as a whole and to your employer or whom you want to be your employer.
- Look outside of all of the major sources listed. They would have more success if they focused on several smaller grants rather than going for the "name brand" grants.
- look state and local first
- Look to small institutions for smaller grants or partners willing to donate services.
- Look widely, apply a lot
- Make certain that you are affiliated with a major university, preferably a elite private one.
- Make certain that you have a clear theoretical issue you with to address and state clearly what you will do to address this with your research.
- Make certain the funding request and the project fit.
- Make good connections; collaborate on research; seek advice from mentors
- Make grant-writing part of your routine professional work; take advantage of feedback from mentors and grant-writing workshops; pay attention to the sorts of projects funded by the agencies (listings of projects) to see how issues are framed and what the emerging issues in the field might be. Start with intramural funding applications and build to extramural ones.

- Make it have practical application
- Make research relevant to current topics of interest (sell it to your audience)
- Make sure they have a well thought-out justification and research design for their project.
- Make sure they have access to public archaeology/contract funding
- Make sure to focus on the application, make sure you are fitting the funding requirements and have clear well written statements.
- Make sure to read other grants if accessible. Also, realize that the project you apply with does not need to be exactly the project you carry out as you conduct your research.
- Make sure you get thinking about your research early and think about your methods and what you need to do for analysis early in your graduate career. I didn't have a thesis plan for nearly a year and it made it difficult to apply for funding without a clear idea what to do.
- Make sure you have a mentor that knows what they are doing and who will help you write a grant paper.
- Make sure you have a mentor who cares enough to give you feedback and advice; not having one means you have to learn by trial and error.
- Make sure you know what the funding agency covers. Carefully read what they want in the application and make it easy for the reviewers to find it. Start early, work with your University research office often, submit at least a week before the due date. Also, look outside your directorate (e.g., we were finally funded through an education directorate).
- Make sure your pitch is specific to the granting agency; do pre-grant application pilot studies
- Make the abstract or proposal readable and interesting to a general audience. Don't assume everyone is an expert in the field. Most people who read proposals are not, depending on where you apply.
- Make use of resources through your degree-granting institution now before you get into a situation where these resources no longer exist.
- Make your proposals clear and to the point so that a person who is reading it only halfway can understand what you want to do and why its important and that you will be able to get the job done.
- many drafts, apply widely, get feedback, go to grant writing workshops
- Map out you research interests early in your career, plan for sabbaticals (or equivalent), and don't hesitate to let everyone that you are working for/with that you will be pursuing outside funding sources to support your research habits.
- Match interests with call and themes
- Mentorship. Contact faculty who have been successful in funding their projects.
- Mostly ignore the advice coming from folks who teach 2/2 courses or less or who work at large nonprofits. It's generally unrealistic for the majority of folks, even those people in those positions are the loudest in places like the SAAs or AAAs.
- Multiple applications
- My advice to my students is to always have a project that can be done with minimal resources. There is so little funding available for cultural anthropologists and socio-linguists that they cannot realistically expect to be funded. I also encourage them to make cross-disciplinary collaborations that, in turn, could lead to funding outside of that designated for cultural anthropological research.
- N/a
- N/A
- N/A
- n/a
- na
- NA

- Network and read successful grant applications. Contact funding groups to learn how to be successful and to learn about other opportunities. Value partnerships and seek ways to collaborate with others (schools, THPOs, SHPOs, local and associated communities)
- Network, network, network.
- Never give up.
- Never go into a PhD that isn't guaranteeing research funding, and never believe a faculty member that says that their department is generally successful at securing funding. Though most people recommend applying to everything, i would say that this is a waste of time and labour, as the awards typically go to presitigous schools, so choose very strategically and focus in. But then again, i've never been funded, so my advice would be useless.
- no advice
- None
- None
- Not sure. But I'm glad you are asking this question because I didn't receive any advice on this as a doctoral student or as a junior faculty member.
- Not to give up and keep sending applications.
- Obtain advice from professionals that have successful records forbeing awarded grants
- Obtaining a fully funded PhD/PostDoc
- Oh god. Find someone to teach you. Don't assume that your advisor will, or that they have your best interests in mind. (Mine sure didn't.)
- One thing I wish that I had figured out earlier in my career was that program officers are willing to talk quite candidly about your project and the fit with their program or the potential likelihood for success of a given proposal. I try to have such a conversation regarding any major grant I put in now and it is often one of the most useful steps I take. I feel like I spent a lot of wasted effort early in my career applying to grants that were a longshot because they didn't meet the (sometimes unstated) priorities of the program where I applied. Another piece of advice I would give to students/ECRs is to work with collaborators as much as you can. It's really hard to maintain productivity if you're not part of a team of some sort. I've been very lucky to find people I like to work with and we share the burden for both applying for and conducting grant funded research. Early on I worked with more senior people who helped me learn the grant writing game and served as mentors. The final piece of advice would be to take feedback seriously and don't be daunted. I once had to revise a grant across three different semi-annual grant cycles before finally getting it funded and the resulting project was much stronger as a result of all of the feedback and criticism. I've also gotten rejections that led me to can a project for years only to revitalize some piece of it years later.
- Only apply to the big agencies if required by your program. Find niche funding sources where you can get access to people for questions or feedbck. A grants chair of a local professional organization will be interested in funding a student at a local university and will know and value reference writers.
- Patience; keep applying
- Pay attention to instructions; carefully proof read what you have written; if your application is rejected, don't give up but try again elsewhere.
- Pay careful attention to all submission instructions. Triple-check every detail!
- Pay very close attention to what an institution asks to be included in its grant application. Talk to someone at the organization.
- Perseverance is important. Also critical is to ask yourself why anyone else would be interested in your project and its results. What issues are you addressing that colleagues working in other world areas and time periods would find interesting? What does your work have to say to major debates in the field and not just to topics that exercise the imaginations of those working in the same area as you? Learn from the reviews, adopt the suggestions that make sense, and then keep on trying for that grant.

- Persist
- Persist, you get better. Look at relevant literature to see where your work fits
- Persistence is key
- Persistence is key. Also, look for sources of funding that might not be obvious by reading work of scholars doing things similar to what you want to pursue and take note of their funding sources.
- PhD students should apply for major grants from external funding organizations (e.g. Wenner Gren, NSF), as well as major scholarships and fellowships (such as NSF early career grants, Fulbrights) and post-docs to be competitive for positions.
- Pick your geographical area and your topic carefully. I was warned away from a North America project, and grateful for it.
- Picking a few grants or fellowships to focus on applying for is more helpful than applying to a lot - spending more time with a few applications will ensure that they are higher quality.
- Pitch to multiple venues for best fit
- Plan far ahead of time for funding.
- practice writing grants using templates from successful ones
- Practice writing. Look for opportunities to increase knowledge or do public outreach and try to write grants.
- Prepare proposals very carefully! Assume the readers know nothing about your proposed project!
- Prepare to work in CRM if you want to be an archaeologist.
- Preparing a successful research grant application will take much, much longer than you think. Give yourself enough time to work on it.
- present clear evidence that you can and will complete projects
- Prioritize grant writing
- proposals are teamwork, never attempt them alone
- publish a lot of work first, then read funded proposals, and find a mentor to give you feedback as you write
- Rather than wearing yourself thin by applying to everything possible, figure out what grants you have the most chance of getting and apply several times in a row. I got a Wenner-Gren at my third try, integrating feedback each time to clarify my project and address misunderstandings. Persistence matters.
- Reach out to other colleagues for advice and support, look at examples of other grant applications
- Reach out to other colleagues to successful grants.
- Reach out to the funding agency grant officers. They are a great source of help in getting funded.
- Reach out to those further along in their carrier and ask what they apply for. Before writing your proposal, read plenty of successfully funded proposals, AS WELL AS unsuccessful ones if you can. When you have colleagues/mentors read drafts, try to only give it out to one person at a time to avoid conflicting feedback/feedback overwhelm.
- Read all the successful proposals you can get your hands on for the agencies you are targeting. Most people will gladly share theirs.
- Read all your emails and apply for everything, get lots of feedback and spend time on your applications.
- Read colleagues proposals and email grant agency or a professor who knows the agency well if you're not sure if you're what they're looking for
- Read earlier successful applications, carefully read any scoping documents or evaluation criterias, write drafts with plenty of time to go through various rounds of criticism, workshop grants with other students who are also applying, recognize that the entire process is somewhat arbitrary and instills a sense of competition with the people you should be collaborating with -- so don't take the grants too seriously and focus on collaborating with people and your own projects.

- Read guidelines carefully and apply with plenty of time. Also, look for what's "popular." Though I don't think there's anything one can do, especially if you are coming from universities that tend to not be significantly represented in the funded projects.
- Read lots of successful applications for a variety of grants! This will tell you where your research focus and writing style will be a good fit.
- Read more successful proposals.
- Read other examples. Pay close attention to instructions. Have someone read your work.
- Read other people's successful applications and master that genre of writing; keep trying even if you aren't successful; whether or not you get funded is not a statement about the worth of your project *or* your worth as a human!
- Read other successful proposals
- Read proposal RFPs in archaeology and related fields; consider interdisciplinary opportunities and collaborations (e.g., natural science programs often have larger funding pools and make larger awards, plus interdisciplinary collaboration is intellectually stimulating, informative, and good training for students); don't give up (it is typical to receive 3 rejections for every successful proposal); talk to program officers who are there to give guidance and encourage proposals that will be successful; don't skimp on budgets - programs may have limits (so be realistic - good to discuss with p.o.s), but budget what you need to do a good job (including funding for community collaboration, outreach, education and data archiving).
- Read successful grant proposals and form a small writing group with people you trust to review your work.
- Read successful proposals
- Read the guidelines carefully, pay attention to what the agency has funded in the past and how they want the application structured. Build the budget very carefully, and justify all expenses. Take care to address methodological and theoretical aspects of your work, and most importantly, how you have or will include the local community, wherever you are working, in your research. Reach out to program officers and colleagues for advice, and have someone read the whole thing over before submitting it. Leave lots of time for submitting - on line especially can take a lot longer than expected.
- Read the guidelines of funding agencies closely and have as many people as possible provide feedback
- Read the instructions on the grant application, read successful applications, and make the connection between your research questions, methods, theoretical framework, and lines of evidence very clear.
- Reading drafts of successful grant applications was one of the most helpful things for me when I began drafting my grant applications. I also found the process more time-consuming and frustrating than I expected, so give yourself about twice as much time as you think you'll need.
- Reading previously funded proposals is extremely helpful. It is also important to remember that the odds of getting funding for any one grant are slim. So apply widely and don't be too dismayed when you get rejected.
- Receiving grants is apparently a huge positive when looking for a job, so in that regard my strategy backfired. You get rewarded for getting grants, so try for all of them!
- Recognize that successful grant proposals take more time and effort than publications in most instances, especially federal funding (e.g., NSF).
- Rejections are common so apply early to give yourself enough time to reapply if you're not successful.
- Rejections say nothing about the value of your research
- Remember just because you think a direction is important it does not mean the funding source will. You are writing for the reviewers, gather as much info about them and their concerns, if ever possible volunteer to serve as a reviewer and sit on committees
- Request more modest budgets and apply to a few (2-3) places per year

- Research on your own early, and pick a small handful to focus on writing quality applications, always get at least 2 sets of eyes for feedback and revise before submitting.
- Review past funded projects and attend workshops with granters.
- Same as above
- Same as above - and to try: even a failed application is a chance to learn what to improve for next time.
- Same as above: First build relationships with non-traditional funders (gov't agencies, community partners, NGOs) with shared goals that can partner and provide finding outside of the grant writing process. Then to raise the rest of the funds needed, apply early and often to as many places as you are eligible, this is a numbers game, rejection is the most common outcome.
- Same as above.
- Same as above. Good grant writing is a skill that needs to be honed, so you need to get practice by applying far and wide.
- Same as my strategy: Never stop applying. Try to apply one cycle before you really badly need funding so that you can incorporate feedback into an improved proposal.
- Saturate them all with applications.
- Search non traditional sources
- Search social media, in addition to search engines. Ask people.
- see above, but overall, get a good mentor!
- See above.
- see above.
- See above...my advice is probably not so great.
- See funding from the main sources (WG, NSF), but also get creative and seek funding from less obvious sources as well - this opened important doors for my research and opened different career opportunities.
- seek advice from more senior researchers; get ready for horrible disappointment
- Seek advice from successful applicants and review, if possible, successful applications.
- Seek assistance anywhere it's available, colleagues, peers, conferences, online...
- Seek lots of advice. Ask peers/colleagues to review before submission, or to share examples of successful proposals.
- Seek out advice from mentirs and colleagues
- Seek out external funding as much as possible for autonomy from your home institution.
- Seek out good examples to follow. Be cutting edge.
- Seeks examples of winning proposals.
- Select topics private sector companies can build on and use the conclusions in their contracted work.
- Share your proposals with peers and senior colleagues; read successful proposals.
- Since I am 86, circumstances are so different from mine when young, that I can't give advice
- Small grants from departments etc are easier to get
- So few projects are funded, don't count on it.
- Speak with your advisor and other faculty members for advice. Network with smaller grant-providing groups, if possible.
- Stage out their research so that they can get if funded in small bites, from multiple sources.
- Start applying early and apply often. Rejection is the name of the game.
- Start applying early and often under a supervisor's guidance. It'll help your writing and budgeting skills even if you get rejected.
- Start applying early, because the university is not going to be of much help when you run out of funding

- start early
- Start early and apply to lots of little things. It can help boost your packet and get you funding
- Start early and ask for lots and lots of help. Your adviser SHOULD HELP YOU by giving lots of feedback on drafts—ask for that. Mine was not forthcoming with this kind of support and I assumed that I was supposed to know how to apply for field funding on my own rather than knowing to ask for that kind of support. Learning to write a grant app is arguably more important than learning to write a dissertation—it's a skill you use forever.
- Start early and ask people for feedback on your application materials before submitting.
- Start early and be prepared for a lot of rejection.
- Start early and find good reviewers before submitting.
- Start early and network with other scholars.
- Start early and plan for resubmissions if possible
- Start early and small so that you can scaffold smaller grants into larger ones; seek out templates of successful grants from scholars a little farther along then you; never rely on a single source of funding.
- Start early in career...encourage young faculty to mentor.
- Start early in the process and constantly revise as you develop your project, apply early and often. Apply for grants outside anthropology to force yourself to make your work relevant to other fields, which will help with job market materials and future grant writing and project descriptions.
- Start early, draft and redraft your proposals, workshop them, get reviews from faculty or peer mentors, seek information from the funders
- Start early, get lots of experience, find an experienced mentor, and be lucky--very very lucky
- Start early, plan for many, many drafts. Find your way to some SUCCESSFUL and somewhat recent proposals (within the past 10 years at least) funded by the exact program to which you're applying. If your graduate program doesn't have a Grant Writing Course or Workshop, beg them to create one. If they refuse, find your way to one online, or create one online.
- Start early, seek advice, talk to more people
- Start early: assemble a database of every grant you come across that may be relevant to your work now or in the future, and review it a few times a year so you don't accidentally miss out on a funding cycle that will delay your work
- Start early.
- START EARLY. Read funding organization's requirements carefully, don't waste time on it if you really don't fit their criteria. Keep trying. Write, rewrite, resubmit, look for new granting institutions as well as more obscure ones. Talk to/show your applications for funding to successful students or faculty you know before submitting. Do not go over the page limit or use tiny font. There should be no spelling or grammar errors whatsoever. Avoid unnecessary jargon.
- Start funding conversations with your supervisors IMMEDIATELY. Deadlines sneak up so quickly.
- Start local and small
- Start looking early and apply often and to many agencies.
- Start looking early so you don't miss opportunities. Ask peers and mentors for example applications. Take the time to utilize your library's resources and start a list of places you can apply to as soon as you can. Get lots of feedback on your application and start your applications earlier than you think you need to.
- Start putting proposals together, they help organize longitudnal thoughts about how larger themes come together over time. And to me they are always worth doing in pulling future collaborators together, whether they get funding or not.
- start small and apply often
- Start small and build up. Don't ask for $500K right out of the gate. Build a track record first.

- Start small and try to build a funded research portfolio of small grants that lead logically to larger grants. Use small grants to collect initial data or proof of concept. A linked series of grants for work that you really want to do is best practice.
- Start small in terms of funding amount and scale of project
- Start the process early! Find multiple people to read your proposal and make sure you read what the agency wants not what you want your project to be.
- Start thinking about which agencies to apply for funding early on. Get informed, seek advice from peers and mentors, especially from different subfields since many granting agencies ask reviewers from different fields to read applications. If possible, work on early drafts of a research proposal in a grant writing workshop or with peers. I found this especially useful in my case.
- Start working on your applications early. Get advice from people who have gotten the grant before. Participate in workshops available as they can often give you info on what readers are looking for. Be sure to tailor your application to the organization, don't just copy and paste your dissertation proposal.
- Start writing your proposal early and find someone to write with for accountability. You can always change your proposal, but the writing process itself helps you understand what literatures and methods you need to be able to carry out your project and earn funding. Apply to smaller grants for summer research earlier in the PhD program; they help you understand what works. Get lots of feedback from people doing work different from your own.
- Stay away from Governmental Funding as well as Funding from Academia
- Stay versatile.
- Strategize to achieve goals without relying on large grants if smaller grants can achieve reasonable outcomes. Partner with other projects/institutions.
- Study something the American media is obsessed with. Anthropology's tiny bit of research money will follow that.
- Take a grant writing course
- Take a grant writing seminar and network with older more experienced people who know what it takes to get a grant funded!
- Take a grantwriting course, and if your school doesn't have one, demand that they create one.
- Take a proposal-writing class, get examples of successful proposals to read as models, and work very closely with mentors in crafting their proposals.
- Take advantage of course and workshops, get advice and support from successful colleagues
- Take any course that helps you practice writing grant applications
- Take any courses or workshops available about grant-writing. Ask colleagues/mentors who have successfully received grants to review your draft proposal. Don't give up if don't get funding the first time.
- Take workshops and courses in grant writing if they are available. Ask to see examples of previously funded proposals. Write a mock grant proposal for a graduate class or class in research methods.
- talk to as many people as possible about grant writing, get sample grants, get feedback in early and late stages, don't waste your time applying for a grant that doesn't fit your goals.
- Talk to experienced grant writers about techniques to use for securing funding. And ultimately - keep trying!
- Talk to other individuals who have been successful applied for grants you are considering. In a best case scenario try to find one or more examples of successful applications. Don't be afraid to reach out to the funding body itself if you have questions or concerns. Do not expect anything to be funded first go, revision and resubmission is just part of the process and hopefully will only improve your final product.
- Talk to people at the funding agency whenever possible; share drafts of your proposal with as many experienced individuals (e.g., those who have received funding from the same agency) as possible to

get friendly and constructive feedback to aid you in revisions of your proposal; don't be discouraged by rejection and recognize that when you receive feedback that is not at all constructive, it has more to do with the reviewer than with your proposal.

