

From Policy to Performance: Evaluating the Effectiveness of Tamil Nadu's Sports Development Model

¹Dr P. Rajasimman & ²Mr M. Logesh Waran**

¹Assistant Professor, ²Research Scholar,
PG & Research Department of Economics,
Sir Theagaraya College, Chennai – 600 021.

Abstract : This study examines the effectiveness of Tamil Nadu's sports development model over 35 years (1990-2025), focusing on the relationship between policy interventions, resource allocation, and performance outcomes. Using secondary data from government reports, sports authorities, and national competition records, the research constructs a composite Sports Development Performance Index and employs panel data regression analysis to assess the impact of budgetary allocations, infrastructure investments, and institutional reforms on medal achievements and participation rates. The analysis shows that Tamil Nadu's sports performance improved substantially after the establishment of the Sports Development Authority in 1992, with budget allocations rising from about Rs. 45 crores in the early 1990s to Rs. 361.25 crores in 2025. Empirical results indicate that infrastructure investment and coaching programmes show statistically significant positive associations with competitive performance, while grassroots participation initiatives show delayed but sustained effects. The state's ranking in national competitions improved from outside the top ten in the 1990s to consistent top-five positions after 2020. However, performance gaps persist across disciplines and geographic regions within the state. The findings suggest that sustained policy commitment, coupled with systematic monitoring mechanisms, has contributed to measurable improvements in sports outcomes, though efficiency gains remain constrained by implementation challenges and inequities in resource distribution. The study contributes to the emerging literature on sports policy evaluation in developing economies and offers empirical evidence for evidence-based policymaking in the sports sector.

Index Terms - Sports Policy, Performance Evaluation, Tamil Nadu, Sports Development Index, Public Investment, Policy Effectiveness

I. INTRODUCTION

Sports development has emerged as a significant policy priority for sub-national governments in India, particularly since the liberalisation period of the 1990s. States increasingly recognise that investment in sports infrastructure and athlete development yields benefits beyond competitive achievements, including public health, youth engagement, and regional identity formation [10]. Tamil Nadu presents a particularly instructive case for examining the relationship between policy interventions and sports outcomes. The state established one of India's earliest dedicated sports authorities in 1992, implemented sustained budgetary increases across three decades, and achieved measurable improvements in competitive performance at national and international levels.

Empirical evaluation of sports policy effectiveness remains underdeveloped in Indian public policy research. While descriptive accounts of sports initiatives exist, systematic assessments linking resource allocation patterns to performance outcomes are notably absent. This gap assumes importance given the substantial public expenditure involved and the growing emphasis on evidence-based policymaking. Tamil Nadu's experience offers an opportunity to examine whether institutional reforms, infrastructure investments, and athlete support programmes produce measurable returns in terms of competitive success and mass participation.

Between 1990 and 2025, Tamil Nadu's sports landscape underwent a considerable transformation. The establishment of the Sports Development Authority of Tamil Nadu in July 1992 consolidated previously fragmented responsibilities under a unified institutional structure. Budgetary allocations increased substantially, infrastructure expanded across district headquarters, and specialised coaching programmes multiplied. The state hosted major international competitions, including the 44th FIDE Chess Olympiad in 2022 and multiple national championships. By 2024, Tamil Nadu had secured second place in the Khelo India Youth Games medal tally with 98 medals, a marked improvement from its eighth-place finish in 2022 (Government of Tamil Nadu, 2025a).

However, aggregate performance indicators may mask underlying inefficiencies, regional disparities, and variations in effectiveness across policy instruments. The relationship between increased expenditure and improved outcomes is not necessarily linear or uniform across sports disciplines. Some initiatives may yield quick returns, whereas others require sustained investment before producing results. Resource allocation may favour urban centres at the expense of rural talent pools. These complexities necessitate careful empirical examination rather than reliance on descriptive statistics alone.

This study addresses three research questions. First, what patterns characterise the evolution of Tamil Nadu's sports policy and resource allocation between 1990 and 2025? Second, to what extent do budgetary investments, infrastructure development, and institutional mechanisms correlate with measurable performance outcomes? Third, what factors explain variations in effectiveness across different policy instruments and time periods?

The analysis proceeds through several stages. Following this introduction, a literature review synthesises existing knowledge on sports policy evaluation frameworks and performance determinants. The methodology section describes data sources, variable construction, and estimation techniques. Results present descriptive trends, correlation patterns, and regression estimates linking policy inputs to performance outputs. The discussion interprets findings in light of theoretical expectations and contextual factors specific to Tamil Nadu. The conclusion summarises key insights and outlines policy implications.

Tamil Nadu's sustained policy commitment over 35 years, combined with relatively comprehensive documentation of expenditures and achievements, provides an unusually rich case for systematic evaluation. The state's performance trajectory—from modest beginnings in the early 1990s to consistent top-tier rankings by 2025—suggests that deliberate policy interventions may indeed influence sports outcomes. Whether this relationship reflects genuine effectiveness or is due to confounding factors requires careful empirical scrutiny. This study attempts such an assessment.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Conceptual Frameworks for Sports Policy Evaluation

The evaluation of sports policy effectiveness has evolved from simple medal counting to sophisticated multidimensional frameworks that incorporate inputs, processes, and outcomes. Early approaches treated competitive success as a straightforward function of resource availability, ignoring institutional quality, talent identification systems, and contextual factors [8]. Contemporary frameworks recognise sports development as a complex system involving multiple stakeholders, feedback loops, and time-lagged effects.

The SPLISS model (Sport Policy factors Leading to International Sporting Success) is an influential approach that identifies nine pillars contributing to elite sports success, including financial support, athlete career support, training facilities, and scientific research [3]. Studies applying SPLISS across multiple countries find that while resources matter, their effectiveness depends critically on governance structures and implementation quality. Countries with similar resource levels often achieve markedly different outcomes, suggesting that policy design and institutional capacity play crucial mediating roles.

Alternative frameworks emphasise broader developmental objectives beyond elite performance. The Sports Development Index approach, adopted in Indonesia and other Asian nations, incorporates dimensions such as mass participation, access to open spaces, human resources, physical fitness, and health outcomes, alongside competitive achievements [9]. This broader conceptualisation recognises that sports policy serves multiple public purposes, and evaluation should reflect this multidimensionality. Recent methodological work emphasises realist evaluation approaches that examine not just whether policies work, but how, for whom, and under what conditions [5].

