

## **European Sport Management Quarterly**

### **Response to Plan S**

Feedback from Editorial Board members on Plan S.

- 1) Under Plan S there appears to be an assumption that funding is available to pay for publication either through:
  - a. Funded research
  - b. University's meeting the cost.

This raises a very real and genuine concern for colleagues.

- a. The vast majority of sport management research is not funded like the natural sciences and so publication fees are unlikely to be met by this route and, moreover, some funding streams stemming from non-public agencies are unlikely to meet open access costs.
- b. The view is that it is also extremely unlikely that host universities of staff will meet these costs directly. Moreover, as recipients of public funding, they might better seek to account for the use of staff time in research and scholarly activity through peer -review and publication etc, thereby influencing strategic research priorities for the institution and, ultimately staff. These constraints might affect younger staff more.

Some colleagues feel very strongly, therefore, that the lack of funds for open access could considerably hamper their research activities, profile and targets for, and impact from, publication (see also below). A 'Matthew effect' might develop in which particular forms of research are privileged and that well-resourced colleagues and institutions benefit at the expense of others.

- 2) There is strong and broad ethical support, however, for the principle that the public funding of research, either directly to research projects, or indirectly through university staff resourcing of time etc. justifies open access to research outputs.