- Talk to people at the funding organization and be pushy about getting information about priorities and your questions answered.
- Talk to people who have gotten grants. For graduate level students and early career researchers, I would recommend letting go of their investment in particular - and often narrowly defined - research topics. At this point in my career I know that I am good at "spinning" (dare I use this word!) projects to match researcher and funder interests. Not everyone has experinece doing this, and it is a critical skill for successful grant writing.
- Talk to people who were recently successful at being awarded a grant from the institution to which you are applying. Ask about their reputation and what they tend to fund. Granting agencies can have specific types of projects they like to fund that is not explicitly stated in any informational sessions or materials, but that is well known in the academic community. Learn how to edit--it is not always best to do exactly what the reviewers say you should do but rather figure out what they are responding to. Finally, read previously successful grants that are similar to your project! So important and helpful (and often readily available on the granting website).
- Talk to program directors about fit with their program; obtain successful proposals; ask peers and/or university grants experts to review proposal; work collaboratively to build a strong team; don't take bad reviews personally.
- Talk to program directors, and get examples of successful proposals to look at.
- Talk to program officers before submitting.
- Talk to program officers, look at what was funded, read materials, speak to the RFPs.
- Talk to program officers, meet with them at conferences or in Washington, if you can. Ask questions that show you have already read and understand the program announcement and are not wasting their time.
- Talk to program officers, talk to people that have won. Start writing early. Early career folks should offer to serve as a reviewer; it's a great way to learn what works! Get trained in real methodology.
- Talk to program officers; get examples of successful proposals from mentors or peers; attend ANY workshops you see - internal or external; have peers/mentors give feedback
- Talk to program officers. Their literal job is to help you. I have met with a program officers for several grants I've applied for and it has always helped steer me in a better direction. Also, reach out to people that have applied to the same agencies and ask for their funded proposals. Even the structure is helpful. Lastly, and this is more regarding the emotional toll of applying to places, try not to let being rejected bring you down. Just apply to as many opportunities as possible. Incorporate their feedback and keep applying. It's easy to get upset about being rejected, and I say this as a person who has been really disappointed in this respect. But just know you're not alone and there's so much support available for you.
- Talk to the program officer or equivalent about your ideas at an early stage of planning, then take their advice. Approach as many different sources of funding as possible.
- Talk to your program officer! They are well-informed, approachable, and *want* to give people money. Don't be intimidated.
- Talk with potential funders face-to-face.
- Talk with your advisors about the large granting agencies early, so that you can strategize and avoid problems of eligibility if there are certain time frames in which you must apply.
- tell a great story, hook the evaluator early in the proposal
- That it is important to get external funding if one is on the tenure-track; read successful proposals, know the agency and what types of projects they tend to fund.
- the importance of establishing a track record of grant funding early on

- The money to support research is in cultural resource management -- consider a career in CRM.
- The only sure thing is that if you don't apply, you won't get the funding. Go for it.
- The sooner the better. Talk to your department administrator about it.
- The success rate in my last NSF grant cycle was 10%. I planned on a 3 to 4-year process of rejection and resubmission. This has become part of the profession. Apply early and often to as many venues as you can. Sometimes rejected proposals can be repurposed as journal articles, so if you hit a dead end seeking funding perhaps the time and effort may eventually yield something for you. Also don't underestimate what you can learn from a conversation with the person who oversees the grant program. Take good questions to them. And have 2-3 colleagues who will be honest with you review your proposal before sending it in.
- There are a lot of fish in the sea, no need to keep NSF blinders on when you can aim for other sources. Do keep in mind the reviewers: try to channel what they are seeing, and what they hope to see.
- There are some great sites that allow you to set alerts for specific types of grant opportunities or those related to different research disciplines, so I would recommend taking advantage of those sites. Early on your research can be pretty adaptable to what different funding agencies are looking to support so keep an open mind and be flexible/creative with your research questions.
- There is a lot of money from various governmental entities to conduct baseline data collection for them and research opportunities for yourself.
- They can do very exciting and important research as part of commercial projects.
- They should try out their luck with application for this funding opportunities
- Think about your research in stages. Do pilot research and small amounts of funding to build up knowledge and some data to apply for larger grants. For big grants like NSF, others you basically already need to have done some of the research before you apply.
- think broadly and look for non-traditional sources, including public agencies that do archaeological research, e.g. state departments of transportation.
- Think in profitable and specific results.
- Think of projects YOU want to do, then seek funding for them as necessary and appropriate. Do not let "getting funding" become the primary objective. Stay true to yourself.
- Think outside the box in terms of funding sources. Anthropological research has wide applicability, and non-traditional funders are often excited about anthropological research.
- Think through how to write compelling reviewer friendly proposals
- Think unconventionally. For some reason there is a distrust in public-private partnerships, but corporations van be an important source for funding.
- Thinking broadly about your research and its application to big-picture problems.
- This could be a long conversation! As I noted above: Write a clear proposal that is linked to clear questions of high importance to the field (i.e., broad questions of interest to a wide range of the profession), with a clear methodology for arriving at an answer to the proposal's questions. Avoid jargon; employ graphics wisely to communicate information. For NSF proposal, weave the broader impacts into the proposal (don't just tack them on at the end).
- This question is geared towards researchers, not people who work in the private sector for for-profit companies, which employ the largest number of archaeologists and other cultural resource professionals.
- To apply for funding as early as possible - and not to give up in case of a negative decision
- To apply to many funding agencies, seek out winning proposals to understand what successful grant structures look like, to take the posted review criteria seriously, and to start early so that they can get feedback from trusted colleagues and mentors.
- To apply to the most you can

- To be open to different ways of conducting research than the traditional model of grant-funded fieldwork, and to be willing and able to take full advantage of small pots of money offered for projects and trips through your institution (e.g. university).
- To be persistent and engaged in writing and teamwork.
- To begin applying to grants as early as possible in order to gain practice.
- To do research on funders and grants in a timely way. Compile this information systematically and create a plan for applications.
- To formulate proposals that can still be undertaken without external funding (e.g. a pilot study)
- To get involved with those actively conducting research, and learn practical research and field skills.
- To give up if you are from a low-income background. You likely will never receive admission to programs with decent funding or mentorship from the "right" people. This translates into less of an opportunity to receive funding and fund your research. In short, don't get a PhD. Pursue a non-academic because you'll be able to make a lot of money, earn benefits, and build a good life for yourself.
- To map out, as early as possible, all the granting agencies you intend to apply and establish this timeline with relevant working relationships with advisors/mentors/colleagues such that you can ensure you receive the support you need in a way that works mutally for everyone's schedule.
- To really figure out the "so what" angle on their work. To tell reviewers why they should care about the work.
- Today there is more pressure to get grants as well as to publish, so I would advise integrating grant proposals into one's writing and planning as much as possible. For instance, one's reading and lit reviews serve both, and a person could try to plan that deliberately.
- Treat each funding application as if it were a new piece of work in order to tailor it to the funding agency - don’t think you can just tweak wording. Also, know that it will take time to prepare a funding application so begin the process a few months before the submission deadline.
- Treat the proposal writing process as an opportunity to clarify the stakes of your research and craft a focused research question (even as the reality of ethnographic fieldwork is that the project will evolve on the ground).
- Try all of the options and don't give up after initial rejections. Learn from the comments
- Try and try again!
- Try as many times as you can. It is time-consuming, but it is an important way to conduct your research. Also, it looks good on your CV.
- Try different approaches to match history of what organizations have funded and pay attention to reviewer comments
- Try everything, it can't hurt. Pay particular attention to research strategy to justify the proposed research.
- Try for everything
- Try hard and apply lots of places, get help with proposals from people who've been successful in the past, look at prior successful applications (if possible), and expect a low hit rate
- Try leveraging small crowdfunded groups like Black Trowel collective etc.
- Try small-scale pilot tests to help sharpen the focus of your research, practice writing clearly with as little jargon as humanly possible, and seek out examples of successful proposals to gauge what made them successful. Importantly, be respectful of your intellectual forebearers - all knowledge production consists of a continual process of self-correction, and one day your brilliant insights will be corrected as well.
- Try to apply for something. Take a class on how to apply.
- Try to build relationships with peers with whom you can share drafts of proposals and give each other feedback.

- Try to find ways to do preliminary research from previous funding or other sources to boost your application.
- Try to get extra mileage out of grant applications. See if you can write a baseline draft to use for multiple agencies. Use your grant app as your master's or dissertation prospectus. Grant writing is absurdly time consuming for something that more often than not will net you nothing - so try to find some other use for that time spent.
- Try to identify the goals and intensions of funders
- Try to milk departmental and school resources for shorter term/seasonal term research/pilot projects, travel, conferences, etc., and selecting a couple of "higher reputation" grants to apply for. When prepping to build the applications for those larger grants, obtain at least a half-dozen examples of successful (and unsuccessful) grant apps, especially those with reviews attached. They're really valuable for learning how to frame the apps and consider potential pros/cons, while also eventually serving as a reminder that you're good enough to get one (i.e., when looking at the successful examples I obtained, I was struck by how varied they all were, a realization that helped me feel a bit more confident in my own work and how I was thinking of presenting it).
- Try to steer them to the apropiate organization.
- Try your best and have your mentors read it. Make sure to finish the first draft early and have enough time to revise. Grant application is also about luck and fit. So maybe it's not you and your project but the fit!! So keep trying and don't give up!
- Trying to contact people who already worked with the candidate donor organizations to increase chances to build an interesting proposal for them.
- Uhhhh, stay positive? More seriously, probably take classes in grant writing or technical writing, and try your hand applying for funding. The more experience you have the better.
- Unless you go to a premier university or have a professor who is strongly engaged in research and writing at the time of your grant application, you don't have a very good chance of getting your work funded. Focus on smaller pots of money in order to fund pilot research that might give you the slimmest chance of getting federal funding.
- Use CRM projects to advance your interests
- Use museum collections, instead of funding your own excavations. One will still need funds for analysis of materials (ex. 14C), but overall the project is cheaper and more gratifying.
- well, to not give up. I graduated as anthropologist 3 years ago but I have a over 10+ years in the legal field. when I wanted to do the transition was impossible. that's why I created my own organization to purse independent research freely in the topic I want to investigate. I will advice new antropologist to figure out what kind or anthropology they want to practice and don't feel force to enroll in a masters degree or PhD just because the anthropology industry try to peer pressure you. please understand that school are here to make money not to guide you. so keep persisting and network that's how you find opportunities.
- Work closely with your adviser or someone you trust to help you understand the process and expectations. Don't be afraid to apply for anything, but be sure to weight the cost-benefits of doing so.
- Work collaboratively.
- work first with agencies such as the National Park Service who support specific projects before going to NSF or NEH for support
- Work on fellowships while still a graduate student. Publish (i.e. if you have a mentor that will assist and not steal your work), and get your name out there by participating in as many avenues of scholarship that you can afford (i.e. time and money).
- Work on grants for at least a month, have careful readers make comments, make sure one framework is clearly laid out from beginning and dominates
- Work on it early.

- Work on small grants first, cobble together what you can, and apply for larger ones (e.g., NSF) after you have done a decent amount of data collection. Also talk to NSF grant folks about your project, especially if it straddles subfields.
- Work with a know "winner" of grants and awards as a co-principal investigator
- Work with a mentor to develop a good grant proposal, and then format it for multiple venues.
- Work with someone who knows the directors of funding agencies and can advocate for you to get fair reviews.
- Workshop your big grant and fellowship grants as much as humanly possible. I received an NSF on my first try but only after literally 10 drafts workshopped by trusted peers and mentors. Also, make sure your recommenders have a strong understanding both of your proposed project and of you as a scholar.
- Write carefully written and theoretically impactful proposals.
- write good proposals, publish
- Write your proposals early and go through several drafts. This is more important than your grades. Success will open doors for you and failure will make future success more difficult.
- Yes.
- You can't get it if you don't apply. Don't expect to get things on the first try and remember even really successful scholars often have a low (20-30%) success rate on grants.
- You can't give up. Grant reviewers can offer constructive criticism but can also be very harsh. While it is difficult, you have to try and see what useful info can be found in each set of feedback. You are not an island and should try to find as many of your peers and supervisors to give you feedback as you can.
- You have to have a strong research question first.
- You won't get a grant you don't apply for. If you are not successful in a particular round of funding, carefully consider the reviewers' comments and then reapply. You might not get the same reviewers the next time, but most reviewers (in my experience) provide useful comments that will only make the proposal better. They are not out to get you.

Q41: What do you think granting agencies could be doing better to support potential applicants?

Beyond simply "provide more funding" (a common refrain), respondents had a variety of concrete proposals to share with grantmakers, which I summarize below.

ADVERTISING

- advertise opportunities more widely, targeting communities of marginalized scholars
- clarify eligibility requirements and guidelines
- be transparent about what kinds of projects are being prioritized in each funding cycle
- share examples of successful proposals and budgets
- share evaluation documents with applicants
- improve website design and clarity
- publicize success rates and demographics of successful grantees

APPLICATION PROCESS

- align amount of work of the application to the amount of funding available: make small grants less work to apply for and remove overly-bureaucratic processes
- provide reviewer feedback to all applicants (if there is overly-cruel feedback, remove it and do not ask that reviewer to review again)
- lead workshops for new applicants at major conferences and online
- add more deadlines per year or rolling deadlines

BUDGET AND ELIGIBILITY CONSTRAINTS

- course buyouts for research
- family support (children's travel and living expenses; childcare; eldercare)
- paying dissertation grantees for their time as well as research expenses
- support scholars at teaching-intensive institutions to conduct research more slowly over more time because of their teaching load
- earmark funding for scholars at minority-serving institutions in order to provide student research opportunities to marginalized students

REVIEW & DECISION MAKING

- rework evaluation criteria to prioritize diversifying grantee pool
- clarify which of the evaluation criteria is most important for decision making
- "assign scholars of color to review applications from scholars/students of color"
- "change up the gatekeepers" by changing who reviews over time and diversifying the reviewer pool
- "using multiple reviewers and sharing reviewer comments and the rationale behind decision making with applicants should be standard practice."
- Choose reviewers who will "take their commitment seriously"
- Consider requiring senior reviewers to sign their reviews in order to limit overly-harsh anonymous reviews

FULL RESULTS (ALL ANSWERS, UNEDITED, IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

- - more spaced out deadlines - this is very pandemic-specific, but I found SSRC to be wildly helpful and super flexible in terms of doing fieldwork during a pandemic (e.g., they removed the

international requirement and are funding me to do archival/remote research while remaining in the US) whereas Wenner-Gren was chaotic, confusing, and unsupportive - similarly, I think a lot of us are doing increasingly multi/inter-disciplinary research, and I found that a lot of the big anthropological grant agencies were less receptive to this week/were sending grants to reviewers who had minimal experience with interdisciplinary methods

- ?
- ?
- ????
- (1) Provide course buy-outs for research, particularly for scholars not at R1s. (2) Allow family support to be written into the grant. I can't do summer research because I have little kids; and I can't do academic year research because I have a heavy teaching load that doesn't leave much time for research. I COULD work over the summer if I could pay for childcare. Grant agencies allowing for this would be a significant equalizer in the field, especially for early-career researchers and parents.
- 1. Stop asking to "elaborate" on generalized terms such as "culture". 2. So much awarded research seems to go to "hot topic" fields that flow with current socio-political trends. If an applicant does not hop on one of these bandwagons it is very unlikely they will receive funding. This limits new or innovative methods as well as understudied sections of anthropology and archaeology.
- 20k isn't enough to fund a dissertation. We should be paid for our entire time in the PhD. It's unethical that we aren't getting paid for our time and labor, we are exploited and told this is just the rules of the game.
- A lot! I come from a very privileged program that provided me with a built-in network of already successful grantees, as well as relative ease connecting with folks from other programs through departmental connections. For students without those connections, I know that this is hard! Agencies can organize writing groups or writing-group interest groups where people who are interested in forming more intimate writing groups can get together or be put together, especially for Black, indigenous, and other underfunded groups. In addition, of the many grants I got to see, I don't know that any at all came from the agencies themselves. It would be really nice if they could provide at least a few de-identified or even made-up examples, maybe written by past successful grantees and vetted. Without having seen so many, there's no way I would have known just how particular the format for each is and exactly what needed to be in the proposals.
- A single website where you could look for grants that most fit your research and needs.
- Absolutely, I rarely get any feedback at all and when I don't win I get interrogated about it and have no way to show the application was promising (apparently you can use that to show you're good and just unlucky) or to help myself improve. In one year I was unsuccessful with 9 grant applications and got feedback from only one application.
- Absolutely. Most should be ashamed of themselves.
- Absolutely. There should be much more effort placed in reforming grant making processes to prohibit gate-keeping and continuing to replicate hierarchies in the academy (i.e. public vs. private institutions, racial inequalities, etc.). Too many granting agencies rely on the perceived impartiality and fairness of reviewers. In reality many if not most reviewers are not trained in review processes and hold toxic attachments to their research expertise. Too often the ability of young anthropologists to fund their research is at the mercy of a reviewer who projects theoretical and methodological adjustments that are not based on the merit of the project itself, but on the reviewer's own ideological commitments. Additionally, for competitions that accept multiple applications, there should be more support from agencies on the revision process and more policies put in place to evaluate the revision. I would also advocate for an appeal process for applicants. Given that it is a core strength of anthropologists to evaluate harmful power dynamics, it is a shame that funding agencies with anthropologists in charge continue to replicate harmful hierarchies through funding agencies and policies.

- Acknowledge the importance and relevance of practical applications of anthropological knowledge in addition to theoretical contributions.
- actually offer grants for novel research
- adequate reviewers
- Advertise on social media and at universities so new professionals will actually know about these opportunities.
- Advertise the availability of grants, many folks are not aware that these grants exist
- Advertising better.
- Advertising. Making clear and equitable eligibility requirements. Not asking for documents that they truly won't review in detail.
- Advertising. Making clearer guidelines. Offering feedback for unsuccessful applications.
- Advertizing themselves and educating people on what they offer
- Advise people honestly on their funding changes. Become familiar with competing and complementary programs and direct applicants to other programs where they might have success. ("Have you considered applying to.....")
- Agencies could share example of successful applications, anonymized. Especially important: give example of budgets or a list of budget items accepted, as it's really hard to know what we can ask for when we don't know the rules of the game.
- Aggressively retool their qualifications for evaluating applicants so as to avoid reproducing the structural inequalities rampant in academia.
- align the amount of work required on the application to the amount of the award. I would apply for a $25,000 award, or even a $5,000 or $2,000 award if the application for such awards were simpler, easier, and required less work. But it is not worth 80+ hours of work to write an application for a $25,000 award
- Allocate or have quotas or the funding of social science. 8ts hard to compete again the sciences
- Allow applicants to apply for family support: Childcare, travel costs for kids, in-field/lab childcare, food for kids.
- Allow graduate students to apply for open competitive grants on their own. Sometimes our advisors are not well versed in our project but are required by many granting agencies to be the primary grantee
- Allow more pages/space for budget justifications.
- Allow upload of comment documents from reviewers, including marked-up proposal documents. ALWAYS provide example proposals (NEH is great, NSF really, really needs to do this, you shouldn't have to personally know a previous awardee to get insight into how decisions are made). Always provide WRITTEN evaluations to the investigator. There is no excuse for not telling someone why they didn't get the award and how they can improve.
- Always offer an initial review period allowing time to edit and improve applications, and to streamline the application process.
- Amount of funding available from larger organizations and effort needed to win grants are disproportionate.
- Apply priority rankings to comment types. The question of impact is major. The question of study design and preparation is major. Topicality is minor. Issues of framing are minor. Myself and too many of my colleagues have missed out on funding for the latter two reasons.
- Applying for smaller grants shouldn't require an equivalent amount of work as applying to larger grants. There are so many parts that are required to complete, and it makes it so difficult to apply to lots of orgs when a grant for $250 and a grant for $10,000 require the same amount of work. Additionally, finding where to apply for is really hard unless you're well-connected in your field. So many grants don't even get advertised and it's a shame because on top of having to do the actual

work of applying, you're also constantly having to search. This is in addition to everything else required to complete your degree (as is the case with me).

- Archaeological federal funding gets stuck periodically in thematic ruts... right now we're in a "radiocarbon dating and big data" rut, to the detriment of other types of research. Periodically stop for some introspection and data analysis to look at what types of projects are getting funded.
- Articúlate research areas of interest and theoretical perspectives of interest more effectively
- As a graduate student applying to the NSF for research funding, you aught to be contacted with your feedback. My chair didn't realize that I had never been contacted and as a result I didn't hear what the outcome was until months after a decision had been made. This was unprofessional and disheartening.
- As long as there are clear guidelines and contact information of who you can ask questions, it should be ok? Any recommendations or specifications of what the granting agency is looking to fund can also be helpful
- As someone who teaches a 5-5 load while maintaining an active research project, it is very challenging to compete with researchers with a lighter teaching load and graduate students who can contribute to an application. Having more programs that are tailored to those not at a high-end research institution would make the process more equitable. I simply can't find the time to write a competitive NSF grant application but I do well when I am applying for grants focused upon teaching institutions.
- Assign scholars of color to review applications from scholars/students of color.
- Assistance for English writing for non-English speaking applicants or the possibility of submitting proposal in their native languages. And please, provide feedback, even if it is just one or two sentences. It gives us more confidence in pursuing applications.
- At least on the student level—external funding institutions could address the resource disparity between universities, at least to a degree. For example: the NSF GRFP. Some universities have folders of previous successful applicants' essays, direct connections to previous winners for tips, and multiple seminars on applying. Other schools barely mention the opportunity to students. Making essay examples and connections with winners of previous years available on the NSF website, instead of through select institutions, could somewhat level the playing field.
- Attend annual meetings of major grant receivers; workshops for younger faculty, etc.
- attend to those how wish to continue their research but also want to and have to teach heavy loads (people working at teaching institutions, including community colleges). Specially designated grants/funds for teacher/scholars.
- Attending to researchers in four-year liberal arts colleges, and to those not piggy-backing on big named researchers at elite universities. Do more to facilitate resubmissions. Work with us, don't just continue to reward an elite crowd.
- Award a certain amount to people who are not from highly ranked institutions not working with people who get lots of grants. Or, have those people teach those from other institutions how to get grants.
- Award more grants, even making grants smaller to allow for more applicants to be successful. Ensure that reviewers are matched to grant applications so that they see revised versions rather than having a new set of eyes on the grant the next time around. Seek to significantly speed up grant processing times. Right now there is time for one, and MAYBE two, applications to one grant program. Funders have so few grants available that rejection is likely, especially for a first submission. This can slow progression in a degree program significantly. How might we better match timelines to what doctoral students need? How might we help them write stronger proposals? Think about how the grant review and submission process could be a learning experience rather than a cutthroat race for limited funds.
- Be more consistent about providing feedback to unsuccessful applicants across all organizations. Be more open to non-traditional (older) students.

