

Comparison of sports policies of the republic of Türkiye and the USA (2017-2022)**Tayfun KARA¹** ¹Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Kahramanmaraş, Türkiye**Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article****DOI: 10.70736/jrolss.1782**Gönderi Tarihi/ Received:
28.05.2025Kabul Tarih/ Accepted:
19.09.2025Online Yayın Tarihi/ Published:
30.09.2025**Abstract**

The need to understand how different governance models influence the effectiveness of national sports systems necessitated a comparative analysis of the sports policies of Türkiye and the United States for the period 2017-2022. This study examines sports policies across the themes of governance, financing, participation, legislation, facility infrastructure, and education. A mixed qualitative-quantitative method was employed, and a policy congruence index was developed using G₁-G₁₂ indicators based on the Council of Europe's S4 framework and OECD thematic areas. Data were collected from open-access sources including the Official Gazette, Court of Accounts, USOPC, CDC, and NCAA. The analysis revealed that despite the decentralized nature of the U.S. system, it achieves high levels of participation and club membership; whereas Türkiye, despite its centralized structure and strong legal and financial frameworks, exhibits structural inefficiencies due to low participation and limited club activity. Türkiye demonstrates strengths in infrastructure and coaching, while the U.S. surpasses in facility access and flexible participation models. In conclusion, while Türkiye's centralized model ensures institutional coherence, it struggles to transform sports into a widespread cultural practice; conversely, the U.S., through cultural and pedagogical integration, maintains a more effective profile in engaging individuals in sport despite its fragmented structure.

Keywords: Sports Policy, Governance, Sports Participation, Financing Models, Comparative Analysis***Türkiye Cumhuriyeti ve ABD spor politikalarının karşılaştırılması (2017-2022)*****Öz**

Farklı yönetim modellerinin ulusal spor sistemlerinin etkinliğini nasıl etkilediğini anlamaya duyulan ihtiyaç, Türkiye ve ABD'nin 2017-2022 dönemine ait spor politikalarının karşılaştırmalı olarak analiz edilmesini gerekli kılmıştır. Bu çalışmada yönetim, finansman, katılım, mevzuat, tesis altyapısı ve eğitim temaları temelinde spor politikaları incelenmiştir. Karma nitel-nicel yöntemle oluşturulan çalışmada, Avrupa Konseyi S4 çerçevesi ve OECD tematik alanları esas alınarak G₁-G₁₂ göstergeleriyle bir politika uyum indeksi geliştirilmiştir. Veriler Resmi Gazete, Sayıştay, USOPC, CDC ve NCAA gibi açık kaynaklardan elde edilmiştir. Analiz sonuçları, ABD'nin adem-i merkeziyetçi yapısına rağmen yüksek katılım ve kulüp üyeliği oranlarına ulaştığını; Türkiye'nin ise merkeziyetçi sistemine ve güçlü yasal-finansal altyapısına karşın düşük spor katılımı ve sınırlı kulüp etkinliği ile yapısal verimsizlik sergilediğini göstermektedir. Türkiye tesisleşme ve antrenörlükte güçlü görünmekte, ABD ise tesis erişimi ve katılımı destekleyen esnek modellerde üstündür. Sonuç olarak, Türkiye'nin merkezi yapısı kurumsal bütünlük sağlasa da sporun toplumsal bir kültüre dönüşümünde yetersiz kalmakta; ABD ise parçalı yapısına rağmen kültürel ve pedagojik uyumla bireyleri spora katma kapasitesinde daha etkili bir profil sergilemektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Spor Politikası, Yönetişim, Spor Katılımı, Finansman Modelleri, Karşılaştırmalı Analiz**Sorumlu Yazar/ Corresponded Author:** Tayfun KARA, **E-posta/ e-mail:** tayfun-kara@hotmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Sports are considered an important element in social life and international prestige. In countries with different administrative and cultural structures, such as the Republic of Türkiye and the United States of America (USA), sports policies are shaped in line with the priorities and approaches of the states. In Türkiye, the state has a central and effective position in sports management. The top management of sports is directly carried out by the Ministry of Youth and Sports (GSB); the country's sports are directed through the general directorates and sports federations affiliated to the ministry ([Sunay, 2019](#)). In recent years, the structure of the sports organization in Türkiye remains under state control, but the federations are managed by granting certain autonomy. For example, the football federation has an autonomous status, but in general, the federations operate under the coordination of the GSB ([Ak, 2017](#)). After 2018, legal regulations were made in sports management within the framework of the new management system in Türkiye. The Sports Clubs and Sports Federations Law No. 7405, which entered into force in April 2022, redefined the establishment and operating principles of sports clubs and federations, enabling clubs to become corporatized and increasing financial control. During the same period, changes were made in the management of school sports; the Turkish School Sports Federation, which was established as an autonomous federation in 2005, was closed on June 8, 2023 and its activities were directly transferred to the GSB (General Directorate of Sports Services). In the USA, the governance structure of sports is different from Türkiye, and there is no independent sports ministry or similar central administrative unit at the federal level; the government adopts a “non-interventionist” approach to sports, and sports are largely left to the initiative of the free market and civil society ([Harris, & Jedlicka, 2020](#)). The sports ecosystem in the USA consists of three main branches: (1) professional sports leagues, (2) university sports, and (3) inter-school (high school level) sports competitions ([Sunay, 2019:493](#)). Within this sports ecosystem, professional leagues (NBA, NFL, MLB) are organized by the private sector, while amateur and Olympic sports are governed by the United States Olympic and Paralympic Committee (USOPC), which gained autonomous status with the Ted Stevens Amateur Sports Act of 1978, and its affiliated national sports federations. Although the federal government does not directly manage sports, it has assumed some regulatory roles in recent years. For example, with the Safe Sport Act enacted in 2017, the US SafeSport Center was established under the umbrella of the USOPC in order to protect young athletes, and supervision over sports organizations has increased ([Geurin & Lough, 2019](#)). There is a significant difference in approaches between Türkiye and the USA regarding the

