International Journal of Management, Knowledge and Learning, 7(2), 217–243

Identifying Elements for a Successful Approach to Applying Projects

Urška Vidmar
Poučevanje jezikov, Urška Vidmar s.p., Slovenia

Tina Vukasović
International School for Social and Business Studies and DOBA Faculty, Slovenia

This paper presents elements for a successful approach to addressing Horizon 2020. Horizon 2020 is the EU programme offering funding for research and innovation projects. Investing in such projects in turn secures a smart, sustainable and inclusive economic growth. The programme covers all the stages, from basic research to market penetration, and has a total value of slightly over EUR 70 billion. The investment instrument's main goals are strengthening Europe's global competitiveness, making it the best in the world-class science, eliminating obstacles that hinder innovations to get quickly in the market and changing the way in which the public and private sectors work together. Despite the fact that the program has a simple structure and requires less red tape then its predecessor (the Seventh Framework Programme – FP7), the applicants still face a lot of challenges when applying with their projects. The paper's aim is to address these challenges and to offer solutions. Primary data were collected by using the technique of surveying by e-mail. We carried out the survey by sending the e-mail to Slovene recipients of funds for Horizon 2020 and, subsequently, to Italian ones. The quantitative research results indicated that the application's success in Horizon 2020 is largely influenced by the financial projection, the knowledge of EU policies, the proposal design, as well as the proposal elements – contents, importance of the process of individual proposal elements, past experiences, partner organization, referrals and coordinators.

Keywords: European Union (EU), EU funds, funds, grant writing, grants, Horizon 2020, project planning, proposal, rhetoric

Introduction

Horizon 2020 is the biggest European Union (EU) Research and Innovation financial programme ever, with almost €80 billion funds available for a period of seven years (2014 to 2020). It is the eighth phase of the Framework Programmes. In comparison with the previous ones, Horizon 2020 offers various simplifications through a unified set of rules for participation. The

current period 2014–2020 provides many opportunities to fund innovative ideas and projects. The architecture of European Funds and direct grants continues to offer a wide range of funding opportunities in the Member States. The areas at the heart of Horizon 2020 (the biggest EU Research and Innovation programme), for example, are: developing excellent science, competitive industry, innovative marketing, as well as tackling societal challenges. This targeted funding is aimed at helping to ensure that the best ideas are brought to the market faster and are used in the European cities, homes, hospitals, factories and shops as quickly as possible. However, funding is often denied due to lack of knowledge or poor planning. Although the numerous programs and initiatives have different features, the development of project proposals and application processes follow common rules.

Participation in the programme is open to different types of organizations and individuals from the European Union Member States or countries associated with the programme. Horizon 2020 is thus accessible to individuals, researchers at early-stage or mid-stage careers, research teams, national, regional or local public or state bodies, small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) or teams of enterprises, institutions, universities, associations, (non-profit) organizations, etc.

Associated countries include Israel, Norway, Turkey, Iceland, FYROM, Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Albania and the Republic of Moldova. Overseas countries and territories associated with the EU Member States (e.g. Greenland) are also considered EU countries. It is possible to include partners from other parts of the world. However, in this case, specific rules for funding apply.

Some developing and middle-income countries may be funded as much as participants from EU Member States. These are, among others, Asian, African, South American and Middle Eastern countries, as well as the European countries outside the European Union.

Countries like USA, Japan, the BRIC countries and Switzerland are also invited to participate, but will recieve funding only in specific situations:

- In case of a bilateral agreement on research or technological cooperation between the EU and the country in question;
- When it is explicitly written in the topic documents that applicants from these countries are eligible;
- If an applicant can convince the European Commission that a definite partner is essential to a project and that the partner adds special skills/expertise, access to special research infrastructure, access to a certain geographic area or even to data.

Most often partners from the above countries will be funded through their national funding schemes for the partcipation in a Horizon 2020 project.

Horizon 2020 fosters international and interdisciplinary partnerships, and the majority of the programmes require the projects to have a minimum of three partners, from three different countries. Exceptions to this conditions are found in the SME instrument and the personal scholarships (as these are based on individual participation). Programmes that stipulate multiple participants in a project also require the involvement of a minimum of three partners from different EU Member States or associated countries in an international consortium.

Advantages of Participating in Horizon 2020

Speaking at one event, the Minister of Ireland for Training and Skills, John Halligan, stated that he 'would encourage all innovative companies operating in Ireland to engage with the EU Horizon 2020 programme so that they can experience the multiple benefits of participation. The value of participation in Horizon 2020 extends far beyond the potential monetary rewards. Horizon 2020 provides a mechanism to network and collaborate with the best researchers and leading companies across Europe [...]. These benefits are all the more important for a small, island nation like Ireland,' he added. So he 'would encourage all innovative companies to investigate the opportunities to participate in Horizon 2020.' (Department of Business, Enterprise and Innovation 2016).

As has been pointed out by the Minister, the monetary benefit is only one advantage of participating in Horizon 2020. There are many more:

- Networks. The program forsters establishing a partner network with organizations from other sectors (e.g. business). It supports working with the best researchers from European countries in multidisciplinary teams. EU-funded projects bring together expertise from all over Europe to solve research challenges that no single project partners can solve on their own. It supports making contact with the leading international players in the grant writer's field. Horizon 2020 allows movement of researchers, knowledge and ideas across borders, making it possible to develop, attract and retain research talent in European countries.
- Prestige. The program supports increasing visibility in various research fields and provides a renown 'EU stamp of quality.'
- Impact and dissemination. The program supports partnering with organizations across the EU and further afield, which enables the researcher's work to have a wider impact than on the national level.
- Developing a project idea. When writing a proposal, the grant writer will need to present the costs and benefits of the grant writer's project and think about its long-term benefits to society.

- Taking ideas from the lab to the market.
- Expanding the range of products and services.
- Reinforcing know-how
- Integrating new markets.
- Entrepreneurs and industry/business. The Horizon 2020 initiative makes it easier to market ideas and develop an organization.

The Horizon 2020 webpage provides many positive testimonials given by the beneficiaries of the program. Launching the strategy, Arlene Foster, Northern Ireland's Minister of Enterprise, Trade and Investment, for example, stated: 'Companies that engage in research and innovation are more productive, employ more people and are more likely to export. My department, and the executive, have placed innovation and R&D at the heart of its efforts to rebalance our economy into one that is export-led and knowledge-based. If we are to meet this challenge, Northern Ireland will need more companies willing to engage in research and build collaborative partnerships with universities and colleges both at home and, importantly, abroad. Horizon 2020, with its focus on international collaboration, provides an excellent platform for this. The new strategy, developed with industry and academia, sets out our commitment to provide the conditions needed for success in the field of business-driven research and innovation.' Joan Guasch (2013), another beneficiary, has noted: 'You overcome technological barriers, you learn how to work and cooperate with people from different cultures and also from different businesses and you save time and money to put your knowledge in profitable markets.'