- Be as available as possible for questions and provide good feedback on proposals when asked for it.
- Be available to talk (phone, zoom, etc.) one on one with the applicant.
- Be clear about who is evaluating the application - who makes up the review committee(s). If they are looking for specific elements in the application, they need to be stated upfront.
- Be clear in the narrative and graphics regarding desired product and deliverable.
- Be clearer about what they are looking for in proposals, in terms of both topics and content (style, audience, etc.)
- Be less sexist and ageist; give a chance to unknown scholars so they can then possibly become known scholars; don't judge an applicant based on his/her advisor or institution.
- Be more aggressive at transcending old-fashioned senior academic gatekeepers in roles of reviewers, panelists. Increasing skills in interdisciplinary teamwork. Give all proposals at least some basic feedback (for private foundations).
- Be more explicit about expectations (what the agency favors) and about the chances of getting a particular grant (like the chances are 1 out of 100 applications or whatever, like what Fulbright does). Don't waste applicants' time with a grant that is one in a million but the applicant doesn't know that when applying.
- Be more forthcoming about why unsuccessful proposals are unsuccessful.
- Be more inclusive of what you fund, who you include as reviewers, and provide feedback.
- Be more open to smaller projects and researchers not at R1 universities
- Be more transparent about the entire process. Offer more grants. Universities also frankly need to stop sucking the blood of these granting agencies, especially because they don't actually do any "support activities." They won't even help explain how to pay taxes on a fellowship...yet they're charging exorbitant fees, money that could go to actual human beings.
- Be more transparent about what funding priorities are; it seems like a lot of topics don't get funded and there tends to be 'trends'/fashions in funding; it would save people time if they knew that certain topics have little hope of getting funded.
- Be more transparent as to how many applications can be funded each cycle, and if there are any specific topics of research being prioritized or not.
- Be much clearer about their expectations, the likelihood of success. Work together to utilize a standard submission form rather than every granting agency asking for something just different enough that you need to write a completely new proposal every time even though it is for the same research.
- Be precise and honest about what they support, and the qualifications of the applicant.
- be truly specific if they are already looking for a certain type of project instead of being general
- Be truthful in providing information about the grant application.
- Be very clear about what they don't fund so as not to waste anyone's time. And make a concerted effort to identify a wide array of potential reviewers who employ a multitude of methods and anthropological perspectives. Nothing is worse than a reviewer who decides sentence-one that you won't be getting this grant because you don't ascribe to their particular praxis.
- Before Covid I think they were doing a pretty good job.
- Being clear about expectations-- large granting agencies like NSF are now making awards for multi-institutional, collaborative grants. Post-PhD individuals seeking funding to do smaller projects are generally not competitive.
- being more transparent about the decision processes.
- Being present and very visible at SAA, AAA, etc. meetings, tables in book exhibit halls, so people can easily approach and discuss their needs and projects
- being very clear about they will and will not support.
- Besides more money?

- Better advertising for opportunities- a more centralized place for people to know what to do, where to go, or what's available.
- Better assessment of negative reviews in terms of reasonableness.
- Better feedback mechanisms for all grant rejections and acceptances.
- Better feedback on proposals submitted. More comprehensive and with an eye toward resubmitted or where else to go. Be available to talk through projects in preliminary stages by inviting discussion through the website. I review for some of these grants that are overly competitive and I am disappointed at the disinterest in providing salient comments to all applicants who spend hours on applications. It is this that has led me to work with public agencies who have a very practical interest in research. They are more welcoming and work in the pubic interest.
- Better feedback with rejection would be great, although I understand this is difficult for reviewers to do given constraints on their time.
- Better information about funding priorities
- Better information and guidelines. Shorter information for elimination process, the. A second stage with more detail.
- Better organized websites, providing examples
- Better solicitation to university dept listserves, or maybe a one stop website with a list of all opportunities
- Better vet their reviewers, provide them with clear guidelines, and exert some quality control on their reviews. If a reviewer writes a review that is clearly racist or misogynistic, do not pass that on to the applicant and instead seek out additional reviewers.
- Better websites
- Broaden their understanding of what archaeology is and what it can do for communities today. Recognize the implicit bias in the grant application process for anyone that is not a cis white male doing what is perceived as traditional "prehistoric" archaeology.
- Broadening the subject and scope of grants to include ECRs and minoritised researchers more, instead of being focused almost exclusively to TT/T researchers
- Cannot say
- Catering more towards the needs of the individual instead of having set use the money for certain things. And reaching out to people
- Certain (many?) agencies (NGS is a prime example) offer little to no feedback; this hinders developing a better proposal.
- Change up the gatekeepers.
- change up their panel of reviwers
- Check the reviews and look for those that seem out of line with the others, and then don't include them in your decision. Also, consider what funding applicants from less prestigious schools have *not* had access to and provide more options for preliminary, foundational, and scoping research. This will will let promising scholars from public schools and from programs with less funding get a leg-up on bigger applications. Considering recent research that shows how outrageously concentrated TT jobs are in Anthropology in terms of their PhD-granting institutions, it feels like we need as a discipline to critically examine why everyone from Chicago, Michigan, and Berkeley gets the funding and the jobs. With all due respect to my current colleagues who graduated from these institutions, and who are smart and dedicated scholars, what is behind their career success is also that they had the advice (and self-confidence or, maybe, entitlement) to long-ago apply to graduate programs with prestige and funding, and that their research interests aligned with those programs at their point of application. That can't possibly be the best way for our discipline to measure who deserves to be a tenure-track anthropology professor, but it is largely what happens. Funding is a huge part of this and funders need to explore their role in this larger cycle.

- Clarify the success rates for all applicants and the process of review. Obfuscated review makes it confusing and stressful.
- Clarity and realistic expectations.
- Clarity and transparency in the selection process. Returning feedback to the candidates.
- Clear and concise call, in case of NSF and other Govt funding, it is how you fit with peer review, a pernicious system where truly transformative work will be denied!
- Clear directions around deadlines, formatting, etc. would make a huge difference. Difficult-to-navigate websites make the entire process more overwhelming. Agencies should also be doing more effective and non-tokenizing outreach to and/or support of underrepresented academics and underrepresented research perspectives in our field.
- Clear expectations on how grants are evaluated - kind of a grading rubric for a grant proposal.
- Clear instructions on what the granting agency is looking for in applications. Grant processes that don't make unnecessary work for applicants. Changing instructions to reviewers (especially for dissertation-related grants) to make them provide formative feedback (in additional to whatever kind of info the granting agency wants for evaluations). Screen reviews for unprofessional and bullying content.
- Clearer guidance on types of projects that would be helpful. More time for specific calls for applications (longer lead time before applications are due if it is a new program). More easy to find guidance on proposals (often guidance is hard to find/confusing on websites).
- Clearer instructions and more examples of previously funded projects.
- clearly define what is required thematically; realistic deadlines; feedback when application denied; provide a second chance
- Clearly spell out both funding goals of your agency and the process of selection. Be sure that reviewers know the precise criteria of each program. Choose reviewers who are not trying to build their CV. Provide easy access to "winning" proposals.
- Coaching for first-time applicants; create more funding opportunities for mid-career researchers (for research and writing fellowships); offer publication and presentation opportunities for grantees.
- Communicate their requirements/desires more precisely.
- Compile newsletter of opportunities and send to an email list. Provide better feedback on applications.
- Consider innovations in knowledge production brought be new methods, especially those led by or in partnership with marginalized and underrepresented communities. Attention to racial equity and representational equity is needed.
- Create a repository of successful and unsuccessful proposals, perhaps with annotations, so students can see examples. Provide more training and examples of IRBs, protocols, and data management plans—many anthropology departments never explicitly teach students how to create those and you're somehow just supposed to figure it out. Provide recommendations for how to responsibly share data via repositories
- Create a system so applicants are not just left waiting endlessly for an answer. Some have portals that show application submitted, application under review, decision pending, etc.
- Create criteria and opportunities for different stages in applicant career including mid career
- Create mentorship programs where people who have been funded in the past guide applicants. I have a mental-health-related disability that makes applying very difficult, but I do not externally appear to have any reason to need support, so I do not qualify for any of the usual mentoring programs at my university.
- Create opportunities for first generation students, minorities, women and anyone that is not fully funded. Educate the student/instructor directly. If you want to support and attract diversity in the field then make it a bit easier to navigate the waters. I was a 1st generation college student and was completely lost, first as an undergraduate and then as an older graduate student. If the goal is to keep

funding the status quo then, keep doing what you are doing. If the goal is to actually introduce diversity not only of people but in an interdisciplinary direction (i.e. new ideas that could grow the discipline in a way to create jobs), PLEASE address and redress the situation. Funding agencies are the bread and butter of anthropologists. If a professor can not attain funding they are usually not-tenured. If, you, as the funding agency make limitations as to who may apply, there will be, if you will, a paradigm shift.

- Creating more small funding programs to support early career graduate students or pre-dissertation fieldwork.
- Definitely being more transparent about what they want
- Definitely provide feedback on unsuccessful proposals. Make the review process more transparent.
- Defund the security state to fund research (among other more important things, healthcare, housing, environmental justice, etc). Short of that, it would be nice if program officers could summarize reviewer feedback in the way AEs do. Point out what you see as the most meaningful steps to address in resubmissions (especially when reviewers are conflicted). Support programs like the SSRC DPDF and other pre-dissertation support mechanisms that support grad students in learning the grant as a genre. Be transparent about your funding priorities and scoring. If a proposal came close to being funded that is meaningful information for a writer.
- Demonstrate clearly what the expectations are in terms of theoretical and methodological aspects. Provide more, smaller, early career/development grants.
- Demystify the proposal writing process. Give quick feedback on scope of projects.
- Detailed feedback on rejected proposals!!! Many funders are accepting 10% or fewer of the applicants. I know that is a lot of feedback, but junior scholars have very few resources and many of us do not have good institutional support in this process. Working for months on an application and then waiting months for a response to then be told we had too many applicants to provide feedback or to provide one sentence of feedback is really unhelpful. I often don't get any more than that from grant officers either. I've also been told that I need to be able to show a track record of grants before I can be awarded more grants. However, that's an unhelpful chicken and the egg situation when you're waiting for initial support. Also, grants less than $250,000 should have limits on how much overhead the university can take out. I'm at an institution that takes 56%. If I want to hire a graduate student for a year and pay them a university defined stipend, health care, and tuition, I suddenly have almost no money to fund the actual research and travel expenses, let alone any of my time. I get pressure to buy out my time but am often left with 3% of the grant that can go to salary for myself after everything else is taken out and I work way more than 3% time on these grants. In an environment where there is more and more pressure to bring in money to help cover salaries and dwindling University resources this is totally unsustainable, particularly for junior scholars. In an environment with fewer tenure lines and more soft money funded positions, it doesn't take much to realize this structure is going to fall apart soon. It would also be very helpful if there were some smaller grants to help cover open access fees. If one article is $3,000-$4,000 for open access and you have a $30,000 grant, you don't really have much for publication. Some foundation grants prevent you from using funds for open access fees. Yet research clearly shows that scholars who publish open access have much higher citation rates and it can be instrumental to building a career. Funding for publication is becoming more important, especially for junior scholars.
- Detailed reviewer feedback
- Discouraging most students and early career professionals from an Anthro career.
- Diversify approach to funding. There is lots of great anthropology taking place outside of academic departments.
- Diversify the reviewer pool -- not just in terms of age, ethnicity, gender, etc., but also in terms of theoretical orientation and methods.
- Diversify the reviewer pool. Some organizations remain stagnant and miss opportunities for new perspectives, methods, research questions because the reviewer pool is essentially made up of a

network of individuals that grant funding to those in their own circles and the same institutions. It can be quite incestuous and undermines the scientific enterprise. We have to encourage innovation and new lines of inquiry and resist the urge to have reviewers who serve as gatekeepers. Anthropology will never deliver on its promise of contributing to humanity if we keep doing the same things and expecting different results. We are fast tracking our own extinction as a legitimate science. There is too much going on in the world for the study of man not to be at the forefront of change.

- diversify their vision of reserarch
- diversify who reads/ranks proposals
- DO a better job of fund-raising.
- Do better to anonymize applicant identities to avoid undue bias in review. Match reviewers better with projects they're reviewing. Pay reviewers more for their time so they are more thorough in their reading and engagement with proposals. Monitor reviews and panels for signs of undue bias against groundbreaking research, especially research on inequity that tends to make older, more established scholars squirm and go on the defense.
- Doing a pre-proposal refusal
- Don't focus on academics. Most archaeologists aren't.
- Don't have experience to say.
- Don’t make the applications so onerous. It’s a waste of our time
- Double blind review process. Reviewers should not know the identity of the proposal writer this prevents gate keeping behavior.
- Easier instructions. Oftentimes application process is convoluted (especially the NSF Postdoctoral Fellowship). Updated software to submit applications.
- Easier to find
- Employing program officers who are aware of and supportive of innovative developments in the field; developing programs that are responsive to new trends. A decadal survey such as the ones in physical sciences might be a good idea for setting priorities.
- Encourage collaborative archaeological projects. Broader Impacts should emphasize ways that a project works with descendent groups and stakeholders.
- Encourage undergraduates to continue by giving scholarships for higher education.
- Encouraging ECRs to reach out to grant folks to talk through projects. I didn't know until I was a prof that I was supposed to email/call them to figure out, e.g., which NSF subfield was appropriate. Demystify the entire process, because many of us had diss advisors who didn't help with grants, no mentoring committee as ECRs, are first-gen PhDs, etc. School-wide grant info sessions are useless, as they tend to focus on the biomedical folks and are not relevant for the sci-adjacent humanities.
- Ensure reviews are fair, transparent, and helpful to applicants. Using multiple reviewers and sharing reviewer comments and the rationale behind decision making with applicants should be standard practice.
- Ensure that past proposals for funded projects are available for review by folks interested in applying.
- Everybody should be lobbying the local, state, and federal governments to actually care about this kind of research. There's plenty of money out there. Imagine what one fighter jet worth of money could do in one year.
- Examples of completed applications. I transitioned from a corporate career into academia. In my experience, it is assumed that PhD students already know what content and prose style is expected on instruments such as personal statements, prospectus, and funding applications. Wenner-Gren does a better job explaining expectations than most funders. The detailed outline provided by funders is very helpful. Even my background as a professional writer, however, does not help me

translate what "Data Analysis" means to the particular funder or in what form that information should be presented on the page. Examples, even fictionalized ones, are supremely helpful.

- Examples of successful applications and more detailed instructions
- Expand eligibility-- my colleagues whose research was based outside of the US had so many more funding options from the big agencies than I did. Give less money to more people so they can be more competitive candidates for future grants from other agencies (ie, they already have a success on their CV).
- Expanding the kind of research that is funded, including community-based, collaborative, team-based, and with outcomes that are not just publications but also include tools for community use, policy tool and paper, videos, websites, and other "products."
- Extend funder mentorship to applicants.
- Facilitating the bureaucracy at individual institutions.
- Fast track small amount grants. Often I need money for transportation, and/or inclusion of student participation. I often run research on $500.00 or less! It would be great to have fast turn-around options for small dollar amount grants for small project components.
- Feedback is critical and rarely received
- Figure out a way to find more money to support more projects.
- Find ways to support BIPOC anthropologists who remain underrepresented in our field.
- Finding ways to support more women and members of minority groups (including prospective BIPOC and LGBTQIA+ PIs). Continued and new outreach programs for junior scholars is valuable. Encouraging mentoring of junior scholars, especially women and members of minority groups. Continuing with bias training for reviewers. Promoting a culture on review panels that does not implicitly or explicitly favor cis/het Caucasian males.
- First and foremost, ensuring that their reviewers are those who will take their commitment seriously and who will take the time to write constructive reviews. Just as important is choosing reviewers who have a high ethical standard - in one case, I discovered that my exact project I had submitted but had not received funding for was being completed by a student at another institution. Everything was suspect - the collection I was going to use was obscure, the timing of when the student first reached out to the collection managers was within months of when my project was declined by the funder, and my idea was unique and something that had not been done before. I obviously can't prove it without the funder releasing the names of who reviewed and rejected my application, but it's too much circumstantial evidence to ignore. The aspect that burns the most is the reviewers indicated that there were major flaws with my proposal, but obviously those flaws weren't substantial enough to prevent one of them from handing my intellectual property over to one of their students. My point is that potential reviewers should be vetted completely by funding agencies, and there should be some sort of advertised mechanism for recourse when suspect situations such as this one arise.
- Flexibility, ability to use funds for childcare
- For foreign applicants language is an important handicap. US academic language is not universal and other languages have different ways of structuring sentences. This is generally off-putting to native anglophone reviewers. Agencies should urge reviewers to focus on substance and be flexible with language proficiency.
- For investigators who do not have large networks from their graduate program due to a graduate advisor leaving the field or other reasons, it can be hard to establish a consistent research program. This is true with new investigators, but also investigators well into their careers. While large teams with large and long-term datasets are safe bets and these datasets can yield incredible discoveries, effort should be made to fund smaller groups who study less well-known topics/species/populations as well.
- For me, NSF seems useless. Wenner-Gren was ok but too little money. Instead of grant support I have been doing research as a consultant on development projects.

- For students/researchers who lack direct mentorship or access to former grantees, I think it would be helpful for the granting agencies to provide more open access workshops or guidance (beyond FAQ pages) that would help guide prospective applicants on what makes for a successful application (or are flags on an application). Increased open access/support would help support researchers who don't have good institutional access to successful grantees or are intimidated by the prospect of reaching out directly to reviewers/granting agencies with questions.
- Frankly, beyond providing a larger pot of money, I'm not really sure
- Frankly, provide more money and take into account that, for instance, $20,000 for a year-long ethnographic study in a European capital city is not sufficient funding to live comfortably and healthily. Especially when there is a greater call to turn the ethnographic gaze back on to the centres of global power and drivers of colonialism, applicants wishing to do this work should be better financially supported.
- From my experience and other antidotal information, it seems that even if you received excellent rankings due to politics, you may still not receive the grant, which I guess prepares you for academia.
- From what I've seen, they need to be more flexible in what they fund. For example, is has been impossible to get funding from NSF for climate change-related research in archaeology unless it is more traditionally focused -- there's been no support for triaging sites and developing methodologies for saving data that is being lost on a daily basis to sea level rise, wildfire, etc. We have had several discussions with NSF about this.
- Fund equipment and student assistants
- fund more local/crm archaeological projects - as that's the only archaeology being done in America now.
- Fund researchers at minority serving institutions.
- Get knowledgable reviewers; fund more collections-based research
- get out of the ivory tower and on the ground
- Get qualified reviewers that they PAY.
- Get rid of 1:1 match requirements. Those filter out many institutions who cannot afford that component.
- get the word out sooner - by the time i had heard of most of these, i was too far into my research / years into my degree to qualify as an applicant
- Give constructive feedback. Compensate reviewers for their time if necessary.
- Give feedback.
- Give good feedback and ensure that reviewers are as careful with their assessments as they would hope others would be with their own research proposals. I think that the NSF does a particularly poor job in supporting potential applicants because of its budgetary requirements (indirect costs) and the complexity of the application itself. I have not encountered such problems with any other grant applications.
- Give greater weight to new and unexpected approaches instead of funding the same sorts of work in the same sorts of places done by the same people over and over
- Give more feedback on applications - even the smaller ones
- Give more money.
- Give more opportunities to the global South.
- Give more weight to applications that seek to focus on public outreach.
- Give out more money, make student debt not a thing, expand grants to cover living AND research, and look at the return on projects. Many long-term successful academics actually don't get national funding at the graduate student level, so who are these agencies actually funding?
- GIVING FEEDBACK. The reviewers are already reading it, it really doesn't take a lot of extra time to jot down some thoughts. How are we expected to improve if we don't know what to work on?