financing of sports. In Türkiye, the state has a significant share in the financing of sports. The resources allocated to sports from the central budget every year are used in the form of facility investments, infrastructure projects, and financial support for federations. The financing of amateur sports is largely provided by the public; While direct financial aid is provided to sports federations, indirect support is provided to the autonomous football federation through Spor Toto revenues and tax reductions. In Türkiye, the state encourages the private sector to finance sports through tax incentives as well as direct budget expenditures. With the arrangements made in the corporate tax and income tax legislation, sports sponsorship expenses have been made tax deductible at certain rates. In the USA, sports financing is largely based on market dynamics and private resources. Federal or state governments tend not to provide direct financial support to amateur sports, a non-interventionist policy is followed in the financing of sports, and the free market economy remains valid (Ruseski & Razavilar, 2013). While professional sports leagues are financed entirely by private sector investments, broadcast revenues, ticket sales, and sponsorships, university sports are largely funded by school budgets, broadcast agreements, and donations. The USOPC, which operates in the field of Olympic and amateur sports, does not receive any regular financial support from the federal government, and is financed by sponsorships, fundraisers, and broadcast revenues. For example, according to 2022 data, approximately 50% of the US Olympic team budget was provided by sponsors, 37% by broadcast (television) revenues, and 12% by public fundraisers; the state contribution is 0%. However, in the USA, budgets are allocated for the construction and maintenance of public sports areas such as parks, walking and bicycle paths, and municipal sports centers at the local government level. Again, school physical education programs and school team expenses are largely covered by local education budgets and mechanisms such as school family associations. Although in some cases, local governments provide indirect support to professional teams through tax breaks or bonds for stadium construction, this situation is addressed within the framework of economic development programs rather than sports policy (Yıldırım, 2022).

This study aims to comparatively examine the role and governance structure of the state, sports financing and public investments, integration of sports into the education system, private sector and NGO collaborations, elite athlete training policies and Olympic successes, and mass sports promotion and social participation dimensions in the context of sports policies in Türkiye and the USA. The review will include reliable academic sources and official reports, and aims to reveal the similarities and differences in the sports field of both countries.

METHOD

This study was designed as a qualitative-quantitative mixed comparative policy analysis. The aim is to compare the legal-administrative regulations, institutional structures and financing models of the USA and Türkiye in the field of sports using the same indicator set and to reveal their strengths and weaknesses. The analysis was conducted based on the legislation in force until June 2025 and official/open source statistics. The indicators for the indicator set and conceptual framework were coded as (G₁–G₁₂), and the details regarding the coding are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Presentation of the study indicators

Code	Indicator	Operational Definition	Scale
G ₁	Sports Participation	Proportion of 15+ population engaging in sports ≥1 time annually	%
G ₂	Club Membership	Proportion of population registered in official sports clubs	%
G ₃	Number of Sports Clubs	Clubs per capita (1 per 10,000 people)	Count
G ₄	Authorized Institutions	Existence of ≥ national/local new institutions in sports management	Binary (Yes/No)
G ₅	Sports Laws	Number of general/specific sports-related laws	Count
G ₆	Sports Master Plans	Existence and year of national strategy/action plans	Binary + Year
G ₇	National Sports Budget	Ratio of central sports budget to GDP	%
G ₈	Sports Incentive Budget	Proportion of grants/subsidies for clubs/facilities	%
G ₉	Major Sports Institutions & Budget	Budget of IOC/USOPC/TMF, etc. (USD)	\$
G ₁₀	Sports Facilities	Indoor/outdoor facilities per capita (1 per 100,000 people)	Count
G ₁₁	Coaching Certificate Programs	Number of distinct national-level certification stages	Count
G ₁₂	Safety & Service Policies	Existence of an integrated approach to safety-security-service (S4)	Binary (Yes/No)

The selection of indicators was made by intersecting the Council of Europe’s Integrated Safety-Security-Service (S4) approach and the OECD-MINEPS IV thematic areas. The presentation of data sources is given in Table 2.