Chen et al. (2024) introduced the PMC Index Model for quantitative policy evaluation, constructing composite indicators across policy type, level, content, function, and implementation guarantees. Applied to China's rural sports policy, this framework revealed substantial variation in policy consistency and completeness across different initiatives. The approach demonstrates that rigorous policy evaluation requires moving beyond outcome measurement to assess the quality of policy design itself. [2]

2.2. Determinants of Sports Performance

Empirical research on sports performance determinants spans multiple disciplines, with varying emphasis on economic, social, and institutional factors. Economic analyses consistently find positive associations between national income levels and Olympic medal counts, suggesting that wealth enables investment in training infrastructure, coaching expertise, and athlete support systems [11]. Population size also matters, as it provides larger talent pools from which high-performing athletes emerge. However, these factors explain only part of the variance, leaving substantial room for policy interventions to influence outcomes.

Recent literature has paid increasing attention to institutional variables. Bernard and Busse demonstrated that host-country advantages in Olympic performance partly reflect investments triggered by hosting responsibilities, underscoring the importance of discrete policy shocks [1]. Political systems also appear to matter, with centralised states potentially better positioned to coordinate elite sports programmes, though at the expense of grassroots participation. The relationship between sports participation rates and elite success remains debated, with some evidence suggesting that broadening the participation base improves talent identification, while other studies find that concentrating resources on elite programs yields more immediate competitive returns.

Regional and state-level analyses within federal systems offer insights more directly relevant to Tamil Nadu. Studies of Australian state sports institutes find that sustained funding, combined with coach quality and athlete pathways, strongly predicts medal achievements [12]. Research on Canadian provincial sport systems emphasises the importance of school-based participation programs as feeder mechanisms for elite development. The effectiveness of talent identification schemes appears highly context-dependent, working well when linked to structured development pathways but showing limited impact when operating in isolation.

2.3. Sports Policy in the Indian Context

Sports policy research in India remains relatively sparse compared to other major developing economies. Government of India reports document steady increases in central sports budgets since the National Sports Policy of 2001, with the Khelo India programme representing the most substantial recent initiative [7]. However, academic literature largely lacks evaluations of policy effectiveness. Descriptive accounts of medal achievements at the Commonwealth and Asian Games exist, but no systematic assessment has examined the factors driving these outcomes.

State-level sports policy research is even more limited. Factogram has documented that sports expenditure as a share of state budgets ranged from 0.04 to 1.16 per cent across Indian states, with northeastern states generally allocating higher proportions than large states [4]. This variation in prioritisation presumably influences performance outcomes, but the relationship has not been empirically examined. Anecdotal evidence suggests that states investing in infrastructure and coaching support—such as Haryana, Punjab, and Kerala—produce disproportionate numbers of national and international medalists, but rigorous analysis is lacking.

It is provided the first empirical evaluation of the relationship between government sports expenditure and performance outcomes in India, using national-level panel data from 2015 to 2022. The study found positive associations between budget allocations and medal counts at international competitions, with effects strengthening over time. However, the analysis did not disaggregate state-level variations or examine specific policy mechanisms through which expenditure influences outcomes. The study also noted data limitations, with inconsistent reporting across states and years, which complicated comprehensive analysis [10].

Research on Tamil Nadu's sports sector consists primarily of policy notes and official reports rather than academic evaluations. The state government's annual policy notes document infrastructure projects, athlete support schemes, and competition results but offer limited analysis of effectiveness (Government of Tamil Nadu, 2025b). Studies examining sports facilities in government schools identified substantial deficits in equipment and in the number of trained physical education teachers, suggesting that infrastructure expansion has not reached all levels of the education system uniformly [6]. The Tamil Nadu Physical Education and Sports University, established in 2004, has produced descriptive research on athlete training and nutrition, but it has not prioritised systematic policy evaluation.

2.3. Research Gaps

The literature review reveals several important gaps. First, no published study has systematically evaluated the effectiveness of Tamil Nadu's sports development model across an extended time period. Second, the relationship between specific policy instruments such as infrastructure investment, coaching programs, and financial incentives and performance outcomes remains unexamined. Third, the role of institutional reforms, particularly the establishment and evolution of the Sports Development Authority, has not been assessed. Fourth, the study has not explored variations in effectiveness across sports disciplines and geographic sub-regions within Tamil Nadu.

This study addresses these gaps by constructing a longitudinal dataset spanning 35 years, developing composite performance indicators, and employing regression analysis to isolate the effects of specific policy variables. The research contributes to both the limited literature on sports policy evaluation in developing countries and the broader public policy literature on sub-national government effectiveness in India.

2.4. Methodology

2.4.1. Research Design and Data Sources

This study employs a quantitative research design, drawing on secondary data from multiple official sources. The analysis spans the period 1990 to 2025, chosen to capture the full trajectory from pre-reform conditions through the mature phase of the Sports Development Authority's operations. Data were compiled from published government reports, sports authority documents, competition records, and academic sources.

Primary data sources include annual policy notes published by the Tamil Nadu Youth Welfare and Sports Development Department, budget documents from the Tamil Nadu Finance Department, annual reports of the Sports Development Authority of Tamil Nadu, and medal tallies from National Games, Khelo India competitions, and other national championships. International competition data were obtained from the Tamil Nadu Olympic Association and relevant sports federation records. Infrastructure and program information came from SDAT publications and supplementary Right to Information Act responses.

Supplementary sources include reports from the Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports on state-wise budget allocations under central schemes, Census of India data on demographic variables, and academic publications providing contextual information. Data collection proceeded systematically, with cross-verification across sources where overlaps existed. Missing data points for specific years were estimated using linear interpolation when adjacent years' values were available, a limitation acknowledged in the interpretation of the results.

2.4.2. Variable Construction

The dependent variable, Sports Development Performance Index (SDPI), was constructed as a composite indicator reflecting multiple dimensions of sports achievement and participation. The index combines four components: competitive performance, participation breadth, athlete development, and infrastructure adequacy. We first standardised each component to a 0-100 scale, then weighted and aggregated them.

We measured competitive performance using medal achievements in National Games, Khelo India competitions, and major national championships. For each year, medals were assigned weights (gold = 3 points, silver = 2 points, bronze = 1 point) and summed to create a total achievement score. This score was then expressed relative to the highest-performing state in that year and converted to a 0-100 scale. International achievements by Tamil Nadu athletes at the Olympic Games, Asian Games, and Commonwealth Games were incorporated with multiplicative weights reflecting their prestige levels.

Participation breadth captures the extent of grassroots involvement in organised sports activities. Data sources included school sports competitions organised by the School Games Federation of India, college-level tournaments, and district sports meets. The total number of participants in state-sponsored competitions served as the primary indicator, normalised by the state's population aged 10-25 years to account for the demographic base. For years where comprehensive participation data were unavailable, estimates were derived from sub-samples of major events and scaled proportionally.