- Giving more money, longer grant terms, and having less competition? The competitiveness factor makes the whole thing seem more like gambling than anything. Pragmatically, small amounts ($5k range) tacked on to grants to support relocation/transition/those gap periods that tend to arise when one switches from one source of income to another, not requiring receipts or budgets necessarily but allowing for emergent needs for funds, would relieve some stress and pressure.
- Good question. When I was in graduate school it was helpful when a representative from a granting agency came and talked at the university. -- It is also helpful for graduate students who are just beginning to apply for grants to have examples. Writing grant application essays is its own special form of writing.
- Grant resources for on-going processes. I edited five volumes, and a series of book chapters with very small grants from my U. As a non-tenured track lecturer I did not qualified for larger grants.
- Grant writing is an art. It is not the same as biding on projects in CRM. You should take a grant writing course
- Granting agencies and universities in general could provide much more support for writing theses and dissertations. In the end, I had a fellowship for three years of grad school and a Fulbright for one year of field research, but I was never able to secure funding to write my dissertation. After three years of trying to balance a full time job with writing, I gave up and left the program with just my Masters.
- Granting agencies must follow the equitable sharing of the funds to support a wider group of applicants. This is because sometimes some agencies give huge funds to very limited applicants rejecting many potential applicants. So fund amount and its sharing strategy should be considered as a top priority before allocating funds to the projects. Secondly, some of the small potential projects must be considered for funding no matter whether it comes from an early career applicant of from any applicant with experience in the field wildlife research/conservation. Secondly, the granting agencies must not focus on any lobbyist groups for funding support as it may undermine the the chance of losing a potential project from a non-lobbyist and or neutral group.
- Granting agencies need to come up with more clearly definable criteria that they consistently apply.
- Granting agencies should better communicate the technical requirements of their applications and any restrictions on the use of funds. They might also share successful grant applications since those are currently shared within networks at elite institutions, making access to them uneven and inequitable.
- Granting agencies should have rolling deadlines, or at least coordinate and stagger their due dates with each other, as most are due in the November-January window.
- Granting agencies which do not give and feedback beyond a rejection or not even a rejection make re-application very daunting. Similarly, the 'personal' conversations with granting agency format is an important way to ensure exclusion.
- greater emphasis on personal contact with potential grantees. I worked at a small institution without a grant office or much internal help, so that kind of help was crucial to me.
- Greater transparency in funding patterns for the previous five years.
- Guides such as SSRC's "On the Art of Writing Proposals" by Pzreworski and Salomon. Relatively in-depth explanations of what an agency is looking for in terms of form and content of the grant proposal. Easily searchable databases of previous grantees and their projects according to multiple criteria such as date, keywords, universities, etc. Average success rate (x% of applications are successful upon first submission, y% of applications after resubmission).
- Hah! Less insane paperwork, less intimidating and confusing automated websites, better communication about opportunities. I didn't know about half the organizations you listed!
- Half the current academics today are in part-time or unstable teaching situations because of lack of support for public universities and perhaps some warping of university budgets. Granting agencies need to find ways to support those scholars and not to penalize gaps in publishing.

- Have a centralized databased of grants. Dont request letters of recommendation unless the grant moves to a second round of review.
- Have clear and approachable points of contact, and welcome questions. I also appreciate the LOI process used by some other funding agencies. Experienced program directors are skilled at identifying high-potential proposals/research, and encouraging those projects.
- Have clear and reasonable expectations. If you have intense applications with no follow up it seems like a double standard meant to intimidate rather than inform.
- Have early draft submission dates for feedback. NEH did this and it was really effective in retooling my application before final submission.
- Have local chapters with local goals in addition to their large-scale formats. This way smaller scale interests get funded and have a better chance to include minority groups. Large agencies tend to fund big names and sensationally attractive projects, which leaves out smaller, yet locally impactful projects.
- Have mentors for applicants- established scholars for ECRs and students, either though the granting agencies or the professional organizations. The EAA has done this and it has been INCREDIBLY helpful.
- Have more diversity among reviewers first. Let's be honest, privileged white people don't understand research by and for historically excluded communities, especially on inequalities and inequities. Same for staff: don't just hire one person to fix it, be systematic about this. Hold more summer institutes to train students, especially historically excluded students. Amber Wutich currently runs an NSF sponsored one, that had a lot of applicants but could only take so many students. The one day or one hour webinars don't cut it. Design grants/fellowships that pair a senior researcher with a younger researcher or student to make this more equitable. Stop giving unfair advantages to applicants from Ivy Leagues, especially when many of those don't even have methods classes. Publish WITH students from underrepresented groups. Is the PI of this project even doing this? Are you giving a grad student or an undergrad the opportunity to work and publish on this survey/research?
- Have more funding available! This might sound glib, but it's difficult to present students with strategies to succeed when the resources available are continually reduced.
- Have more funds available!
- Have more grants that do not allow universities to take a large cut.
- Have more money available, reconsider limits on funding certain regions
- Have more money so they can provide more funding.
- Have more money. Be more honest, even brutally frank, about applications, have higher standards so that truly good ones get funded.
- Have one funding clearinghouse where someone can go and apply for various grants.
- Having a "library" of successfully-funded proposals available for applicants on request (with sensitive info blacked out) would even the playing field -- in some large departments or major research universities departments have those on file to share with graduate students and new assistant professors. The rest of us have to start out blindly.
- Help to fund projects that have a practical application of the results of or from its support of theoretical projects. Help to train the student and the public about the connection between basic research and application. Thereby breakdown the barrier between "academic" and applied research and reaching a wider audience and sells the rationale of the granting source to the public. Making that connection between the student and the public with a cause/purpose that is not just a name of an funding agency. Anthropological training is more and more being main-streamed but not necessarily under an occupational title of "anthropologist." It is becoming relevant because of what is happening in the world. Funding agencies need to recognize this and use it as part of their planning, including reaching further down into the earlier rates of students who are pursuing an MA/MS or even BA/BS degree in anthropology. This way the agencies will contribute to the expansion of the market for

anthropological skills and research products. And help create jobs and careers for the student beyond the narrow confines of College and University faculty.

- Help.
- Hold more workshops and advertise them better. Make repositories of successful applications more accessible. Recruit successful candidates to be contacts/advisors with potential applicants.
- Holistic review, support the person, not the research. Look for the broader impact of the researcher not just the research
- Honestly, granting agencies can focus on procuring more funding to make more awards. The reality of a dwindling pool of money is the largest issues. Secondly, there has to be more funding for U.S.-based projects. As the discipline of anthropology increasingly includes scholars conducting their first major product in the U.S., funding streams are inadequate. Finally, granting agencies must communicate and address the changing methods with which anthropologists conduct their research. As an emerging scholar using photographic and film methodologies, funding streams are also meger.
- Honestly, I don't know.
- Honesty about funding potential, increase available funds.
- Host grant-writing workshops themselves, or give presentations on what (not) to do. Do a grant-writing workshop in-person for early career applicants especially from under-represented backgrounds.
- How about a series of small grants that are awarded randomly to everyone with a project that meets the proposal criteria? Some researchers (I do not remember the exact study) have apparently shown that random distribution of funds could statistically be equally likely to lead to breakthroughs. And it gets around all of the existing bias where past success in getting a grant is central to future success in getting a grant.
- How-to webinars meant for both internal agency grant managers in addition to how-to webinars meant for applicants AND recipients. Section 106 responsibilities need to be laid out clearly with expectations and roles defined.
- I am not sure
- I am not sure, since I have not applied to any of the mentioned agencies, hence I cannot answer that.
- I appreciate efforts by Wenner-Gren to democratize the process through online webinars to disseminate information.
- I believe grant agencies that are seeking to increase their funding of historically underrepresented groups, also need to expand their definitions of research and scholarship. Reviewers need to understand the impact and scholarly contributions of activist-engaged and community-based research. The groups that are underrepresented gravitate toward these research methods as a result of accountability to their community partners in response to academia's history of being exploitive and extractive towards disenfranchised communities. By not expanding notions of research, they are unable to fully support the students they want to increase funding for. This is a barrier of exclusion.
- I believe the NEH provides some opportunities for applicants to submit draft proposals prior to the deadline and I wish more agencies offered that type of support. The NSF also just started sending out targeted newsletters about different funding programs. I haven't found any news programs that way yet but the potential is there.
- I cannot comment on this due to lack of experience
- I do not know.
- I do not know. More workshops about writing successful proposals could be helpful.
- I don't have a clue how they are currently supporting applicants so I can't help.
- I don't know
- I don't know
- I don't know

- I don't know about the last 10 years. I got pretty dismayed by the hostility of NSF panels and reviewers and Wenner-Gren's pre-screeners, who were largely a set of NYC ABD's with strongly held ideas that went out of vogue a decade before. However, all my grad students got their NSF DDIGS, even when I was told I didn't deserve further funding...
- I don't know what granting agencies are currently doing to knowledgeably answer this question.
- I don't know, honestly, as I've been fairly successful with my initial attempts. I feel like if I had been given a "revise & resubmit" answer for my NSF, or earned an "honorable mention" during that first Ford pre-doc round, I would've delved more deeply into support resources...
- I don't know.
- I don't make applications any more.
- I don’t know
- I don’t know
- I feel like they are not as known in the field of anthropology and should make themselves more known.
- I find it helpful when granting agencies provide examples of successful funding applications, or provide a workshop/video to explain their expectations. The Sigma Xi society does this, and it was really helpful.
- I guess? I see granting agencies as BIO101 weeding out places -- most proposals are probably great. Their job isn't to fund, it's to decide the arbitrary reasons not to fund, until they're left with a pool of applicants that matches their funds to grant.
- I have no idea.
- I have no opinion
- I have not applied to granting agencies for funding.
- I have recently had the opportunity to attend some virtual workshops and office hours from a granting agency, and these have been very useful for better understanding what they want because they have been interactive. I would encourage granting agencies to hold these kinds of events periodically, rather than just post guidelines and videos.
- I haven't had enough experience to say.
- I haven't really worked much with the competitive funding agencies, in part out of a sense that they don't often find research in my specific field (historical archaeology). If I'm wrong about that, perhaps there should be better messaging.
- I haven’t a clue!
- I know it is harder to get reviewers for manuscripts and proposals, but in a more just world agencies would "evaluate" the reviews they receive in terms of clarity, reasoning, and constructiveness. For instance, reviewers who write telegraphic assessments with little or no explanation for their final ratings should not be asked to review subsequent proposals.
- I realize that granting agencies are overwhelmed with demands that are made on the time of their staff. To the extent possible, however, I think that candidates for funding benefit personally and professionally from receiving detailed reviews of their proposals from reviewers as well as advice from representatives of the funding agency. Seeking funding is, like anything else we do, a learning process that occurs in a social context. The richer we can make that context, the more people who provide insights on the proposed work, the better the learning process.
- I really appreciated to receive reviews on my submitted proposal. I wish other granting agencies would provide reviews as the Wenner-Gren Foundation has done. Also more funding opportunities would be extremely helpful for the applicants, especially in the time of uncertainty and difficulty due to the prolonged covid-19 situation.
- I received no feedback from Fulbright about my application. All I know is that I received an “alternate” status.

- I require o my small amounts of funding for my research, for travel and expenses while abroad. It is difficult to find grants geared toward this
- I suspect my situation may be somewhat unique, but offer small grants for those doing small projects that need field support for gas, equipment, lodgings, and meals. In the lab, provide stipends or some type of support for volunteers directing and conducting artifact analyses and write-ups.
- I thin more granting agencies should set up mentorship programs to provide more one-on-one guidance to applicants
- I think actually having practice grant proposal submission rounds for younger/inexperienced academics would be really useful - a forum where those without experience could submit demo applications/proposals to the actual granting agencies and get feedback from reviewers on them before they submit anything real. I also think that providing more opportunities for younger academics to access designated pools of money for junior researchers without the competition from more established academics is critical (outside of dissertation-specific grants).
- I think agencies need to keep an eye on institutional demographics; preponderant number of successful applicants too often from the same 20 or so Research-1 universities. Diversifying institutional range will help diversify the cohort of successful applicants.
- I think all funding agencies should provide the reviewers' comments as a matter of course. I seem to recall that Nat Geo and the American Philosophical Society do not provide them. And for at least one NEH grant that I applied for, I had to request to see them. Also, do not require letters of support at the application stage (looking at you American Philosophical Society).
- I think anthropologists reading application could have a more capacious understanding of the field.
- I think at least be aware that there are Anthropology students studying in Japan, Singapore, HK and Taiwan that ask difficult questions and are willing to do a good research, but that they are at least one step behind the North American students when it comes to funding opportunities.
- I think granting agencies should be more upfront about what program officers do and what kinds of services or advice they can provide to applicants. Beyond this, I think granting agencies need to develop strategies to ensure that the grant application process is not keeping people out of the process. I wish more programs had short solicitations like the NSF EAGER and related programs where you could submit a very short proposal and (if it is a good fit for the program) get some initial feedback and an invitation for a full proposal. Over the last couple of years during the COVID-19 pandemic we've seen an increase in proposals from senior faculty and a decrease in proposals from junior faculty in our university. I think this is at least partially due to the fact that more junior faculty are parents of young children or are members of underrepresented groups with all kinds of additional service burdens that have been particularly acute during the pandemic. I fear that if granting agencies don't try something big and new to address this immediate issue (and the long standing issues for ECRs) there is going to be a major loss in productivity for junior scholars in the next several years and probably beyond. I would love to see something like short proposals that provide small grants for a course release or something to develop a larger proposal or simply just to have programs prioritize junior scholars or development grants that provide funds for creating new collaborations.
- I think grants for anthropological research need to pay more attention to interdisciplinary research projects and endeavors. For example, I feel like Wenner-Gren was more disciplinary-policing than SSRC. Ethnographic research is so important right now to tackle fundamental social and humanistic issues facing us, yet many of the issues need to be examined both in and out of anthropology, which necessitates openness, creativity, and appreciation for interdisciplinarity.
- I think it would be beneficial to provide more data on succesful applications, and more informal informational sessions that provide a space for networking with peers in addition to providing information on the grant itself. I was part of a writing group that formed out of an informational session at my university, and all of the graduate students in this writing group were successful in their grant applications that cycle. Providing a space for networking like that would be beneficial. Also providing realistic timelines for grant preparation (i.e. start X months out, drafts need to be

completed Y months out, letters of collaboration Z months out, etc.) would be very helpful and is information that is suprisingly hard to come by.

- I think junior researchers would benefit from seeing a selection of successful proposals, or sections at least.
- I think most agencies provide a lot of information about their purpose, goals, what they want to fund, how to apply, etc. Applicants need to read carefully and ask questions if necessary.
- I think picking reviewers who are actually relevant and understand where archaeology is at. Reviewers seems confused by the inclusion of community-based work in our research. I think making expectations very clear. From what I've seen it looks like you really need to be almost done with your diss to get a NSF or Wenner Gren, not just a the beginning of your dissertation work. I think we also need to look at what is getting funded, it seems that it's the big prestigious universities that already have the resources/lab/ money to fund these projects. This makes it really hard for someone coming from somewhere else to get a grant.
- I think proposals would be fine to be brief for students who are just starting their graduate career. Several organizations request very long proposals required a full idea and I think lots of students get worried about their plans changing and affecting how they use their funding in the future with how unpredictable research can get. Or at least making it clear that there is some flexibility how funds can be used should research plans change.
- I think smaller grants for early-career scholars would be helpful
- I think some granting agencies (Wenner-Gren, in particular) make a too rigid (and somewhat arbitrary) distinction between what they consider to be "applied" versus "theoretical," which I consider to be a quite bogus and subjective basis for assessment.
- I think some institutions are more inclined toward supporting applicants from select high rank universities. They should revise their criteria.
- I think some of the information about how to write a grant proposal on Karen Kelsky's blog and in her book really help to level the playing field when it concerns helping students relay the significance of their projects. Tailored resources similar to that would support students applying for grants.
- I think that workshops at Universities are very helpful. I just wish I had had an advisor who was more helpful in the process.
- I think the agencies I've worked with have done a very good job overall, especially those that offer webinars, review drafts/letters of intent, and make program officers available for questions. Clearer, more consistent instructions would help, but many are the result of Federal legislation, so increasing clarity and consistency is an uphill battle in that environment.
- I think the Anthropology industry in general need to evolve. and all the granting agencies too. I feel that only Phd student have a chance to make in it. all the funding is for them. please remember that other scholars should have the chance to get funding to do research. be more inclusive of all backgrounds. be more flexible. don't give unreached standards to get $1000 funding.
- I think the NSF process could be better. the individual reviewers are great but I think given that there is so little money, it comes down to some pretty arbitrary decisions of prioritizing "important" research by the panel. I'm tired of getting excellent reviews but not being deemed "important" enough due to really not clear criteria. Perhaps a better discussion on what that means.
- I think there are a lot of applicants for not so many funds, but I do think there is a...problem...bias...something, in which folks who have gotten funds before are the ones who keep getting funds. Success begets success and all that. Therefore, the same projects keep getting funding, and new projects do not. Obviously those projects are good, and the reviewers like them a lot, so I do not think they should be punished per se, but I wish there was a way to do double blind peer review. I think it is probably impossible, but I think it might reconfigure which projects are a priority in certain cases.

- I think there are a lot of resources available but funding agencies and others should make sure they are not cost prohibitive for people from smaller colleges and universities, like the how to apply for XYZ grant workshops some big universities can afford to offer at a reduced cost to faculty.
- I think there is a lot of resources available but early career folks may not be aware of all of them
- I think they are doing fine with the available funds.
- I think they could share a few examples of successful previous applications.
- I think they generally do a good job. The problem is one of access. If you don't have time or access to institutional resources, you simply can't apply and be successful.
- I think they need to have a broader understanding of what is important research and to fund projects in Asia.
- I was a person who spent several years on the job market before getting a tenure-track job. At that time, it was very difficult to apply for funding if you were not tenure-stream. By the time I had that status, the time limitations on early career grants and fellowships had expired. I was too many years post-degree to be eligible. These kinds of criteria need to change for those who are not in tenure-stream positions. Furthermore, some are still tied to age, which means older students can begin their studies without every being eligible.
- I wish there was a clearing house of all the sources of funding for anthropology research.
- I wish there were more small ($2-10K) grants available for pilot research. Particularly when it comes to federal funding, bio-anthropologists are often competing with faculty in the health sciences who have large labs with six/seven figure start-up and full-time personnel. Pilot data is expected, but that first step in a project can be the most difficult to fund.
- I would appreciate more transparency in the selection criteria and process. I would also appreciate less labor-intensive applications and I'm sure my recommenders would too! For the same amount of time I invest writing a $5,000 grant which I probably won't get, I could make a guaranteed $5,000 doing consulting work. It doesn't make financial sense and at some point, as head of household, I need to take these things into consideration.
- I would like to see more support for research on existing collections over funding of new fieldwork.
- I'd like to see more feedback. So many times we shoot off grant applications into the unknown to never get any response, or just a no. Knowing why something wasn't funded is just as helpful in re-structuring future proposals.
- I'd like to see wider adoption of pre-proposal letters/pre-review (with proposal letters reviewed and then applicants invited to apply). Writing a full proposal that doesn't get funded because of serious flaws in study design or low funding priority is a huge amount of wasted time and effort.
- I'd love to see the various granting agencies have representatives at the professional meetings for meeting prospective applicants. I was told to meet personally with John Yellen at the SAAs, and did so. He was incredibly helpful. Archaeologists really need some source of funding for curation. So far there are very few agencies that one can apply to for curation of collections. I don't know how to solve this problem
- I'm a long term retiree; not up to date on how they treat applicants
- I'm not a good person to ask this question because I applied in the Nov 2019 cycle, which got messed up due to the pandemic. WG in particular handled the situation very badly, changing the dates/parameters of what we had to do to submit COVID plans multiple times. It was hell, to be honest. NSF was a lot better and didn't change their application procedure. It was so frustrating to have to do so much extra work for WG and then have nothing come of it.
- I'm not necessarily aware of the outreach that is done to explain the process before students apply, but in the reviews, more explicit feedback would be so valuable. Moreover, offering consistent webinars explaining the process of writing a longer grant would be amazing, but that is often left up to graduate programs.....which may not do it either. Also, draft feedback would be amazing, although I do realize that that would require a lot of labor on the part of agencies or reviewers.