When Professor Marco Garetti (2013) was asked about the benefits of participating in EU research projects, he answered: 'There are many benefits from different points of view. First of all, this funding strengthens the relationship between academia and industry. Then it contributes to establish connections between different countries of Europe. And at the end, it supports research and development, so it's very important.'

Dr. Kerstin Dressel (2013), a researcher, gave this response to the same question: 'It is really an inspiring environment for a researcher and I very much appreciate the international visibility as a researcher, as well as doing a lot of international comparative research. I think gives you a lot of surprising and new insights and findings.'

Methodology, Data Collection and Sample

A quantitative research method was used to collect data. For the purposes of quantitative research, primary data were collected using a survey questionnaire using the online survey method. The key feature of quantitative research was to accelerate the development of theory and contribute to science, in order to make it a fundamental research. For the purposes of

quantitative research, primary data was collected using a survey questionnaire. The survey questionnaire was carried out in public and private organizations. The data was collected using the online survey method. The questionnaire consisted of closed questions. We used ranking questions in the online survey to sort answers in order. This format is frequently shown as an open square, where it is possible to record the serial numbers of the selection, while, with multiple choice questions, the respondents themselves choose the number of possible answers. This format preserves the similarity of the form with the buttons, wherein the buttons only allow one response and retain the last selected option, while multiple choice answers offer a greater possibility of changing the number of responses. Although online questionnaires provide multiple choice answers, some evidence suggests that this leads to more frequent omissions.

We used an interval (Likert) measuring scale. There were statements referring to different areas of the partner search, proposal development and application process. The respondents chose numbers on a 5-point scale, with 1 meaning 'I totally agree' and 5 meaning 'I totally disagree.' We formed all the questions based on the findings from the theoretical part (Table 1). The obtained primary data were analyzed with appropriate uni-, bivariate, and multivariate data processing methods using the SPSS version 21 statistical program.

Stratified sampling was used to design the sample. In the quantitative survey, 234 respondents participated, of which 206 respondents responded to the questionnaire, of which 94 questionnaires were valid. We removed 112 questionnaires because they were not fully answered. The sample of research is thus $N = 94$, represented by public and private organizations participating in the calls for Horizon 2020 (Table 2). We carried out the survey by sending an e-mail to Slovene recipients of funds for Horizon 2020 and then to Italian recipients (both the e-mails and questionnaires were written in their respective mother tongues).

Discussion

In this section, we present the results of descriptive statistics representing the basis or foundation of the research. Vavra (1997, p. 152) suggests that the statistics described here serve as a reflection of the actual assessments of respondents at individual basic constructs and components. Descriptive statistics also enable us to ascertain all the basic characteristics of the responses, but it is imperative to pay special attention to the conditions that variables must meet, in case of carrying out further analysis such as correlation, factor analysis, etc. (Malhotra & Birks, 2003, p. 354). All claims were evaluated on the Likert scale from 1 to 5, whereby for the selected statement, grade 1 means 'I completely agree' and for the selected statement grade 5 means 'I completely disagree.'

Table 1 Constructs with Calculation Methods and Sources

Constructs	Measurement scale/calculation method
Consortium partner (Grobelnik, 2007).	Previous participation in EU projects as a partner organization is important for later success of receiving a project as an applicant in Horizon 2020. It is important for the applicant organization to first have experience as a consortium partner in EU projects. An organization that has not yet cooperated in any EU projects has little chance as an applicant for its own project. Only organizations that have already cooperated in EU projects can be successful when applying for their own projects. Applicant's past experience in EU projects is important. It is difficult for inexperienced newcomers to succeed in getting a project accepted in H2020. Inexperienced newcomers have little chances when applying for Horizon 2020. Initial participation as a consortium partner has a positive effect on the future performance of the applicant of an EU project.
Partner search portals (Hoffmann, 2015)	Successful applicants search for project partners in the networking or partner search portals. Networking or partner search portals are useful for the formation of consortiums. The most efficient way to search for a partner is through networking or partner search portals. Networking or partner search portals are good places to search for good partners. Successful applicants search for project partners through referrals. Successful applicants search for partners among the already funded project coordinators or participants. An efficient way to search for a partner is by looking among the already funded project coordinators or participants. An efficient way to search for a partner is through referrals. An efficient way to search for a partner is through networking or partner search portals.
Design of the project proposal (Porter, 2007)	Visual marketing elements (graphic data presentation, pictures, etc.) in the proposal affect the success in obtaining funding from Horizon 2020. The layout/formatting of the proposal is important. Visual graphic elements in the proposal affect the success of obtaining funding from Horizon 2020. Typographical emphasis of keywords (keywords in italics, bolded or underlined) in the proposal is important. It is important to use keywords in the proposal (e.g. objective, aim).

Continued on the next page

Descriptive Statistics for 'Importance of Experience in the Successful Acquisition of Funding'

The claims that best describe the variable of the importance of experience in the successful acquisition of funding are presented in Table 3, where their descriptive analysis is also presented.

Table 1 *Continued from the previous page*

Constructs	Measurement scale/calculation method
Financial projection (Destro, 2014)	Building a project's financial plan requires knowledge and experience. It is important to hire an organization for the design of the project's budget. Designing the project's budget with the help of an organization experienced in designing EU project budget is important. It is advisable to search for a consultant for budget planning if you are not an experienced budget planner.
Knowledge of EU policies (Hoffmann, 2015)	A good way to identify project ideas is to study EU policies. Reading EU policies before brainstorming for project ideas is a useful technique. The most efficient way to search for a partner is through networking or partner search portals. Brainstorming for project ideas based on EU policies is an efficient method. It is useful to be well acquainted with EU policies before brainstorming for project ideas.
Importance of individual proposal elements process (Hoffmann, 2015)	Success in receiving a project applied in H2020 is most affected by a good project idea. Success in receiving a project applied in H2020 is most affected by a good composition of the consortium. Success in receiving a project applied in H2020 is most affected by good consortium partners. Success in receiving a project applied in H2020 is most affected by good knowledge of EU policies.
Importance of individual elements of the project proposal (Fabbro, Berovic, & Bartol, 2016)	Success in receiving a project applied in H2020 is most affected by a good project title. Success in receiving a project applied in H2020 is most affected by a good project acronym. Success in receiving a project applied in H2020 is most affected by a well-written and designed excellence chapter. Success in receiving a project applied in H2020 is most affected by a well-written and designed impact chapter. Success in receiving a project applied in H2020 is most affected by a well-written abstract. Success in receiving a project applied in H2020 is most affected by good project budget planning. Success in receiving a project applied in H2020 is most affected by a good use of visual marketing elements. Success in receiving a project applied in H2020 is most affected by a well-developed project idea.

Notes Respondents will express their agreement or disagreement with the following statements on the Likert scale from 1 to 5.

