

Comparative analysis of the Spanish and United Kingdom sport-political models

MARÍA ESTHER PUGA-GONZÁLEZ¹, ATHANASIOS PAPPOUS², PEDRO TOMÁS GÓMEZ-PÍRIZ³, JOSUÉ GONZÁLEZ-RUIZ⁴, DAVID CABELLO-MANRIQUE¹ ✉

¹Department of Physical Education and Sports. Faculty of Sport Sciences. University of Granada. Granada, Spain.

²Department for Life Quality Studies. University of Bologna. Bologna, Italy.

³Department of Human Mobility and Sport Performance. University of Sevilla, Sevilla, Spain.

⁴Department of Musical, Plastic and Corporal Expression. Faculty of Educational Sciences. University of Granada. Granada, Spain.

ABSTRACT

This research conducts a comparative study between the sports models of the United Kingdom (UK) and Spain, emphasizing the complexity of these systems and the need for a multidimensional analysis. The objective of analysing the most important characteristics and differences between the Spanish sports model and structure and the UK sports model, the leading exponent due to its efficiency in the development of sports practice and in obtaining international sports results, to determine possible improvements. To carry out this study, a comparative analysis of the sports models of both countries has been made from a political-sports perspective, and the study of the administrative-organizational structure of sport and the legal regulations that support it, through a mixed design for the analysis of different qualitative dimensions. The most significant conclusions are that in the United Kingdom, a successful transformation has been achieved with a focus on efficiency, public investment, and private partnerships, while in Spain, sporting results have been maintained without a clear strategy, suggesting the need for a re-evaluation of its model. Moreover, the stronger associative culture and a higher number of qualified professionals in the United Kingdom are significant advantages. In conclusion, the United Kingdom's sports model is considered more developed and efficient, highlighting the importance of comprehensive planning and collaboration between public and private entities as key factors for sporting success.

Keywords: Sport systems, Sport politics, Sport policy, Comparative study, UK, Spain.

Cite this article as:

Puga-González, M. E., Pappous, A., Gómez-Píriz, P. T., González-Ruiz, J., & Cabello-Manrique, D. (2023). Comparative analysis of the Spanish and United Kingdom sport-political models. *Journal of Human Sport and Exercise*, in press. <https://doi.org/10.14198/jhse.2024.191.15>

✉ **Corresponding author.** Department of Physical Education and Sports. Faculty of Sport Sciences, University of Granada, Ctra de Alfacar, 21, 18071 Granada, Spain. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8037-4755>

E-mail: dcabello@ugr.es

Submitted for publication October 04, 2023.

Accepted for publication October 16, 2023.

Published in press November 00, 2023.

JOURNAL OF HUMAN SPORT & EXERCISE ISSN 1988-5202.

© Faculty of Education. University of Alicante.

doi:10.14198/jhse.2024.191.15

INTRODUCTION

The sport phenomenon

Following García-Ferrando (2006), we can affirm that the different manifestations of sport have led to a democratisation of its practice and a globalisation in the number of spectators, transforming it into an unprecedented social and economic lever, and turning its major sporting events, such as the Olympic Games (OGs) or the World Cup in football and some other sports, into the most watched television broadcasts. This, together with the massive increase in the practice of sport due to its beneficial effects on psycho-physical health, especially in the most developed countries, has boosted the turnover of the sports industry in terms of equipment, products and materials, as well as the demand for services for training and leisure, without forgetting the figures for sports tourism that sporting events, sports holidays in nature, adventure sports and golf generate.

Coalter (2007) describes it as the social revolution of the 21st century, which has turned sport into a social phenomenon commonly practised in all social strata, as a "*polypill*" for health, which in addition to the physical, mental and emotional benefits, fosters more cohesive societies impregnated by the values of sport, especially among young people.

The effects of COVID19 and restrictions on movement have further shown the importance of having a healthy life.

The political system and sporting models

Chappelet (2010) indicated that since the origins of modern sport and for the last two centuries, organised sport has been an independent activity that has been regulated through the international sport movement and its associative fabric, outside governmental control.

However, with the emergence of the welfare state and the governmental interference of the new world order, governments started to develop sport policies, initially with the appearance of public subsidies to non-profit and voluntary sport entities. Soon after, the different levels of government also took on the role of active and direct providers of sporting provision, with public programmes of physical-sporting activity and the organisation of sporting events of different levels and categories (Bergsgard, 2007).