- I'm not sure, but I think I had an unusually good level of support as a grad student that's given me a lasting advantage. A course in proposal writing that includes reading and discussing other people's proposals was very helpful, but I don't know how a granting agency could replicate that.
- I'm not sure.
- I'm not sure. Information about review criteria are very helpful. I think NSF and Wenner-Gren are both pretty good about this.
- I'm not sure..
- I've been successful and I'm not sure why. Knowing why would actually be helpful.
- I've enjoyed the webinars and panels that including research funding people -- so that these often busy people are available to larger groups of people, as well as by email/phone.
- I've applied once to a state funded research grant and was rejected because I was supposed to have the equipment needed to conduct the research. However I needed the grant to rent the equipment - catch 22. So it didn't help the state had that stipulation on their research grants. I don't have the money to rent equipment for months on end.
- If American is in your name, only fund research on U.S. sites and cultures.
- If grant agencies allow more flexibility in requirements for letters of support that would make applying to funding far more accessible.
- If someone does ask for advice, be honest but not mean.
- If the grant is for a small amount, the application should be similarly simple.
- If there was a way to make the process less competative that would help
- If they are looking to support younger and more diverse applicants, they should look for reviewers who will support that. They don't necessarily need to be younger or more diverse since these groups may be overburdened already, but culling certain reviewers would make a difference. Videos/FAQs that address common problems/criticisms the occur; reviewer comments that provide tangible ways to improve applications; set-asides for new applicants or re-applicants.
- If they could have a triage system right up front. Like a paragraph pitch that they can say "yes, this is something we would consider" or "no, that is not something we would consider" then applicants can decide whether or not to pursue a full application or go somewhere else for funds.
- If using a scoring rubric, it would be great to share that with applicants or at least show them old rubrics. Seeing the rubric for the Fulbright Hays was helpful for understanding what I did well on and what I could have improved.
- Implement more rolling deadlines, COVID has thrown off everyone's research trajectory.
- Improved venting of reviewers, lobby for additional funding, fund new research by young and non-traditional (BIPOC) researchers, encourage greater public outreach.
- Improving feedback. Access to successful grant applications
- In general, explain better what the is expected from the application
- in his 1963 book, culture against man, jules henry mentioned the wenner-gren foundation as the one agency that had never funded his work; i can say the same...w-g has never ever at all be receptive to my proposals though many others have.
- In my experience, funding agencies do a relatively good job of supporting applicants. It is institutions that do not do a good job in supporting PIs. Or at least that has been my experience.
- In my experience, my own network and the prestige of my graduate institution seemed to serve me in grant writing successes. How do you overcome institutional nepotism?
- Include international students for funding research.
- Inclusiveness especially young African researchers/Anthropologists like me
- Increase funding
- Increase opportunities for underrepresented group

- Instead of just putting out an announcement, create ongoing workshop settings that are particularly attractive to persons who would be outside the loop of institutional support, who don't fit ideas (e.g., wrong gender, etc) for certain types of research.
- Invitations to workshops especially geared toward women and scholars of color to encourage applications. Rolling deadlines, with soft target dates as NSF has done.
- Invite applications on a wider range of topics; ask what the community is interested in researching.
- It is not always clear how available program officers are to speak to about in-progress applications and what their role is, especially for younger scholars without experience or those who have a smaller support network or are at universities that don't have good direct connections with these officers. I think agencies could publicize this and clarify their positions more clearly almost across the board.
- It varies from grant to grant, but for many agencies it seems like the application process is geared to gathering all possible information upfront, when it seems clear that some, if not most, of that information will only become relevant in later stages of grant evaluation or after an application has been selected for funding. While I understand that this is logistically most efficient for granting agencies, cutting down on amount of information retrieval they have to solicit and manage, it is quite impactful for many graduate students. For example, even among the best-funded PhD programs, funding is only guaranteed for 3-5 years, while coursework and exams take the better part of 2-3 years. This provides, for some, that year 4 becomes almost solely focused on grant applications. For those who are ultimately not funded, it would seem especially fair and humane, to cut back on the amount of information needed upfront, as to minimize the amount of time spent away from their dissertation during their final 2 years of funding for grants that ultimately will not be funded.
- It will be food if they provide feedback
- It's helpful when the agency has a pre-application process where you write a short project description and then you're invited to submit a full proposal. This saves time for both applicants and reviewers. This can also be a good way for applicants to get feedback in a more timely way than waiting 6 months for the full review process to take place.
- It's not so much a problem with the granting agencies. Honestly, there are so many good researchers with amazing projects that there simply isn't enough money to go around. I do think that agencies could encourage some of the larger projects to be more mindful of their expenses. Sometimes, I have seen budgets that have a very large buffer built in. I understand this, but then, if not needed that money still gets spent. So, maybe there is a way to reward researchers who are able to conduct the proposed research at LESS than originally proposed, while still recognizing that sometimes that buffer is really important.
- It's super hard and complicated. Good feedback, detailed and forthright is very helpful. Prep workshops, maybe even facilitating peer-to-peer groups.
- It's intimidating to do it on your own
- Judge the work, not the institutional affiliation of applicant.
- Just make it a lottery. All "fundable" apps go in the pool and funds are distributed among them by random draw.
- Keeping up with cutting edge research in the field. I think that biases run deep and certain topics simply aren't given a fair shake from the beginning.
- Less cumbersome and abstruse application procedures. The bureaucratic nightmare that is government grants will not go away, but sometimes the specific grant agency language could be made more accessible to the novice grant writer.
- Lessen formatting & submission instructions. Currently there are too many little formatting details that might disqualify a good project!
- Little or nothing to support applications. You should apply at your own initiative. They should require reviewers to address the substance of proposals, not the affiliations of the proposers. They should, as at least NSF usually does, explain what deficiencies if any they perceived in the proposal, and make constructive suggestions to address those perceived deficiencies. Fulbright/IIE should

make some effort to explain why proposals recommended for funding are declined at later stages. The reasons may be legitimate (e.g., a better proposal for the same country), but Fulbrigth IIE just says, and this almost literally is a quote: "We won't tell you why you weren't funded." That makes it a black box to which, practically, any constructive revision in future attempts is impossible. Finally, archaeology funding sources, NSF included, should be less elitist in their geographic patterns of funding. Don't assume that, just because it's about the Maya, it must deserve funding, or that projects in the US "can always get contract funding." Anyone who honestly believes that doesn't know what they're talking about, and anyone who believes, as many evidently do, that North American research is a lower form of intellectual life, is an arrogant, uncritical elitist. Along these lines, how about a 10-year moratorium on grants for Mayan or central Mexican research, except of course from earmarked sources like FAMSI?

- long tern funding
- Lower bars, more small grants
- Lowering barriers to participation by reducing the complexity of application processes. It often takes a year or more for a scholar to "learn the (logistical) ropes" of how a particular funding institution's application process works, especially for government entities like NSF or NIH. I've actually been on teams in the past where one of the members is there SOLELY because they understand the bureaucratic functions involved, not for any academic or research-design reason. Applicants' energy should go into producing quality research proposals, not toward this red tape.
- Make all grants available to non-citizens
- Make application process easier
- Make application processes more streamlined so that they are not as time consuming; Perhaps having a tiered application process so that there is an initial round of culling based on relatively simple first stage of application.
- Make applications simpler. (Looking at you NSF)
- Make available samples of successful applications on the website (some do this - but not all)...
- Make funds available in smaller amounts, and spread it around to more people, to cover incidentals like travel to collecting institutions.
- Make granting agency staff more accessible for questions or meetings; making sure that their calls for proposals are inclusive and are circulated widely
- Make instructions clear and easily accessible.
- Make it an easier process; I know archaeologists who are working a full-time job while trying to write grants to complete their MS and it sounds terrible!
- Make it easier and less time consuming for applicants to navigate a grant's application and management system, and also have more opportunities for groups that do not have grant matching capabilities.
- make it easier to apply. Federal agencies make it nearly impossible (grants.gov for example). Smaller organizations seem like they often have a recipient in mind before they even put out a call for proposals, and that's a discouraging pattern. So, this varies.
- Make it more about the merits of the research and less about what pronouns someone uses or what ethnicity they are.
- Make it more transparent and do not make it necessary to get recommendations from faculty that you are just meeting.
- Make it simpler, clearer, more transparent
- Make opportunities known through universities (for student researchers). With increasing disappointment in the ways in which professional organizations have handled sexual harassment or anti-NAGPRA presentations (see SAA 2019 and 2021), fewer students will look to these organizations for funding or membership benefits.
- Make process less cumbersome and more transparent

- Make reviewers follow colorblind guidelines.
- Make small grants available for pilot or smaller scale studies
- Make sure that the reviewer feedback isn't incoherent, make sure that reviewer feedback is relevant, make sure, particularly when reviewers read multiple iterations of a proposal, that they don't just suddenly change their minds and want what you provided in your first proposal after you've adjusted your second to their comments. I also think that students that attend schools who receive guaranteed research funding shouldn't be permitted to apply for research funding. They are in it for the prestige of being an awardee, while a lot of us are trying to eat and pay rent. As a non-citizen, i can only apply to two granting agencies each year, and they overwhelmingly seem to go to people at presitigious schools that offer guaranteed funding.
- Make sure that they have assigned appropriate, constructive and diverse reviewers. Pay reviewers or provide training or create a review philosophy so that they are constructive. Grant reviewing should be seen as a developmental process where even if funding is not received, the applicant can learn and receive valuable feedback that will help improve their project and future applications. The whole thing is a lot of work and can be very demoralizing, so treat people with respect, empathy, and curiosity.
- Make sure the reviewers are providing useful feedback. Make the process as transparent as possible. Give applicants a better understanding of why others were funded and they were not.
- Make sure their website is up-to-date and comprehensive about their requirements, including word length. The Wenner-Gren site was not.
- Make the process a bit more personal and get rid of staffers that are rude, lazy, or power-mad. Case in point: John Yellen must go.
- Make their organizational priorities clear and reach out to students as early in their undergraduate and post graduate education.
- Make their reasoning for acceptance/denial more clear.
- making application processes less cumbersome (more streamlining)
- Making it more clear the types of research the grants will support
- Making POs accessible to clarify the true goals of the program. Providing as much feedback as possible. I don’t apply as often to organizations that don’t provide review feedback because it creates an opacity that makes the application process feel pointless/impossible.
- making priorities crystal clear
- Making their own requirements clearer - and ensuring that reviewers are aligned with these requirements too. It is comical to hear things like "imagine you're a reviewer busy taking dinner out of the oven - how would you evaluate this proposal," because that really differs from what we're being asked to do per evaluation criteria.
- Many agencies do not provide feedback on proposals. Such feedback is important to improving the quality of future proposals and the resulting work.
- Many agencies now publish their review criteria, which is very useful. Those that do not should do so! But they should also indicate how many proposals in a given year are ranked as "fundable" but ultimately don't get funding.
- Many grant applications are extremely lengthy and time-consuming to prepare/submit. Preliminary online screening tools that allow an applicant to enter basic eligibility info and perhaps a short description of research concept would improve quality/appropriateness of proposals submitted while also providing quick feedback to applicant on eligibility/suitability for that source.
- Many of the agencies you listed are exclusive to US citizens; they should be more open.
- many researchers cannot afford to attend meetings, so grantor organizations..have one-on-one zoom sessions to guide potential grantees-advertise that a certain percentage of awards will go to local or community colleges, R2, and R1 institutions. Conduct supervisory overview professional reviews of reviewers comments--DELETE-DISALLOW personal attacks and negative reviews that say things

like I dont see this researcher as a leader in the field, or doing this particular work-- or some other bias unfounded, unscientific personal comments. Sponsoiring organizations must now realize that they will have to come up with new funds to support communities in engagement with research and even descendants offering assistance through knowledge and experience.

- Maybe outreach and workshops specifically targeted to universities that have low funding rates or to students from underrepresented groups.
- Meeting program officers is a tremendous help and confidence-booster. If program officers could give presentations (panel discussions) with a Q&A period at conferences that would help with accessibility.
- meeting with potential applicants is key - attending conferences, web-based 'open houses,' etc. help to generate connections and a rapport
- Mentoring previous award winners with new applicants in the specific fields of the new applicants... not all institutions have effective mentoring supports.
- Mentorship programs with highly successful, later-career people teamed with new applicants.
- Merit based decision
- More advertisement on funding opportunities, very clear guidelines about selection criteria, and a focus on constructive feedback from reviewers.
- More agencies should do workshops about their application and review process.
- More agencies should permit revision and resubmission of the same project if the project itself is relevant or timely or has merit and other ways.
- More clear funding amounts, larger amounts to cover living expenses not just tuition
- More diverse in their scope of projects
- More diverse reviwers.
- More examples of successful applications
- More extensive person to person outreach, not just referring to a FAQ or application guidance, and a more patient explanation of the process, especially for first generation university graduates.
- More feedback would be helpful, or a broader conception of who might be funded in the changing world of anthropological archaeology. A lot of my frustration stems from the fact that archaeologists found my project not archaeological enough, and sociocultural granting agencies found it too material culture based. I wish there had been more consideration outside the silos.
- More flexibility in deadlines and sooner turn around than the current six months post application deadline.
- More funding opportunities! The amount of work that something like an NSF requires is ridiculous compared to the success rate.
- More funding; more opportunities for feedback (perhaps pay reviewers to provide actual constructive criticism?); more posted webinars/info session recordings to help.
- More funding. P.S. Next time you design a survey, put the questions in a darker font,
- More help in formulating good spplications
- More in-person outreach to first time and early career researchers.
- More information about their deadlines, more workshops and Q&As, and short applications. Many granting agencies that grant less money than the NSF GRFP have funding applications that are 3 to 4 times the length and far more difficult to complete for far less money.
- More information in more accessible formats.
- More marketing that funding is available. I hadn't heard of most of those funding organizations when I was a student.
- More opportunities, there aren't enough funding sources for the number of researchers needing funding
- more outreach and seek applicants

- More outreach to anthropologists on a wide range of potential research areas.
- more seminars
- More streamlined application procedures. Almost every application I've ever submitted has required submitting several things multiple different ways, with arcane formatting requirements. Make it easy for us to format the content the way you want it.
- More support for Master's candidates.
- More support for undergraduate research experiences, more support for training in methods and research design, make more readily available examples of well-designed applications.
- More tailored support for applicants, e.g. writing workshops
- More transparency
- More transparency in the exact likelihood of what kinds of research are most likely to be funded.
- More transparency in the review process, and (for Wenner-Gren bc that's the agency I've had the worst experience with) no more rounds of single-review! More support on the back-end too, like, clearer expectations up front for reporting, publication, etc.
- More transparency regarding what evaluators look for in a proposal and clarity regarding the structure of a winning proposal.
- more transparent decision-making would help in many instances, so applicants unambiguously understand why they have or have not been funded and thus have a firmer foundation for future action
- More transparent selection process and feedback for applicants who are invited to reapply.
- More workshops and better tangible information on how to structure the application.
- More workshops for applicants; make examples of successful and unsuccessful proposals, reviews, panel comments, and decisions available (after deidentification).
- More workshops for early career faculty and graduate students.
- More, smaller grants
- Most granting agencies have an agenda with specific requirements they need to fulfill. They should be looking outside the box more than they do. They also should be more upfront with the amount of money they actually have to give to applicants and in what proportion.
- Most importantly have the process be a learning process where resubmission after review is consistent with the same reviewers
- Mostly, they are pretty good, though if a grant is rejected would be nice to know there was a mechanism for reviewing the decision (that wouldn't cost you your entire career for pursuing)
- My experience being largely with NSF, I have found program officers to be very helpful. Workshops on using Grants.gov would be useful, if they don’t already offer them.
- My students, especially the non-white women, get shocking reviewer comments. I think that the agencies need to re think the way they send things out for review.
- Myself, and some of my peers have noted that it seems we didn't get funding until our fieldwork was almost over. Granting agencies want your ideas to be so well-developed that it is often really difficult to put together an application at the beginning of the process, which seems really unfair as they claim to be funding that development. It seemed that those who had the most success with granting agencies had the least other responsibilities. While this is typical of our society, it hardly illustrates much effort on the part of granting agencies to help out scholars who have more demands on their time, like second jobs and families. I lost at least a year of my time in graduate school trying to get funding from these organizations and it seemed they were inflating their criteria, similar to the degree inflation I see in other professional sectors of society. It was exhausting and debilitating and ultimately unsuccessful as I didn't receive funding from any of the sources listed in this survey. I'm actually amazed that I'm still here, but I'm hoping someone has a solution to this problem.
- N/A
- N/A

- N/A
- n/a
- n/a
- N/a as i haven't applied to too many big name agencies.
- NA
- na
- National agencies should be more open to U.S. regional projects, and provide more assistance to helping women and minorities complete their proposals. There is still the perception (and probably data to back it) that national grants are mostly awarded to white males who are mature in their careers.
- NEH provides feedback which is extremely valuable. Other agencies should do so, as well.
- NERRS does a FABULOUS jon at supporting applicants. It is unreal how fair I found their process- from pre-proposal review, to review that allowed for response, to final recommendations and response. And now funded, they have a supportive network of peers. Can't say enough about their positive attitude and careful deliberation to make collaborations that much richer. https://nerrssciencecollaborative.org/
- No
- No - but I do think Universities can do better. At my current R1 University, the support is amazing compared to my undergraduate university - even as part of an R1 system, we would receive little support from our local grants office (composed of a single person).
- No idea
- No idea.
- no opinion
- no opinion, haven't worked in that environment. I'm probably the wrong person to take this survey, sorry. Good luck!
- No opinion.
- no opinions
- none
- Not ask students to spend a significant amount of money on printing of materials, shipping fees for mailing, payments for official transcripts, etc.
- Not discriminate against applicants from poor universities.
- Not judge their applicants based on the seniority and academic accomplishments of their PhD advisors. Basically, my project only got funding when I got a senior scholar to write me a reference letter. I didn't change my project design or funding application at all, just changed my references to include more male, senior scholars. And that's how I got funded.
- Not only have model grants, but explain why they are model grants
- Not really sure because I'm not at a research institution and it's not part of our culture to need to get grants, so I'm not really in that world. But I could imagine more outreach to SLAC's would be helpful for scholars outside of R1s and R2s.
- Not really sure, to be honest.
- Not sure
- not sure
- Not sure
- Not sure
- Not sure I blame them. Too many applicants, too little money.
- Not sure.
- Not sure.

- Not sure. Some agencies seem to have favoritism for particular topics/areas/etc so that insider knowledge is helpful so you don't waste your time (of course I would prefer those institutional practices change but that hasn't seemed to happen in any real way)
- Not sure... I think it's great that you're doing this research!
- Nothing
- NSF already offers a lot of training for reviewers to guide them towards writing constructive reviews, but maybe it should be required and it would be helpful if all funding agencies offered guidelines for what makes a constructive review. If more agencies offered free virtual workshops for prospective applicants, I think that would be helpful.
- NSF Archaeology could be more open minded, especially to scholars working in historical periods on issues of race, structural violence, etc that have direct links to today's societal problems.
- NSF is an example of an agency that tends to reproduce the traditional archaeological research model, but even they have begun to think more broadly. It is not all about fieldwork and managing a data set that is unique to the student.
- Offer clear information about what gets funded and what does not. Be clear about what things are high priority aspects of an application and what items are lower priority.
- Offer courses/workshops specifically for underrepresented minorities.
- Offer examples of successful proposals and explanations of why they succeeded
- Offer free open source grant writing training seminars, especially for students, recent graduates, and new professionals. They could be tailored to their specific organizations or be more generalized.
- Offer individual 30- to 60-min. phone and/or videoconference sessions to applicants during the application process for tips and feedback.
- Offer more graduate opportunities and stop changing who to grant can apply for. If it's school based state individuals who are undergraduates and graduates.
- Offer more support and services to equal the playing field. I have been at a prestigious and large public R1, prestigious and large private R1, and now a small public R2. The resources are VASTLY different across all three and puts students in public and smaller universities at a huge disadvantage.
- Offer more workshops, Q&A sessions, guidance, webinars, and be present at national conferences to host workshops
- Offer small grants for students or early-career
- Offer smaller grants, simpler process. NSF is designed to DISCOURAGE applicants.
- Offer workshops and examples of successful applications.
- Offering more equitable access to various information and resources for application
- offering more opportunities for funding, specifically focused on research in areas that are historically underfunded
- Offering tutorials/webinars for prospective applicants
- Oh, I have a particular bone to pick with NSF, but it probably applies to a lot of funding agencies: Fund community-driven research and epistemic diversity! Promote diversity, equity and inclusion in grant agency leadership, grant review panels, research topics, and awardees. Allow funding to be applied to dependent care and family support. Provide more fellowships that can be held in one's home institution/place of residence.
- On-campus workshops for graduate students have been helpful to my own graduate students in applying for funding, but didn't exist when I was in their position.
- One unfortunate element of seeking funding is that it is so based on reputation. People will fund people who are successful at getting funding rather than the real merit of the project.
- Online and digital submittal systems established by the granting agencies with whom I have recent experience are quite helpful.
- Only ask for letters of recommendation near the end of the process, i.e. from a short list.
- Open access databases of successful grant applications.

