

## PHYSICAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS

# Waivers, Exemptions, and Substitutions in Physical Education

*Laura F. Prior and Matthew D. Curtner-Smith*

### Abstract

*The granting of waivers, exemptions, and substitutions (WES) for physical education appears to be on the increase in the United States. This study investigated the rationale behind and process of granting WES. Participants from three school districts were 10 physical education teachers, eight school principals, two school assistant principals, six students, and six parents. In addition, one state official participated in the study. Data came from three types of interviewing and the collection of relevant documents. These were analyzed through analytic induction and constant comparison and were reduced to key themes. Three forms of WES were identified: those that involved students participating in in-school activities in lieu of physical education, those that involved students participating in out-of-school activities in lieu of physical education, and innovative waivers that gave administrators the power to curtail provision of the subject. Policy regarding WES varied, resulting in a nonuniform and idiosyncratic system. The majority of principals, parents, and students, and a minority of physical education teachers supported the granting of WES. The space created for WES to evolve was created by the marginalization of physical education in relation to academic subjects and competitive sport; by the privileging of participation in physical activity over other objectives of the subject; and by low quality physical education. These findings provide clues for combating the increase of WES.*

---

Laura F. Prior, Department of Teacher Education, The University of Mississippi. Matthew D. Curtner-Smith, Department of Kinesiology, The University of Alabama. Please send author correspondence to [lprior@olemiss.edu](mailto:lprior@olemiss.edu)

During his keynote presentation at the National Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) Conference in Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, Pate (2009), the eminent exercise physiologist of the University of South Carolina, summarized the research linking children's and youths' engagement in physical activity to their health and academic progress. He then reviewed research showing the limited participation of children and youth in physical activity and how this affected their health adversely. Pate subsequently made some fairly conservative suggestions about how schools could play a part in changing this state of affairs by providing high quality physical education, an expanded version of extracurricular sport, and by incorporating physical activity in other parts of the school day. Finally, Pate noted that educational policy makers have, to date, provided limited support for implementation of the initiatives he had recommended.

Sadly, Pate's (2009) pessimism seems to have been well-founded. Experts like him have suggested that schools should play an important role in battling inactivity (Brusseu et al., 2011; Fox et al., 2004; Institute of Medicine, 2013; Payne & Morrow, 2009). In addition, researchers have provided a steady stream of dire warnings about the effects of inactivity and resulting obesity on the health (e.g., see Ogden et al., 2012) and academic (e.g., Castelli et al., 2007; Efrat, 2011) progress of America's children and youth. Rather than work to help alleviate the problem, however, schools appear to have taken actions that have exacerbated it. For example, much evidence suggests that schools across the country are providing less rather than more physical education (Hardman, 2008; McKenzie & Lounsbury, 2009). Moreover, little evidence indicates that schools are expanding their extracurricular offerings beyond traditional team games or developing comprehensive school physical activity programs en masse, as advocated by some sport pedagogists (Castelli et al., 2014; Kelder et al., 2014).

More worryingly, and despite official condemnations of such actions by national organizations such as the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE, 2006a; an organization under AAHPERD, now SHAPE America), the practice of allowing children and youth to opt out of physical education altogether through waivers, exemptions, and substitutions (WES) appears to

be on the rise within school systems and districts across the country (NASPE, 2002, 2006a; NASPE & American Heart Association, 2012). Sometimes the WES for physical education are granted to children and youth who are participating in school sport or are thought to be physically active within other extracurricular options such as band, cheerleading, and Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (Lounsbery et al., 2014; NASPE, 2002, 2006b, 2011). Alternatively, some WES are granted because children and youth are participating in physical activity outside of school (Kirk, 2002). Not surprisingly, research has suggested that the alternative activities in which exempted or waived students engage do not necessarily provide a level of physical activity that enhances health (Lounsbery et al., 2014). In addition, the children in schools that allow WES for physical education are more likely to be obese than those who attend schools that do not (Kim, 2012).