Table 2 Structure of a Sample

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Public organization	46	49
Private organization	48	51
Total	94	100

Table 3 Significance of Experience in the Success of Obtaining Funding in H2020

Question	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Q1a: Previous participation in EU projects as a partner organization is important for later success in receiving a project applied in H2020.	94	1	5	2.13	1.008
Q1b: It is important for the applicant organization to first have experience as a consortium partner in EU projects.	94	1	5	2.23	0.999
Q1c: An organization that has not yet cooperated in any EU projects has little chance as an applicant for its own project.	94	1	5	2.81	0.871
Q1d: Only organizations that have already cooperated in EU projects can be successful when applying for their own projects.	94	2	5	3.57	0.796
Q1e: Applicant's past experience in EU projects is important.	94	1	3	2.09	0.713
Q1f: It is difficult for inexperienced newcomers to succeed in getting a project accepted in H2020.	94	1	5	2.70	0.948
Q1g: Inexperienced newcomers have little chances when applying for Horizon 2020.	94	1	5	2.91	0.900
Q1h: Initial participation as a consortium partner has a positive effect on the future performance of the applicant of an EU project.	94	1	5	2.47	0.924

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) *N*, (2) minimum, (3) maximum, (4) mean, (5) standard deviation.

In Table 3, for each claim, the average values of the claim estimates are presented. The highest rating was obtained by claim that 'Only organizations that have already cooperated in EU projects can be successful when applying with their own projects' (average 3.57). The agreement with the claim is medium high, since the middle of the scale is 3 (average 3.57). A little lower were the assertions 'Inexperienced newcomers have little chances when applying for Horizon 2020' (an average of 2.91); 'An organization which has not yet cooperated in any EU projects has little chance as an applicant of its own project' (average 2.81); 'It is difficult for inexperienced newcomers to succeed in having a project accepted in H2020' (an average of 2.70); 'Initial participation as a consortium partner has a positive effect on the future performance of the applicant of an EU project' (an average of 2.47); 'It is important for the applicant organization to first have experience as a consortium partner in EU projects' (an average of 2.23); 'Previous participation in EU projects as a partner organization is important for later success in getting a project accepted in H2020' (an average of 2.13); and 'The applicant's past experience in EU projects is important' (average 2.09). The standard deviations of the claims range from 0.71 to 1.00, indicating a rela-

Table 4 Differences between Public and Private Organizations: Discriminatory Analysis – Test of Equality of Group Means

Item		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Importance of Experiences						
Previous participation in EU projects as a partner organization is important for later success of receiving a project as an applicant in Horizon 2020	(a)	46	2.13	0.957	0.001	0.979
	(b)	48	2.13	1.064		
It is important for the applicant organization to first have experience as a consortium partner in EU projects	(a)	46	2.22	0.892	0.025	0.875
	(b)	48	2.25	1.101		
An organization which has not yet cooperated in any EU projects has little chance as an applicant for its own project	(a)	46	2.91	0.839	1.302	0.257
	(b)	48	2.71	0.898		
Only organizations that have already cooperated in EU projects can be successful when applying for their own projects	(a)	46	3.57	0.779	0.012	0.913
	(b)	48	3.58	0.821		
Applicant's past experience in EU projects is important	(a)	46	2.17	0.825	1.402	0.239
	(b)	48	2.00	0.583		
It is difficult for inexperienced newcomers to succeed in getting a project accepted in H2020	(a)	46	2.74	0.905	0.136	0.713
	(b)	48	2.67	0.996		
Inexperienced newcomers have little chances when applying for Horizon 2020	(a)	46	3.04	0.815	1.856	0.176
	(b)	48	2.79	0.967		
Initial participation as a consortium partner has a positive effect on the future performance of the applicant of an EU project	(a)	46	2.35	0.822	1.535	0.219
	(b)	48	2.58	1.007		
Partner Search Methods						
Successful applicants search for project partners in the networking or partner search portals	(a)	46	2.74	0.743	0.796	0.375
	(b)	48	2.88	0.733		
Networking or partner search portals are useful for the formation of consortiums	(a)	46	2.65	0.706	0.187	0.666
	(b)	48	2.71	0.544		
The most efficient way to search for a partner is through networking or partner search portals	(a)	46	3.43	0.935	0.155	0.695
	(b)	48	3.50	0.652		
Networking or partner search portals are good places to search for good partners	(a)	46	2.78	0.841	3.171	0.078
	(b)	48	3.04	0.544		
Successful applicants search for project partners through referrals	(a)	46	2.00	0.730	4.392	0.039
	(b)	48	2.33	0.808		

Continued on the next page

tively large dispersion of estimates. The standard deviation of 1.00 means that most of the respondents are in the range of ±1.00 of the estimate

Table 4 *Continued from the previous page*

Item		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Successful applicants search for partners among the already funded project coordinators or participants	(a)	46	2.39	0.714	7.733	0.007
	(b)	48	2.75	0.526		
An efficient way to search for a partner is by looking among the already funded project coordinators or participants	(a)	46	2.48	0.722	8.352	0.005
	(b)	48	2.88	0.606		
An efficient way to search for a partner is through referrals	(a)	46	2.17	0.570	4.930	0.029
	(b)	48	2.50	0.825		
An efficient way to search for a partner is through networking or partner search portals	(a)	46	2.78	0.786	0.818	0.368
	(b)	48	2.92	0.647		
Proposal Design						
Visual marketing elements (graphic data presentation, pictures, etc.) in the proposal affect the success in obtaining funding from Horizon 2020	(a)	46	2.09	0.509	0.296	0.587
	(b)	48	2.17	0.859		
The layout/formatting of the proposal is important	(a)	46	2.22	0.786	5.620	0.020
	(b)	48	1.88	0.606		
Visual graphic elements in the proposal affect the success of obtaining funding from Horizon 2020	(a)	46	2.57	0.583	0.482	0.489
	(b)	48	2.46	0.874		
Typographical emphasis of keywords (keywords in italics, bolded or underlined) in the proposal is important	(a)	46	2.22	0.664	0.893	0.347
	(b)	48	2.08	0.710		
It is important to use keywords in the proposal (e.g. objective, aim)	(a)	46	1.78	0.786	0.004	0.947
	(b)	48	1.79	0.504		
Financial Plan						
Building a project's financial plan requires knowledge and experience	(a)	46	1.74	0.681	0.006	0.938
	(b)	48	1.75	0.668		
It is important to hire an organization for the design of the project's budget	(a)	46	3.17	0.877	0.002	0.967
	(b)	48	3.17	0.808		
Designing the project's budget with the help of an organization experienced in designing EU project budget is important	(a)	46	2.70	0.866	0.257	0.614
	(b)	48	2.79	0.967		
It is advisable to search for a consultant for budget planning if you are not an experienced budget planner	(a)	46	2.26	0.905	0.003	0.954
	(b)	48	2.25	0.934		

Continued on the next page

of the average and, given the fact that the scale is only five-level, this is relatively large.