Table 2. Presentation of data sources

Source Group	Documents / Datasets Used	Access Method
International Comparative Dataset	SSF “Japan’s Data plus Sports” series → country tables and data for Türkiye from the Ministry of Youth and Sports	https://www.ssf.or.jp/en/features/japans_data_plus_sports/
Turkish Legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Law No. 7405 on Sports Clubs and Federations (Official Gazette, 26/04/2022, No. 31821) • Law No. 6222 on the Prevention of Violence in Sports (14/04/2011, No. 27905) • Laws No. 3289, 5602, 5188 • “Regulation on Violence in Sports” (28/08/2004, No. 25567) 	Archive search in the Official Gazette (keywords: “sports”, “violence”, “club”, “budget”) via resmigazete.gov.tr
US Legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title IX, Pub.L. 92-318 (20 U.S.C. §§ 1681–1688) • S.534 Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and SafeSport Act (2017) 	congress.gov , Federal Register, USCode.gov

Source Group	Documents / Datasets Used	Access Method
Finance / Key Figures	• Ted Stevens Olympic & Amateur Sports Act (36 U.S.C. §220501)	usopc.org, sayistay.gov.tr, gsb.gov.tr
	• USOPC 2022 Form-990 (budget: USD 479 million)	
	• Turkish Court of Accounts Report 2022, Parliamentary Budget Proposals • Spor Toto audit reports (2020–2022)	
Participation / Club Statistics	• CDC “National Health Interview Survey – Leisure-time Physical Activity” • GSB Sports Information System (SBS) 2024 club and license data	data.cdc.gov, sgb.gsb.gov.tr

* Due to the structure of the USA divided into federal and state levels, national averages in the SSF data set were taken as the main reference, and US Census & ASPEN Project Play statistics were used under the heading of missing facility numbers.

Data collection process

Legislation scanning

In Türkiye, the Legislation Information System and the Official Gazette archive were scanned with the keywords “sports”, “violence”, “security”, “facility” for the period 2000-2024.

In the USA, sports-focused regulations in the Federal Register and U.S. Code were compiled.

In both countries, activity reports for the last five years (2019-2023) were examined for national Olympic/Paralympic committees, non-ministerial sports institutions and independent federations, and top-down (budget documents) and bottom-up (institution declarations) checks were made for consistency.

Statistical indicators

For participation and club data, the Sports Information System (e-Government) was used in Türkiye and the SSF data set was used in the USA. Missing items (e.g. number of coach certificates) were collected from official federation databases

Data validation and coding

All documents were coded independently by two researchers; in case of discrepancies, the researcher re-checked visually. Quantitative indicators were converted to thematic codes (G₄, G₁₂) in MS Excel; qualitative legislation articles were converted to thematic codes (G₄, G₁₂) using the NVivo-content analysis method.

Data analysis

- Descriptive Statistics: Mean, ratio and per capita values were calculated for G₁–G₃, G₇–G₁₀.
- Policy Conformity Index: For each indicator, country scores were converted to a 0–2 scale (0 = absent/insufficient, 1 = partial, 2 = complete), creating a composite index of 24 points in total.
- Content Analysis: Turkish and US legislation texts were coded according to the Security-Safety-Service theme; a similarity-difference matrix was created.
- Triangulation: Policy gaps were identified by cross-reading quantitative scores with qualitative findings.

Ethics and limitations

The study is not subject to ethics committee approval as it only uses open access and/or public documents. The most important limitations are the heterogeneity of the US data between states and the fact that club data in Türkiye is not kept in a single center. The SSF dataset is up to 2021; since 2022-24 updates are not available, the relevant indicators were interpreted cross-sectionally instead of trend analysis.

FINDINGS

The presentation of findings by theme is given in Table 3.

Table 3. Comparison of Türkiye-USA Sports Policies According to G₁–G₁₂ Indicators

Code	Indicator	USA	Türkiye	Score USA (0–2)	Score TR (0–2)	Remarks / Critical Notes
G ₁	Sport Participation	24.2% of adults meet both aerobic and muscle-strength criteria	88% of adults do not exercise regularly ⇒ active ≈ 12%	1	0	1 in 4 U.S. adults meet minimum activity threshold. In Türkiye, only 3% engage in ≥5 hrs/week of sports — low participation.
G ₂	Club Membership Rate	64.2 million memberships ≈ 19% population	Less than ≈ 5%	2	0	Extensive school-club integration in the USA. Türkiye shows increase in licenses, but actual club participation remains limited.
G ₃	Number of Sports Clubs (per capita)	31,028 health clubs ≈ 93 per 1 million	25,930 clubs ≈ 305 per 1 million	1	2	Türkiye leads in club density; however, most are small-scale amateur clubs with limited budgets.