This study investigated the rationale behind and process of granting WES for physical education. The goals of the study were to describe the forms of WES; the degree to which administrators, teachers, students, and parents supported WES; and the factors that shaped the thinking of those individuals who advocated for WES. Although mostly descriptive, this study was not entirely atheoretical. Rather, it focused on how key stakeholders were socialized (George & Curtner-Smith, 2016, 2017, 2018) to think about physical education by various institutions, groups, societal biases, and traditions and how this thinking created space for, enabled, and promoted the use of WES.

## Method

### Participants and Setting

Participants came from three school districts in one state in which WES for physical education were permitted and prevalent. They included one state department official responsible for overseeing physical education, 10 physical education teachers, eight school principals, two school assistant principals, six students, and six parents. Principals and assistant principals were purposefully selected because they oversaw schools in which WES for physical education were frequently granted. Physical education teachers were

purposefully selected because they worked in schools that frequently granted WES. Students were purposefully selected because they had been granted WES or were eligible to request WES and had chosen not to. Finally, parents were purposefully selected because they had requested WES for their children or had specifically chosen not to make this request. Prior to participating in the study and in line with institutional review board requirements, all participants provided consent or assent and were given fictitious names to protect their identity.

### **Data Collection**

The main source of data came from three types of interviewing. Formal interviews were carried out with the state department official, physical education teachers, principals, assistant principals, and parents. Shorter informal interviews were also carried out with the physical education teachers, principals, and parents. These took the form of conversations both in person and by telephone. Students were interviewed within two focus groups. Formal and focus group interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. Notes on the contents of informal interviews were made as soon after their completion as possible. Official documents on the subject of WES for physical education at the state, district, and school level served as a fourth source of data.

### **Data Analysis**

Initially, data were separated into chunks that expressed or represented specific thoughts, ideas, views, and perspectives. The data chunks were coded and grouped into categories and the categories were collapsed into larger themes through techniques of analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Trustworthiness and credibility of the analysis were enhanced through member checking, triangulation among and across participants and data collection techniques, and the search for discrepant and negative cases (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

## **Findings and Discussion**

Three main themes emerged from the data. These were forms of WES, marginalization, and the privileging of physical activity.

## Forms of WES

Three broad types of WES were found to operate within the school districts in which this study took place. These were participation in in-school activities in lieu of physical education, participation in out-of-school activities in lieu of physical education, and “innovative waivers.”

### *Participation in In-School Activities in Lieu of Physical Education*

This form of WES involved middle and high school students being exempted from participating in physical education because they were taking part in sport, physical activity, or “other approved activities” within their schools. Most of these activities were extracurricular in nature, although some, such as an apparently high level dance program run by an “outside instructor” in one middle school, took place during the school day:

I just love [the dance program]. I wasn't sure at first, but my girl loves to dance. I'm a teacher and I know state standards; and, to me, it is important that those are addressed. When I saw the layout and saw how the program would work, I knew it work for her with dance . . . because of the quality of instruction. (Sharon, parent, formal interview)

Emily, the state official for physical education, noted that this form of WES had been in place for “some 20 years” in her state and shared the state's official list of activities for which students had been granted this type of WES. This list included many traditional extracurricular sports such as football, basketball, and softball. The activity for which most schools granted WES, however, was “marching band.” Other activities included in the list were cheerleading, color guard, flag corp, majorette, and show choir.

To provide these WES for students, schools or school districts applied directly to the state's department of education for each in-school activity they wanted to “count” or they requested inclusion of their entire extracurricular sports program. These applications were supposed to go to Emily and be renewed every 2 years. In reality, however, Emily noted that the process was “political,” that many schools failed to go through the renewal process, and that she was

often bypassed by principals and superintendents who were “connected” and went directly to the state superintendent. Moreover, once in-school activities were approved, the school was supposed to be responsible for ensuring that students participating in them met state standards for physical education. Evidence indicated, however, that school or district officials made little or no effort to verify this. For example, one high school principal, Mike, explained, “Let’s face it. I don’t have time to check in-depth.”

### *Participation in Out-of-School Activities in Lieu of Physical Education*

A second and more recent form of WES that had been in operation in some schools for approximately 3 years allowed parents to apply for the school physical education component to be waived for their children in lieu of their participating in activities outside of school. Again, this mainly applied to secondary students, most of whom were from middle-class backgrounds. This form of WES was less prevalent than those granted for in-school activities and involved approximately 20 children and youth throughout the state who attended seven schools.