Athlete development reflects the pipeline of emerging talent identified through structured programs. This component measured the number of athletes enrolled in government-supported coaching schemes, sports hostels, and talent identification initiatives. Data primarily came from SDAT annual reports and records of the Tamil Nadu Physical Education and Sports University. The indicator was expressed per capita to enable meaningful comparisons across years as the state's population grew.

Infrastructure adequacy assesses the availability and quality of sports facilities relative to demand. A facility index was constructed by counting stadiums, sports complexes, specialised training centres, and well-equipped school playgrounds, and weighting them by capacity and amenity standards. The index incorporated stadium capacity, synthetic track availability, international-standard venues, and district-level sports complex completeness. The index was normalised by population to create a per capita infrastructure score.

The composite SDPI assigned weights of 0.40 to competitive performance, 0.25 to participation breadth, 0.20 to athlete development, and 0.15 to infrastructure adequacy. These weights reflect the judgment that competitive achievements constitute the most visible and policy-relevant outcome, while recognising the importance of broader developmental indicators. Sensitivity analysis examined whether different weighting schemes substantially altered the index trajectory and found generally robust patterns.

Independent variables capture policy inputs and institutional characteristics. Budget allocation represents the Tamil Nadu government's total annual expenditure on sports development, expressed in constant 2020 prices using the Consumer Price Index deflator. Data sources included budget documents and policy notes. Budget intensity, calculated as sports expenditure per capita or as a percentage of the state's total budget, was also constructed to account for overall fiscal constraints.

Infrastructure investment measures capital expenditure on stadium construction, renovation of existing facilities, and equipment procurement. This variable was separated from recurrent expenditure on athlete support and administrative costs to test whether capital and recurrent spending affect performance differently. Data came from detailed expenditure statements in SDAT annual reports, supplemented by specific project documents for major construction initiatives such as the Jawaharlal Nehru Stadium renovation.

Coaching program intensity quantifies the scale of structured training initiatives. Indicators include the number of coaches employed (domestic and foreign), athletes enrolled in residential coaching camps, and specialised training centres operational. The variable was standardised by the number of registered athletes to capture coaching availability per participant rather than absolute numbers.

Institutional reform variables include a dummy indicator for the post-SDAT period (1 from 1992 onward and 0 before) and a discrete variable measuring the number of major policy initiatives implemented each year. Policy initiatives identified from official documents include the Chief Minister's Trophy Games (launched in 2023), the Kalaigarnar Sports Kit Scheme (2024), athlete incentive programs, and foreign coach recruitment drives.

Control variables account for factors that influence sports outcomes but are not directly related to state policy. State GDP per capita, drawn from Reserve Bank of India and Planning Commission data, controls for overall economic development. Population growth rates from the Census and projected population figures adjust for demographic change. A time-trend variable captures secular improvements in sports performance nationwide that may also affect Tamil Nadu, independent of state-specific policies.

2.4.3. Estimation Strategy

The analysis employs multiple techniques to assess the relationship between policy inputs and performance outcomes. Descriptive statistics document trends in budget allocation, infrastructure development, and performance indicators across the study period. Growth rates, periodized averages, and visual presentations establish basic patterns in the data.

Correlation analysis examines bivariate associations between policy variables and performance measures. Pearson correlation coefficients are calculated for key variable pairs, with statistical significance assessed at conventional levels. This analysis identifies which policy instruments exhibit the strongest associations with outcomes, providing preliminary evidence of effectiveness.

The core empirical analysis uses ordinary least squares regression to estimate the impact of policy variables on the composite Sports Development Performance Index and its components. The baseline specification takes the form:

$$SDPI_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Budget_t + \beta_2 Infrastructure_t + \beta_3 Coaching_t + \beta_4 Reform_t + \beta_5 GDP_t + \beta_6 Population_t + \beta_7 Trend_t + \varepsilon_t$$

where t indexes years from 1990 to 2025, SDPI represents the dependent variable, Budget through Reform represents policy variables of interest, GDP and Population are controls, Trend is a time variable, and ε is the error term. The coefficients β_1 through β_4 capture the marginal effects of policy inputs on performance, holding other factors constant.

An extended specifications test for lagged effects, recognising that infrastructure investments and coaching programs may require time to influence outcomes. Models incorporate one- and two-year lags of policy variables to assess whether past investments better predict current performance than contemporaneous spending. The lag structure is specified as:

$$SDPI_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Budget_t + \beta_2 Budget_{(t-1)} + \beta_3 Budget_{(t-2)} + \beta_4 Infrastructure_t + \beta_5 Infrastructure_{(t-1)} + \beta_6 Infrastructure_{(t-2)} + \dots + \varepsilon_t$$

Distributed lag models estimate cumulative effects over multiple periods, with lag lengths selected based on information criteria and theoretical expectations about gestation periods for sports infrastructure and athlete development programs.

The analysis also estimates separate regressions for individual SDPI components—competitive performance, participation, athlete development, and infrastructure—to determine whether policy instruments affect dimensions differently. This disaggregation tests whether certain interventions primarily affect elite performance while others expand grassroots participation, or whether effects are more uniform.

Given the time-series nature of the data, diagnostic tests assess serial correlation in the residuals and heteroskedasticity. The Durbin-Watson statistic assesses autocorrelation, and we apply corrections if necessary using generalised least squares. Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors ensure valid inference. Multicollinearity among independent variables is examined using variance inflation factors, and highly correlated variables are entered separately in alternative specifications.

A limitation of the single-state time-series design is the inability to fully control for national trends that affect all states simultaneously. If central government policies improved sports infrastructure across India during this period, the estimated effects attributed to Tamil Nadu policies may partially reflect broader national developments. The time trend variable and national-level control variables partially address this concern, but causal identification remains weaker than in a panel design including multiple states. Interpret the results as associations rather than definitive causal effects, though the consistency of patterns across specifications strengthens confidence in the findings.

2.4.4. Data Limitations

Several data limitations warrant acknowledgement. First, consistent annual data were not available for all variables across the entire 1990-2025 period. Infrastructure counts and athlete enrollment figures exhibit gaps in the 1990s when reporting systems were less systematic. We applied interpolation and estimation procedures transparently, but they introduce measurement error. Second, budget figures for the early 1990s were reconstructed from archived documents and may not align perfectly with later reporting standards. Third, participation data capture only organised competitions registered with official bodies, excluding informal sports activities that may also reflect policy effectiveness. Fourth, the study focuses on quantifiable indicators and may overlook qualitative dimensions of sports development, such as improvements in coaching quality or changes in sports culture.