Scheerder et al. (2015), has added to the public activity of governments, the exponential growth of the private sector in the last three decades, as a commercial provider of sporting offerings for all tastes and pockets, which has reduced the importance and weight of the traditional associative fabric that maintained a clear monopoly. According to the principle of subsidiarity, in those areas where the private sector provides an adequate and suitable offer for the different social strata, the public administration should not intervene, allowing the market to regulate itself, in accordance with the prevailing capitalist system. However, the level of government regulation of the sport sector has soared to levels that it has threatened the autonomy and independence of sport that the Olympic movement establishes in its Olympic Charter (Chappelet, 2010).

Since the beginnings of contemporary sport in the UK, it has been organised around the associative fabric, with the subsequent appearance of Olympic committees (international and national), centred on what has become known as the federative sports model, which each country has adapted to its own characteristics. Thus, the international sports federations become the guarantors of compliance, control and development of their sporting modality, structuring a pyramidal competitive system based on two legal links, that of

recognition and that of integration (Camps, 2006).

According to González-Ruiz et. al (2022), despite the described parallelism and homogeneity, two reasons could be described that could explain the transnational differences we currently find:

- The socio-cultural climate of each country sets its priorities regarding sport approaches. While Scandinavian countries pay special attention to grassroots sport, Anglo-Saxon countries (UK & Australia), put their main focus on elite sport (Green & Collins, 2008).
- For Puga-González (2018), the distribution of competences between different actors (government, civil society and market) shapes different sport systems in Europe and the rest of the world, in line with the studies of Camy et al. (2004) and Henry (2009).

However, it is important not to forget the historical use of politically oriented sport, from fascist Italy and Nazi Germany as precursors, to the long-term planning with national interests developed by the USSR and the German Democratic Republic, together with other European communist countries and Cuba, which dominated the Olympic medal tables until the fall of the Berlin Wall (Andreff, 2021).

The sport policy model in Europe

The European Sports Charter was published by the Council of Europe in 1975, and revised in 2021, after two decades without updating, to define sport as "*all forms of physical activity which, through organised or unorganised participation, aim to maintain or improve physical and mental fitness, to develop social relations or to achieve results in competition at all levels*".

It was not until 2007 that the European Commission really intervened in sport with the publication of its white paper, as a reference guide for all EU countries, with the Lisbon Treaty of 2009 (article 6) establishing for the first time competences in sport, which in practice would mean a shared competence to support national policies, through dialogue, subsidiary cooperation and the drafting of recommendations and guidelines, but without deploying its legislative power (European Commission, 2011).

However, the intervention of the EU began much earlier without planning it, as it has been the Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU), which has had to intervene on numerous occasions in labour and economic matters of professional sport, basically football, with the "*Bosman case*" being the most emblematic ruling, regarding the right of free movement for any worker, without being considered as a quota of foreigners, which revolutionised the transfer market (Velázquez, 2010).

Article 165 of the TFEU lists the EU's objectives in the field of sport, excluding a possible harmonisation of the national regulations of the member states. Thus, the task defined is to "*contribute to the promotion of European sporting issues*" and to "*develop the European dimension in sport*", encouraging cooperation between the different actors in the sporting ecosystem, but respecting the national autonomy and governmental structures of each member country.

Also noteworthy is the 2011 EU communication "*Developing the European dimension in sport*", which highlights the potential of sport and its contribution to achieving the objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy, highlighting its capacity to contribute to social inclusion and its economic dimension as a catalyst for employability and direct consumption. In addition, to promote transnational cooperation in the fight against doping and good governance in the sport sector (European Parliament, 2020).

The European Sport Satellite Account (ESSA) project, launched in 2016, carried out an analysis of the labour market and the qualification profile of the sport sector, with an increase of almost 20% since the beginning of the economic crisis. Spain is among the four leading countries in terms of sports employment, with 12%, although far behind the UK, which leads with more than 25%. There is a certain parity in terms of gender.

In this way, we can speak of the existence of a European sport model, characterised by a high level of government intervention, but which respects the different social contexts and cultural characteristics of each member country, which implies different sport models and systems with their own organisational structure (De Bosscher, 2018).

The Spanish sport model

The model of sport in Spain is identified by a high level of public-private collaboration, although with a high level of intervention by the public sector, which carries out its functions at the 3 levels of administration (state, regional and local). The private sector is divided into the for-profit business sector (companies and self-employed professionals) and the non-profit sector (federations, clubs and other sports associations) (Puga-González, 2018).