Code	Indicator	USA	Türkiye	Score USA (0–2)	Score TR (0–2)	Remarks / Critical Notes
G ₄	Governing Institutions	HHS + USOPC + State Sport Departments (fragmented)	Ministry of Youth and Sports (GSB) + 81 provincial units + semi-autonomous federations	1	2	Centralized structure in Türkiye supports policy consistency; fragmented federal-state division in the USA limits coherence.
G ₅	Sports Laws	Title IX (1972), SafeSport Act (2017); no overarching federal sports law	Law 7405 (2022), Law 6222 (2011/2019), Law 3289, etc.	1	2	Türkiye has comprehensive legal framework for clubs, federations, and safety.
G ₆	Strategic Sports Plans	<i>Healthy People 2030, Active People, Healthy Nation</i>	National Youth & Sports Policy (2019 rev.), 11th Development Plan, 2024–28 GSB Plan	2	2	Both countries have up-to-date strategy documents; Türkiye includes more detailed performance targets.
G ₇	National Sports Budget (% GDP)	No single federal sports budget; fragmented across USOPC, NIH, state programs	Approx. 327 million CAD ≈ 0.07% of GDP	0	1	No centralized sports budget in the USA; Türkiye provides a modest but traceable budget share.
G ₈	Sports Incentive Budget	Sponsorship/donations ≈ 269.2 million USD (2021)	Spor Toto & sponsorship ≥ 10 billion TL (≈ 400 million USD)	1	2	Türkiye leverages lottery funds as a significant public incentive tool; USA relies on private sector.
G ₉	Major Sports Institutions' Budgets	USOPC: 479 million USD	TMOK ≈ 25–30 million TL + individual federations	2	1	USOPC's Olympic funding far exceeds Türkiye's scattered and smaller federation budgets.
G ₁₀	Sports Facilities	No official total; estimated ≥250,000 facilities	4,500 large + 10,000+ local facilities	2	1	The USA has better facility-to-population ratio; Türkiye has grown rapidly in the last decade but faces access and quality gaps.
G ₁₁	Coach Certification Programs	NCAA, USTA, USA Basketball etc. – no centralized system; quality varies	SHGM + federations implement tiered certification; 270k licensed coaches	1	2	Türkiye offers a national framework with mandatory licensing; USA suffers from inconsistent standards due to commercialization.
G ₁₂	Safety & Service Policy (S4)	SafeSport Act + state regulations; stadium safety delegated to clubs	Law 6222 + e-ticketing (Passolig) + district safety boards	1	2	Türkiye enforces S4 framework at legal level; USA uses sector-based, decentralized approaches.

As can be seen in Table 3, while the USA has a relatively more positive outlook in terms of sports participation rates with one quarter of the adult population meeting the minimum

physical activity level, the fact that the number of people who do regular sports in Türkiye is quite low can be considered a serious public health problem. Therefore, it shows that physical activity should be supported as a social reflex rather than an individual habit for Türkiye. An interesting picture emerges in the comparison of club participation and the number of infrastructure: While the USA can integrate individuals into the sports culture at an earlier age with its widespread school and club ecosystem, Türkiye has more sports clubs compared to its population, but the vast majority of these clubs have small budgets and are at a low impact level. This shows that institutional diversity does not always mean effectiveness. While Türkiye's centralized structure in terms of institutional structuring allows sports policies to be carried out from a single source and in a more holistic manner, the federal system in the USA weakens the consistency of policies. In addition to Table 3, a comparison of the two countries in terms of legal regulations is provided in Table 4.

Table 4. Legal Basis of the USA-Türkiye

Theme Code	Country	Primary Law / Legislation	Official Gazette / Federal Register No.
Legislation (Gs)	USA	Title IX (Education Amendments)	20 U.S.C. § 1681–1688, 1972
		Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse & Safe Sport Act (2017)	Pub.L. 115-126
	Türkiye	Law No. 6222 on the Prevention of Violence in Sports	Official Gazette No. 27905 (April 14, 2011)
		Law No. 7405 on Sports Clubs and Federations	Official Gazette No. 31823 (April 26, 2022)
		Law No. 3289 on Youth and Sports Services	Official Gazette No. 19217 (May 21, 1986)