These limitations suggest interpreting the findings with appropriate caution. The analysis provides the best feasible assessment given available data, but refinements would be possible with more comprehensive information systems. Recommendations for improved data collection are offered in the conclusion.

III. RESULTS

3.1. Descriptive Trends in Sports Development Inputs

Tamil Nadu's sports development expenditure grew substantially over the study period, though growth rates varied considerably across sub-periods. Table 1 presents quinquennial averages for key input variables, revealing the broad trajectory of policy commitments.

Table 3.1 Quinquennial Averages of Sports Development Inputs in Tamil Nadu (1990-2025)

Period	Budget (Rs. Cr.)	Budget per Capita (Rs.)	Coaches	Infrastructure Index
1990-1994	42.3	6.8	127	18.2
1995-1999	68.5	10.2	183	24.6
2000-2004	112.7	15.8	245	32.4
2005-2009	187.4	24.1	312	43.7
2010-2014	278.6	33.7	398	56.8
2015-2019	412.3	48.5	487	68.3
2020-2025	598.4	69.2	603	79.5

Source: Compiled from Government of Tamil Nadu Policy Notes (various years) and SDAT Annual Reports

Budget allocations increased from an average of Rs. 42.3 crore in the early 1990s to Rs. 598.4 crore in the 2020-2025 period, representing a compound annual growth rate of approximately 8.2 per cent in real terms. Per capita expenditure rose from Rs. 6.8 to Rs. 69.2 over the same interval, reflecting both absolute increases and adjustment for population growth. These figures position Tamil Nadu among the higher-spending states in India on sports development, though still below northeastern states like Manipur and Meghalaya when measured as a budget share.

The establishment of the Sports Development Authority of Tamil Nadu in July 1992 marked an institutional watershed. Before this reform, sports administration was split between the Department of Sports and the Tamil Nadu State Sports Development Corporation, with unclear coordination mechanisms. The consolidation under SDAT, with the Chief Minister serving as President, elevated the institutional status of sports policy and appears to have facilitated sustained budget increases. Average annual budget growth accelerated to 10.3 per cent in the five years following SDAT's establishment, up from 6.7 per cent in the preceding five years.

Infrastructure development followed a similar trajectory, with the composite infrastructure index rising from 18.2 in the early 1990s to 79.5 by 2020-2025. Major infrastructure milestones included renovating Chennai's Jawaharlal Nehru Stadium and Nehru Indoor Stadium (completed in 2022-2023 at a cost of Rs. 60 crore), constructing district sports complexes in all 38 districts, and establishing specialised training centres for swimming, athletics, and racquet sports. The announcement of a Global Sports City project near Chennai, with a planned investment of Rs. 261 crores, represents the most ambitious infrastructure initiative to date, though the facilities will not be operational until 2027.

Coaching capacity expanded substantially, with the number of employed coaches growing from 127 in the early 1990s to 603 by 2025. Notably, the state recruited 81 foreign coaches between 2021 and 2024 to improve technical expertise in sports where domestic coaching depth was limited. These included specialists in athletics, swimming, gymnastics, and combat sports, who were contracted at higher salaries than domestic coaches. Whether foreign coaching expertise translates into proportionate performance improvements represents an important question for cost-effectiveness analysis, though isolating their specific contribution proves challenging given concurrent changes in other inputs.

3.2. Performance Outcomes Across Time

Table 2 documents trends in the dependent variable, the Sports Development Performance Index, and its constituent components. The composite index demonstrates an upward trajectory with some fluctuations, rising from an average of 32.4 in 1990-1994 to 68.7 in 2020-2025.

Table 3.2 Sports Development Performance Index and Components (1990-2025)

Period	SDPI	Competitive	Participation	Athlete Dev.	Infrastructure
1990-1994	32.4	28.6	31.2	35.8	34.5
1995-1999	38.7	35.4	37.9	42.1	39.8

2000-2004	45.2	42.8	44.6	48.7	45.3
2005-2009	52.6	51.3	49.8	55.4	53.2
2010-2014	58.9	58.7	54.3	62.1	60.8
2015-2019	64.2	65.8	58.7	67.3	64.9
2020-2025	68.7	72.4	62.1	71.2	69.8

Source: Author's calculations based on National Games results, SDAT data, and infrastructure surveys

Competitive performance, weighted most heavily in the composite index, improved the most. Tamil Nadu's medal achievements in National Games and other major competitions showed a particularly pronounced upturn after 2015. In the 36th National Games held in Gujarat (2022), Tamil Nadu secured 91 medals, including 27 gold, finishing sixth overall. By the 38th National Games in Uttarakhand (2025), the state improved to 91 medals (27 gold, 30 silvers, 34 bronze), maintaining its top-six position in the most comprehensive assessment of state sports prowess.

The performance trajectory was not uniformly smooth. Tamil Nadu's ranking fluctuated considerably during the 1990s and early 2000s, finishing outside the top ten at several National Games. The state placed eleventh in the 1997 National Games in Karnataka, ninth in the 2002 Hyderabad Games, and tenth in the 2007 Guwahati Games. The state improved markedly in the 2010s, posting consistent top-six finishes from 2015 onward. This periodisation suggests a gestation period between policy initiatives launched in the early 2000s and their manifestation in competitive outcomes.

Participation metrics expanded substantially, though growth rates were slower than for competitive achievement. The Chief Minister's Trophy Games, initiated in 2023, dramatically increased recorded participation. The 2023 edition attracted 376,000 sportspersons in district and state-level competitions, while the 2024 edition reached 1.156 million participants across Tamil Nadu. These figures represent an order-of-magnitude increase in organised sports participation compared to earlier decades, though it remains unclear whether this reflects genuine expansion in sporting activity or improved registration of existing participation.

Athlete development indicators measuring enrollment in structured training programs and talent identification schemes exhibited steady improvement without dramatic discontinuities. The number of athletes supported through government hostels, stipends, and coaching camps grew from approximately 2,400 in the early 1990s to 12,800 by 2025. The Tamil Nadu Physical Education and Sports University, established in 2004, enrolled approximately 1,200 students annually in degree and diploma programs, contributing to the pipeline of coaches and sports administrators.

3.3. Correlation Analysis

Table 3 presents correlation coefficients between policy input variables and performance outcomes, providing initial evidence of associations before controlling for confounding factors in regression analysis.

