

## Call for Proposals: Researching Stigmatisation and Discrimination of People who Experience Gambling Harms in Great Britain

### Clarification Q&As

Question	Answer
<p><b>What would a collaboration with non-gambling stigma researchers look like, so learning is available from other adjacent areas?</b></p>	<p><i>Working with researchers with expertise in areas of stigmatisation is key. Stigmatising processes tend to operate similarly across communities and having an expertise in areas of stigmatisation (and turning these lenses of expertise to build our understanding of gambling) is more important for realising these research aims than having an expertise in gambling harms without attendant expertise in stigmatisation, though expertise in both is of course positive. We want to learn from the wealth of established research focusing on stigmatisation in other communities and apply this to the stigmatisation of gambling harms.</i></p>
<p><b>We have identified some stigma scales, however there is not a lot on measuring gambling stigma, and certainly no validated scales. How does one measure stigma of gambling if the existing scales are not exactly adequate?</b></p>	<p><i>We mention establishing a matrix of stigmatising terms and constructions, similar to but divergent from the scales you mention. That is not to say this is mutually exclusive from creating a stigma scale, and this could be included as a facet of your proposal, or as an extra piece of work further to the research we are funding, notably if such a scale is to be validated. We envisage from the matrix the grantee will develop that it can serve as a tool to be used to identify, challenge and subvert stigma.</i></p>
<p><b>In terms of the deliverables on the grant – 18 months seems rather tight for the completion of the grant and the publication of the 3 peer reviewed papers. At what stage would you expect the 3 peer reviewed publications to be at the conclusion of the grant?</b></p>	<p><i>We would ask you to be happy with the draft of the manuscripts and for these to have been submitted to the journal of your choice; however, we do not expect the papers to be published, and recognise the great variability in lead time from journal to journal.</i></p>

<p><b>The document says that proposals are max 50,000 words: I assume this is 5,000?</b></p>	<p><i>To confirm, the proposals are 50,000 words. However, this is a maximum, so applicants should feel free to write less</i></p>
<p><b>In relation to the ‘scope and focus’: “Effective interventions to reduce and prevent stigma for these communities”. We’d be keen to hear a bit more about whether you’re looking for actual development and piloting of intervention(s) as part of this project, or are looking for recommendations for interventions, based on the findings of the research and considerations of what the literature says works for reducing/preventing stigma.</b></p>	<p><i>We are looking for recommendations for interventions, based on the findings of the research and considerations of what the literature says works for reducing/preventing stigma.</i></p> <p><i>To clarify we are not looking for any piloted interventions.</i></p>
<p><b>We are in discussions with various possible academic collaborators from the wider field of stigma and still weighing up the most useful collaboration.</b></p> <p><b>Although we will definitely submit an excellent proposal within the deadline (as we have finalised research methods/work packages), we would like if at all possible to explore the possibility of an extension to the deadline. This will provide us with some more time to make sure we have agreed all the plans thoroughly with the collaborators.</b></p>	<p><i>We are happy to give flexibility around the choice of academic, and bidders noting prospective partnerships in the proposal would be sufficient to submit.</i></p> <p><i>Hopefully, this gives you leniency in submitting your proposal whilst also allowing us to stick to our internal timeframe.</i></p>
<p><b>Please can you advise whether we are able to include overheads in our grant request, and if so whether there are any rules we need to adhere to?</b></p> <p><b>Please can you also confirm that we are able to request grant to cover:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time spent on the project for existing University staff and partners</li> <li>• Additional posts that we would employ to work exclusively on the project (i.e. Research Assistant)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Overheads as a percentage of the grant cannot be requested (e.g. having a line that is 11% of the budget marked ‘overheads’); only direct costs can be requested. However, these include all relevant core, logistical, and human resource costs necessary to realise the work (and so anything that would normally come under the auspices of costed overheads).</i></p> <p><i>Yes, the requested grant can cover all the listed items. As for subcontracting, we would expect it to be costings as necessary.</i></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Subcontracting – and if so, if there are any limits/ceilings we need to adhere to for these costs</b></li><li>• <b>Other costs relating to the project, such as travel, participant payments, dissemination costs etc.</b></li></ul>	
---	--