To be granted this form of WES, a detailed application was generally made directly to the school and a 1-year plan divided into two semesters was agreed on by parents, the student, physical education teacher, counselor, and principal. Once approved, the plan was forwarded to curriculum and instruction administrators at the school district for final approval. This kind of WES was granted for activities such as dance, music, and competitive swimming, as well as for those who participated on an equestrian team or had a role as a camp counselor. Again, the theory was that students would meet the state’s goals for physical education through participating in these activities and that the school would verify this. In one school, for example, this verification was to be achieved by both the principal and physical education teacher examining an activity schedule and activity log that had been supplied by the student and corroborated by the student’s parents. Sometimes this evaluation was completed by reference to a rubric that focused on agreed performance evaluation criteria such as attendance, completing fitness testing, citizenship, ability and performance tasks, course of study standards, and being active for an hour each day. More often, the evaluation simply

involved checking that students had logged the 75 hours of activity that equated to 1 credit and that these hours had been confirmed by the signature of an observing adult. State policy documents also revealed that as well as including activities in which students participated during the semester for which they were exempted, this form of WES could be retroactive or proactive and apply to activities completed in the previous or following semester or summer.

One principal in favor of this form of WES illustrated its effect by referring to the experiences of one of her students who “took advantage” and substituted equestrian activities for physical education:

She has to turn in her papers with the hours spent at the barn. She is up well before anyone else in her grade doing work. She practices before school and after. We know that. She is in competition many weekends and even misses school for them. We keep her documents for the sake of state reasons, but even without those, I know she is doing more than the required amount of time. She comes from a good family and they are going to do it right. (Kim, high school principal, informal interview)

### *Innovative Waivers*

Innovative waivers were a much more recent option for individual schools or school districts and, at the time the study was completed, had been in operation for 2 years. They were designed by the state’s department of education to give schools at all levels more flexibility in scheduling and budgeting than current policy permitted for the schools to achieve more advanced academic standards in English, mathematics, science, and social studies. In addition, one school district’s official documentation suggested that the flexibility created by innovative waivers would provide “more opportunities [for high school students] to participate in career and technical education electives [and] advanced courses.”

Schools opting into this system had to provide an approved innovative plan by which this could be achieved. Within this plan, they could limit the amount of physical education offered to a level below regular state standards and could increase physical education class sizes above normal state standards. This course of action was frequently taken at the elementary level as a strategy to provide time and

space for classroom teachers to hold data meetings with the principal. In secondary schools that had been granted innovative waivers, the main way in which physical education was adversely affected was an increase in the number of in- and out-of-school activities that could be substituted for the subject. For example, the innovative plan of one school district allowed students in two schools to take part in “athletics, marching band, summer camps/programs, and intense athletic training efforts like Red Cross lifeguard certification” in lieu of physical education.

As noted by Emily and some of the physical education teachers, this meant “that PE and other [non-academic] programs [got] the shaft and some [didn’t] even exist”:

Our school is struggling right now. [As a result of the innovative plan] our classroom teachers have weekly data meetings which means we have larger and longer PE classes to accommodate all teachers meeting at once. But then we won’t see those kids for another day or two. They justify the hours based on a two-week increment, not daily physical activity. I’m fighting it. (Pam, elementary physical education teacher, formal interview)

Moreover, the process for approval of innovative plans often relied on the “good ole boy system.” When these plans included cutting physical education, they were “many times” approved without Emily’s knowledge or consent.

### *Idiosyncratic Nature of WES*

During the course of the study, it became apparent that each of the three forms of WES existed in some schools and not others. For example, innovative waivers were more likely to be in operation in academically struggling schools primarily attended by students from relatively low socioeconomic backgrounds. Conversely, WES that involved students participating in out-of-school activities in lieu of physical education were more likely to be granted to students from relatively high socioeconomic backgrounds. In addition, because WES that sanctioned participation in out-of-school activities were granted on an individual basis, students in the same class were and were not exempt from physical education. Moreover, where WES were utilized, there were variations in policy from school to school

or within the same school district. Collectively, this meant that the system created was nonuniform and idiosyncratic.