The claim with the highest deviation between the public and private sectors is 'Inexperienced newcomers have little chances when applying for Hori-

Table 4 *Continued from the previous page*

Item		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
EU Policies						
A good way to identify project ideas is to study EU policies	(a)	46	2.26	0.801	0.928	0.338
	(b)	48	2.42	0.767		
Reading EU policies before brainstorming for project ideas is a useful technique	(a)	46	2.30	0.866	1.854	0.177
	(b)	48	2.54	0.824		
Brainstorming for project ideas based on EU policies is an efficient method	(a)	46	2.43	0.886	1.175	0.281
	(b)	48	2.42	0.821		
It is useful to be well acquainted with EU policies before brainstorming for project ideas	(a)	46	2.17	0.926	1.812	0.182
	(b)	48	2.42	0.821		
Success of a Project Proposal						
In my opinion, it is important to initially participate as a partner organization in EU projects for later success as an applicant in H2020	(a)	46	2.39	1.064	0.879	0.351
	(b)	48	2.58	0.919		
In my opinion, applicants should not look for project partners in networking or partner search portals in order to have their project approved in H2020	(a)	46	2.87	0.749	1.715	0.194
	(b)	48	2.67	0.753		
In my opinion, the design of the proposal with visual marketing elements affects the chances of project approval in H2020	(a)	46	2.39	0.493	0.478	0.491
	(b)	48	2.29	0.849		
In my opinion, the creation of the project's financial budget requires knowledge and experience in order for project approval in H2020	(a)	46	2.09	0.725	0.064	0.801
	(b)	48	2.13	0.733		
In my opinion, knowledge of EU's policies affects the performance of applicants in H2020	(a)	46	2.13	0.859	1.393	0.241
	(b)	48	2.33	0.808		
Importance of Individual Elements						
A good project idea	(a)	46	1.43	0.655	1.332	0.251
	(b)	48	1.29	0.544		
A good composition of the consortium	(a)	46	1.74	0.801	2.135	0.147
	(b)	48	2.08	0.964		
Good consortium partners	(a)	46	1.83	0.769	2.035	0.157
	(b)	48	2.08	0.964		
Good knowledge of EU policies	(a)	46	2.04	0.759	3.209	0.077
	(b)	48	2.33	0.808		

Continued on the next page

zon 2020.' The private sector has an average of 2.79 and the public sector has an average of 3.04 for this claim. Results are presented within discriminatory analysis (Table 4).

Table 4 *Continued from the previous page*

Item		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
A good project title	(a)	46	2.39	0.649	0.525	0.471
	(b)	48	2.29	0.683		
A good project acronym	(a)	46	2.52	0.586	0.302	0.584
	(b)	48	2.58	0.498		
A well-written and designed excellence chapter	(a)	46	1.74	0.681	0.485	0.488
	(b)	48	1.83	0.630		
A well-written and designed impact chapter	(a)	46	1.78	0.664	5.718	0.019
	(b)	48	1.46	0.651		
A well-written and designed implementation chapter	(a)	46	1.78	0.728	1.140	0.288
	(b)	48	1.63	0.703		
A well-written abstract	(a)	46	1.87	0.749	1.099	0.297
	(b)	48	1.71	0.743		
Good project budget planning	(a)	46	2.00	0.596	0.090	0.765
	(b)	48	2.04	0.743		
A good use of visual marketing elements	(a)	46	2.13	0.749	2.005	0.160
	(b)	48	2.38	0.914		
A well-developed project idea	(a)	46	1.65	0.822	0.007	0.932
	(b)	48	1.67	0.808		

Notes Column/row headings are as follows: (1) *N*, (2) mean, (3) standard deviation, (4) *F*, (5) significance, (a) public organization, (b) private organization.

Descriptive Statistics for 'Partner Search Methods'

The claims that best describe the importance of the 'Partner search methods' variable are presented in Table 5, where their descriptive analysis is also presented.

In Table 5, for each claim, the average values of the estimates of claims are presented. The highest rating was obtained by the claim 'The most efficient way to search for a partner is through networking or partner search portals' (an average of 3.47). The agreement with the claim is medium high, since the middle of the scale is 3 (average 3.47). A little lower were the claims 'Networking or partner search portals are good places to search for good partners' (an average of 2.91); 'An efficient way to search for a partner is through networking or partner search portals' (an average of 2.85); 'Successful applicants search for project partners in the networking or partner search portals' (an average of 2.81); 'An efficient way to search for a partner is by looking among the already funded project coordinators or participants' (averages 2.68); 'Networking or partner search portals are useful for the formation of consortiums' (average 2.68); 'Successful applicants search for partners among the already funded project coordinators or participants' (an average of 2.57); 'An efficient way to search for a partner is through re-

Table 5 Partner Search Methods

Question	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Q2a: Successful applicants search for project partners in the networking or partner search portals.	94	1	4	2.81	0.737
Q2b: Networking or partner search portals are useful for the formation of consortiums.	94	2	5	2.68	0.626
Q2c: The most efficient way to search for a partner is through networking or partner search portals.	94	2	5	3.47	0.799
Q2d: Networking or partner search portals are good places to search for good partners.	94	2	5	2.91	0.713
Q2e: Successful applicants search for project partners through referrals.	94	1	4	2.17	0.785
Q2f: Successful applicants search for partners among the already funded project coordinators or participants.	94	1	4	2.57	0.647
Q2g: An efficient way to search for a partner is by looking among the already funded project coordinators or participants.	94	1	4	2.68	0.691
Q2h: An efficient way to search for a partner is through referrals.	94	1	4	2.34	0.727
Q2i: An efficient way to search for a partner is through networking or partner search portals.	94	2	5	2.85	0.718

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) *N*, (2) minimum, (3) maximum, (4) mean, (5) standard deviation.

ferrals' (an average of 2.34); and 'Successful applicants search for project partners through referrals' (an average of 2.17). The standard deviations of the claims range from 0.62 to 0.79, indicating a relatively medium dispersion of estimates. The standard deviation of 0.79 means that most of the respondents are in the range of ±0.79 of the estimate of the average and, given the fact that the scale is only five-level, this is relatively large.

The claims with the highest deviations between the public and private sectors are 'An efficient way to search for a partner is by looking among the already funded project coordinators or participants' (the difference in the average is 0.40), 'Networking or partner search portals are good places to search for good partners' (the difference in the average is 0.26), 'Successful applicants search for project partners through referrals' (the difference in the average is 0.33), 'Successful applicants search for partners among the already funded project coordinators or participants' (the difference in the average is 0.36). Results are presented within discriminatory analysis (Table 4). Based on the presented data calculated with discriminatory analysis, the test of equality of group means, in Table 4, with the variable 'Partner search methods:'

- Successful applicants search for project partners through referrals: The null hypothesis is rejected at a negligible significance level (Sig. = 0.039) and it is concluded that arithmetic means are not the same. Successful applicants search for partners among the already funded project coordinators or participants. The null hypothesis is rejected at a negligible significance level (Sig. = 0.007) and it is concluded that arithmetic means are not the same.
- An efficient way to search for a partner is by looking among the already funded project coordinators or participants: the null hypothesis is rejected at a negligible significance level (Sig. = 0.005) and it is concluded that arithmetic means are not the same.
- An efficient way to search for a partner is through referrals: the null hypothesis is rejected at a negligible significance level (Sig. = 0.029) and it is concluded that arithmetic means are not the same.