The form of government in Spain is the parliamentary monarchy, a product of the democratic transition that culminated in the approval by referendum of the Spanish Constitution of 1978, with an explicit recognition of an autonomous State, made up of 17 Autonomous Communities and two autonomous cities (Ceuta and Melilla) under a Statute of Autonomy with broad executive (regional governments) and legislative (their own parliaments) scope for all cases, although with certain differences. To this organisation must be added the subdivision into 50 provinces and a total of 8,122 municipalities with autonomy for the implementation and management of local policies, including the promotion of sport (González-Ruiz, 2022).

The Foundation “*España Activa*” (2020), through a study commissioned to PWC, carried out a study of the economic impact, both direct and indirect, establishing that 3.3% of GDP is generated by the sports industry (almost €40 billion), without taking into account the pull effect it generates on many other sectors such as tourism, the media and sports betting. The professional football industry alone has a turnover of more than three billion euros a year, not counting television rights, which amount to almost another two million, and directly employs almost 50,000 people (CSD, 2022).

Teruelo (2013) has already established that the impact of sport is so far-reaching that it multiplies by four every euro of investment made, which has led public administrations to invest heavily in sport in recent years, and all this without including the savings in health costs involved in having a healthier population.

The latest pre-pandemic COVID19 data (Jiménez et al. 2020) show that more than eight million people in Spain pay a monthly or annual fee to a sports club or fitness centre, highlighting the importance of sport in the country's strategy, from an economic and social point of view.

The organisational model of Spanish sport is made up of the public and private sector, where the role of public administrations in its regulation and funding plays a very important role, in the three areas identified by Monroy (2012):

- State level – Spanish Sport Council (CSD) on the Ministry of Education and Sports.
- Regional level - Autonomous Communities (Regional Ministry responsible for sport).
- Local level - provinces (provincial councils) and municipalities (town councils).

However, non-profit associations and, especially, sports federations (FF.DD) are key agents in the development of sport in Spain, with functions delegated by the administration, which provides significant public funding to guarantee quality organised practice, top-level national and international sporting events and top-level international representation, with very good sporting results since the Barcelona Olympics in 1992, although without improvement in the last 30 years (Cabello et al, 2011).

The UK sport model

Legally speaking, the UK does not have a constitution for its entire territory, due to the permanent conflicts since its origins, which has configured an asymmetrical legal structure, with the compilation of different texts that aim to "unify" the legal security and equality of its entire territory, while respecting its historical idiosyncrasies. Thus, from a sporting perspective, there are numerous government bodies and agencies which, in a balance of public-private collaboration in each of the "home nations", carry out their work. The absence of a supra-state sport law allows for greater freedom for the actors involved in the UK sport ecosystem (González-Ruiz et. al, 2022).

The role of sport in the UK has undergone a rapid evolution in the last three decades, from being considered a minor sub-sector in social policy, with no defined strategy or clear provision of funds, to becoming a state strategy with supranational and national entities, to becoming a source of social cohesion and pride of belonging, as the backbone of the most diverse political objectives in the socio-economic area, and an important part of the political agenda, especially since the award of the London 2012 OGs (Miège & Jappert, 2013).

The UK sport system as a whole and at a national level has undergone a major transformation with the emergence of new government agencies and a closer relationship with the UK's National Sport Governance Bodies (NGBs), which are a key player in the UK's sport strategy, enjoying high recognition as the custodians of the founding values of sport, serving an extensive network of sports clubs (more than 170,000), thanks to the work carried out by sports volunteers who are affiliated to more than 7% of the country's adult population (more than 3 million).

The UK is the most employable country in Europe in the sports industry, generating almost half a million jobs, with more than €1.6 billion a year in public investment and almost 9.2 million sportspeople who are registered with a sports club (more than 20% of the UK population).

It is important to highlight the unifying work carried out by UK Sport (2015), as a supranational agency, in a system structured by government bodies and NGBs from each of the 4 nations, but which compete unified under the British flag to participate in the Olympic Games.

A turning point in the transformation of British sport was the elaboration and publication of a cross-government strategy called "*Game Plan*" by the UK Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport in 2002, which proposed a profound renewal of the sporting structure based on a self-critical reflection of the fragmentation of the system, the lack of concise strategies and a cumbersome funding system. In this process of profound transformation, in 2008 the same group of experts drew up a new strategy "*Playing to win: a new era of sport*" to ensure the UK's sporting success at the London 2012 OGs, based on performance and excellence, but also on the integral legacy that this important event would mean for British sport in the medium and long term (Citoyenneté, 2013, Sport England, 2019).