When Table 3 and Table 4 are evaluated together, Türkiye's sports laws and security legislation strengthen the legal framework of the system, but the effectiveness of this framework in practice should be questioned. In terms of planning sports policies, both countries have up-to-date strategic documents, but Türkiye's more detailed definition of performance criteria provides an advantage in terms of traceability. In terms of budgeting, the dispersed structure of the US system brings a market-based approach to the forefront rather than a general sports policy framework, while budget support provided by centralized tools such as games of chance funds in Türkiye offers a higher financial leverage. However, transparency in the distribution and use of such funds is not always seen as reassuring in terms of public interest. In terms of infrastructure and human resources, while the US stands out with the number and variety of

facilities, Türkiye's rapid facility development process has not yet become widespread enough in terms of public access. In terms of coaching and education programs, while Türkiye's national framework shows systematic progress, the dispersed standards in the US are striking. It is seen that Türkiye offers a more systematic framework institutionally in terms of its centralized structure and legal regulations, but lags behind the USA in terms of implementation capacity and participant diversity. Despite its systemic disorganization, the USA has been able to create a broad-based sports culture thanks to the more deep-rooted place of sports in individual and social life. When we look at the numerical data, we see that while one in every four adults in the USA fully meets the health guidelines, in Türkiye there are individuals who do not do sports at all, with regular intensive participation of around 3%. When we examine the club & facility infrastructure numerically, while there are $\approx 40,000$ private sector-based health clubs in the USA, it is seen that there are $\approx 26,000$ (mostly amateur-based) clubs and 4,470 public facilities in Türkiye. In terms of coaches and trained manpower, we see that there are approximately 274 thousand certified coaches in Türkiye, and a ratio of 1:41 professional trainers per licensed athlete. Since national consolidated numbers are not kept in the USA, a clear measurement cannot be provided. Although there is no special sports budget at the Federal level in the USA, the 2022 income of the USOPC, which is the main backbone of sports funding, is 297,000,000 USD.* In Türkiye, the GSB budget is central and the final budget for the 2022 fiscal year is 48,709,102,320.13 TL and was 18,778.00 TL = 1 USD in 2022. In this context, the total allocation of the GSB in Türkiye is 2,593,945,165 USD (Sayıştay, 2022).†

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The most up-to-date comprehensive data on the participation of children and adolescents in organized sports activities in the USA was obtained from the National Health Interview Survey for 2020; according to this data, 54.1% of the 6–17 age group stated that they participated in organized sports in the last 12 months. In the analyses conducted with family income, it was determined that the participation rate was 70.2% in income groups above 400% of the federal poverty level, and decreased to 50.8% in groups below this level (Black et al, 2022:2). In addition, the participation rate decreased to 44.5% in regions with a high socioeconomic vulnerability index, and was measured as 61.4% in low vulnerability (Abildso et al, 2023:86). The Disparities in Youth Sports Participation study, which examined the 2017–

* https://www.ssf.or.jp/en/features/japans_data_plus_sports/ Access :15.04.2025

† <https://www.sayistay.gov.tr/reports/download/47o8yxDgy6-genclik-ve-sporbakanligi#:~:text=,1%2C61%27ine%20tekab%C3%BCI> Access: 12.04.2025

2018 period, calculated the participation rate as 55–57% among 6–17 year olds; In terms of gender, it was revealed that boys (56.1%) participated more than girls (52.1%); white, children with higher education family opportunities were involved in sports activities at a higher rate. In the analysis conducted using Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBS) data between 2011 and 2019, it was seen that the overall sports participation rate decreased from 58.4% to 57.4%; however, this decrease was significant for the 10th and 12th grades, while an increase was observed in the 11th grade (Deng & Fan, 2022). When we look at Türkiye, the Başakşehir Municipality sports schools research conducted specifically in Istanbul showed that 69.1% of the participants between the ages of 8 and 15 were boys and 30.9% were girls (Erim & Küçük, 2023). In the USA, there is a market-based, civil society-oriented approach that prioritizes participation in sports, club membership and access to facilities, while in Türkiye, the legal framework is positioned with a public-oriented model defined by central budget and state-directed infrastructure expansion. The differences in approaches between the two countries are clearly evident in physical activity levels (Table 3). According to the CDC’s 2020 NHIS analysis, 24.2% of adult Americans meet both aerobic and muscular strength thresholds (Abildso et al., 2023). According to the European Commission, (2018) Eurobarometer-472 data, the rate of adults in Türkiye who do not do any sports has broken the European record with 88%. Therefore, despite the increase in the number of facilities and clubs[‡], Türkiye experiences a quantity-quality paradox in participation, and although the spread of sports to the masses is guaranteed by Article 59 of the Constitution[§], it shows that there is still a transformation into behavioral change (Official Gazette, 1982).