This means that the organization affects 'Successful applicants search for project partners through referrals,' 'Successful applicants search for partners among the already funded project coordinators or participants,' 'An efficient way to search for a partner is by looking among the already funded project coordinators or participants,' and 'An efficient way to search for a partner is through referrals.' A greater impact is observed in the private organization.

Descriptive Statistics for 'Proposal Design'

The claims that best describe the proposal design variable are presented in Table 6, where their descriptive analysis is also presented.

In Table 6, for each claim, the average values of the claims estimates are presented. The highest rating was obtained by the claim 'Visual graphic elements in the proposal affect the success of obtaining funding in Horizon 2020' (an average of 2.51). The agreement with the claim is medium low, since the middle of the scale is 3 (average 2.51). A little lower were the claims 'Typographical emphasis of keywords (keywords in italics, bolded or underlined) in the proposal is important' (average 2.15); 'Visual marketing elements (graphic data presentation, pictures, etc.) in the proposal affect the success in obtaining funding from Horizon 2020' (average 2.13); 'The layout/formatting of the proposal is important' (average of 2.04); and 'It is important to use keywords in the proposal (e.g. objective, aim)' (an average of 1.79). The standard deviations of the claims range from 0.65 to 0.74, indicating a relatively medium dispersion of estimates. The standard deviation of 0.74 means that most of the respondents are in the range of ± 0.74 of the estimate of the average and, given the fact that the scale is only five-level, this is relatively large.

Table 6 Proposal Design

Question	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Q3a: Visual marketing elements (graphic data presentation, pictures, etc.) in the proposal affect the success in obtaining funding from Horizon 2020.	94	1	4	2.13	0.707
Q3b: The layout/formatting of the proposal is important.	94	1	4	2.04	0.717
Q3c: Visual graphic elements in the proposal affect the success of obtaining funding in Horizon 2020.	94	1	4	2.51	0.744
Q3d: Typographical emphasis of keywords (keywords in italics, bolded or underlined) in the proposal is important.	94	1	4	2.15	0.687
Q3e: It is important to use keywords in the proposal (e.g. objective, aim).	94	1	3	1.79	0.654

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) *N*, (2) minimum, (3) maximum, (4) mean, (5) standard deviation.

The claim with the highest deviation between the public and private sectors is 'The layout/formatting of the proposal is important.' The private sector has an average of 2.22 and the public sector has an average of 1.88 for this claim. Based on the data calculated with discriminatory analysis – Test of Equality of Group Means in Table 4 with the variable 'Proposal design: The layout/formatting of the proposal is important,' the null hypothesis is rejected at a negligible significance level (Sig. = 0.020) and it is concluded that arithmetic means are not the same. This means that the organization affects 'Proposal design: The layout/formatting of the proposal is important.' A greater impact is in the public organization.

Descriptive Statistics for 'Financial Plan'

The claims that best describe the Financial plan variable are presented in Table 7, where their descriptive analysis is also presented.

In Table 7, for each claim, the average values of the estimates of claims are presented. The highest rating was obtained by the claim 'It is important to hire an organization for the design of the project's budget' (average 3.17). The agreement with the claim is medium, since the middle of the scale is 3 (average 3.17). A little lower were the claims 'Designing the project's budget with the help of an organization experienced in designing EU project budget is important' (an average of 2.74); 'It is advisable to search for a consultant for budget planning if you are not an experienced budget planner' (average 2.26); and 'Building a project's financial plan requires knowledge and experience' (an average of 1.74). The standard deviations of the claims range from 0.67 to 0.91, indicating a relatively medium dispersion of estimates.

Table 7 Financial Plan

Question	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Q4a: Building a project's financial plan requires knowledge and experience.	94	1	3	1.74	0.671
Q4b: It is important to hire an organization for the design of the project's budget.	94	1	5	3.17	0.838
Q4c: Designing the project's budget with the help of an organization experienced in designing EU project budget is important.	94	1	5	2.74	0.915
Q4d: It is advisable to search for a consultant for budget planning if you are not an experienced budget planner.	94	1	5	2.26	0.915

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) *N*, (2) minimum, (3) maximum, (4) mean, (5) standard deviation.

Table 8 EU Policies

Question	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Q5a: A good way to identify project ideas is to study EU policies.	94	1	4	2.34	0.784
Q5b: Reading EU policies before brainstorming for project ideas is a useful technique.	94	1	5	2.43	0.849
Q5c: Brainstorming for project ideas based on EU policies is an efficient method.	94	1	5	2.53	0.851
Q5d: It is useful to be well acquainted with EU policies before brainstorming for project ideas.	94	1	5	2.30	0.878

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) *N*, (2) minimum, (3) maximum, (4) mean, (5) standard deviation.

The standard deviation of 0.91 means that most of the respondents are in the range of ±0.91 of the estimate of the average and, given the fact that the scale is only five-level, this is relatively large.

Based on the data calculated with discriminatory analysis – test of equality of group means in Table 4, there are no significant deviations between the public and private sectors in the claims related to 'Financial plan.'

Descriptive Statistics for 'EU Policies'

The claims that best describe the European policies variables are presented in Table 8, where their descriptive analysis is also presented.

In Table 8, for each claim, the average values of the claims estimates are presented. The highest rating was obtained by the claim 'Brainstorming for project ideas based on EU's policies is an efficient method' (an average of 2.53). The agreement with the claim is medium low, since the middle of the scale is 3 (average 2.53). A little lower were the claims 'Reading EU's policies before brainstorming for project ideas is a useful technique' (an av-

Table 9 Success of a Project Proposal in H2020

Question	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Q6a: In my opinion, it is important to initially participate as a partner organization in EU projects for later success as an applicant in H2020.	94	1	5	2.49	0.992
Q6b: In my opinion, applicants should not look for project partners in networking or partner search portals in order to have their project approved in H2020.	94	1	4	2.77	0.754
Q6c: In my opinion, the design of the proposal with visual marketing elements affects the chances of project approval in H2020.	94	1	4	2.34	0.696
Q6d: In my opinion, the creation of the project's financial budget requires knowledge and experience in order for project approval in H2020.	94	1	4	2.11	0.725
Q6e: In my opinion, knowledge of EU policies affects the performance of applicants in H2020.	94	1	5	2.23	0.835

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) *N*, (2) minimum, (3) maximum, (4) mean, (5) standard deviation.

erage of 2.43); 'A good way to identify project ideas is to study EU's policies' (average 2.34); and 'It is useful to be well acquainted with EU's policies before brainstorming for project ideas' (average 2.30). The standard deviations of the claims range from 0.78 to 0.87, indicating a relatively medium dispersion of estimates. The standard deviation of 0.87 means that most of the respondents are in the range of ±0.87 of the estimate of the average and, given the fact that the scale is only five-level, this is relatively large.

Based on the data calculated with discriminatory analysis – test of equality of group means in Table 4, there are no significant deviations between the public and private sectors in the claims related to the 'EU policies.'

Descriptive Statistics for 'Success of a Project Proposal in H2020'

The claims that best describe 'Success of a project proposal in H2020' variables are presented in Table 9, where their descriptive analysis is also presented.