Table 3: Correlation Coefficients: Policy Inputs and Performance Outcomes

Variable	SDPI	Competitive	Participation	Athlete Dev.
Budget (current)	0.847***	0.823***	0.762***	0.801***
Budget (1-year lag)	0.879***	0.861***	0.791***	0.824***
Budget (2-year lag)	0.892***	0.883***	0.808***	0.835***
Infrastructure Investment	0.813***	0.828***	0.724***	0.789***
Coaching Intensity	0.761***	0.792***	0.683***	0.778***
SDAT Reform	0.682***	0.698***	0.615***	0.671***
State GDP per Capita	0.794***	0.771***	0.753***	0.762***

Note: *** indicates statistical significance at the 1% level

Source: Author's calculations

Budget allocations exhibit strong positive correlations with all performance dimensions, with correlation coefficients ranging from 0.76 to 0.89. Notably, lagged budget variables demonstrate stronger correlations than contemporaneous spending, consistent with the hypothesis that sports investments require time to generate results. The two-year lagged budget shows the highest correlation with the composite SDPI (0.892), suggesting an approximate two-year gestation period for the full effects of increased expenditure to materialise in competition outcomes.

Infrastructure investment correlates strongly with competitive performance ($r = 0.828$), indicating that facility development is closely associated with medal achievements. The slightly weaker correlation with participation (0.724) suggests that infrastructure primarily benefits elite athletes training intensively rather than casual participants, though causality could run in either direction. Coaching intensity similarly shows a stronger association with competitive outcomes than with broad participation.

The institutional reform indicator (SDAT establishment) shows positive correlations across all performance dimensions, though weaker than those for financial and physical inputs. This may reflect the reform's primary effect operating through increased resource allocation rather than directly improving outcomes. The correlation between state GDP per capita and sports performance indicates that broader economic development accompanies sports achievement, consistent with the national-level literature, though the direction of causality remains ambiguous.

3.4. Regression Analysis

Table 4 presents regression estimates of the determinants of the Sports Development Performance Index. Model 1 includes only contemporaneous policy variables and controls. Models 2 and 3 incorporate lagged effects to capture gestation periods. Model 4 adds interaction terms to test whether policy effectiveness changed over time.

Table 3.4 Regression Results: Determinants of Sports Development Performance Index

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Budget (log)	8.42***	5.67**	4.23*	3.89*
	(2.13)	(2.48)	(2.39)	(2.31)
Budget (t-1)	-	6.34**	5.12**	4.87**
		(2.56)	(2.44)	(2.38)
Budget (t-2)	-	-	3.87*	3.65*
			(2.21)	(2.19)
Infrastructure Investment	4.27***	4.18***	3.96***	3.82***
	(1.34)	(1.37)	(1.35)	(1.33)
Coaching Intensity	2.89**	2.76**	2.61**	2.54**
	(1.18)	(1.19)	(1.17)	(1.16)
SDAT Reform	6.83**	5.47*	4.92*	4.68*
	(2.87)	(2.91)	(2.86)	(2.84)
State GDP per Capita (log)	3.54*	2.98	2.67	2.43
	(1.89)	(1.96)	(1.93)	(1.91)
Time Trend	0.87***	0.73**	0.68**	0.64**
	(0.28)	(0.29)	(0.28)	(0.27)
Budget × Time	-	-	-	0.18*
				(0.09)
Constant	-42.36**	-38.72*	-35.48*	-33.21*
	(18.74)	(19.83)	(19.56)	(19.32)
Observations	36	35	34	34
R-squared	0.847	0.872	0.889	0.894
Adj. R-squared	0.824	0.846	0.861	0.865
F-statistic	37.2***	33.8***	31.4***	29.7***

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *, **, *** indicate significance at 10%, 5%, and 1% levels respectively

Source: Author's estimations

The regression results confirm that budget allocations are positively and statistically significantly associated with sports performance across all model specifications. In Model 1, which includes only contemporaneous variables, a 1% increase in the sports budget is associated with an 8.42-point increase in the SDPI, significant at the 1% level. This coefficient declines in magnitude when lagged budget terms are included (Models 2 and 3), indicating that the contemporaneous estimate partially captured the delayed effects of past spending.

Model 3, incorporating two-year lags, suggests that budget increases affect performance gradually over a three-year period. The sum of coefficients across current and lagged budget terms ($4.23 + 5.12 + 3.87 = 13.22$) indicates the total effect of sustained budget increases, with roughly 38 per cent of the impact materialising contemporaneously, 39 per cent in the following year, and 23 per cent in the second year. This distributed lag pattern appears consistent with the time required for infrastructure projects to be completed and for recruited coaches to systematically develop athletes.

Infrastructure investment demonstrates robust positive effects across specifications, with coefficients around 4 points significant at the one per cent level. The relative stability of this coefficient when lagged terms are added suggests that infrastructure impacts occur with shorter delays than overall budget increases, possibly because renovated facilities immediately improve training conditions for athletes already in the development pipeline. New stadiums may take longer to build, but renovating existing facilities yields more immediate returns.

Coaching intensity shows positive, significant coefficients in the 2.5 to 2.9 range across models. While statistically significant, the magnitude is smaller than the budget and infrastructure effects, suggesting that adding coaches yields more modest marginal returns per unit increase. This could reflect diminishing returns as coach-to-athlete ratios improve, or may indicate that coaching quality matters more than quantity. The relatively modest coefficient for foreign coach recruitment specifically (not shown in the main table but estimated in supplementary specifications) raises questions about cost-effectiveness, given their substantially higher compensation.

The SDAT reform variable exhibits significant positive coefficients ranging from 4.68 to 6.83 across specifications. This suggests that institutional consolidation contributed approximately 5 to 7 points to the SDPI independent of resource increases, equivalent to roughly 15 to 20 per cent of the total improvement observed between the pre- and post-reform periods. The reform's impact likely operated through improved coordination, heightened political priority, and gains in bureaucratic efficiency that enabled more effective resource deployment.

State GDP per capita shows positive coefficients in all models but loses statistical significance when lagged budget terms are included (Models 2-4). This suggests that the apparent association between economic development and sports performance operates largely through increased public spending on sports as state revenues grow, rather than through independent pathways such as private sports participation or improvements in nutrition. This interpretation aligns with Tamil Nadu's policy model, which emphasises state-led development rather than relying on private sports academies or corporate sponsorships.

The time trend variable remains positive and significant across specifications, indicating that factors not captured by the included regressors also contributed to performance improvements. These could include nationwide improvements in sports science, increased media coverage that elevates the salience of sports achievement, or secular changes in youth culture that increase sports participation. National-level policies such as Khelo India, launched in 2018, may also have contributed, though Tamil Nadu's allocation under this scheme was modest relative to its state expenditure.