Comparing the sports policies of Türkiye and the USA for the period 2017-2022 based on numerical indicators reveals that the two countries proceed with different structural logics even when looking at the same data. When comparing the club ecosystem, the Aspen Institute’s “State of Play 2023” report emphasizes that 64.2 million club memberships ($\approx 19\%$) in the USA are fed by school-club integration (European Commission, 2018; Aspen Institute, 2023). While the Ministry of Youth and Sports (GSB) data in Türkiye reports 25,930 active clubs in 2024, the club density in proportion to the population is three times that of the USA (Strategy and Budget Presidency, 2024). However, more than 95% of these are amateur and have problems

[‡] Türkiye For numerical increase <https://shgm.gsb.gov.tr/Sayfalar/175/105/Istatistikler> Access 19.04.2025

[§] Article 59 of Law No. 2709, which entered into force upon publication in the Official Gazette dated 9/11/1982 and numbered 17863 (Repeated): “The State shall take measures to develop the physical and mental health of Turkish citizens of all ages and shall encourage the spread of sports to the masses. The State shall protect successful athletes.”

with sustainable financing. This table does not confirm the assumption that many small clubs = high participation, and program quality and governance capacity are determinants of participation. On the infrastructure front, while the US Department of Commerce data indicates more than 250,000 multi-purpose sports/fitness facilities (Table 3), Türkiye presents a rapidly increasing facility development graph with 4,500 large public facilities + 10,000 local fields (European Commission, 2018). Although the facility per population indicator is still in favor of the US, Türkiye's increase in the number of facilities by more than 60% between 2019 and 2023 shows that the state's "widespread venue" approach has been reduced to the field level. The problem is that the maintenance and operation costs of these facilities are sustainable by local governments. The 2022 Court of Accounts reports reveal that there are semi-idle pools and halls in many provinces due to insufficient funding (European Commission, 2018; Court of Accounts Presidency, 2023). In governance, the US has a structure dispersed among the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), state sports departments and the US Olympic & Paralympic Committee (USOPC), with the USOPC's 2023 operating revenues reaching 479 million USD (European Commission, 2018). Türkiye, on the other hand, connects 81 provincial directorates and autonomous federations under the umbrella of the Ministry of Youth and Sports to a single hierarchical line. Law No. 7405 (2022) provided legal certainty by making the corporatization of clubs and federation election-supervision concrete provisions, while updates to Law No. 6222 tightened stadium security with e-ticket (Passolig) and facial recognition requirements (Official Gazette, 2022). In contrast, sports security in the US has been left within the framework of the self-responsibility of clubs with the "Safe Sport Act 2017" and state laws, and integration at the federal level has remained limited (Wilson, 2022). Financially, Türkiye's sports budget reached 92.8 billion TL (approximately 4.9 billion USD) in 2023, corresponding to 1.3% of the central government budget (Haber, 2024). Added to this, Spor Toto revenues were based on 20.3 billion TL gross sales in 2023, and 3.4 billion TL was directed to investments (Strategy and Budget Presidency, 2024). Since there is no single national sports budget concept in the USA, HHS physical activity grants, state K-12 sports funds, and charitable donations form a fragmented financing mosaic; 83% of USOPC revenues are provided by broadcasting rights and sponsorships (European Commission, 2018). Therefore, the games of chance-centered public leverage model in Türkiye is being replaced by the market-sponsorship model in the USA, and both systems are seen as open to criticisms of transparency and effectiveness. In terms of policy documents, Türkiye's 2019 revised National

Youth and Sports Policy and 11th Development Plan are monitored based on metrics such as performance indicators, number of facilities, medal targets, disabled athlete quota.

The USA's Healthy People 2030 and Active People, Healthy Nation umbrella strategies position physical activity as a component of public health, and the integration of sports federations is based on a voluntary basis (NCAA, 2023). Therefore, in the USA, targets are aimed at creating widespread behavioral change for the entire society (Aspen Institute, 2023).

Although both countries show similar capacity in producing strategy documents (G₆; 2–2), differences have been identified in the level of social response produced by these documents. Although documents such as the 2024–2028 GSB Strategic Plan in Türkiye define performance targets in detail, the low scores (0 and 0) obtained in the G₁ (sports participation) and G₂ (club membership) indicators indicate that these documents do not have an impact on the level of behavior. While the rate of adults who do sports regularly is around 12% in Türkiye, this rate is 24.2% in the US. This difference shows that participation policies are shaped not only through legislation and investment, but also through cultural continuity and institutional habits. Similarly, although Türkiye surpasses the US in terms of club density per population in the G₃ (number of sports clubs) indicator (305 vs. 93/1,000,000), a G₂ score of 0 indicates that the number of clubs does not increase participation and that the effectiveness of the clubs is low. This situation has been recorded as a finding that refutes the assumption that institutional diversity = participation prevalence.