Research objectives

This proposal aims to deepen the knowledge of the Spanish sports model by means of a comparative study with one of the best reference models, the UK model, with the objective of analysing the most important characteristics and differences between the Spanish sports model and structure and the sports model of the UK, the leading exponent due to its efficiency in the development of sports practice and in obtaining international sports results, in order to determine possible improvements.

METHOD

A comparative analysis of the sporting models of both countries has been carried out from a political-sporting perspective, and of the study of the administrative-organisational structure of sport and the legal regulations that support it, through a mixed design for the analysis of different dimensions with qualitative variables (Table 1).

Table 1. Dimensions and variables analysed.

Dimension	Variable
Legal regulations	National and regional legislation
Organisational structure	State (national)
	Other levels of administration
Distribution of competences	Elite sport
	Recreational sport
	Sports facilities
Associative network	Sports federations
	Voluntary work
Physical education	Compulsory and promotion of school sport
Funding sources	Public, private and other

In accordance with the methodology used by Puga-González (2018) and González-Ruiz (2022), this study is based on the theory for the evaluation of organisational performance by Bayle (1999, 2001).

The procedure for presenting the data was by means of graphs and comparative tables of the documents analysed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Legal regulations

From the analysis of Table 2, it can be seen that Spain has a wider range of specific regulations in the field of sport than the UK, with constitutional protection, which has recently been reinforced with a law on sport (39/2022, 30 December), which replaces the avant-garde law 10/1990, 15 October, designed to promote sport with the organisation in Spain of the Barcelona OGs in 1992, and which represented a turning point in the harmonious development of sport for more than three decades.

However, at regional or autonomous community level, there is a similar regulatory structure, with competences transferred in both countries, which are responsible for the promotion and development of sport.

Table 2. Comparison of legal regulations between Spain & UK.

	UK	Spain
Sport in the constitution	NO No Constitution or similar text.	YES Art.43.3.
National sport legislation	NO There are no unified sport regulations at supranational level, whose main function is to finance. Sport is considered an acquired right.	YES Law 39/2022 of 30 December on Sport, with entry into force on 1.01.2023. Will require a lot of development in the coming months.
Regional sport legislation	The four "home nations" have competence in sport for its autonomous management, through ministerial departments.	With the exception of Ceuta and Melilla, the 17 Autonomous Communities have an autonomous law on sport or similar legislative development.

Although the legislative protection of sport in Spain is arguably much greater than in the UK, the importance of sport on the political agenda is higher in the UK, from an institutional perspective with strategically well-designed and far-reaching sport policies, which have had a great social and economic impact, but also in relation to the financial support that sport receives in the UK, through direct government support, but especially with fiscal policies that encourage the support of private initiative.

Organisational structure

Table 3 shows how the governmental structure oversees sport in both countries, with similar levels of administration (at state, regional-autonomous and local level), but while in Spain all the sport of the state administration falls under the CSD, in the UK there are several governmental entities or agencies with state influence, and with very distinct functions and autonomy.

The regional-autonomous and local structures are similar in both countries, although much more atomised in the case of Spain, with almost 5 times more autonomous regions, twice as many provinces and 20 times more municipalities than the UK.

Table 3. Comparison of the organisational structure of the sport between Spain & UK.

	UK	Spain
Government administration responsible for sport	Department of Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS). Responsible for elite sport and major events, but also for cross-cutting policies on sport for all. It is responsible for the coordination and collaboration of more than 40 governmental sports bodies and agencies.	Since the formation of the government in 2020, sport has been under the Ministry of Culture and Sport, with the autonomous body CSD, chaired by the Secretary of State for Sport, being the highest sporting body in Spain. The CSD presides over the Inter-territorial Sports Commission, in which all the Autonomous Communities are represented.
State sport administration	- Sport England (SE): responsible for: infrastructures, grassroots sport and technical training. Supervision of NGBs and their programmes. - UK Sport: responsible for elite sport. - English Institute of Sport (EIS):	In accordance with the laws of sport since democracy, the CSD exercises control and supervision of sport, with exclusive competence in matters of elite sport and international representation, being the only state body.