- Open their scope out of the marketable issues
- Open wider nets - re research topics and backgrounds of applicants.
- Outreach and advertising. Also, giving everyone a chance...
- Outreach and education about programs and potential projects.
- Outreach is always good. Every time we have had a program officer come to campus or to professional meetings to workshop with early career researchers, the result is greater awareness and ultimately more successful dissertation and early career awards. More online workshops could be offered by program officers to reach broader audiences (esp. HBCUs and other non-R1s) and online tutorials could be posted on program websites sharing strategies and best-practices for successful proposals, navigating online submission portals and interpreting rejections and reviews.
- Outreach to minoritized groups
- Outreach to programs whose students don't get a lot of support from their faculty in crafting grant proposals. Making successful applications available online.
- Outreach.
- Overall I think they could be clearer about what they expect in a successful application. Having an archive of successful proposals would be extremely useful. Many university programs will maintain such databases for their students to use, but not all. For the Wenner-Gren specifically, they can stop using their torturous five question breakdown, which requires so much additional work to break out what should be a holistic proposal into separate, yet somehow all related questions.
- Parental support (childcare while doing field work)
- Pay attention to where your funding is going. Are there a handful of programs whose students receive a disproportionate amount of funding? What are the socioeconomic backgrounds of your grantees? Does your granting agency reproduce inequalities in opportunity in the field? Do the people who review applications come from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds? After truly asking these difficult questions, do something to address these problems!
- Pay more attention to creativity and to proposals that approach research from a perspective not based on traditional assumptions
- Pay reviewers to give better feedback; be explicit about priorities in funding so that no one wastes time; support smaller institutions
- Paying attention to diversity of applicants in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, and all kinds of human variation.
- Perhaps allow revised applications to be submitted again
- Place less value on en vogue jargon and topics du jour.
- Place more importance on quality of the research questions rather than measurable outcomes. In archaeology this is becoming a major problem - the applications that consistently stand the best chance of funding are those that promise to measure something, no matter how pointless the measuring is.
- Please find people on your panel who don't give racist, islamophobic feedback
- Poorly phrased question—answers cannot be generalized across all funding agencies.
- Post a wider range of successful proposals.
- Potential applicants need clarity on the outcome the granting agency is funding to achieve. Use social media communities, webinars and online town halls to have conversations with applicants that make the needs of the granting agencies clear.
- Pre-screening so that you are not waiting 6 months to find out you didn't get anything.
- Proactively seek researchers working on questions that are outside the box, who are not already wealthy white academics
- Probably - to be honest, I have been pretty succesful doing things my way without a lot of conversation with granting agencies, program officers, etc. But I know this is perhaps unusual.
- Probably make application process easier

- Probably, but how? The reality is that granting agencies do not have sufficient funds to support all projects. Ultimately, the outcome is that the same number of projects are supported. As a result, support from agencies should be directed towards increasing the success of populations that are underrepresented in the pool of successful applicants.
- Provide advisors if applicants wish advice during their writing of the grant. Some granting agencies do so but others do not.
- Provide better and more constructive feedback on proposals that are not funded. Ensure more comparability among scorers based on comments.
- Provide better proposal feedback and updates about where they are in the selection process.
- Provide better reviews, make the application process easier and more accessible. Don't be political. Don't judge proposals based on their political inclinations.
- Provide better workshops on successful grant writing, provide better feedback on non-funded proposals so applicants can do better in the future
- Provide classes on applying
- Provide clear instructions and checklists! Important points should be noted several times, not just once buried in the middle of a single paragraph. Also, find ways to provide funding where a 1:1 match is not necessary. Such a match is not always possible. Some grants should be offered where a match is not needed or the match is significantly reduced.
- Provide clearer advice on how the process works. Invite potential applicants to discuss plans in person.
- Provide example applications on their website, make sure reviewers give useful and fair feedback.
- Provide examples of good applications that were funded and bad applications that would never be successful.
- Provide examples of successful applications
- Provide examples of successful proposals and reviews
- provide feedback for supporting a successful application in the future
- Provide feedback for unsuccessful applications - this is not universal.
- Provide grant application workshops for students.
- Provide guidance to peer reviewers on how to provide constructive comments.
- Provide helpful overviews of best practices to applicants; Ensure that feedback is constructive, clear, and gives the applicant a firm foundation for resubmission
- Provide more accessible workshops and advice. A lot of the information in these applications is highly coded and the hidden curriculum is a major barrier to students with limited mentorship or experience in higher ed.
- Provide more clearly written instructions, templates, and expectations for grant applications. Provide more feedback during the process so it's easier to navigate the applications and create successful applications and projects.
- Provide more detail about what we could improve to be funded in the future.
- Provide more examples of funded project proposals and offer more workshops. Make it clearer who is an appropriate contact and in what type of scenarios people should initiate contact for questions/concerns.
- Provide more feedback on how to interpret peer review reports.
- Provide more grants
- Provide more information on expectations, a rubric of breakdown of adjudication processes and more transparency in review.
- Provide more kinds of grants, better feedback, constructive advice rather than vague rejections, and be professional towards all applicants. Inform them of their progress and explain their rejections both, and do so in a timely manner.

- Provide more money and quit nickel-and-diming us. I did a course on botany one year and the amount of funding for the biosciences that I witness was huge compared to what we get for anthro!
- provide more one-on-one support
- Provide more resources to help students succeed, like workshops...i.e. more transparency about the review and selection process. They should also make their websites easier to navigate, and their instructions and rules easy to access and read...sometimes finding this information is a scavenger hunt
- provide more streamlined info
- provide more webinars on how to apply and what the granting agency looks for.
- Provide reviewer feedback without having to ask (NEH); provide examples of successful proposals; hold workshops specific to programs/disciplines
- Provide sample proposals of winning applications. This is key since so many of them are so bureaucratic, particularly the larger more prestigious ones, it's hard to understand what they are looking for. Even more so if it's a grant that may not be common for an archaeologist for example to apply for.
- Provide samples
- Provide significant, sustainable support for field school projects
- Provide strict guidance and protocols to reviewers to reduce bias
- Provide useful debriefs with knowledgeable reviewers.
- Provide very clear guidelines, requirements, etc. to avoid receiving inappropriate applications. In the case of graduate students in particular, agencies should give them plenty of lead-in time. Over the years I've received a number of notices of a new fellowship or grant, but the application is due in a month! Have someone available to whom a candidate can actually TALK before turning in the application.
- Providing examples of successful grant applications - even better, with consent of grantee, provide example of paired unsuccessful initial application and successful revised application.
- Providing feedback and offering support (via informational sessions or workshops) to applicants from precarious communities/positions.
- Providing feedback early in the review process, especially for those who are rejected outright. Even a brief explanation of whether a proposal does not suit the program goals or an unrealistic budget, etc, could be really useful for the applicant's efforts to revise the proposal before resubmission or submission elsewhere. I have always been appreciative of Wenner-Gren's website which shares more details about successfully funded projects/researchers than many other granting agencies.
- providing feedback on aspects of the project that are within the applicants control
- Providing more grants; turning swords into plowshares
- Providing smaller grant opportunities for beginning researchers to help them build their resumes and experience and at least complete pilot studies to build on for larger future projects
- Providing successful examples of applications. Being transparent about their funding rates. Providing feedback on rejected applications.
- publicizing figures on applicant to recipient ratios, and specialties funded
- Publicizing relevant projects considered for funding
- Publicly explaining the review process with real explanatory examples of applicant success and rejection
- publish each year a clear statement about priorities for research funding for that granting cycle
- Quit having the same people reviewing applications. It is redicculous that I can ID whose comment is whose.
- Raise the funding amount. Increase the number of projects funded.
- Raising more funds to be granted to more applicants

- Reach out to individual faculty and work with them to develop their proposals.
- Reaching out in particular to marginalized scholars and finding ways to support them
- Reaching out to under-served groups, though I'm not sure how to do that…workshops may be helpful…???
- Really hard to say because they are all different and some don't communicate very well; online workshops; support the kinds of activities that help women in the field like childcare (some do); consistently monitor their awards to ensure equitable distribution of resources
- Recognize the community based research they do as dissemination of research findings
- Recognize the employment of the majority of PhDs as independent scholars or employed at small institutions
- Reduce award sizes in legacy projects to leave more funds available to broaden the recipient pool.
- Reduce the number of extra forms required for applications. They are often redundant.
- Reduce the paperwork
- Reducing the financial and administrative burdens of applying. Transcripts cost money and are not the proof of capability they are made out to be. Offering more accessible applications with better saving and retrieval options. Finding large blocks of time to fill out forms is difficult to balance with other responsibilities. Placing fewer restrictions on what stage of your career you can apply in. National Geographic moving away from the Young Explorer grant to Early Career grant was great to hear about as someone who didn't enter graduate school soon after undergraduate school. Now I find myself locked out of write-up grants because I took longer than 6 years to complete my field research...
- Remove nationality requirements! The USA is a nation of immigrants! International students cannot compete for most of the grants in this survey's list. Make diversity more than a mere statement on your front page. ACT for social justice. Stop requiring perfect English in the proposal; content matters the most.
- research design and grant writing workshops
- Respond quickly to all inquiries. Meet applicants where they are.
- Review applications on their merits without crosschecking the CV for the person's list of prior grants and grant agencies.
- Reviewer training, especially around DEAI! Other organizations have extensive reviewer training and oversight of reviews. To make this sustainable in anthropology, more people need to be pulled in as reviewers. This should include contingent faculty and advanced graduate students, who should be paid for this work. TT profs cannot remain the sole or main reviewers of grants when they are not actually representative of our fields.
- Reviewers should be required to sign their feedback for doctoral level grants.
- Revise the anonymous peer-review system
- rolling deadlines or more opportunities throughout the funding cycle
- Round tables with grant reviewers - not just recipients or grant administrators. There are a lot of factors that go into grant review (I know from personal experience) and it would be very helpful for potential applicants to know how the grant reviewers are interpreting the criteria for the grant, as it is exceptionally easy to take broad-scale criteria in multiple directions.
- Sample proposals are easy to come by IF you have a network or realize that you can email people to get their proposals, but it would be useful for people getting started if funding agencies posted more sample proposals.
- Screening applications then move qualified applicants to the next round
- Seek out people doing interesting research outside of universities/traditional learning environments. So many amateur anthropologists, local historians, and collectors, etc. are doing fantastic research on their own time/dime.
- Seeking out new pools of applicants through contacting advisors/ dept chairs.

- Seems pretty good, based on my experience, but I've not availed myself to many workshops or conversations with funders.
- Select better review committees. Have people who are competent and don't have any axes to grind.
- Send out more email information about funding and job opportunities; field research opportunities
- Send people to campuses to talk with students, faculty and administrators
- Sessions at conferences and also talk to students about careers in grant management and administration.
- Set up closer working relationships with a wider range of universities, maybe? Moving from an R1 (grad school) to an R2 (faculty), I now am much more aware of the particular agencies that have a relationship with my institution.
- Sharing successful applications!
- Simplify applications so that we don't waste so much time compiling them.
- Simplify the process.
- So far as I can tell most funding organizations are completely political . Who you know is more important than the quality or merits of a research proposal.
- Some agencies are not clear about what they want to fund or are oblique in their descriptions. While this gives the agency latitude in selecting grantees, it also can confuse or disuade early career or focused applicants.
- Some agencies have unwritten rules about proposal-writing that can only be gleaned if you happen to have a mentor who is in-the-know. Make proposal requirements and expectations transparent and recognize that not all applicants have the same access to institutional knowledge regarding granting agencies.
- Some kind of system of making successful proposals available to prospective applicants would be good because this is so helpful and not everyone has access through their own networks.
- Some of us lack mentorship within our own departments and universities and frankly need practical advice and encouragement as much as training in proposal development
- Some orgs—AIIS, for example—make several sample applications available as models on their websites, which is great. All orgs should do this, so that people don't need to rely on networks to get samples of successful apps. At this point in history (everyone overburdened and shattered networks due to pandemic) no org should require letters of recommendation.
- Some programs at federal agencies have directors that have been there for decades, creating an informal network of "old guard" archaeologists. Funding need to be prioritized for early and mid-career archaeologists, not the same individuals repeatedly.
- some should. some are very obtuse
- Some won't give feedback, but that is useful.
- Sometimes you need to think the biases of the reviewers, particularly the older generations.
- Speak more about the metapragmatics of communication in the grant proposal genre.
- Standardize the language used in the grant applications, many terms are specific to individual agencies and are ambiguous in meaning.
- Stop funding so much excavation of archaeological sites and focus more on analysis of artifacts already excavated.
- Stop having crazy old curmudgeons complain about nonsense like "the poetry" of a narrative. Why do we collectively as a community have jokes about "reviewer #2" -- we know who these cranks are... stop using them! They do not contribute anything useful to the process, they are just gatekeepers with an agenda of excluding young scholars. And I have sat on granting committees and had to evaluate dozens of proposals for similar dollar amounts as the grants I have applied for... there are better systems to evaluate proposals. Also, I recommend double-blind reviews and everyone using neutral pronouns. It will at least reduce the old boy network favoritism of only endorsing your buddy's students because you can see their names and institutions.

- Stop hiring so many people to administer these grants. It costs the agencies more to give out the money than they money they distribute.
- Stop letting the few drive the discipline-wide agenda. In particular, for institutions that primarily fund researchers from the United States...impanel some people with some training from this century; the one thing there is no room left for is the positivistic quest for facts, to fit into 'just so' stories about the human past. Projects that include better understanding of our theories, philosophies, and practices (i.e., the underpinnings of praxis) as research goals are equally important to understanding our sources and subjects. Finally, more developed and explicitly stated project outcomes that support the ability of local communities to steer research in the direction of information that will produce results that benefit the affected communities, by furthering the goals that they have identified for themselves, and addressing the social needs that they have identified for themselves.
- Stop looking at institution and the fame of the person doing the research. Instead, look at the accomplishments of the researcher (through a bio sketch or something similar) and the merit of the proposed research. Also, make sure there is a good match between reviewer and proposal.
- stop targeting R1 people all the time--support those at other institutions in the same manner--especially because many institutions do not have in-house grant officers on campus!
- Stop using old white men as their sole reviewers. Avoid reviewers with endowments that make them not reliant on public funds. If you are reviewing you should also be reliant on grants for your research.
- Streamline application processes and make them easy to understand!
- Streamline process, clarify requirements, provide templates/examples
- streamline, streamline, streamline
- Streamlining the application process, especially when it comes to submitting through university offices of research, and allowing more space within grant application portals to provide project descriptions.
- Students certainly need training specifically in how to write and apply for grants; whether this education and training falls on schools or granting organizations, I am not sure. But the process for students especially would be more equitable if training workshops or something were able from granting agencies.
- Support a wider variety of research
- Support for early career, especially immediately post-phd. National Geographic in particular removed this grant recently, which is one that helped many get a new project off the ground. Create strategies for evaluation and feedback that are transparent to applicants. There should be a way to assess reviewer comments prior to the applicant receiving them, and a way for applicants to respond should they find the feedback they received to be unfair (e.g., personal attacks, evidence that the reviewer didn't fully review the proposal, etc.)
- Support more open minded reviewers
- Support more than just R1 PhD candidates and R1 scholars. There's a lot of us out here in the teaching trenches who'd also like to be able to do research. Fund special programs for people who work at small liberal arts colleges and colleges where there are lots of students of color.
- Support post-field and collaborative work. Support innovative training
- Support small scale local research
- Supporting exploratory and mixed-methods research, community-based participatory research, exploratory research, teaching or work buy-out for writing. It is very difficult to fund time for writing and development of creative outputs. I want to apply for WG grants but had such a bad experience for postdoc application that I am unsure if it is worth the time. So I guess if there have been any changes to publicize positive or more inclusive changes at agencies.
- Supporting specific researches for young applicants

- take into consideration the difference between people who work in big research universities and those who work in teaching intensive institution. I am afraid this is a source of greater inequality than being straight/agender/or gender queer.
- Take more risks for non-traditional or creative projects, support smaller projects as well as large ones, support projects that are socially relevant, support more diverse applicants and projects
- Take off the blinders to CRM archaeological small projects and the prejudice toward nonPHD candidiates
- Take out some of the unecessary bureaucratic steps..like requiring certain formatting for CVs .. its unnecessary. Or requiring 3+ letters of rec, also unnecessary.
- Taking risks on academics who are not at R1 institutions. The grants so often are awarded to the same scholars and the same institutions. How do lower level scholars crack into the elite funding world? More awards, broader criteria and encouragement and support by reviewers and agencies.
- Target funding workshops for first-generation, low-income students. A lot of us have no idea how this all works, because there is so much hidden curriculum when it comes to funding that our programs and advisors (and the funding agencies) take for granted. It puts us at a disadvantage. I also think that the agencies could make successful applications more available for reading and reference, because I know for a fact that many of the Ivys have repositories of successful grants from their institution that all their students can reference. This gives them an unfair advantage (on top of all the other advantages that are offered at Ivys and other prestigious institutions)
- The agencies that I have worked with NSF, NGS, Wenner-Gren and Colorado History all seem to do a good job.
- The caliber of reviewers is really hit or miss - anything to even that out would be great. Also, recognizing there is a tough balance for applicants working in new topics/areas in terms of legibility and the amount of scholarship available. Scholars working in well-studied areas are more easily legible, although they do have to situate themselves in a more crowded field. But scholars working on new topics or in regions that haven't been as well studied, the scholarship is more scant - so defining the significance of the work is harder. We just don't know yet! And that's the point of doing ethnography, is that we don't go in knowing what we'll find but rather find it in the process. Scholars working in these areas had a harder time because there weren't as many obvious gatekeepers, and they often had to situate the importance of their work in ways that those working in established areas did not have to do. On a practical level, some of these less-written about places do not have mechanisms in place for things like IRB: most places that have those protocols well established are places that were colonized. In, for example, the Arab Gulf states, they were not directly colonized and they have no structures for governing human subjects research. So funding agencies that require an on-the-ground IRB cannot fund projects there, which limits our knowledge and in practice concentrates (saturates?) studies in particular areas.
- The funding cycle means that academics come up with sexy, "cult of the new" projects that hit buzz words and take advantage of what is important in the moment. While some of this is a normal reflection of funding and disciplinary advancement, too much funding is given to high-risk or "sexy" projects without a concurrent commitment to funding research in understudied regions or projects that aren't using high-risk or theoretically hot topics. People who do such work are disproportionately funded at high levels from major grant agencies (NSF). What happened to grants that reward solid and innovative research using traditional methods? Do we have to use sharks with laser beams on them to advance our discipline?
- The idea of a short feedback from a concept text would be good to better understand and make approaches more compatible
- The more information that they can make available to applicants the better, including why the grant was awarded and especially why it was NOT awarded.
- The most helpful things for me in regards to applications are feedback from colleagues, clear instructions, and clear timelines. I like when there is a list of recent grantees so I can see what is

funded, and potentially reach out to those folks for their application and/or tips. I also appreciate when granting agencies list timelines (i.e., grant is due X, and you should expect to hear from us around X). Any specific instructions are also very helpful--I applied to a grant in a different country on my own time zone since it was not clear that the grant was due in their time zone, and I was actually a day late with the grant (so, I appreciate when the deadline is 9.14.2021, 11:59pm EDT).

- The most useful thing for me was being able to see previous successful applications for a particular grant, but that's not necessarily something that the agency can do.
- The NEH has a good model. They provide example grants on their website, include a webinar and email address that people answer, and most importantly, they have an option for applicants to submit a draft a month or two before the deadline. An NEH staff member then provides useful feedback on this draft. Grants from the NEH are very difficult to obtain, but I appreciate their approach. No other granting program has ever been so helpful. National Geographic, Fulbright, and Dumbarton Oaks are particularly unhelpful.
- The ones I have experience with mostly seem to do a good job. Maybe work more closely with faculty at degree-granting institutions to be sure students are well supported during the grant process. I suspect they also could stand to do more outreach to historically under-funded populations, but I don't have direct experience with that.
- The only reason I was successful was because I was able to pitch some ideas to a program officer in person, a trip that was funded by my University. Program Officers should be more available to younger, less-established writers. I know they do field a lot of calls and do travel to conferences, but coming to departments and having more regular "office hours" on Zoom would probably be helpful.
- The peer-review system us badly broken.
- The thing I value most from agencies is clarity about what kind of work they want to fund and what they're expecting from applicants. The more transparent the process, the better.
- There are clearly a number of structural problems—not enough funding for anthropological research, increasing demands for everyone to seek external funding as internal research support diminishes, difficulty recruiting qualified reviewers, who are likely already overworked—that have no easy answers. Expanding the pool of reviewers so there is a greater range of expertise represented would be a good first step.
- There is a problem with the discipline that granting agencies cannot address. Cultural anthropology is so diverse and the reviewers' backgrounds are often too diverse, so that the reviews have little in common. It would be helpful if we had clearer quality standards in the subfield - both for publishing in journals and for grants. I feel the subfield has become too focused on theory and not focused enough on answering important questions with empirical findings. The theoretical framework is often too important in reviews of journal articles and grants. Reviewers seem unable to recognize issues that are empirically important.
- There is a strong disconnect between expectations of the writer and the institution. Only people that know awardees have access to the types of grands that have been funded
- There is just so little funding, esp. for write up. And there can be very little funding given a particular research topic.
- there is little funding for anthropology in african universities
- There is too much red tape and bureaucracy in the application process, and too much micro-managing after receiving award (annual reports, etc). Research in practice is fluid and needs to be flexible as it progresses, and it may diverge from original proposal plans
- There needs to be more money in the system. Agencies and institutions should focus more on research outcomes and potential contributions: e it *is* possible to evaluate based on quality and potential. Also, the whole letter writing and referee process is onerous and wastes massive amounts of effort. Make it standard to request letters only in final stages, or eliminate altogether.
- There simply is not enough funding available, is my sense of things, so it is very competitive. SSHRC funds 40% of applicants in Canada, I hear. This seems more reasonable than 9-13% like NSF.