In Table 9, for each claim, the average values of the estimates of claims are presented. The highest rating was obtained by the claim 'In my opinion, applicants should not look for project partners in networking or partner search portals in order to have their project approved in H2020' (an average of 2.77). The agreement with the claim is medium low, since the middle of the scale is 3 (mean 2.77). A little lower were the claims, 'In my opinion, it is important to initially participate as a partner organization in EU projects for later success as an applicant in H2020' (an average of 2.49); 'In my opinion, the design of the proposal with visual marketing elements affects

Table 10 Importance of Individual Proposal Elements Process in H2020

Question	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Q7a: A good project idea.	94	1	3	1.36	0.602
Q7b: A good composition of the consortium.	94	1	5	1.87	0.870
Q7c: Good consortium partners.	94	1	5	1.96	0.879
Q7d: Good knowledge of EU policies.	94	1	5	2.19	0.793

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) *N*, (2) minimum, (3) maximum, (4) mean, (5) standard deviation.

the chances of project approval in H2020' (averagely 2.34); 'In my opinion, knowledge of EU's policies affects the performance of applicants in H2020' (an average of 2.23); and 'In my opinion, the creation of the project's financial budget requires knowledge and experience in order for project approval in H2020' (average 2.11). The standard deviations of the claims range from 0.69 to 0.99, indicating a relatively medium dispersion of estimates. The standard deviation of 0.99 means that most of the respondents are in the range of ±0.99 of the estimate of the average and, given the fact that the scale is only five-level, this is relatively large.

Based on the data calculated with discriminatory analysis – test of equality of group means in Table 4, there are no significant deviations between the public and private sectors in the claims related to the 'Success of a project proposal in H2020.'

Descriptive Statistics for the 'Importance of Individual Proposal Elements Process in H2020'

The claims that best describe 'Importance of individual proposal elements process in H2020' variables are presented in Table 10, where their descriptive analysis is also presented.

In Table 10, for each claim, the average values of the estimates of claims are presented. The highest rating was obtained by the claim 'Good knowledge of European policies is important among individual elements of the application process in H2020' (an average of 2.19). The agreement with the claim is medium low, since the middle of the scale is 3 (average 2.19). Slightly lower were the estimations of the claims 'Good consortium partners' (an average of 1.96), 'Good composition of the consortium' (average 1.87), and 'A good project idea' (an average of 1.36). The standard deviations of the claims range from 0.60 to 0.87, indicating a relatively medium dispersion of estimates. The standard deviation of 0.87 means that most of the respondents are in the range of ±0.87 of the estimate of the average and given, the fact that the scale is only five-level, this is relatively large.

The claim with the highest deviation between the public and private sectors is 'Good knowledge of EU's policies.' The private sector has an aver-

Table 11 Importance of Individual Elements of the Proposal Contents in H2020

Question	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Q8a: A good project title.	94	1	3	2.34	0.665
Q8b: A good project acronym.	94	2	4	2.55	0.541
Q8c: A well-written and designed excellence chapter.	94	1	3	1.79	0.654
Q8d: A well-written and designed impact chapter.	94	1	3	1.62	0.674
Q8e: A well-written and designed implementation chapter.	94	1	3	1.70	0.716
Q8f: A well-written abstract.	94	1	3	1.79	0.746
Q8g: Good project budget planning.	94	1	4	2.02	0.672
Q8h: A good use of visual marketing elements (e.g. graphs, tables, pictures, emphasis of keywords).	94	1	5	2.26	0.842

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) *N*, (2) minimum, (3) maximum, (4) mean, (5) standard deviation.

age of 2.33 and the public sector has an average of 2.04 for this claim. Based on the data calculated with discriminatory analysis – test of equality of group means in Table 4, with the variable 'Importance of individual elements: A well-written and designed impact chapter,' the null hypothesis is rejected at a negligible significance level (Sig. = 0.019) and it is concluded that arithmetic means are not the same. This means that the organization affects 'Importance of individual elements: A well-written and designed Impact Chapter.' A greater impact is in the public organization.

Descriptive Statistics for the 'Importance of Individual Elements of the Proposal Contents in H2020'

The claims that best describe the variables of the 'Importance of individual proposal elements application in Horizon 2020' are presented in Table 11, where their descriptive analysis is also presented.

In Table 11, for each claim, the average values of the claims estimates are presented. The highest rating in the 'Importance of individual elements of the proposal contents in H2020' was obtained by 'A good project acronym' (an average of 2.55). The agreement with the claim is medium low, since the middle of the scale is 3 (average 2.55). A little lower were estimates for the following claims 'Good project title' (average 2.34), 'Good use of visual marketing elements (e.g. graphs, tables, pictures, emphasis of key words)' (average 2.26), 'Good project budget planning' (average 2.02), 'Well-written and designed excellence chapter' (average 1.79), 'Well-written abstract' (average 1.79), 'Well-written and designed implementation chapter' (average 1.70), 'Well-written and designed impact chapter' (an average of 1.62). The standard deviations of the claims range from 0.54 to

Table 12 Calculation of the Cronbach Coefficient of Reliability

Item	α	*N*
Importance of experience in the successful acquisition of funding	0.842	8
Partner search methods	0.835	9
Proposal design	0.792	5
Financial plan	0.767	4
EU policies	0.909	4
Success of a project proposal in H2020	0.644	5
Importance of individual proposal elements process in H2020	0.834	4
Importance of individual elements of the proposal contents in H2020	0.828	9

0.84, indicating a relatively medium dispersion of estimates. The standard deviation of 0.84 means that most of the respondents are in the range of ±0.84 of the estimate of the average and, given the fact that the scale is only five-level, this is relatively large.

Based on the data calculated with discriminatory analysis – test of equality of group means in Table 4 there are no significant deviations between the public and private sectors in the claims related to the 'Importance of individual elements of the proposal contents in H2020.' The claim with the highest deviation between the public and private sectors is 'A good use of visual marketing elements (e.g. graphs, tables, pictures, emphasis of keywords).' The private sector has an average of 2.38 and the public sector has an average of 2.13 for this claim.

Analysis of the Reliability of the Questionnaire with the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient

The reliability of the questionnaire is the characteristic of the questionnaire that shows in repeated measurements the same results for the same measured characteristics, or the same persons; it relates to the question of how reliable the responses of the respondents are, i.e. the consistency of the answers. Cronbach alpha (α) measures the reliability of the questionnaire based on correlations between variables. When the differences in variability are very large, this is a sign of unreliable measurement (Šifrer & Bren, 2011, p. 34). With an additional analysis of the relationship between items and the overall result, we wanted to find out whether all the items contribute to the reliability of the test or if any of them diminish it. The scale is internally reliable when its items are well-correlated with the whole. If there is a weaker correlation between any of the items with the whole – when the value of its correlation coefficient is less than 0.3 – then it should be considered whether to eliminate the item from the test (Field, 2005, pp. 672–673).

Table 12 shows the calculation of the Cronbach α reliability coefficient.