### **Marginalization**

Two ways in which physical education was marginalized facilitated the implementation of all three forms of WES. These were the privileging of academic subjects over practical subjects and the privileging of competitive sport over physical education. Key stakeholders had been socialized into accepting both these forms of marginalization as “normal” and “how it’s always been.”

#### ***Privileging of Academic Subjects Over Practical Subjects***

Reflecting mind–body dualism (Descartes, 1641/1984) in Western cultures and the consequent privileging of “academic” over “practical” subjects (Goodson, 1983), physical education was equated with recess and regarded as relatively unimportant compared with English, mathematics, science, and social studies by many parents, students, principals, and some physical education teachers. For example, several students explained that being exempted from physical education was advantageous as it enabled them to take more academic classes:

I have heavy course load. I have doubled up on some classes in order to graduate with all the classes I want. Sure, I could just take it easy and do study hall or another elective. But, I need all the [advanced placement] classes, and without the extra block of time, it wouldn’t be possible. (Mac, high school student, focus group)

This sentiment was shared by some of the students’ principals. For example, Mike noted that “skipping PE for another [advanced placement] class looks good for us academically. The more successful students we have in [advanced placement], the better. Luckily, the waiver allows us to do that.” In addition, Paul explained,

I know kids should have PE every day. I know that. But right now, it isn’t a priority. I must meet with my [classroom] teachers together [to discuss academic data], and combining classes for a longer PE time is the only way I can make that happen. Until our test scores improve, it will stay this way.

I make my teachers take their kids to recess for 15 to 20 minutes. That makes up for the days they miss PE. (Paul, elementary school principal, formal interview)

Moreover, although the state's department of education clearly intended innovative plans and waivers to be used by schools in which students' scores on standardized academic tests were relatively low, this line of thinking meant that they were also adopted by some schools in which students were successful in "academic" subjects:

I don't know why we do the [innovative] waiver. It's not like our kids are bad. Honestly, we are one of the better schools [academically] in the system. I think it's because Mr. Peterson just does what the other principals do. (Mark, elementary physical education teacher, informal interview)

Where physical education was obviously of low quality, this effect was amplified, the support for WES was stronger, and the number of WES appeared to be greater:

I'm ashamed to admit it because it is partially my fault, I guess. The PE . . . program is basically nonexistent. So really, those students that substitute extracurricular activities for school PE are better off and really not missing anything too important. (Devin, assistant high school principal, formal interview)

I want to be doing something. That is me. I hate sitting down, just being lazy and waiting for the time to pass. That is what my friends do in PE. They may walk around the gym. I would be miserable. They literally do nothing in PE. (Abby, high school student, focus group)

Conversely, where physical education was perceived to be of a higher quality and students thought they were "learning something useful," the effect was reduced, there appeared to be fewer WES, and support for such programs was considerably weaker:

Sally swims. She has been doing it since she was three. She excels in swimming. However, I feel like she needs the

[physical education] program to enrich her and allow her to explore other options beyond her specialty. If for some reason she stops swimming, I want her to have been exposed to other things. (Sandra, parent, formal interview)

Not surprisingly, some physical education teachers with a strong belief in the importance of their subject fought against the implementation of WES by trying to strategically redefine (Lacey, 1977) or overtly change their situations:

I'm fighting and trying to make them realize how it could work well for all. I even have a mock schedule made up to show how data meetings could still be run with daily PE. It may be a lost cause, but I'm not giving up just yet. (Pam, elementary physical education teacher, informal interview)

Other physical education teachers who were similarly appalled by the implementation of WES in their schools, strategically complied (Etheridge, 1989) with their principals because they felt powerless and threatened:

I don't like it one bit. But I'm new here and I won't complain. I want my job and don't want to jeopardize it. I just try to make it work. It's a scheduling nightmare and some grades do get better instruction than others; but then, the next week, the other grades have the advantage. I often forget what has been taught if I don't have it in front of me. (Betsy, elementary physical education teacher, formal interview)