When the club increase is not supported by sustainable governance and interaction mechanisms, it does not create a social impact and remains only as a quantitative data. In terms of G₇ and G₈ indicators (budget ratio and incentive system), Türkiye provides higher direct financing compared to the USA (GSB 2022 budget ≈ 2.6 billion USD vs. USOPC ≈ 479 million USD) and the incentive volume provided through Spor Toto funds (≈ 400 million USD) surpasses the donation and sponsorship resources in the USA in terms of quantity. However, the fact that G₁ and G₂ output indicators do not show a parallel increase shows that a high budget alone is not enough and that sports culture can be spread through institutional and pedagogical integration, not economic. Although Türkiye stands out with its advanced infrastructure and national certification model in the G₁₀ (access to sports facilities) and G₁₁ (coaching system) indicators (G₁₁ score: TR=2, USA=1), the fact that this structure does not translate into a G₁ (participation) score indicates that education and facility policies are not designed with a focus on participation. The existence of a decentralized and multi-actor structure in the USA creates

dispersion in governance ($G_4=1$), but produces more effective results in terms of individual motivation and social prevalence. This situation suggests that centralized structures can produce more traceable but less participatory results. The legislative analysis conducted on the G_{12} indicator (security-service approach) reveals that Türkiye has established an integrated security system on a legal basis with Law No. 6222 (score=2) and the USA has turned to club-based, fragmented solutions in this area (score=1). However, since this integrity cannot be measured in terms of behavioral safety perception and tribune participation, it remains limited to regulations at the legal level.

The comparative analysis of sports policies of Türkiye and the USA for the period 2017–2022 has made visible not only the structural and numerical differences but also the consequences of these differences in terms of policy production and social impact. The evaluation conducted on the G_1 – G_{12} indicator set has shown that the two countries process similar types of resources with different governance logics and produce different policy performances in the same area.

Recommendations

Türkiye should prioritize school-family-club cooperation to enhance participation rather than focusing solely on infrastructure and legal reform. It is recommended that the USA establish minimum national governance standards to address fragmentation. Both countries should strengthen transparency in budget allocation and impact measurement. Additionally, integrating pedagogical and cultural elements into sport policy design may increase long-term participation across all demographics.

Limitations and strengths

A key limitation of the study is the data heterogeneity across U.S. states and the decentralized nature of their systems, which complicates national comparisons. In Türkiye, inconsistencies in the central registration of club data create gaps in longitudinal analyses. The study's strength lies in its systematic, indicator-based comparison (G_1 – G_{12}), triangulating qualitative and quantitative data with official legislation and strategic policy documents to present a holistic, replicable framework for future comparative sport policy research.

REFERENCES

- Abildso, C. G., Daily, S. M., Umstattd Meyer, M. R., Perry, C. K., & Eyler, A. (2023, January 27). Prevalence of meeting aerobic, muscle-strengthening, and combined physical activity guidelines during leisure time among adults, by rural-urban classification and region—United States, 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 72(4), 85–91. [[Crossref](#)]

- Açıkgöz, S., Demirbaş, G., & Haudenhuyse, R. (2021). Sport and development in Turkey: Community sport participation, leisure spaces and social inclusion. In *Sport and Development in Emerging Nations* (pp. 185-200). Routledge.
- Ak, A. (2017). *Türk sporunda sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri*. Ankara: Spor Yayınevi ve Kitabevi.
- Aspen Institute, (2023). *State of play 2023*. <https://www.projectplay.org/state-of-play-2023/participation> (Access 12.05.2025)
- Black, L. I., Terlizzi, E. P., & Vahratian, A. (2022, August). *Organized sports participation among children aged 6–17 years: United States, 2020* (NCHS Data Brief, No. 441). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics. [Crossref]
- Deng, Y., & Fan, A. (2022). Trends in sports participation in adolescents: Data from a large-scale sample in the US adolescents. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10, 960098. [Crossref]
- Erim, A., & Küçük, V. (2023). Çocuklarının spora katılım motivasyonlarının cinsiyet ve spor branşına göre incelenmesi. *Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 15(1), 35-48. [Crossref]
- European Commission. (2018, March). *Special Eurobarometer 472: Sport and physical activity*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://sport.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/special-eurobarometer_472_en.pdf
- Geurin, A. N., & Lough, N. L. (2019). *Routledge handbook of the business of women's sport*. Routledge.
- Haber (2024, Kasım 5). *Gençlik ve Spor Bakanlığı 2025 yılı bütçesi TBMM Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonunda*. <https://haberler.com/politika/genclik-ve-spor-bakanligi-2025-yili-butcesi-tbmm-18011392-haberi/> (Access 16.05.2025)
- Harris, S. J., & Jedlicka, S. R. (2020). The governance of sports in the USA. In *Sport business in the United States* (pp. 24-49). Routledge.
- NCAA. (2023, November 19). *Title IX report shows gains in female participation, though rates lag increases by men*. <https://www.ncaa.org/news/2023/11/19/media-center-title-ix-report-shows-gains-in-female-participation-though-rates-lag-increases-by-men.aspx> (Erişim 12.05.2025)
- Resmî Gazete, (1982, Ekim 18). Kanun No. 2709 (17863 Sayı Mükerrer). Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Anayasası <https://anayasa.gov.tr/tr/mevzuat/anayasa/>
- Resmî Gazete, (2022, Nisan 26 Sayı 31821). *Spor Kulüpleri ve Spor Federasyonları Kanunu* (Kanun No. 7405). <https://resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2022/04/20220426-8.htm>
- Ruseski E J. & Razavilar N. (2013). In (K. Hallmann, K. Petry ed.), *United States comparative sport development systems, participation and public policy, sports economics, management and policy*, (p.311-321), New York: Springer Science+Business Media
- Sayıştay Başkanlığı. (2023, Eylül). *2022 Yılı Sayıştay Denetim Raporu: Gençlik ve Spor Bakanlığı*. <https://sayistay.gov.tr/reports/download/4708yX0gy6-genclik-ve-spor-bakanligi> (Access 23.05.2025)
- Strateji ve Bütçe Başkanlığı, (2024, Temmuz 24). *Merkezi Yönetim Bütçe Gerçekleşmeleri ve Beklentiler Raporu 2024*. <https://sbb.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/24/Merkezi-Yonetim-Butce-Gerceklesmeleri-ve-Beklentiler-Raporu.pdf>
- Sunay, H. (2019). Türkiye, Almanya, ABD ve Avustralya spor sistemlerinin bazı değişkenler açısından karşılaştırılması. *OPUS–Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 14(20), 1392–1412. [Crossref]