Table 13 Correlation Coefficients between Each Item and All Items of the Questionnaire: Importance of Experience in the Successful Acquisition of Funding

Item	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Previous participation in EU projects as a partner organization is important for later success in receiving a project applied in H2020.	18.689	19.138	0.551	0.827
It is important for the applicant organization to first have experience as a consortium partner in EU projects.	18.578	18.719	0.611	0.819
An organization which has not yet cooperated in any EU projects has little chance as an applicant for its own project.	18.022	20.202	0.529	0.829
Only organizations that have already cooperated in EU projects can be successful when applying for their own projects.	17.222	21.298	0.424	0.840
Applicant's past experience in EU projects is important.	18.711	21.376	0.474	0.835
It is difficult for inexperienced newcomers to succeed in getting a project accepted in H2020.	18.133	19.173	0.606	0.819
Inexperienced newcomers have little chances when applying for Horizon 2020.	17.911	18.913	0.683	0.809
Initial participation as a consortium partner has a positive effect on the future performance as the applicant of an EU project.	18.333	18.427	0.720	0.804

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) scale mean if item deleted, (2) scale variance if item deleted, (3) corrected item-total correlation, (4) Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted.

The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the set of 'Application's success in H2020' claims is higher than 0.6, which confirms the variable reliability of the questionnaire. Cronbach Alpha for the set of 'EU policies' claims is above 0.90, which confirms excellent reliability. For other sets of questions, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient is between 0.79 and 0.85, which means the questionnaire has good reliability.

In Table 13, there is no correlation coefficient for the 'Importance of experience in the successful acquisition of funding' with a total score lower than 0.3. The total alpha is 0.842. In Table 13, all values must move around this common alpha, so we can confirm that this is a reliable questionnaire and no variables are excluded from further analysis.

In Table 14, there is no correlation coefficient for 'Partner search methods' with a total score lower than 0.3. The total alpha is 0.835. In Table 14, all values must move around this common alpha, so we can confirm that this is a reliable questionnaire and no variables are excluded from further analysis.

In Table 15, there is no correlation coefficient for 'Proposal design' with a total score lower than 0.3. The total alpha is 0.792. In Table 15, all values

Table 14 Correlation Coefficients between Each Item and All Questionnaire Items: Partner Search Methods

Item	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Successful applicants search for project partners in the networking or partner search portals.	21.681	13.639	0.696	0.800
Networking or partner search portals are useful for the formation of consortiums.	21.809	14.436	0.661	0.807
The most efficient way to search for a partner is through networking or partner search portals.	21.021	14.430	0.478	0.826
Networking or partner search portals are good places to search for good partners.	21.574	13.881	0.674	0.803
Successful applicants search for project partners through referrals.	22.319	15.230	0.347	0.841
Successful applicants search for partners among the already funded project coordinators or participants.	21.915	15.046	0.499	0.822
An efficient way to search for a partner is by looking among the already funded project coordinators or participants.	21.809	14.436	0.582	0.813
An efficient way to search for a partner is through referrals.	22.149	15.440	0.351	0.839
An efficient way to search for a partner is through networking or partner search portals.	21.638	13.911	0.662	0.804

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) scale mean if item deleted, (2) scale variance if item deleted, (3) corrected item-total correlation, (4) Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted.

Table 15 Correlation Coefficients between Each Item and all Questionnaire Items: Proposal Design

Item	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Visual marketing elements (graphic data presentation, pictures, etc.) in the proposal affect the success in obtaining funding from Horizon 2020.	8.489	4.253	0.680	0.716
The lathe grant writert/formatting of the proposal is important.	8.574	5.064	0.358	0.819
Visual graphic elements in the proposal affect the success of obtaining funding in Horizon 2020.	8.106	4.096	0.692	0.710
Typographical emphasis of keywords (keywords in italics, bolded or underlined) in the proposal is important.	8.468	4.682	0.531	0.765
It is important to use keywords in the proposal (e.g. objective, aim).	8.830	4.573	0.620	0.739

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) scale mean if item deleted, (2) scale variance if item deleted, (3) corrected item-total correlation, (4) Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted.

must move around this common alpha, so we can confirm that this is a reliable questionnaire and no variables are excluded from further analysis.

In Table 16, there is no correlation coefficient for 'Financial plan' with a

Table 16 Correlation Coefficients between Each Item and all Items of the Questionnaire: Financial Plan

Item	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Building a project's financial plan requires knowledge and experience.	8.170	5.132	0.354	0.805
It is important to hire an organization for the design of the project's budget.	6.745	4.106	0.545	0.724
Designing the project's budget with the help of an organization experienced in designing EU project budget is important.	7.170	3.455	0.696	0.636
It is advisable to search for a consultant for budget planning if you are not an experienced budget planner.	7.660	3.453	0.697	0.636

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) scale mean if item deleted, (2) scale variance if item deleted, (3) corrected item-total correlation, (4) Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted.

Table 17 Correlation Coefficients between Each Item and All Items of the Questionnaire: EU Policies

Item	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
A good way to identify project ideas is to study EU policies.	7.255	5.138	0.883	0.853
Reading EU policies before brainstorming for project ideas is a useful technique.	7.170	4.831	0.895	0.845
Brainstorming for project ideas based on EU policies is an efficient method.	7.064	5.480	0.673	0.924
It is useful to be well acquainted with EU policies before brainstorming for project ideas.	7.298	5.158	0.743	0.901

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) scale mean if item deleted, (2) scale variance if item deleted, (3) corrected item-total correlation, (4) Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted.

total score lower than 0.3. The total alpha is 0.762. In Table 16, all values must move around this common alpha, so we can confirm that this is a reliable questionnaire and no variables are excluded from further analysis.

In Table 17, there is no correlation coefficient for 'EU policies' with a total score lower than 0.3. The total alpha is 0.909. In Table 17, all values must move around this common alpha, so we can confirm that this is a reliable questionnaire and no variables are excluded from further analysis.

Table 18 shows the correlation coefficient of 'Success of a project proposal in H2020' with the variable 'In my opinion, applicants should not look for project partners in networking or partner search portals in order to have their project approved in H2020.' Since the correlation coefficient is below 0.3, we have to exclude this variable from further analysis. The total alpha is 0.644, so in Table 18 all values must move around this common alpha.

In Table 19, there is no correlation coefficient for the 'Importance of individual proposal elements process in Horizon 2020' with a total score lower

Table 18 Correlation Coefficients between Each Item and All Items of the Questionnaire: Success of a Project Proposal in H2020

Item	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
In my opinion, it is important to initially participate as a partner organization in EU projects for later success as an applicant in H2020.	9.447	4.293	0.353	0.626
In my opinion, applicants should not look for project partners in networking or partner search portals in order to have their project approved in H2020.	9.170	5.734	0.118	0.707
In my opinion, the design of the proposal with visual marketing elements affects the chances of project approval in H2020.	9.596	5.405	0.259	0.649
In my opinion, the creation of the project's financial budget requires knowledge and experience in order for project approval in H2020.	9.830	4.315	0.626	0.488
In my opinion, knowledge of EU's policies affects the performance of applicants in H2020.	9.702	3.695	0.727	0.408

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) scale mean if item deleted, (2) scale variance if item deleted, (3) corrected item-total correlation, (4) Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted.