	responsible for medical research and sport science. - UK Anti-doping (UKAD) - Youth Sport Trust: overseeing and promoting physical education and school sport.	
Local sports administration at regional level	Existence of a regional SE department in each of the four "home nations".	Regional department in each of the 17 Autonomous Communities, plus Ceuta and Melilla. Mostly at the level of Directorate General, although 5 reach the level of Secretary General.
Local sports administration at provincial level	27 provinces	50 provinces, Whose local government administration is the Provincial Councils, as an inter-municipal institution supporting municipalities with less than 20,000 inhabitants. With a sports area, independent or associated with other related areas, and therefore a sports deputy with a sports directorate or service.
Local sports administration at municipal level	No information is available on the sports structure, if any. 418 municipalities Which have no delegated competence to provide recreational or sports services. However, they are very active in sports promotion with a high investment (over £1.5 billion per year), working closely with SE and UK Sport.	8122 municipalities Whose local government administration is the local councils, which exercise shared sporting competences with the Autonomous Regions, in sporting facilities and sport promotion, for those with more than 20,000 inhabitants.
Non-governmental sports bodies	British Olympic Association (BOA) The British Paralympic Association (BPA) The Sport Recreation Association (SRA), with over 350 member bodies. UK Sports Coaches Community Amateur Sports Club (CASC) with great tax advantages for its clubs. 46 FF.DD (NGBs) - 38 of which are Olympic (5 winter and 33 summer). 171,000 sports clubs	Spanish Olympic Committee (COE) Spanish Paralympic Committee (CPE) 66 FF.DD (NGBs) - 35 of them Olympic (2 winter and 33 summer) 76,566 sports clubs

The structure of non-governmental sport entities also differs between the two countries, since, although in the Olympic movement they are the same with an Olympic Committee and a Paralympic Committee, in the case of the UK there are also other entities that carry out specific tasks in recreational sport, sports coaches and clubs, thanks to the widespread Anglo-Saxon associationism culture.

In relation to the number of recognised FF.DD (NGBs), there is a certain difference in that Spain has 1.5 times more of these types of entities, while the UK has 2.5 times more sports clubs, which are the most relevant associative entities for ascertaining the state of a country's sporting health, as they really bring together competitive practitioners and an important part of recreational practitioners.

Distribution of competences in sport

As can be seen in Table 4, elite sport and international representation is an exclusive competence of UK Sport and CSD in both countries, i.e. a governmental responsibility at state level.

However, UK Sport is the agency specialising exclusively in elite sport, which agrees with the NGBs (FF.DD) the sports programmes and performance objectives in those sports included in the top-level programme for obtaining medals in major international events, especially in the OGs, while the CSD is the state responsible for all sport, although with numerous competences transferred to the Autonomous Regions.

Similarly, we see how recreational sport and sport for all in the UK is strongly supported by the highest state sports body (DCMS), which funds the NGBs for the promotion of sport from the grassroots level, but we cannot forget the existence of a non-governmental entity for the support of all clubs and other associations promoting sport development and training, while in Spain it is a task for the Autonomous Communities by mandate of the CSD, but without a clear strategy or funding.

Table 4. Comparison of the distribution of sport competences between Spain & UK.

	UK	Spain
Elite sport and FF.EE.	UK Sport y Sport England (SE)	CSD
Recreational sport or sport for all	SRA groups all clubs (competitive and recreational), as regulator and promoter of recreational sport or sport for all and sport training in collaboration with the FF.DD, receiving funding for it.	CSD as promoter, but without direct responsibility. The Autonomous Regions are responsible for the promotion of sport and recreational sport or sport for all.
Sports facilities	Mainly SE, although with the collaboration of local entities of a public nature, but also private.	The CSD establishes the rules and finances some projects, but it is the Autonomous Regions, together with the municipalities, which are responsible for the construction, maintenance and management of the facilities.
Regional sports federations (FF.TT.)	Although they are independent private entities, they are supervised and financed by the regional offices of SE in each of the 4 "home nations".	Here they are also private and independent entities, although the ACs supervise, delegate and finance the FF.TT. in their territory
Sports clubs	These are private, autonomous entities governed by the principle of the traditional independence of Anglo-Saxon associations.	They are also private and independent entities, although without local funding in the form of subsidies, many of them would not be able to survive.

Regarding sports facilities, there is also a certain similarity between the two countries, with Sport England and local entities being responsible for their construction, maintenance and management, while in Spain it is the responsibility of the Autonomous Regions and municipalities, although in some cases with state funding from the CSD.