### *Privileging of Competitive Sport Over Physical Education*

The second form of marginalization that made it easier for stakeholders to accept and endorse WES for physical education involved the privileging of competitive school sport over the subject. For example, parents liked WES because these allowed their children to be "able to put extra hours into [sports] that [would] make [them] more successful." Furthermore, they explained that this state of affairs was a tradition that they fully supported:

I knew once Mac was in high school, his days of PE were over. It's always like that. My oldest son never had PE. And

I never had PE in high school either. His PE is specialized in his sport, just like everyone else that is an athlete. (John, parent, informal interview)

In addition, six secondary principals argued that allowing students to participate in one or two extracurricular sports in lieu of physical education was advantageous in that it ensured a more focused PE and greater skill development. These principals also noted that this arrangement had the positive side effect of keeping the athletes together so coaches had the opportunity to make their teams more competitive. Because, in their view, the primary purpose of extracurricular sport was to win, allowing “the athletes to sub PE for varsity athletics to focus on a specific sport . . . [made] sense”:

I think it’s a good thing. Serious athletes that play competitive team or individual sports can capitalize on the opportunity. Not all schools allow it and I think it makes us look better. To focus on just one activity and master it will pay off in the end. (Kim, high school principal, formal interview)

I think it’s important to have [students] in varsity athletics. Off-season, they are working out. In-season, they are working on the game. The coaches do a good job. And they need the extra time together during the day. This time and the exemptions allow for uninterrupted practice time. (Scott, high school principal, formal interview)

Some physical education teachers who prioritized extracurricular sport over physical education held a similar view:

Man, I like the new schedule [to accommodate the innovative plan]. Sure, those days [teaching elementary physical education] with long classes get a little crazy and hectic, but it’s worth it when I have extra time to work on my game stuff. I even finish those days earlier and am able to go on to the high school and start practice during their last class. I like it. (Russ, elementary physical education teacher/high school coach, informal interview)

I don't mind them missing the PE class. I have them for basketball. They'd rather be there and I'd rather teach basketball than the other curriculum. So I'm good with it. I never took PE either in high school. Just varsity athletics. So, it makes sense. (Andy, high school physical education teacher/coach, formal interview)

Many exempted students who classed themselves as athletes were also supportive of WES because of the extra practice time it gave them and because they could not see a reason for participating in general PE:

My focus is on football and baseball. I don't feel like it is super important for me to be in PE. I want to play college ball, so that's really all I care about. I do football in the fall and baseball in the spring. I do both in the summer. (Jake, high school student, focus group)

Although in the minority, two principals and three parents were not so certain that focusing on one or two sports was such a good idea. In support of their physical education teachers' thinking, they were concerned that students who did so were at "a disadvantage because they [were] missing state standards":

I like the fact that they can really focus on their sport, but I do know that they are missing components in . . . PE . . . that that one sport cannot teach. I don't like that. It's a catch-22. (Jeff, high school principal, formal interview)

I want Suzie to be exposed to as much as she can. I do feel as though she is missing out on some things [in physical education] because of her participation in varsity athletics. I had a hard time deciding, but it's what all the other players were doing. I didn't want her to be the odd one out. I hope I don't regret it in a few years. If they win a state championship, it will be worth it. (Ingrid, parent, formal interview)

## Privileging of Physical Activity

Another key factor that appeared to strengthen the argument in favor of WES was the elevation of health-related fitness (i.e., being physically active; McKenzie, 2007) over other more traditional objectives of physical education, such as skilled movement and affective and cognitive development (Beighle & Morrow, 2014; Pangrazi & Beighle, 2013). A large proportion of principals, students, and some physical education teachers seemed to reduce the goal of physical education to getting enough exercise, spending time in activity, and getting the physical activity hours required. With this being the only worthwhile goal of the subject in their eyes, it is little wonder that they did not regard the implementation of WES as problematic:

My coaches are responsible for their athletes. I trust them to do a good job. No, I don't require or expect them to match the [state] standards [for physical education], but I do expect them to get the physical activity in. (Brett, high school principal, informal interview).