Model 4 includes an interaction term between budget and time to test whether budget effectiveness changed over the study period. The positive and significant coefficient (0.18) indicates that the marginal impact of budget increases grew over time, suggesting learning effects or complementarities with accumulated infrastructure and coaching capacity. An additional rupee of sports expenditure in 2020 produced higher returns than an equivalent investment in 2000, possibly because later investments built on existing foundations rather than starting from lower baselines.

The models explain between 84.7 and 89.4 per cent of the variance in the dependent variable, indicating a strong overall fit. The adjusted R-squared values account for the increasing number of regressors in extended models, confirming that the additional variables genuinely improve explanatory power. F-statistics decisively reject the null hypothesis that all slope coefficients equal zero, confirming that the models capture systematic relationships rather than noise.

Diagnostic tests reveal some serial correlation in the residuals, with Durbin-Watson statistics of around 1.4-1.6, suggesting mild positive autocorrelation. This is unsurprising given the time series structure and indicates that standard errors may be slightly understated. Robust standard errors partially address this concern, though fully correcting for autocorrelation would require generalised least squares estimation. Multicollinearity is present among budget variables and their lags, as expected, but variance inflation factors remain below concern thresholds when variables are entered as specified.

3.5. Disaggregated Analysis by Performance Component

Table 5 presents regression estimates for individual SDPI components, using the specification from Model 3 above. This disaggregation reveals whether policy instruments have differential effects across performance dimensions.

Table 3.5 Regression Results by Performance Component

Variable	Competitive	Participation	Athlete Dev.	Infrastructure
Budget (sum of lags)	14.67*** (3.42)	9.83** (4.18)	12.45*** (3.67)	11.28** (4.52)
Infrastructure Investment	5.23*** (1.56)	2.87* (1.68)	4.18** (1.61)	6.92*** (1.89)
Coaching Intensity	3.87*** (1.38)	1.94 (1.52)	4.23** (1.41)	2.11 (1.58)
SDAT Reform	5.78** (2.91)	3.42 (3.24)	6.12** (2.98)	4.67* (3.18)
Controls Included	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	34	34	34	34
R-squared	0.892	0.768	0.856	0.813

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. Controls include state GDP, population, and timetrend
Source: Author's estimations

Budget effects appear strongest for competitive performance and athlete development, with cumulative coefficients of 14.67 and 12.45, respectively, compared to 9.83 for participation. This pattern suggests that increases in resources disproportionately benefited structured elite development programs rather than mass participation initiatives. The relatively weaker effect on participation may reflect that grassroots sports engagement depends heavily on school-level programs and community facilities, which receive only a portion of the state sports budget.

Infrastructure investment shows particularly strong effects on the infrastructure component itself (by construction, since the variable measures facility development), and it also significantly predicts competitive performance and athlete development. The weaker effect on participation again suggests that new stadiums and specialized training centers primarily serve elite athletes rather than casual participants. Rural areas received fewer infrastructure investments than urban centres, potentially limiting the benefits of mass participation despite increased overall facility counts.

Coaching intensity strongly predicts competitive performance and athlete development but shows no significant relationship with participation. This makes sense given that coaching programs target identified talent rather than general youth populations. The lack of significance for participation indicates that expanding the coaching staff does not, in itself, draw more people into organised sports; rather, coaches work with those already engaged to improve their skill levels.

The SDAT reform dummy significantly predicts competitive performance and athlete development but not participation or infrastructure per se. This suggests that the institutional change primarily improved the effectiveness of elite athlete support systems through better coordination and resource allocation, while infrastructure development followed its own trajectory driven by capital budget allocations.

3.6. Performance Variations Across Sports Disciplines

Examining performance across specific sports reveals considerable heterogeneity in Tamil Nadu's achievements. Table 6 summarises medal counts in major National Games across key disciplines for recent editions.

Table 3.6 Tamil Nadu Medal Counts by Sport in Selected National Games (2015-2025)

Sport	2015 (Kerala)	2022 (Gujarat)	2025 (Uttarakhand)	Growth
Athletics	8	12	14	+75%
Chess	6	9	11	+83%
Shooting	4	7	9	+125%
Kabaddi	5	6	8	+60%
Boxing	3	5	7	+133%
Swimming	7	8	9	+29%
Wrestling	2	4	5	+150%
Weightlifting	6	7	8	+33%
Badminton	4	6	7	+75%
Table Tennis	3	5	6	+100%
Total (selected)	48	69	84	+75%

Source: National Games official results and Tamil Nadu Olympic Association records

Chess and shooting showed particularly strong growth, with increases exceeding 100 per cent over the decade. Tamil Nadu's chess prowess reflects deep roots in Chennai's chess culture, historically anchored by Viswanathan Anand's global prominence. The state hosted the 44th FIDE Chess Olympiad in 2022, which may have provided additional impetus. Specialised infrastructure investments, including modern shooting ranges built in Chennai and Coimbatore during this period, likely supported shooting improvements.

Traditional strength sports like wrestling and boxing showed robust growth from lower bases, suggesting successful talent identification and coaching programs in these disciplines. Kabaddi, a sport with strong cultural resonance in Tamil Nadu, showed steady, if unspectacular, improvement. Swimming and weightlifting, where Tamil Nadu historically performed well, showed more modest growth rates, possibly indicating maturity effects where further improvements become increasingly difficult.

Team sports showed mixed results that medal counts don't fully capture. Tamil Nadu's basketball and volleyball teams achieved national prominence during the 2010s, though translating team success into individual medal counts proves challenging in National Games formats. Cricket, despite enormous popularity and deep talent pools in Tamil Nadu, features less prominently in National Games medal tallies due to format constraints.

International achievements by individual Tamil Nadu athletes complemented the state team's performance in the National Games. Notable examples include Mariyappan Thangavelu's gold medal in high jump at the 2016 Rio Paralympics, weightlifter Satish Sivalingam's Commonwealth Games medals, and multiple shuttlers achieving international rankings. These individual successes often reflected state support through SDAT coaching and financial assistance programs, though quantifying the state's contribution relative to national-level support proves difficult.

IV. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS IN POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

While aggregate performance indicators demonstrate improvement, qualitative evidence from policy documents and media reports suggests persistent implementation challenges. Geographic disparities in facility quality and coaching availability constrain talent development in rural districts. A study of government schools found that physical education infrastructure remained inadequate in many areas despite overall budget increases, with shortages of trained PE teachers and basic equipment [6].

The concentration of advanced training facilities in Chennai and other major urban centres may overlook rural talent. Transport costs and opportunity costs of intensive training disproportionately affect athletes from modest economic backgrounds, even when coaching and facility access are subsidised. Programs to identify and support rural talent exist, but appear insufficiently scaled relative to the geographic distribution of Tamil Nadu's population.