The FF.DD are private and autonomous entities in both countries, although the level of economic dependence on the CSD in Spain is much higher than that found in the UK. Furthermore, in Spain there is a problem of coordination and interdependence between the National Sport Federation (NGBs) and the FF.TT, the latter being dependent on the Autonomous Regions.

In the case of sports clubs there is a great similarity, as private and autonomous entities, although highly financially dependent on the municipalities in Spain, whereas in the UK they are more independent in every sense and much more.

Voluntary associative fabric

According to Table 5, the associative fabric linked to sports volunteering is very different between the two countries, which is largely associated with the Anglo-Saxon culture of active and frequent participation of the population in any social sphere, especially of young people and the elderly in voluntary tasks of all kinds, including sports. In Spain, sports volunteering is not very organised in associative terms and is directly related to volunteering in major sporting events, whereas in the UK, volunteering tasks are more stable and frequent, and are also related to participation in the management, administration and collaboration in sports clubs, charity events, collaboration in promotion and other sporting activities, beyond events.

Table 5. Comparison of the voluntary sport association network between Spain & UK.

	UK	Spain
Sports volunteering	<p>With more than 3 million volunteers who dedicate at least 1 hour a week to sports volunteering of various kinds.</p> <p>Especially frequent in NGBs for the organisation of sporting events, but there are also national and regional associations that bring them together.</p> <p>There is an obligation to take out civil liability insurance (SRC) for each volunteer</p>	<p>Although the control of sports volunteering in Spain is not very well centralised, it is estimated that there are about 35,000 volunteers with a very occasional participation, almost always for sports competitions.</p> <p>There is also the obligation of CRS for their participation in any sporting activity.</p>

Physical education

As shown in Table 6, both education systems have a very similar timetable for Physical Education (PE), the standard being 2 hours per week. While in the UK the regulation is national, but with flexibility to adapt the curriculum at school level, in Spain the power belongs to the Autonomous Communities which set the limits homogeneously for the whole region, being 2 hours per week for the 17 Autonomous Communities, with the exception of 3 regions (Andalusia, the Basque Country and Castile and Leon) with 3 hours per week in the primary and first year of secondary education.

Table 6. Comparison of Physical Education classes between Spain & UK.

	UK	Spain
Timetable for the subject of physical education (pe) at compulsory education stages	<p>The legal regulation of compulsory education establishes a minimum load of 2 hours per week of PE classes in primary and secondary education, with the power of each centre to increase it, including the possibility of carrying out sports activities outside school hours, but with funding for PE teachers.</p>	<p>Education is a competence transferred to the ACs, with less than 50% of the curriculum defined at national level, so we find different teaching loads in the subject of PE, although most have opted for 2 hours per week, although Andalusia has returned to implementing 3 hours in Primary and the first year of Secondary School</p>

It is interesting to note the initiative carried out in the UK from 2016, which has been almost doubled annually since then, to increase support for PE and the practice of school sport, through the "Physical Education and Sport Premium" programme, funded by taxes on sugary drinks (soft drinks) with the aim of improving teacher training, providing schools with more sports equipment and thus increasing the quality and quantity of the teaching load of the subject of PE and extracurricular sport.

Financing sport

As can be seen in Table 7, the sources of funding are very diverse and varied between the two countries, with few similarities, apart from strong public investment and some participation of private initiative. However, the UK makes a firm commitment to sport through the national lottery and taxes on sugary drinks (more than 500 million pounds in 2021), which boosts the total funding for sport as the main tool for healthy habits.

Table 7. Comparison of sources of sport funding between Spain & UK.

	UK	Spain
Public funding	DCMS distributes between Sport England and UK sport, which determine the distribution of public funds according to various criteria, mainly depending on the level of achievement of the agreed objectives.	From the budget of the Ministry of Culture and Sport, the budget item for the CSD is established, which determines the distribution with the rest of the agents, mainly the FF.DD, which absorb more than 75% of the total.
Business support	Patronage and sponsorship programmes, through UK Sport and BOA for the Olympic team "Team GB".	Olympic sport support programme (ADO) which began for the Barcelona 92 Olympic Games, although with less and less business support.
Taxation	Linked to the participation of the volunteers and the insurance premiums, which are returned to the sports clubs responsible for the volunteers.	Different programmes with different percentages of tax benefits, depending on whether the event or programme is declared to be of "exceptional public interest", with up to 90% tax reduction of the contribution made by the participating companies, but with a complex system of exemption for advertising. The rest have to comply with the provisions of law 49/2002, or patronage law.
National lottery and taxes	The National Lottery is the main source of funding for sport in the UK, with 20% being invested in sport through SE & UK Sport for elite sport since 1997. Taxes on soft drinks and sugary drinks are reinvested to strengthen the education system (FE) and school sport.	50 % of the proceeds from the football pool are divided between the professional league and the football FE, while the other 50 % goes to the provincial councils for the construction of football pitches. Since 2016, the decree on the distribution of the TV rights of the football league dedicates 1.5% to the CSD to cover the social security contributions of non-professional athletes of other sports and their training.