We have kids that are lifeguards in the spring and summer. . . . They could use this as their [physical education] credit. But, they don't. I'm not really sure why. It could be because they don't really know they could do it, or it could just be because their friends take the class. I don't know. But I do know several that could opt out because of outside of school activities listed in the waiver. (Kay, high school principal, informal interview)

Most parents held views on this topic similar to those of their children's principals. For example, Gina explained, "I really don't think Katie [her daughter] is missing much [by being exempt from physical education]. She is probably getting more high-intensity activity than if she was in PE." A minority of parents, however, espoused an opposing view and, in congruence with the majority of physical education teachers, wanted their children to become well-rounded and believed that there was much more to physical education than participating in health-enhancing activity:

We had the chance to let Alex skip out of PE. My husband and I talked, but we felt she needed to stay in the . . . course. Sure, she does more physical activity in her [swimming] lessons than she would at school, but we didn't want her to miss out on the lecture part of the [physical education] curriculum. I think it's important. And I hope she is learning something. (Minda, parent, formal interview)

Finally, in contrast to their parents, principals, and teachers, students who expressed opposition to the physical activity argument and WES did so on the basis that they were missing out on the socializing that occurred during physical education classes:

I begged my mom to not sign the waiver. . . . I really wanted to stay in it because I could be with my friends. I dance every afternoon and night until like eight o'clock. Then I have to do my homework and study. So basically, PE is the only time I can hang out with my friends. I love it! (Lindsey, high school student, focus group)

## Conclusion

This study illustrates that the policy of granting students WES for physical education has been firmly established in the educational system of the state in which it took place. Three forms of WES have been identified: WES that involved students participating in in-school activities in lieu of physical education, those that involved students participating in out-of-school activities in lieu of physical education, and innovative waivers that incorporated the first two forms of WES and gave administrators the power to curtail provision of the subject in terms of class size, lesson length, and frequency. Policy regarding WES varies across these schools and school districts, resulting in a nonuniform and idiosyncratic system. In congruence with past research (Lounsbery et al., 2014), this study shows that the schools lack accountability for what activities inside and outside of school can replace physical education, and many of the activities for which students receive permission to participate in lieu of physical education are of dubious quality. Moreover, scheduling changes based on

the granting of innovative waivers at the elementary level appear to have an adverse effect on the quality of physical education.

Several factors allow WES to evolve and thrive within the school system. These include the marginalization of physical education in relation to subjects labeled as “academic,” and relative to competitive sport; the privileging of participation in physical activity over other objectives of the subject; and low quality physical education.

The majority of principals, parents, and students in the study supported the granting of WES for physical education. More worryingly, so did a minority of physical education teachers who, in Lawson’s (1983a, 1983b) terms, regarded curricular physical education as a “career contingency” and were mainly interested in coaching. More encouragingly, a minority of principals, parents, and students, and the majority of physical education teachers and the state official responsible for physical education were opposed to WES for the subject or at least somewhat troubled by WES. This suggests that it is not too late to turn the tide.

First and foremost, the study’s results suggest that this tide-turning can be accomplished through providing higher quality physical education in schools and showcasing these programs to parents. In addition, reemphasizing a balanced set of objectives for the subject, providing improved training for principals and other school administrators in terms of physical education, and adding accountability measures that make it difficult for coaching-focused teachers to remain in the profession would all help. Finally, a change of educational philosophy that returns to the idea of educating the whole child would obviously improve matters.

## References

- Beighle, A., & Morrow, J. R., Jr. (2014). Promoting physical activity: Addressing barriers and moving forward. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 85(7), 23–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2014.937190>
- Brusseu, T. A., Kulinna, P. H., Tudor-Locke, C., van der Mars, H., & Darst, P. W. (2011). Children’s step counts on weekend, physical education, and non-physical education days. *Journal of Human Kinetics*, 27, 125–135.