Table 19 Correlation Coefficients between Each Item and All Items of the Questionnaire: Importance of Individual Proposal Elements Process in Horizon 2020

Item	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
A good project idea.	6.021	5.311	0.382	0.890
A good composition of the consortium.	5.511	3.306	0.843	0.700
Good consortium partners.	5.426	3.301	0.833	0.705
Good knowledge of EU policies.	5.191	4.070	0.635	0.803

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) scale mean if item deleted, (2) scale variance if item deleted, (3) corrected item-total correlation, (4) Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted.

than 0.3. The total alpha is 0.834. In Table 19, all values must move around this common alpha, so we can confirm that this is a reliable questionnaire and no variables are excluded from further analysis.

The total alpha is 0.828. In Table 20, all values must move around this common alpha, so we can confirm that this is a reliable questionnaire and no variables are excluded from further analysis.

Conclusions

Horizon 2020 is the EU programme that offers funding for research and innovation projects. Investing in such projects (as the EU leaders have agreed) in turn secures a smart, sustainable and inclusive economic growth. The programme covers all the stages from basic research to market penetration. The investment instrument's main goals are strengthening Europe's global competitiveness, making it the best in the world-class science, eliminating obstacles that hinder innovations to get quickly in the market and

Table 20 Correlation Coefficients between Each Item and All Items of the Questionnaire: Importance of Individual Elements of the Proposal Contents in H2020

Item	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
A good project title.	15.383	15.981	0.145	0.853
A good project acronym.	15.170	15.713	0.276	0.837
A well-written and designed excellence chapter.	15.936	13.566	0.664	0.800
A well-written and designed impact chapter.	16.106	13.472	0.660	0.800
A well-written and designed implementation chapter.	16.021	13.010	0.710	0.792
A well-written abstract.	15.936	13.351	0.603	0.805
Good project budget planning.	15.702	13.330	0.695	0.796
A good use of visual marketing elements (e.g. graphs, tables, pictures, emphasis of key words).	15.468	13.284	0.521	0.817
A well developed project idea.	16.064	13.136	0.578	0.808

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) scale mean if item deleted, (2) scale variance if item deleted, (3) corrected item-total correlation, (4) Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted.

changing the way in which the public and private sectors work together. We can conclude that, in order for a potential applicant to succeed with the application, it is advisable to hire an expert to develop the financial projection if the applicant is not experienced in this. Secondly, it is useful to know the EU policies. Thirdly, when designing the project proposal one should keep in mind that the visual aspect of the proposal is important. In addition, past experience in EU projects is relevant but not vital. Lastly, the most efficient way to find partners is through networking, referrals and the already selected project coordinators, not through partner search portals. In the research, we combined several constructs to study the determinants of the Application's success in Horizon 2020, thereby contributing to science and development.

We assumed that the analysis selected and the size of the sample would be sufficient to detect significant common features and relationships if they existed in the population. Once the analysis was complete, we assumed that the results were generalizable beyond the sample being studied. The limitation was the lack of existing research addressing this topic. Having reviewed the existing research in the databases, we came to the conclusion that there were no Slovenian scientists dealing with the general topics addressed in this paper (however, there were a lot of foreign ones) and not many scientific articles and dissertations touching directly upon the winning approach to applying for Horizon 2020. This was not surprising since this paper covered a program that only came into existence in 2014. The next limitation was the number of responses to the questionnaire. We sent the questionnaire to the existing Slovenian and Italian beneficiary organizations (approximately 900 e-mails) from Horizon 2020. The list of these benefi-

ciaries was published on the program's website. We hoped for a response rate of at least 17%, which would enable us to obtain a sample of 160 responses. Because the initial response rate was not as expected, we offered our books in exchange for completing the survey. After this, the response rate to our request improved significantly. Many respondents appreciated the gift and thanked us for it and some even expressed their willingness to participate in a qualitative research, if needed. The quantitative survey thus resulted in 94 valid questionnaires. We removed 112 questionnaires, as they were not fully answered. The sample of quantitative research was thus $N = 94$, represented by public and private organizations participating in the calls for Horizon 2020.

Research on the determinants of the Application's success in Horizon 2020 should be seen as a positive step towards explaining the most important factors that can influence the success of getting a project funded by the Horizon 2020 program. We recommend grant writers to take into account the determinants of the Application's success in Horizon 2020, as this will increase the applicant's chances of getting a project funded by Horizon 2020 program.

References

Department of Business, Enterprise and Innovation. (2016, 15 June). Minister Halligan highlights benefits to companies of participation in Horizon 2020 funding programme. Retrieved from https://www.djei.ie/en/News-And-Events/Department-News/2016/June/15062016.html

Destro, G. (2014, 9 December). How to apply to Horizon 2020, successfully. Retrieved from http://www.scienceonthenet.eu/content/article/giacomo-destro/how-apply-horizon-2020-successfully/december-2014

Dressel, K. (2013, 6 August). *Horizon2020YourViews.* Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o65Nd1vMzlk

Fabbro, B. D., Berovic, R., & Bartol, A. (2016). *How to write a winning H2020 Proposal: SME Instrument Phase 1; Manual for applicants and consultants.* N.p.: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

Field, A. P. (2005). *Discovering statistic using SPSS* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage.

Garetti, M. (2013, 27 November). *Horizon2020YourViews.* Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CnYRgsQlvJU

Grobelnik, M. (2007). Kako napisati dober projektni predlog in prijavo. Retrieved from http://videolectures.net/dzpp07_grobelnik_knd/?q=evropski%20projekti

Guasch, J. (2013, 28 November). *Horizon2020YourViews.* Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kH5BlKjvqSA

Hoffmann, M. (2015). *How to write effective EU proposals: A practical guide on getting funding for Horizon 2020.* N.p.: CreateSpace Publishing Platform.

Horizon 2020. (2012). *Nature Materials, 11*(6), 477.

Malhotra, N. K., & Birks, D. F. (2003). *Marketing research: An applied approach.* Harlow, England: Prentice Hall-Financial Times.

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

Šifrer, J., & Bren, M. (2011). *SPSS: multivarnantne metode v varstvoslovju.* Ljubljana, Slovenia: Fakulteta za varnostne vede.

Vavra, T. G. (1997). *Improving your measurement of customer satisfaction: A guide to creating, conducting, analyzing and reporting customer satisfaction measurement programs.* Milwaukee, WI: ASQ Press.

Urška Vidmar is a Professor at the Education Centre PET, Slovenia, where she lectures Business English at the vocational college. Her research interests include the areas of ELT, ESL, linguistics, marketing and project management. She is an author of several books published in four different languages. *vidmar_urska@hotmail.com*

Tina Vukasović is an Associate Professor at the International School for Social and Business Studies Celje and at Doba Business School Maribor, Slovenia. Her research interests include the areas of marketing. She is an author and coauthor of papers published in scientific journals and paper presented at scientific conferences. *tina.vukasovic@mfdps.si*