CONCLUSIONS

Considering the objective of the study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- The complexity of sport models requires an analysis that combines quantitative and qualitative dimensions and variables, in order to be able to interpret the possible causes that influence the definition and effectiveness of the system, covering the basic aspects of a socio-demographic nature, the organisational structure and competencies of the administration in the field of sport, sporting or

related legislation and regulations, the associative structure of sport, the sources of sport funding, as well as the levels of participation and sporting success. Which has been a limitation of this study.

- The complete overhaul of the UK sports system, following the failure of the Atlanta 96 OGs, has led to a transformation of the model with efficiency and effectiveness indexes that are world leaders, and much higher than those of Spain. Since then, the UK government and the different levels of administration have identified sport as an essential and priority activity in public policies, to strengthen the sport system, while in Spain sport is still not part of the political agenda of the main political parties and institutional leaders.
- UK has designed a structured system through specialised agencies in each area of sport that develops partnerships with key sport stakeholders to maximise coordination and return on investment. All of this is based on long-term strategic planning, with strong direct public investment and the building of alliances with private initiative, which have been transformed into excellent results since London 2012. However, in Spain, it is the CSD that faces all the challenges of the Spanish sports system alone, with a deficient coordination and distribution of competences with the Autonomous Regions and local authorities, and with a strong intervention of the Spanish Sport Federations (FF.DD).
- Meanwhile, the Spanish sports system, which developed a magnificent structure for the organisation of the Barcelona 1992 OGs with an excellent legislative development with the Sports Law of 1990, has been weakened over the last decade, with a total absence of strategy and planning in all areas of sport, which is disguised by the maintenance of good sporting results, especially in the most mediatic sports, where sports policy has very little influence.
- The greater associative culture in the UK, which provides great added value to its sports model, and the greater number of qualified sports professionals and managers, compared to the Spanish market, is a clear advantage that has repercussions on the sports system in both countries.

Thus, we can affirm that the UK sports model has shown itself to be more developed, structured and financed than the Spanish model, which is associated with greater efficiency with much higher investment ratios and sports results than in Spain, because of more effective, coordinated and strategically designed planning, and promoting public-private collaboration and the involvement of civil society in the promotion of the sports system.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

P.G.,M.E. and C.M.,D. have contributed in all part of the study including the translation of the article. P.,A has designed the methodology and has analysed the UK system. G.P.,P.T. has contributed in the data analysis and discussion. G.R.,J. has contributed in the analyses of the Spanish system, introduction and conclusions.

SUPPORTING AGENCIES

University of Granada - Research Plan 2023 (Exchange at University of Bologna) and the Spanish Ministry of Education, Culture, and Sport (Research Project - PRX 16/00367).