While narrowing, gender disparities in participation and support remain evident. Female participation in the 2024 Chief Minister's Trophy Games reached 45 per cent of the total, up from approximately 35 per cent in earlier editions, suggesting progress but continued underrepresentation. Certain sports exhibit particularly skewed gender participation, reflecting both cultural factors and differential facility availability.

Coordination between school-level sports programs and elite development pathways appears incomplete. Many talented school athletes fail to transition into structured training programs due to information gaps, academic pressures, or a lack of systematic scouting. The School Games Federation and SDAT operate somewhat independently, with limited formal mechanisms to identify promising school athletes and channel them into state-supported coaching programs.

V. DISCUSSION

The empirical findings indicate that Tamil Nadu's sports development model achieved measurable success in improving competitive performance and expanding participation from 1990 to 2025. Budget allocations, infrastructure investments, and institutional reforms each contributed to these improvements, with effects generally materialising over multi-year periods consistent with the gestation time required for facility construction and athlete development. The results align with international evidence that sustained public investment in sports systems can improve outcomes, particularly when coupled with institutional reforms that improve resource allocation efficiency.

The lag structure of budget effects warrants particular attention. The finding that expenditure exhibits stronger associations with performance when lagged by one to two years suggests that sports investments should be evaluated with patience rather than expecting immediate returns. This temporal pattern has implications for political economy, as elected officials may face incentives to prioritise initiatives with shorter feedback loops. Tamil Nadu's ability to sustain expenditure growth across multiple electoral cycles under governments of different political parties suggests that sports development has achieved some degree of consensus, transcending partisan competition.

The relatively stronger effects of infrastructure and coaching on competitive performance than on mass participation may reflect the design of Tamil Nadu's policies, which emphasised elite athlete development over grassroots engagement for much of the study period. The dramatic expansion in participation following the 2023 launch of the Chief Minister's Trophy Games demonstrates that targeted mass-participation initiatives can deliver rapid results when prioritised. This suggests a potential rebalancing toward broader participation may yield welfare benefits beyond medal counts, including public health improvements and social capital formation.

The positive independent effect of SDAT institutional reform, beyond resource increases, underscores the importance of governance structures for policy effectiveness. Consolidated authority, high-level political ownership (with the Chief Minister as President), and unified budgeting appear to have improved coordination across previously fragmented activities. This finding complements the broader public administration literature, which emphasises that institutional design matters alongside resource availability. Other states seeking to improve sports performance might learn from Tamil Nadu's experience with institutional consolidation.

Performance heterogeneity across sports disciplines raises questions about resource allocation strategies. Should Tamil Nadu concentrate investments in sports where the state has a comparative advantage (chess, shooting, athletics), or distribute resources evenly to build comprehensive capacity? Economic efficiency arguments favour specialisation, but broader developmental objectives may justify comprehensive programs. The current approach appears to pursue a middle path, with greater resources flowing toward stronger disciplines but continued support for emerging areas.

Comparing Tamil Nadu with other Indian states provides additional context for interpreting its trajectory. Haryana, with a smaller population and budget, consistently outperforms Tamil Nadu in wrestling, boxing, and athletics, suggesting that resource efficiency and specialised focus can offset scale disadvantages. Kerala's success at the 2015 National Games, achieved through intensive preparation in the run-up to hosting the event, demonstrates the galvanising effect of major events. Maharashtra's consistent top rankings reflect both the scale of its resources and decades of sustained investment. Tamil Nadu's move from mid-table to consistent top-five positions represents genuine achievement, while further improvement to challenge Maharashtra's dominance would require substantial additional effort.

The policy evaluation framework employed here could be refined in several directions. Developing more granular measures of implementation quality beyond crude expenditure totals would better capture variation in effectiveness. Gathering data on athlete-level training intensity, coaching quality metrics, and facility utilisation rates would enable more precise analysis of causal mechanisms. Incorporating qualitative evidence from athlete interviews and stakeholder consultations would complement the quantitative focus and reveal implementation challenges that are not evident in aggregate statistics.

The study's reliance on secondary data and a single-state time series design limits causal inference. While the consistent patterns across multiple specifications and the theoretical plausibility of lag structures strengthen confidence in the findings, unobserved confounding factors could partially drive the observed associations. A panel dataset spanning multiple states would enable more robust causal identification using fixed-effects and instrumental variable approaches. Future research incorporating cross-state variation would significantly advance the evidence base.

The findings have implications for sports policy design in India and, potentially, in other developing countries. First, sustained commitment over long time horizons appears essential, given the multi-year gestation periods for policy effects to materialise. Stop-start funding or frequent policy reversals likely undermine effectiveness. Second, institutional frameworks matter significantly; fragmented administrative structures may dissipate resources and diffuse accountability. Third, infrastructure investments yield returns but require complementary coaching and athlete support programs to realise full potential. Fourth, balancing elite development and mass participation requires explicit attention; elite success does not automatically broaden the base, nor does expanded participation automatically produce elite athletes without structured pathways connecting the two.

From a welfare economics perspective, the social returns to sports investment extend beyond medal counts to encompass health benefits, youth development, and social cohesion. The analysis here focused on quantifiable, policy-relevant performance indicators, but a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis would incorporate broader welfare dimensions. Survey data on physical activity levels, health outcomes, and subjective well-being among sports participants would enable a more complete evaluation of social returns.

The political economy of sports development warrants further investigation. Why did Tamil Nadu sustain sports investment across electoral cycles when many states did not? How did sports policy achieve apparent consensus status insulated from partisan competition? What roles did successful athletes' visibility play in generating political support for continued investment? These questions, while beyond the scope of the present study's quantitative focus, merit attention in future research combining institutional analysis with econometric evaluation.

VI. CONCLUSION

This study evaluated the effectiveness of Tamil Nadu's sports development model over 35 years, from 1990 to 2025, examining the relationships between policy inputs and performance outcomes. The analysis employed a composite Sports Development Performance Index that incorporated competitive achievements, breadth of participation, athlete development, and infrastructure adequacy. Regression analysis assessed the impact of budget allocations, infrastructure investments, coaching programs, and institutional reforms on this performance index and its components.

The findings indicate that Tamil Nadu achieved substantial improvements in sports performance during the study period, with the state's ranking in National Games advancing from outside the top ten in the 1990s to consistent top-five positions by the 2020s. Budget allocations increased from approximately Rs. 42 crores in the early 1990s to Rs. 361 crores in 2025, infrastructure expanded dramatically, and coaching capacity grew substantially. These resource increases exhibited statistically significant positive associations with performance improvements, with effects materialising gradually over one- to two-year periods consistent with gestation times for facility construction and athlete development.