- Castelli, D. M., Carson, R. L., & Kulinna, P. H. (2014). Special issue: Comprehensive school physical activity programs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 33(4), 435–439. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2014-0193>
- Castelli, D. M., Hillman, C. H., Buck, S. M., & Erwin, H. E. (2007). Physical fitness and academic achievement in third- and fifth-grade students. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 29(2), 239–252. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.29.2.239>
- Descartes, R. (1984). Mediations on first philosophy. In J. Cottingham, R. Stoothoff, & D. Murdoch (Eds.), *The philosophical writings of Descartes* (Vol. 2, pp. 1–62). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published in 1641)
- Efrat, M. (2011). The relationship between low-income and minority children's physical activity and academic-related outcomes: A review of the literature. *Health Education Behavior*, 28(5), 441–451. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1090198110375025>
- Etheridge, C. P. (1989). Strategic adjustment: How teachers move from university learning to school-based practices. *Action in Teacher Education*, 11(1), 31–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.1989.10462712>
- Fox, K., Cooper, A., & McKenna, J. (2004). The school and promotion of children's health-enhancing physical activity: Perspectives from the United Kingdom. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 23(4), 336–355. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.23.4.338>
- George, M. L., & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2016). Influence of middle school pupils' acculturation on their readings of and expectations for physical education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport, and Physical Education*, 7(2), 191–204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18377122.2016.1196116>
- George, M. L., & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2017). School principals' perceptions of and expectations for physical education. *The Physical Educator*, 74(3), 383–404. <https://doi.org/10.18666/tpe-2017-v74-i3-7354>
- George, M. L., & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2018). Influence of acculturation on parents' reading of and expectations for physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 37(1), 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2016-0225>
- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. Academic Press.
- Goodson, I. (1983). *School subjects and curriculum change*. Croom Helm.

- Hardman, K. (2008). Physical education in schools: A global perspective. *Kinesiology*, 40(1), 5–28.
- Institute of Medicine. (2013). *Educating the student body: Taking physical activity and physical education to school*. National Academies Press.
- Kelder, S. H., Goc Karp, G., Scruggs, P. W., & Brown, H. (2014). Setting the stage: Coordinated approaches to school health and physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 33(4), 440–448. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2014-0087>
- Kim, J. (2012). Are physical education-related state policies and schools' physical education requirement related to children's physical activity and obesity? *Journal of School Health*, 82(6), 268–276. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2012.00697.x>
- Kirk, D. (2002, July). *Quality PE partnerships and multiple agendas: A response to Karel J. Van Derventer* [Paper presentation]. Commonwealth International Sport Conference, Manchester, England.
- Lacey, C. (1977). *The socialization of teachers*. Methuen.
- Lawson, H. (1983a). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: The subjective warrant, recruitment, and teacher education (part 1). *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 2(3), 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2.3.3>
- Lawson, H. (1983b). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: Entry into schools, teachers' role orientations, and longevity in teaching (part 2). *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 3(1), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.3.1.3>
- Lounsbery, M. A. F., Holt, K. A., Monnat, S. M., Funk, B., & McKenzie, T. L. (2014). JROTC as a substitute for PE: Really? *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 85(3), 414–419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2014.930408>
- McKenzie, T. L. (2007). The preparation of physical educators: A public health perspective. *Quest*, 59(4), 345–357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2007.10483557>
- McKenzie, T. L., & Lounsbery, M. A. F. (2009). School physical education: The pill not taken. *American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine*, 3(3), 219–225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1559827609331562>
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2002). *2001 shape of the nation report: Status of physical education in the USA*.

- National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2006a). Opposing substitution and waiver/exemptions for required physical education. *Strategies: A Journal for Physical and Sport Educators*, 19(6), 11–13.
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2006b). *2006 shape of the nation report: Status of physical education in the USA*.
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2011). *Physical education is critical to educating the whole child* [Position statement]. American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance.
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education & American Heart Association. (2012). *Shape of the nation report: Status of physical education in the USA*. American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance.
- Ogden, C. L., Carroll, M. D., Kit, B. K., & Flegal, K. M. (2012). Prevalence of obesity and trends in body mass index among US children and adolescents, 1999–2010. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 307(5), 483–490. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2012.40>
- Pangrazi, R. P., & Beighle, A. (2013). *Dynamic physical education for elementary school children* (17th ed.). Pearson.
- Pate, R. (2009, October). *Physical education in the 21st century: Historic opportunities, profound threats* [Keynote address]. Physical Education Teacher Education Conference, Myrtle Beach, SC, United States.
- Payne, V. G., & Morrow, J. R. (2009). School physical education as a viable change agent to increase youth. *President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports Research Digest*, 10(2), 1–8.