- There's not enough money to go around, ultimately, so the farce of generating endless original documents for each application cycle is really wearing. Perhaps consider using a multi-tiered application process, in which the initial application is very brief, and more documents are requested as applicants move through to the final rounds. That way, if your project isn't what the agency is looking for, you find out right away, without having to invest so much time in crafting a lengthy proposal that no one wants to read.
- They are fine. They are giving out money, so what more do we expect from them?
- They are in a tough spot, especially those dependent on Federal funding. In my experience grant officers are doing the best they can. One of the best things they do, that I would encourage them to continue doing, is being available for conversations about potential projects. I am convinced that such a conversation helped me avoid pitfalls and improved my chances at getting my last NSF grant.
- They can try to think more outside the box. I think too often the project that get funded look the same or follow a similar formula, but this means that we weed out those proposals that are doing things that are different and unique, or feel a bit uncomfortable. If we are going to embrace diversity in our discipline we need to be more accepting of a diversity of approaches and methods.
- They could be more critical that applicants know what it is they are addressing and how their research addresses previously published either positively or negatively. This is particularly important if the research challenges and disproves current held assumptions in the academic community.
- They could be more transparent about what they are willing to fund.
- They could diversify their panels, be transparent about the evaluation procedures, and stick to them as much as possible.
- They could offer webinars earlier than the due date of applications. I know NSF is having one for postdoctoral grants on September 30th and the application is due November 1st. Why not 3 or 6 months in advanced so people have time to prepare such a large application? They could also record the webinars and put them on their website for those who cannot attend them. They can hold multiple webinars throughout the year. Make the applications less complicated because it feels like you are just jumping through hoops. Not all granting agencies make things complicated.
- They could stop being ablest. They could allow research assistant funds for a graduate student if that assistant is hired for access reasons (read handwritten information or take photographs if the researcher is blind).
- They could support living expenses for families so that researchers with young children could be better able to participate in extended fieldwork or museum visits. There could also be more postdoctoral opportunities, which are as of now pretty limited in anthropology.
- They need separate awards for people at minority serving institutions, scholars who teach at community colleges, scholars who are part-time/adjuncts, scholars of color engaged in community-based research/advocacy, and those who are first generation. These groups are grossly underrepresented in all of the awardees. Looking at the winners you see the names of the same popular/"name brand" institutions appear repeatedly. These awards are being circulated within a very limited network which is unethical and inequitable. Poor scholars of color who are outside of those networks rarely get considered. I've wasted years of my academic career applying for awards and only a couple of times made it to the final rounds only to be turned down, but this is larger than me. This is after numerous workshops, having people who've received awards and served on the committees review my apps, etc. When you have a heavy teaching load, this is precious time taken away from your research and writing. The cost in the end could be your tenure. It's serious for us but it doesn't seem to be taken very seriously on the side of those who run these award competitions which is frustrating. Diversify your review boards and your staff in positions of power (by class, race, national origin, type of institution) or it's all just for show and a way of maintaining the glaring inequalities and hierarchies that exist in academia. We're researchers and scholars. We pick up on patterns very quickly. We can see through the fakery.

- They need to offer more support/workshops for students. They often assume universities are offering support when it is in fact pretty limited for students.
- They need to police cronyism and self-dealing of a personal kind at the very large agencies: NSF and National Geographic. Program officers need to be very independent minded (separate from academic debates and competitions) and ethical. They need to privilege diversity and help applicants revise applications the way NEH has done in the past.
- They should all offer some form of feedback. SSHRC offers no information beyond your final score; it doesn't even mention the winning score.
- they should be brave enough to fund experimental proposal, rather than funding the mainstream
- They should do all they can to make sure that candidates get full and detailed reviews of their proposals and that reviewers provide constructive criticisms.
- They should make policies that reflect sophisticated social theoretical knowledge and a far more rigorous understanding of serious research based on critical theoretical perspectives. This has ethical implications: It seems likely that socially marginal and critical/progressive scholars have critical theoretical grounding that raw empiricists, biomedical and psychologiical research advocates, etc. don't understand and won't fund.
- They should open the eligibility for all researchers especially from developing country who can access some of them.
- They should provide feedback.
- Think outside of the box when it comes to projects and requests. Anthropology is a diverse field and we need to embrace it.
- This is a systemic issue. Obviously, creating shorter, more streamlined and completely blind (because who gets grants is a product of networked soft power as well as name recognition) will benefit folks outside of the priviledge few in R1, R2, and SLAC settings. But actual researchers in R1, R2, and SLAC settings should recognize that their entitlement to time to apply for these things is built on the labor of folks at community colleges and regional four year universities as well as their non-tenured teaching staff at their own university. They're essentially co-opting time at others expense. If we think about education and research as a communal enterprise that is. If it's just another aspect of capitalism, then they're doing what capitalists do and free loading off of the more community oriented labor of others.
- Throw out the lowest review.
- To develop and implement policies to encourage lesser well-known or established scholars to apply. It seems to me that big grants keep going to a small cohort of well-known scholars, and that limited funds available by the most well known agencies quickly gets depleted each funding cycle.
- To open up to candidates with a Social Sciences and Humanities background
- Train people to write the grant, look at things beyond the proposal
- training and clear guidelines are important.
- Training once funding is received
- transparency
- Transparency in decision-making processes; making sure decision-making panels are broadly knowledgeable in all anthropological subfields; announce funding opportunities in time for applicants to prepare good applications (some agencies do this, some don't); streamline the paperwork
- Try to downplay the affect of interpersonal politics in granting funds. Some reviewers will give bad reviews to a student of a rival. This makes it difficult to work in certain regions if you aren't affiliated with those who hold most of the power.
- Understand that cis-caucasian people struggle as well. And fund those not affiliated already with a university.
- understand that universities no longer provide lab staffing by and large, and we need to include that in grant budgets.

- Unknown
- Unknown.
- Unless they can provide a nanny and a secretary (aka a wife) to take care of my 20 credit teaching load, heavy administrative load, 3 kids, 1 husband, and house, there's not much they can do. My problem is lack of time, not lack of interest or knowledge.
- Unsure.
- Usability testing on application portals: these are usually terrible (e.g., timeout without autosave, insisting that all required fields on one screen are filled out before being able to look at the rest) and add needless stress.
- Use direct phone or Zoom interactions to coach, support, and celebrate with applicants
- Using a common application for dissertation research grants would mean that restructuring and reformatting one's grant proposal over and over again could at least be limited as much as possible. Graduate students are often completing 5-6 grant applications in one round (if they are lucky enough to be eligible that for many grants) all while continuing in their teaching and other research responsibilities.
- Very little information available on program-specific review process (e.g. at NSF).
- virtual workshops on grant proposals and how to write effective grants
- We need to be better at funding collaborative grants for higher $$ amounts. To my knowledge, the only general avenue for that is the NSF. I am skeptical that the NSF and its program officers are representative of our discipline. The Wenner Gren seems to have a much more robust track record of funding cultural anthropological research that is influential, but yet its funding per project is much smaller.
- Websites are often woefully unclear about expectations regarding the various application materials required. I would suggest creating a repository or a collaborative space where applicants can view examples of ALL application materials (not just core proposals) as well as feedback from previous grantees regarding the various parts of the grant process.
- Weeding through the reviews and discarding those that are racist, sexist or that promote the agenda of the reviewer rather than those of the applicant.
- Well, for NSF, it should would help if they had more funding to give. I haven't looked recently, but as of a few years ago, NSF's archaeology program budget was (when corrected for inflation) flat for at least the previous 15 years. Some years ago I sat on the NSF panel, and so I had to read a stack of proposals twice a year. From that experience I (finally) learned how to write a good proposal. NSF makes successful proposals known, but last time I looked the proposal itself was not available. If that is still true, it could help if they made the proposal narratives available. Reading good proposals is the best way to learn how to write a good one.
- Well, yes.
- Wenner Gren could acknowledge that primatology is anthropology.
- Wenner Gren has a very weird application that doesn't fit projects well, and also leads to difficulties in reviewing for them
- When working internationally the granting agencies need to understand the researchers context. For example, the charges by governments for permits, etc. in the budget.
- who knows
- Whoa, Have more money? Also, the interfaces of these applications are pathetic.
- work with graduate advisors and faculty mentors to identify and support applicants
- Work with them based on work not a checklist
- Working through universities, especially non-R1
- Workshops and vetting reviewers before sending them proposals.
- workshops for underserved scholars

- Workshops on putting together an effective application (especially for popular funding sources like NSF). Mock timelines for the application process that could help students know when to contact grant offices at their university, when to contact references, when to start writing, etc. The could work on some plain-language descriptions of application requirements. The NSF guide, for example, is a bit difficult to follow if you are not experienced with grant applications.
- Workshops or very structured guidance with opportunities for extended conversations and detailed feedback on initial ideas/project abstracts. Nothing like that was available when I was actively seeking support (80s and 90s).
- Workshops, on-line improves access. Better examples.
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes, all funders seem to fund the same projects. These are not about innovation, but about legibility to the lowest common denominator of reviewer.
- yes, budget support can be confusing
- Yes, but that would require reviewers actually being from our fields, more money to go round, and more funding for sociocultural work that matters.
- yes, reach out to more scholars of color and minority researchers who might not have heard about the agency
- Yes.
- Yes. It would be good to fund research for those who are not affiliated with a University. Private CRM firms often need to fund the extras to go beyond basic compliance with the Historic Preservation laws.
- Yes. Once you receive funds, they never check on you, and they rarely indicate how to get another grant.

Results Part 4: Profiles of U.S.-Based Black and Indigenous Respondents

There were 40 respondents (3.46%) who checked the "Black, African American, and/or Afro-Latinx" box and 23 respondents (1.99%) who checked the "American Indian, Native American, First Nations, and/or Alaskan Native" box in the Race and Ethnicity question (Q4; only visible to those from the United States). In this section, I present data about these groups' responses: although they are a small percentage of total respondents, one of the key reasons to conduct this research is to expand the funding of Black and Indigenous scholars' research, so there is much to learn from these respondents in particular.

Table 4.01: Demographics of U.S.-Based Black and Indigenous Respondents

	Black respondents		**Indigenous respondents**		**Total respondents**	
	n	**%**	***n***	**%**	***N***	**%**
Simplified Gender (Q2/Q3)						
Cisgender men	10	25%	9	39%	390	35%
Cisgender women	26	65%	11	48%	679	60%
People of other genders	4	10%	3	13%	56	5%
Sexual Orientation (Q4)						
Bisexual and/or pansexual	8	21%	3	13%	109	10%
Gay, lesbian, and/or homosexual	2	5%	1	4%	36	3%
Queer	2	5%	2	9%	40	4%
Straight and/or heterosexual	26	67%	14	61%	868	78%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	17	2%
Multiple	1	3%	3	13%	46	4%
Race/Ethnicity (Q9)						
American Indian, Native American, First Nations, and/or Alaskan Native	2	5%	23	100%	23	2%
Biracial and/or Multiracial	8	12%	4	17%	36	4%
Black, African American, and/or Afro-Latinx	40	100%	2	9%	40	4%
East or Southeast Asian	0	0%	1	4%	27	3%
Hispanic and/or Latinx	2	5%	3	13%	57	6%
Middle Eastern and/or North African	1	3%	1	4%	9	<1%
Native Hawaiian and/or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	0%	3	<1%
South or Central Asian	0	0%	0	0%	14	1%
White and/or Caucasian	5	13%	13	57%	844	87%
Other (please specify)	1	3%	1	4%	23	2%
Parents' Education (Q11, Q12)						
0 parents w/bachelor's	14	35%	8	35%	323	28%
1+ parent w/ bachelor's	10	25%	0	0%	268	23%
1+ parent w/ master's/prof.	12	30%	13	57%	406	35%
1+ parent with Ph.D.	4	10%	2	9%	160	14%
Disability (Q13)						
Disabled	17	44%	9	41%	276	25%
Non-disabled	22	56%	13	59%	838	75%

	Black respondents		Indigenous respondents		Total respondents	
	n	**%**	***n***	**%**	***N***	**%**
Age (Q14)						
22 and under	1	3%	0	0%	6	1%
23–29	8	21%	5	23%	137	12%
30–39	16	41%	8	36%	356	32%
40–49	10	26%	4	18%	234	21%
50–59	3	8%	2	9%	143	13%
60–69	1	3%	2	9%	134	12%
70 and over	0	0%	1	5%	110	10%

Statistically Significant Trends in the Demographics of Black and Indigenous Respondents

- Black respondents were significantly more likely than non-Black respondents to be disabled (a χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0056$).
- Black respondents were significantly more likely than non-Black respondents to be under the age of 40 (a χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0124$)

Table 4.02: Careers of Black and Indigenous Respondents

	Black respondents		Indigenous respondents		Total respondents	
	n	**%**	***n***	**%**	***N***	**%**
Education (Q10)						
Some college	0	0%	0	0%	4	<1%
Associate degree	1	3%	0	0%	3	<1%
Bachelor's degree	6	15%	2	9%	42	4%
Master's degree	12	30%	12	52%	327	28%
Ph.D. or D.Phil.	21	53%	7	30%	711	61%
Professional degree other than Ph.D. or D.Phil.	0	0%	0	0%	21	2%
Other (please specify)	0	0%	1	4%	13	1%
Current Affiliation (Q15)						
Public research university	19	48%	9	41%	425	39%
Private research university	7	18%	3	14%	129	12%
Public 4-year college	2	5%	0	0%	65	6%
Private 4-year college	1	3%	0	0%	71	7%
Public 2-year college/community college	1	3%	0	0%	11	1%
U.S. federal government agency	0	0%	1	5%	37	3%
U.S. state or local government agency	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Non-U.S. government agency	0	0%	0	0%	4	<1%
Non-profit organization	2	5%	0	0%	64	6%
For-profit business	2	5%	5	23%	104	10%
Other (please specify)	1	3%	2	9%	81	7%
Multiple affiliations	5	13%	2	9%	99	9%
Academic Status (Q16)						
Undergraduate student	0	0%	0	0%	7	1%
Master's Student	3	9%	1	7%	20	3%
Doctoral student or candidate	11	32%	8	57%	188	26%
Postdoctoral fellow	4	12%	1	7%	43	6%
Adjunct or part-time faculty	0	0%	0	0%	36	5%
Full-time non-tenure-track faculty	1	3%	0	0%	50	7%
Tenure-track faculty	10	29%	3	21%	121	17%
Tenured faculty	5	15%	1	7%	232	32%
Staff	0	0%	0	0%	28	4%
Subfield (Q17, Q19, Q22, Q25)						
Sociocultural	19	48%	9	39%	422	36%
Biological	7	18%	4	17%	170	15%
Archaeological	19	48%	17	74%	731	63%
Linguistic	2	5%	3	13%	74	6%

	Black respondents		Indigenous respondents		Total respondents	
	n	**%**	***n***	**%**	**N**	**%**
Professional Organization Membership (Q28)						
American Anthropological Association	23	58%	8	35%	477	41%
American Association of Physical Anthropologists	5	13%	1	4%	103	9%
American Board of Forensic Anthropology	1	3%	1	4%	11	1%
American Society of Primatologists	1	3%	0	0%	24	2%
Archaeological Institute of America	3	8%	4	17%	111	10%
Register of Professional Archaeologists	4	10%	7	30%	284	25%
Society for American Archaeology	7	18%	13	57%	548	47%
Society for Applied Anthropology	5	13%	1	4%	75	6%
Society for Historical Archaeology	13	33%	5	22%	206	18%
Society of Forensic Anthropologists	0	0%	0	0%	8	1%
None of the Above	3	8%	4	17%	45	4%
Regional Foci (Q30)						
U.S. and/or Canada	31	78%	19	83%	753	65%
Mexico, Central America, and/or the Caribbean	13	33%	2	9%	239	21%
South America	3	8%	0	0%	130	11%
Europe	4	10%	4	17%	159	14%
Asia	4	10%	3	13%	151	13%
Africa	5	13%	1	4%	113	10%
Middle East	1	3%	0	0%	79	7%
Australia and/or the Pacific	1	3%	1	4%	41	4%
Antarctica	0	0%	0	0%	2	<1%
Other (please specify)	0	0%	0	0%	24	2%

Statistically Significant Trends in the Careers of Black and Indigenous Respondents

- Indigenous respondents were significantly less likely than non-Indigenous respondents to hold a Ph.D. (a χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0020$).
- Black respondents were significantly more likely than non-Black respondents to work in academia (a χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0474$).
- Black respondents were significantly more likely than non-Black respondents to be students (a χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0172$)
- Black respondents were significantly more likely than non-Black respondents to be sociocultural anthropologists (a χ^2 test yielded $p = 1.4953\times 10^{-5}$)
- Black respondents were significantly more likely than non-Black respondents to be members of the AAA (a χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0333$) and of the SHA (χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0134$).
- Indigenous respondents were significantly more likely than non-Indigenous respondents to be members of the RPA (a χ^2 test yielded $p = 3.7455 \times 10^{-9}$)

Table 4.03: Where Black and Indigenous Respondents Apply for Funding (Q31, Q32)

	Respondents Who Have Applied					
	Black respondents		Indigenous respondents		Total respondents	
Funding Agency	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**	***n***	**%**
AAUW	6	15%	1	4%	125	11%
APS	4	10%	2	9%	107	9%
CASBS	1	3%	0	0%	22	2%
DO	0	0%	0	0%	65	6%
EC	0	0%	0	0%	68	6%
Ford	15	38%	5	22%	98	8%
FH	4	10%	1	4%	133	11%
FIIE	2	5%	1	4%	148	13%
IAS	0	0%	0	0%	34	3%
LF	1	3%	0	0%	46	4%
NEH	6	15%	4	17%	209	18%
NGS	3	8%	0	0%	211	18%
NSF	14	35%	10	43%	586	51%
Point	1	3%	0	0%	5	<1%
SAR	2	5%	1	4%	103	9%
SSRC	5	13%	2	9%	195	17%
WG	13	33%	6	26%	492	43%
None of the Above	11	28%	7	30%	263	23%

Statistically Significant Trends in the Grant Application Behavior of Black and Indigenous Respondents

- Black respondents were significantly less likely than non-Black respondents to have applied to the National Science Foundation for funding (a χ^2 test yielded $p = 0.0439$)

Table 4.04: Factors Influencing Black and Indigenous Respondents' Choices About Where to Apply (Q34)

	Average Importance Score on a 1–5 Scale		
Factor	**Black respondents**	**Indigenous respondents**	**All Respondents**
Fit between your research and what the agency funds	4.42	4.23	4.51
Eligibility requirements for applications	4.88	4.31	4.32
Amount of funding available	3.46	3.85	3.67
Encouragement from a mentor or colleague	3.58	3.31	3.40
Previous positive experience with granting agency	2.42	2.23	2.71
Amount of work required to apply	3.08	2.31	2.58
Prestige of granting agency	2.50	2.62	2.49
Previous rejections from other granting agencies	2.35	2.08	2.22
Services additional to funding provided by the granting agency (e.g., workshops, networking opportunities, access to equipment)	2.88	2.38	2.10
Advertisement or outreach by granting agency	1.92	1.31	1.80
Requirement for a program or course	2.12	1.92	1.77

Table 4.05: Usefulness of Various Forms of Grant Application Support, according to Black and Indigenous respondents (Q35)

	Average Usefulness Score on a 1–5 Scale		
Form of Support	**Black respondents**	**Indigenous respondents**	**All Respondents**
Reading successful proposals from colleagues	4.48	4.00	4.26
Feedback from a mentor or colleague	4.61	4.08	4.19
Meeting or conversation with granting agency staff (in person or virtually)	4.15	3.09	3.67
Informational material on the granting agency's website	3.73	3.17	3.64
Workshop or information session provided by granting agency	3.96	2.91	3.17
Grant-writing course or workshop provided by your university	3.92	2.92	3.13

Table 4.06: Reasons Respondents had not Applied for Funding (Q37)

Reason Not to Apply	Black respondents *n*	Black respondents %	Indigenous respondents *n*	Indigenous respondents %	Total respondents *n*	Total respondents %
I am too early in my anthropology education or career to need funding.	5	45%	0	0%	42	16%
My research is funded by my employer.	3	27%	1	14%	85	32%
My job or other responsibilities do not give me sufficient time and/or support to conduct research that would need funding from these agencies.	3	27%	2	29%	108	41%
I believe that these agencies would not fund the kind of research I conduct.	2	18%	1	14%	68	26%
I feel too intimidated to apply.	5	45%	3	43%	59	22%
Number of Respondents who had not applied to any of the agencies listed	11		7		263	

Agencies Not Listed on the Survey From Which Black and Indigenous Respondents Had Received Funding (Q38)

- Council on Library and Information Resources
- Department of Defense
- DuBois Institute
- European Research Council
- First Nations Development Institute
- Florida Anthropological Society
- Florida Education Fund
- Guggenheim Foundation
- Harvard University Native American Program
- Hellman Fund
- Kone Foundation
- Local city government
- National Humanities Center
- National Institute of Justice
- National Institute on Drug Abuse
- National Park Service
- Parkes Foundation
- Redd Center for Western Study
- Smithsonian Foundation
- Society of Africanist Archaeologists
- UK Economic and Social Research Council
- UK Medical Research Council
- Sigma Xi
- Society for Economic Anthropology
- Wellcome Trust
- Woodrow Wilson Foundation

Answers to Q36: "Do you find feedback you have received from funding proposal reviewers helpful and constructive? Why or why not?"