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

REFERENCES

- Andreff, W. (2021). The Economic Determinants of the Olympic Performance in Communist and Post-Communist Countries. In: Andreff, W. (eds) *Comparative Economic Studies in Europe. Studies in Economic Transition*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-48295-4_18
- Bayle, E. (1999). *Management et performance des organisations à but non lucratif: le case des fédérations sportives nationales*. Limoges. Université de Limoges.
- Bayle, E. (2001). Les modes de gouvernance des organisations à but non lucratif: une étude appliquée aux fédérations sportives nationales. *La Revue des Sciences de Gestion: Direction et Gestion*, 188/189, 83-96. <https://doi.org/10.1051/larsg:2001012>
- Bergsgard, N. A. (2007). *Sport policy: A comparative analysis of stability and change*. Routledge.
- Cabello, D., Rivera, E., Trigueros, C., & Pérez, I. (2011). Análisis del modelo del deporte federado español del siglo XXI. *Revista Internacional de Medicina y Ciencias de la Actividad Física y el Deporte*, 11 (44) 690-707. Retrieved from [Accessed 10/25/2023]: <http://cdeporte.rediris.es/revista/revista44/artanalisis257.htm>
- Camps, A. (2006). *Las competiciones deportivas*. Navarra. Aranzadi.
- Camy, J., Clijsen, L., Madella, A., & Pilkington, A. (2004). *Improving employment in the field of sport in Europe through vocational training. Vocational education and training in the field of sport in the European Union. Situation, trends and outlook*. Lyon. Vocasport.
- Chappelet, J. L. (2010). *Autonomy of Sport in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Citoyenneté, T. (2013). *L'organisation du sport dans les Etats membres de l'Union européenne*. Saumur, Imprimerie du Val de Loire.
- Coalter, F. (2007). *A Wider Social Role for Sport: Who's Keeping the Score?*. Londres, Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203014615>
- Consejo Superior de Deportes-CSD (2022). *Anuario de estadísticas Deportivas*. Madrid: CSD. Retrieved from [Accessed 10/25/2023]: <https://www.culturaydeporte.gob.es/dam/jcr:68eb569f-ed5b-413f-b8ad-0e9071f320a2/anuario-de-estadisticas-deportivas-2023.pdf>
- De Bosscher, V. (2018). A mixed methods approach to compare elite sport policies of nations. A critical reflection on the use of composite indicators in the SPLISS study, *Sport in Society*, 21 (2), 331-355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17430437.2016.1179729>
- European Commission. (2011). *Communication on Sport: Developing the European dimension in sport*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved from [Accessed 10/25/2023]: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/EN/legal-content/summary/european-dimension-in-sport.html>
- European Parliament. (2020). *EU sport policy: Going faster, aiming higher, researching further*. European Parliament.
- Fundación España Activa (2020): *Termómetro del ecosistema del deporte en España*. Retrieved from [Accessed 10/25/2023]: <https://www.pwc.es/es/publicaciones/entretenimiento-y-medios/termometro-ecosistema-deporte-espana.html>
- García Ferrando, M. (2006). *Los españoles y el deporte: Posmodernidad y deporte: entre la individualización y la masificación: encuesta sobre hábitos de los españoles*. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.
- González-Ruiz, J., Gómez-Píriz, P., Puga-González, E., & Cabello-Manrique, D. (2022). Spanish women athletes' performance in the Summer Olympic Games history. *Journal of Human Sport and Exercise*, 17(3), 473-483. <https://doi.org/10.14198/jhse.2022.173.01>
- González-Ruiz, J., (2022). *Análisis comparado del modelo de tercer sector del deporte en España y Reino Unido*. Universidad de Granada (tesis doctoral). Retrieved from [Accessed 10/25/2023]: <https://digibug.ugr.es/handle/10481/74590>

- Green, M., & Collins, S. (2008). Policy, politics and path dependency. Sport development in Australia and Finland. *Sport Management Review*, 11 (3), 225-251. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523\(08\)70111-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523(08)70111-6)
- Henry, I. (2009). European models of sport: Governance, organisational change and sport policy in the EU. *Hitotsubashi Journal of Arts & Sciences*, 3, 41-52.
- Jiménez, A., Mayo, X & Copeland, R.J. (2020). The positive impact of physical activity and exercise on immune function. Brussels. Europe Active.
- Miège, C., & Jappert, J. (2013). L'organisation du sport dans les Etats membres de l'Union Européene. Sport et Citoyenneté.
- Monroy Antón, A. (2012). Las instituciones públicas en el deporte. *International Journal of Sports Law & Management*, 21-30.
- Puga-González, E. (2018). El efecto de la crisis en el deporte federado español y su realidad a nivel europeo. Universidad de Jaén (tesis doctoral). Retrieved from [Accessed 10/25/2023]: <https://ruja.ujaen.es/handle/10953/997>
- Scheerder, J., Willem, A., Claes, E., & Billiet, S. (2015). International study on the organisation of sport in twelve countries and their policy towards sport federations. Ghent: University of Leuven.
- Sport England (2019). Measuring the Social and Economic Impact of Sport in England Report 2: The Economic Importance of Sport and Physical Activity in England. Sheffield Hallam University. Sport Industry Research Center.
- Teruelo Ferreras, B. (2013). El Deporte Municipal en España: La Revisión del Modelo. Ayuntamiento de Bilbao.
- UK Sport (2015). How UK sport funding works. London: UK Sport.
- Velázquez, P. (2010). Implementation of the White Paper on Sport and consultations for implementing the Lisbon Treaty in the field of sport. EU Sport Forum.