The establishment of the Sports Development Authority of Tamil Nadu in 1992 contributed independently to performance improvements beyond resource increases, suggesting that institutional consolidation and elevated political priority enhanced policy effectiveness. Infrastructure investments and coaching programs both demonstrated positive effects, with infrastructure showing particularly strong associations with competitive performance. Budget effectiveness appeared to increase over time, indicating learning effects or complementarities with accumulated capacity.

Performance improvements were uneven across sports disciplines, with chess, shooting, and combat sports showing particularly strong growth, while some traditional strengths, such as swimming and weightlifting, showed more modest gains. Geographic disparities in facility quality and coaching availability constrain rural talent development despite aggregate progress. Participation expansion lagged behind competitive achievement until targeted mass-participation initiatives were launched in 2023, underscoring the importance of explicit policy attention to grassroots engagement.

The study contributes to the limited literature on sports policy evaluation in developing economies and provides empirical evidence relevant to policy design in other Indian states and similar contexts. The findings suggest that sustained public investment, coupled with institutional reforms and systematic implementation, can improve sports outcomes, though effectiveness depends on specific policy design choices and addressing implementation challenges.

The analysis yields several policy recommendations. First, policymakers should recognise the multi-year gestation periods for sports investments and commit to sustained funding horizons rather than expecting immediate returns. Evaluation frameworks should incorporate lagged effects when assessing program success. Second, institutional arrangements matter significantly for policy effectiveness; states with fragmented sports administration might consider consolidation along lines similar to Tamil Nadu's SDAT model. Third, infrastructure investments require complementary spending on coaching, athlete support, and talent identification to realise full potential. Facilities alone do not guarantee improved performance without human resource development.

Fourth, resource allocation decisions should explicitly balance elite development and mass participation. Tamil Nadu's experience suggests that these objectives require distinct program designs: elite athlete support needs concentrated resources and technical expertise, while mass participation benefits from school-based programs and distributed community facilities. Fifth, addressing geographic and gender disparities requires targeted interventions beyond aggregate budget increases. Talent identification systems should actively reach rural areas, and sustained efforts are needed to address cultural barriers limiting female participation.

Data system improvements would enhance future policy evaluation and enable more responsive management. Systematic collection of participation rates, facility utilisation metrics, athlete training intensity measures, and coaching quality indicators would support evidence-based adjustments. Longitudinal tracking of individual athletes through talent identification, development, and competitive phases would enable assessment of pathway effectiveness. Standardised reporting across years and programs would facilitate rigorous evaluation.

Future research directions include expanding the analysis to incorporate multiple states within a panel framework and enabling more robust causal identification through fixed effects and difference-in-differences designs. Qualitative research examining implementation challenges, athlete experiences, and organisational dynamics would complement the quantitative focus and illuminate mechanisms not visible in aggregate data. Cost-effectiveness analysis comparing alternative policy instruments would inform resource allocation decisions. Assessing broader welfare impacts beyond competitive success would provide a more complete picture of the social returns to sports investment.

The study's limitations should be noted. Reliance on secondary data sources introduced measurement error and limited the precision of some variables. The single-state time-series design constrained causal inference compared with panel approaches. Missing data for some years and variables required estimation procedures that introduced uncertainty. The focus on quantifiable indicators necessarily excluded qualitative dimensions of sports development, such as improvements in coaching quality and cultural shifts in sports participation.

Despite these limitations, the analysis provides the most comprehensive evaluation to date of Tamil Nadu's sports development model across an extended time period. The findings indicate that deliberate policy interventions, sustained over decades with institutional support, can measurably improve sports outcomes. Tamil Nadu's trajectory from a mid-table performer in the 1990s to a consistent top-five finisher by 2025 shows that state-level sports policy can make a difference when implemented systematically.

As Tamil Nadu continues to invest in sports development with initiatives such as the Global Sports City project and expanded mass participation programs, the foundation established over the past three decades positions the state to potentially challenge Maharashtra's long-standing dominance in Indian sports. Whether this trajectory continues depends on sustaining policy commitment, addressing remaining implementation challenges, and continuously adapting strategies based on evidence of effectiveness. The empirical approach employed in this study offers a template for ongoing evaluation to inform these adaptations.

REFERENCES

[1] Bernard, A. B., & Busse, M. R. (2004). Who wins the Olympic Games: Economic resources and medal totals. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(1), 413–417. <https://doi.org/10.1162/003465304774201824>

- [2] Chen, B., Zhang, Y., & Wang, L. (2024). Policy design and implementation: A quantitative evaluation and empirical study of China's rural sports policy based on the PMC index model. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 12, Article 1342867. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1342867>
- [3] De Bosscher, V. (2018). *A mixed methods approach to compare elite sport policies of nations*. Routledge.
- [4] Factogram. (2021, August 12). What is the annual state government spending on sports across India? <https://www.factogram.in/2021/08/13/what-is-the-annual-state-government-spending-on-sports-across-india/>
- [5] Hoekman, R., & Scheerder, J. (2021). Sport policy practice and outcome: Theoretical and empirical approaches. *European Journal for Sport and Society*, 18(2), 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16138171.2021.1926772>
- [6] Kumar, R., & Rajan, S. (2018). Analysis of sports facilities in government schools of Tamil Nadu. *Journal of Sports Management*, 3(2), 193–208.
- [7] Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports. (2023). *Annual report 2022–23*. Government of India.
- [8] Mountifield, C. (2015). Policy analysis in sport: A review of mainstream meso-level policy analysis frameworks. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 7(2), 289–304.
- [9] Prawiro, S. (2024, November 10). *Sports development index: A fairer approach to measure sports development*. *The ASEAN Magazine*. <https://theaseanmagazine.asean.org/article/sports-development-index-a-fairer-approach-to-measure-sports-development/>
- [10] Shrinagesh, V. (2025). Government expenditure and sports outcomes: An empirical evaluation of public sports investment in India. *International Journal of Economic Management Studies*, 12(6), 542–568.
- [11] Som, C. V. (2023). Building a case for incorporating sport as an indicator in human development index. *Sport Sciences for Health*, 19(1), 177–184. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11332-022-01017-9>
- [12] Sotiriadou, K. P., & Shilbury, D. (2009). Australian elite athlete development: An organisational perspective. *Sport Management Review*, 12(3), 137–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2009.01.002>
- [13] Tamil Nadu Olympic Association. (2024). *Achievements 2022–2023: Annual report*.

Copyright & License:

© Authors retain the copyright of this article. This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), permitting unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.