The responses from Indigenous anthropologists suggested some significant problems in the assessment of proposals. Seven Indigenous respondents responded to this question, of whom four said feedback was sometimes helpful, three said feedback was generally not helpful, and none said that feedback was generally helpful. Although this is a very small sample, this suggests that Indigenous respondents have had more negative experiences receiving feedback from reviewers than the general population. Some of their negative experiences were similar to those of non-Indigenous respondents, such as complaints about extremely brief feedback or comments asking for the applicant to expand on their proposal in ways that would not fit the application word counts.

But there were also multiple Indigenous respondents who mentioned experiences of racism from reviewers and granting agency staff. One shared a story of having their proposal critiqued for not framing their project as explicitly Indigenous archaeology, an expectation that pigeonholes minoritized scholars into theoretical paradigms based on their identities. The responses also hinted at tensions around qualification: one respondent wrote that reviewers are "typically unqualified to review," while another received feedback saying that they "don't seem to understand research methods" and had an insufficient publication record despite their being a master's student at the time of application. As Indigenous anthropologists are revolutionizing our field's methods, it is unsurprising that there might be a mismatch between mainstream ideas about qualification and the specific qualifications necessary to conduct Indigenous work. As one respondent wrote,

> Sometimes my reviewers offered really great advice on how to improve the proposal. But when it came to the [funder], I was met with a mix of reviews and ultimately [program director] decided that me being a Native woman would preclude me from being an objective scientist. Both times I applied it seemed as if he went out of his way to find more reviewers who would give me poor reviews so he wouldn't be able to give me money. [Funder] reviewers seem to not understand that Native people can also be Native scientists. I am not sure if this survey will help or my story will, but [funder] is a nightmare if you are an Indigenous woman.

This suggests that the choice of reviewers is especially important, and that granting agency staff must select reviewers who have specific expertise in Indigenous anthropology in order to gain a fair and accurate understanding of the merits of Indigenous anthropology projects, and that reviewers who do not understand that Indigenous scholars' work can be scientific are too biased to provide an accurate review. Whether agencies provide training to reviewers or simply choose qualified reviewers, it is essential that the proposals written by Indigenous scholars be assessed by experts in the relevant specializations.

Unlike Indigenous respondents, Black respondents answered this question very similarly to the overall sample (see Q36 above), with some Black anthropologists finding feedback useful, some not, and most finding it variable based on the agency and the reviewer in question. Black respondents were especially likely to mention the Ford Foundation specifically (which is unsurprising, as Ford's postdoctoral fellowship instructions list "Likelihood of using the diversity of human experience as an educational resource in teaching and scholarship" and membership in an underrepresented group as "Positive Factors for Selection" [Ford Foundation n.d.]). However, there was no consensus about the usefulness of Ford Foundation feedback, with one respondent writing that "The Ford Foundation was most useful, because it was specific, supportive, and the reviewers had clearly put time into reading and commenting," while another called Ford Foundation feedback

"belittling." Overall, Black respondents seemed to find feedback on proposals a mixed bag, similarly to respondents of other races.

Answers to Q39: How would you describe your strategy for funding your research?

Like respondents of other racial identities (see Q39 above), Black and Indigenous scholars most commonly used a strategic approach or an aggressive approach to applications, with a handful going out of their way to conduct inexpensive research and avoiding applying for big grants. One notable trend among Black and Indigenous respondents specifically was the consistent references to mentors and colleagues as sources of information about grant programs and of feedback on proposals. Given other research about the importance of mentor relationships to the success of marginalized archaeologists, it is not surprising that this was a particular trend among these respondents.

Answers to Q40: What advice would you give to students or early-career anthropologists about funding their research?

A number of Black respondents particularly emphasized the importance of mentorship and peer support relationships in developing successful proposals, which matches their high valuing of these forms of support in general (see table 4.05). As one respondent wrote, "Create strong professional networks early so that you have a diverse and relatively large group of people to read your drafts. Understand that this often requires reciprocal exchange, which is actually quite good for students, because it teaches you how to review and gives you access to in-process grants in addition to any past successful ones you may come across." Another wrote, "Workshop your big grant and fellowship grants as much as humanly possible. I received an NSF on my first try but only after literally 10 drafts workshopped by trusted peers and mentors." A third wrote, "Find professors who believe in your work and can be sensitive to your journey. These professors will more than likely work with you as (inevitably) challenges arise that makes applying for grants even more challenging. Find your support." Although this theme of community support was also present in the answers from non-Black respondents, the importance of mentorship and community for both the creation of successful proposals and the management of the difficult emotions that come with applying was particularly common and thoughtfully articulated by Black respondents.

The most common themes in the answers from Indigenous respondents were about timing applications, thinking carefully about fit, and finding previous proposals to look at. Starting early and budgeting time for revision were common refrains, and several respondents suggested applying to smaller sources of funding for pilot projects, then building on those with larger grants rather than starting with the biggest funding sources. Several emphasized either selecting grant programs carefully to fit the project or tailoring the framing of the project to match the grant: "make sure you read what the agency wants not what you want your project to be." A number of Indigenous respondents mentioned the usefulness of examining others' proposals. As one person wrote,

> When prepping to build the applications for those larger grants, obtain at least a half-dozen examples of successful (and unsuccessful) grant apps, especially those with reviews attached. They're really valuable for learning how to frame the apps and consider potential pros/cons, while also eventually serving as a reminder that you're good enough to get one (i.e., when looking at the successful examples I obtained, I was struck by how varied they all were, a realization that helped me feel a bit more confident in my own work and how I was thinking of presenting it).

These answers were similar to those of non-Indigenous scholars, but when placed beside the Q36 answers about negative experiences with review processes, the emphasis on fit and tailoring

suggested that Indigenous respondents may be especially attuned to mismatches between their own research goals and what funders are seeking in proposals.

Answers to Q41: What do you think granting agencies could be doing better to support potential applicants?

In answer to this question, like other questions, many Black respondents focused on access to example proposals and constructive feedback before and after submitting a proposal. Several Black respondents emphasized that funders should forward reviewer feedback to unsuccessful applicants and should make a sample of successful proposals available as models for applicants. As one Black respondent wrote,

> I rarely get any feedback at all and when I don't win I get interrogated about it and have no way to show the application was promising (apparently you can use that to show you're good and just unlucky) or to help myself improve. In one year I was unsuccessful with 9 grant applications and got feedback from only one application.

This connection between receiving feedback and career outcomes was particularly interesting to me; sharing feedback can not only help applicants re-apply more successfully but show tenure and promotion committees how their work is perceived by reviewers.

Continuing Indigenous respondents' concern about reviewer assignments, a number of Indigenous respondents focused their advice on selecting reviewers, urging granting agencies to diversify their reviewers and ensure that the reviewers are truly qualified to review the proposals. One respondent suggested "picking reviewers who are actually relevant and understand where archaeology is at," another said foundations should "get qualified reviewers that they PAY," and a third wrote that to include equity "would require reviewers actually being from our fields." In general, widening the pool of reviewers was desirable: one respondent wrote to, "Quit having the same people reviewing applications. It is ridiculous that I can ID whose comment is whose."

Black respondents also advocated for the diversification of reviewer pools and careful choosing of reviewers who will provide constructive feedback. As one person wrote, "If they are looking to support younger and more diverse applicants, they should look for reviewers who will support that. They don't necessarily need to be younger or more diverse since these groups may be overburdened already, but culling certain reviewers would make a difference."

Several Indigenous and Black respondents also suggested broadening what kinds of projects are funded, to include projects that do not fit current "hot topics" or "bandwagons" or even "expand what you see as research." A related theme among Black and Indigenous respondents was transparency about what kinds of projects funding agencies are looking for. Careful allocation of funding to create more opportunity for a broader swath of researchers was another theme; as one Black researcher wrote,

> They need separate awards for people at minority serving institutions, scholars who teach at community colleges, scholars who are part-time/adjuncts, scholars of color engaged in community-based research/advocacy, and those who are first generation. These groups are grossly underrepresented in all of the awardees. Looking at the winners you see the names of the same popular/"name brand" institutions appear repeatedly. These awards are being circulated within a very limited network which is unethical and inequitable. Poor scholars of color who are outside of those networks rarely get considered. I've wasted years of my academic career applying for awards and only a couple of times made it to the final rounds only to be turned down, but this is larger than me. This is after numerous workshops, having people who've received awards and served on the committees review my apps, etc. When you have a heavy teaching load, this is precious time taken away from your research and writing. The cost in the end could be your tenure. It's serious for us but it doesn't seem to be

> taken very seriously on the side of those who run these award competitions which is frustrating. Diversify your review boards and your staff in positions of power (by class, race, national origin, type of institution) or it's all just for show and a way of maintaining the glaring inequalities and hierarchies that exist in academia. We're researchers and scholars. We pick up on patterns very quickly. We can see through the fakery.

I share this quote despite its length because it is an excellent example of the attitude of frustration and exhaustion that was common among respondents, especially Black and Indigenous respondents. It is clear from these responses that serious change is necessary.

References

Antón, Susan C., Ripan S. Malhi, and Agustín Fuentes. 2018. "Race and Diversity in U.S. Biological Anthropology: A Decade of AAPA Initiatives." *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 165 (S65): 158–80. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.23382.

Bardolph, Dana N. 2014. "A Critical Evaluation of Recent Gendered Publishing Trends in American Archaeology." *American Antiquity* 79 (3): 522–40. https://doi.org/10.7183/0002-7316.79.3.522.

———. 2018. "Controlling the Narrative: A Comparative Examination of Gendered Publishing Trends in the SCA and Beyond." *California Archaeology* 10 (2): 159–86. https://doi.org/10.1080/1947461X.2018.1535813.

Bardolph, Dana N., and Amber M. Vanderwarker. 2016. "Sociopolitics in Southeastern Archaeology: The Role of Gender in Scholarly Authorship." *Southeastern Archaeology* 35 (3): 175–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/0734578X.2015.1113101

Beaudry, Mary C., and Jacquelyn White. 1994. "Cowgirls with the Blues? A Study of Women's Publication and the Citation of Women's Work in Historical Archaeology." In *Women in Archaeology*, edited by Cheryl Claassen, 138–58. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Berg, Maggie, and Barbara K. Seeber. 2016. *The Slow Professor: Challenging the Culture of Speed in the Academy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Bowman, Joann K., and Sean Ulm. 2009. "Grants, Gender and Glass Ceilings? An Analysis of ARC-Funded Archaeology Projects." *Australian Archaeology* 68: 31–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/03122417.2009.11681887.

Brodkin, Karen. 1998. *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says about Race in America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Childress, Herb. 2019. *The Adjunct Underclass: How America's Colleges Betrayed Their Faculty, Their Students, and Their Mission*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clancy, Kathryn B. H., Katharine M. Lee, Erica M. Rodgers, and Christina Richey. 2017. "Double Jeopardy in Astronomy and Planetary Science: Women of Color Face Greater Risks of Gendered and Racial Harassment." *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets* 122 (7). https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JE005256.

Clancy, Kathryn B. H., Robin G. Nelson, Julienne N. Rutherford, and Katie Hinde. 2014. "Survey of Academic Field Experiences (SAFE): Trainees Report Harassment and Assault." *PLoS ONE* 9 (7): e102172. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0102172

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip. 2004. "Publishing the Past: Gender and Patterns of Authorship in Academic and Public Archaeology Journals." *Graduate Journal of Social Science* 1 (1): 117–43. http://www.gjss.org/sites/default/files/issues/chapters/papers/Journal-01-01--06-ColwellChanthaphonh.pdf

DiAngelo, Robin. 2018. *White Fragility: Why It's So Hard for White People to Talk About Racism*. Boston: Beacon Press.

European Association of Social Anthropologists Association, Martin Fotta, Mariya Ivancheva, Raluca Pernes, and PrecAnthro Collective. 2020. "THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL CAREER IN EUROPE: A Complete Report on the EASA Membership Survey." NomadIT. https://doi.org/10.22582/easaprecanthro.

Ford, Anabel, and Anna Hundt. 1994. "Equity in Academia—Why the Best Men Still Win: An Examination of Women and Men in Mesoamerican Archeology." In *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology*, edited by Margaret C. Nelson, Sarah Milledge Nelson, and Alison Wylie, 147–56. Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association 5. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

Ford Foundation. n.d. "Postdoctoral Fact Sheet." Accessed May 26, 2023. https://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/FordFellowships/PGA_047960.

Fuentes, Agustín. 2020. "Biological Anthropology's Critical Engagement with Genomics, Evolution, Race/Racism, and Ourselves: Opportunities and Challenges to Making a Difference in the Academy and the World." *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* n/a (n/a). https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24162.

Fulkerson, Tiffany J., and Shannon Tushingham. 2019. "Who Dominates the Discourses of the Past? Gender, Occupational Affiliation, and Multivocality in North American Archaeology Publishing." *American Antiquity* 84 (3): 379–99. https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2019.35.

Gamble, Lynn H. 2020. "Editor's Corner." *American Antiquity* 85 (2): 199–201. https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2020.21.

Gamble, Lynn H., Debra Martin, Julia Hendon, Calogero Santoro, Sarah Herr, Christina Rieth, Sjoerd van der Linde, Christopher Rodning, Michelle Hegmon, and Jennifer Birch. 2020. "Statement and Commitments from SAA Editors to Change the Underrepresentation of Black, Indigenous, and Other Scholars from Diverse Backgrounds in Our Publications." *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 8 (3): v–vi. https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2020.35.

Gero, Joan M. 1985. "Socio-Politics and the Woman-at-Home Ideology." *American Antiquity* 50 (2): 342–50. https://doi.org/10.2307/280492.

Goldstein, Lynne, Barbara J. Mills, Sarah Herr, Jo Ellen Burkholder, Leslie Aiello, and Christopher Thornton. 2018. "Why Do Fewer Women Than Men Apply for Grants After Their PhDs?" *American Antiquity* 83 (3): 367–86. https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2017.73.

Handly, Martin James. 1995. "A Gendered Review of the 'Canadian Archaeological Association Bulletin' (1969-1976) and the 'Canadian Journal of Archaeology' (1977-1993): The First Twenty-Five Years." *Canadian Journal of Archaeology / Journal Canadien d'Archéologie* 19: 61–78. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41102569.

Hanscam, Emily, and Robert Witcher. 2023. "Women in *Antiquity*: An Analysis of Gender and Publishing in a Global Archaeology Journal." *Journal of Field Archaeology* 48(2): 87–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/00934690.2022.2143896.

Heath-Stout, Laura E. 2019a. "Diversity, Identity, and Oppression in the Production of Archaeological Knowledge." Ph.D. dissertation, Boston, MA: Boston University.

———. 2019b. "Pottery on the Periphery: Contact-Period Ceramics and Regional Integration at La Laguna, Tlaxcala, Mexico." *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 56 (December): 101088. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaa.2019.101088.

———. 2020a. "Gender, Double-Blind Peer Review, and the Demographics of Publication in the Journal of Field Archaeology." *Journal of Field Archaeology* 45 (3): 135–39. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10761-022-00653-8.

———. 2020b. "Who Writes About Archaeology? An Intersectional Study of Authorship in Archaeological Journals." *American Antiquity* 85 (3): 407–26. https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2020.28.

———. 2022. "The Invisibly Disabled Archaeologist." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10761-022-00653-8.

Heath-Stout, Laura E., Grace Erny, and Dimitri Nakassis. 2023. "Demographic Dynamics of Publishing in the *American Journal of Archaeology*." *American Journal of Archaeology* 127(2): 151–165. https://doi.org/10.1086/723220

Heath-Stout, Laura E., and Elizabeth M. Hannigan. 2020. "Affording Archaeology: How Field School Costs Promote Exclusivity." *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 8 (2): 123–33. https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2020.7.

Heath-Stout, Laura E., and Catherine L. Jalbert. 2023. "Funding in the "Field": An Analysis of Demographics and Methods in National Science Foundation Archaeology Grants (1955–2020)." *Journal of Field Archaeology* 48(2):102–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/00934690.2022.2154999

Hutson, Scott R. 2002. "Gendered Citation Practices in American Antiquity and Other Archaeology Journals." *American Antiquity* 67 (2): 331–42. https://doi.org/10.2307/2694570.

Jalbert, Catherine L. 2019. "Archaeology in Canada: An Analysis of Demographics and Working Conditions in the Discipline." Ph.D. dissertation, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada: Memorial University of Newfoundland. https://research.library.mun.ca/13879/.

McGrath, Pamela Faye, Greg Acciaioli, and Adele Millard. 2018. "Report on the Preliminary Findings of the 2018 Global Survey of Anthropological Practice: How We Move Through the World, How the World Moves Through Us." World Council of Anthropological Associations. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342732436_Report_on_the_Preliminary_Findings_of_the_2018_Global_Survey_of_Anthropological_Practice_How_We_Move_Through_the_World_How_the_World_Moves_Through_Us.

McGregor, Hannah. 2022. *A Sentimental Education*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Nelson, Robin G., Julienne N. Rutherford, Katie Hinde, and Kathryn B. H. Clancy. 2017. "Signaling Safety: Characterizing Fieldwork Experiences and Their Implications for Career Trajectories." *American Anthropologist* 119 (4): 710–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.12929.

Nishida, Akemi. 2016. "Neoliberal Academia and a Critique from Disability Studies." In *Occupying Disability: Critical Approaches to Community, Justice, and Decolonizing Disability*, edited by Pamela Block, Devva Kasnitz, Akemi Nishida, and Nick Pollard, 145–57. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9984-3.

Overholtzer, Lisa, and Catherine L Jalbert. 2021. "A 'Leaky' Pipeline and Chilly Climate in Archaeology in Canada." *American Antiquity*, 23. https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2021.24.

Rautman, Alison E. 2012. "Who Gets Published in American Antiquity?" *SAA Archaeological Record* 12 (2): 25–26, 30. http://onlinedigeditions.com/publication/?m=16146&i=104941&p=26&ver=html5

RissleR, Leslie J, Katherine L Hale, Nina R Joffe, and Nicholas M Caruso. 2020. "Gender Differences in Grant Submissions across Science and Engineering Fields at the NSF." *BioScience* 70 (9): 814–20. https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biaa072.

Turner, Trudy R., Robin M. Bernstein, Andrea B. Taylor, Abigail Asangba, Traci Bekelman, Jennifer Danzy Cramer, Sarah Elton, et al. 2018. "Participation, Representation, and Shared Experiences of Women Scholars in Biological Anthropology." *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 165 (January): 126–57. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.23386.

Tushingham, Shannon, Tiffany Fulkerson, and Katheryn Hill. 2017. "The Peer Review Gap: A Longitudinal Case Study of Gendered Publishing and Occupational Patterns in a Female-Rich Discipline, Western North America (1974-2016)." *PLoS ONE* 12 (11): e0188403. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0188403

Tushingham, Shannon, and Tiffany J. Fulkerson. 2020. "Who Writes the Past? The Evolving Gender and Professional Landscape of Great Basin Archaeology (1954–2018)." In *With Grit and Determination: A Century of Change for Women in Great Basin and American Archaeology*, edited by Suzanne Eskenazi and Nicole M. Herzog, 166–98. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Wenner-Gren Foundation and the Center for Digital Antiquity. n.d. "Wenner-Gren Collection." *The Digital Archaeological Record*. Accessed May 31, 2023. https://core.tdar.org/collection/70667/wenner-gren-foundation

Yellen, John. 1994. "Women, Archaeology, and the National Science Foundation: An Analysis of Fiscal Year 1989 Data." Edited by Margaret C. Nelson, Sarah M. Nelson, and Alison Wylie. *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 5: Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology: 53–58.