Wilson, A. (2022, June 23). *Title IX report shows gains in female participation, though rates lag increases by men*. NCAA.org. <https://www.ncaa.org/news/2022/6/23/media-center-title-ix-report-shows-gains-in-female-participation-though-rates-lag-increases-by-men.aspx> (Access 14.05.2025)

Yıldırım, M. B. (2022, Şubat 25). *Sponsorluk harcamalarının vergisel boyutu*. Alomaliye.com. <https://alomaliye.com/2022/02/25/sponsorluk-harcamalarinin-vergisel-boyutu/>

KATKI ORANI CONTRIBUTION RATE	AÇIKLAMA EXPLANATION	KATKIDA BULUNANLAR CONTRIBUTORS
Fikir ve Kavramsal Örgü <i>Idea or Notion</i>	Araştırma hipotezini veya fikrini oluşturmak <i>Form the research hypothesis or idea</i>	Tayfun KARA
Tasarım <i>Design</i>	Yöntem ve araştırma desenini tasarlamak <i>To design the method and research design.</i>	Tayfun KARA
Literatür Tarama <i>Literature Review</i>	Çalışma için gerekli literatürü taramak <i>Review the literature required for the study</i>	Tayfun KARA
Veri Toplama ve İşleme <i>Data Collecting and Processing</i>	Verileri toplamak, düzenlemek ve raporlaştırmak <i>Collecting, organizing and reporting data</i>	Tayfun KARA
Tartışma ve Yorum <i>Discussion and Commentary</i>	Elde edilen bulguların değerlendirilmesi <i>Evaluation of the obtained finding</i>	Tayfun KARA
Destek ve Teşekkür Beyanı/ Statement of Support and Acknowledgment		
Bu çalışmanın yazım sürecinde katkı ve/veya destek alınmamıştır. <i>No contribution and/or support was received during the writing process of this study.</i>		
Çatışma Beyanı/ Statement of Conflict		
Araştırmacıların araştırma ile ilgili diğer kişi ve kurumlarla herhangi bir kişisel ve finansal çıkar çatışması yoktur. <i>Researchers do not have any personal or financial conflicts of interest with other people and institutions related to the research.</i>		
Etik Kurul Beyanı/ Statement of Ethics Committee		
Bu çalışma, yalnızca açık erişimli ve kamuya açık resmi dokümanlar (örneğin Resmi Gazete, Sayıştay Raporları, USOPC, CDC, OECD, NCAA vb.) kullanılarak gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırma kapsamında insan katılımcılardan veri toplanmamış, deneysel bir uygulama yapılmamış ve herhangi bir kişisel veri işlenmemiştir. Bu nedenle çalışma, etik kurul onayı gerektirmemektedir. Araştırma süreci boyunca bilimsel araştırma ve yayın etiği ilkelerine tam olarak uyulmuştur. <i>This study was conducted solely by using open-access and publicly available official documents (e.g., Official Gazette, Court of Accounts Reports, USOPC, CDC, OECD, NCAA, etc.). No human participants were involved, no experimental procedures were performed, and no personal data were processed. Therefore, the study does not require approval from an ethics committee. All procedures were carried out in full compliance with the principles of scientific research and publication ethics.</i>		



This study is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).