I. INTRODUCTION

Many research studies in discipline-based education research have been conducted on higher education instructors’ adoption of research-based instructional strategies, the barriers they face in their implementation, and instructional transformation at the departmental and institutional level [2–8]. Research-based instructional strategies, which aim to promote student active engagement when learning physics, refer to named teaching practices at the core of many physics education studies. Examples of these instructional strategies are Just-in-Time Teaching, Peer Instruction, and Tutorials [9]. Studies have shown that knowledge of innovative teaching practices does not necessarily translate into actual implementation of these strategies, which are proven to improve student learning and retention. Research shows that instructors discontinue using strategies after attempting to use them [6] or they greatly modify them in ways that render them ineffective [4]. This classical narrative of faculty change aims to encourage the use of established research-based instructional strategies and aims to better understand why faculty modify or discontinue the use of these methods [6].

Building upon this classical narrative, lead physics education researchers on faculty development, Dancy and Henderson, worked on identifying the influence of both individual and situational characteristics that inhibit the implementation of PER-based strategies [4]. Their work highlights the need for increased awareness of potential barriers [4], the presence of a disconnect between instructors’ conception of their practice and their actions in the classroom [9] and the institutional barriers that inhibit change [5]. The latter particularly emphasizes how any type of lasting effective instructional change requires an in-depth understanding of an institution’s complex system in order to design locally effective strategies [5]. Therefore, a framework for planning and implementing change at the institution level was developed [5]. The framework creates what are referred to as departmental action teams and addresses three levels of the university that are most likely to influence department culture change: faculty, department, and administration. This holistic approach attempts to address some of the limitations of change in higher education, which include ignoring the complex interrelated nature of changing culture and university systems [10].

In parallel, studies have also highlighted the resourcefulness and need for ongoing support structures for physics faculty. The physics education community has and continues to develop programs to help physics faculty bridge the gap between research findings and physics teaching in their local context. Successful initiatives such as the New Faculty Workshop for Physics and Astronomy exist to encourage relatively new physics faculty to use research-based instructional strategies in their classrooms [11]. These workshops have been proven to increase the use of research-based instruction, but physics faculty’s use of these methods, as previously discussed, does not necessarily translate to a sustained implementation [6]. To address this continuity issue and to create ongoing support structures for faculty, programs such as a faculty online learning community (FOLC) model for educational change was developed [12]. With the goal
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to support the transformation of faculty’s teaching practices, these virtual communities create a support network for instructors to discuss, share, and help each other in their development of their teaching practices [12]. This initiative supports a relatively new research direction on physics faculty, which aims to take the view that faculty have agency over their practice. This avenue of research on faculty development aims to broaden the community’s awareness of how physics faculty are viewed and discussed. In particular, this relatively new research lens is based on the premise that faculty’s career experiences make them best suited to choose the research-based resources that best fit their own classrooms [3, 8, 13, 14].

The role of local context has also been highlighted in the broader science community as crucial to support faculty’s development of their teaching practices. Many studies in the sciences highlight the importance of local context for effective and lasting pedagogical interventions [5, 13, 16]. The broader education literature also includes ways to assess the interpersonal dynamics that exist in context and their impact on the professional development of individuals. The three components of Communities of Practice (mutual engagement, joint enterprise and a shared repertoire) play a critical role in the ways in which an individual grows and flourishes within their field [17]. Other education literature has highlighted the idea of situated teacher learning, which underlines how an instructor’s learning is intertwined with their classroom practices at their particular school [18]. Thus, teacher development needs to consider the interplay of these contextual factors [18]. Education literature has also put the spotlight on the interplay of different factors such as interpersonal relationships, institutional structures, personal considerations, and personal characteristics as supportive elements or impediments to the professional development of an instructor [19]. Lastly, theoretical frameworks have emphasized the importance of overlapping contextual factors and its role on professional development of instructors [1]. For instance, the Bell and Gilbert framework focuses on the contextual factors that come into play during a professional development program on teachers’ development. Through various studies, the literature has demonstrated that an instructor’s professional development is an ongoing and dynamic product of factors relating to an instructor’s experiences in their environment.

As we can see from the above overview of the literature, studies have emphasized in many ways the importance of the interplay of contextual factors on instructors’ professional development. However, most research particularly on physics faculty and their development has only focused on the impact of particular programs or institutional structures on faculty’s development or how to effectively help faculty adopt particular research-based instructional strategies and not on the interactions of these multiple facets of the environment on faculty’s development over time. This paper aims to contribute to filling this gap for physics faculty by focusing on how physics faculty negotiate the interactions between the different entities that influence their professional development. Through the case study of two physics instructors, we refocus the discussion on physics faculty professional development by taking a longitudinal faculty-centric approach, in which we highlight the myriad of ways they bring together all their experiences to develop their physics teaching in order to answer the research question, how is the growth of physics faculty moderated by their context?

II. DATA

We had access to three sets of interviews with physics faculty conducted over the course of a year and a half, where each interview lasted about an hour. Interviewees were asked to reflect on their existing and prospective teaching and assessment needs, practices, and philosophies as well as their use of student-centered teaching methods.

The first set of semi-structured interviews was with twenty-three physics faculty at different types and sizes of institutions conducted at the beginning of the 2018-2019 academic year. Eight of the twenty-three interviewees had follow-up interviews at the end of the 2018-2019 academic year and seven of the eight were interviewed again at the beginning of the 2019-2020 academic year. Therefore, we had access to three successive interviews for seven physics instructors.

From our available data set, two instructors were ultimately chosen for our in-depth analysis. We named them Cleopatra and Sphinx. They were deemed good candidates because they were particularly articulate about their teaching practices and their environment. In addition, they both were relatively new physics faculty at their current institutions, but there was a clear contrast in their circumstances, which we deemed to be an interesting feature to explore in this type of project.

We analyzed their physics faculty experience in order to explore their development as physics faculty. Therefore, we adopted a phenomenological-case study approach with the aim of understanding the lived experiences of these physics faculty.

III. METHODOLOGY

The key features of phenomenology provided the tools to characterize the interactions between an instructor’s unique interactions with their environment, their personal experiences and their teaching. The focus of phenomenology is on the meaning or essence between participants and the world they experience through the study of a specific phenomenon. According to Sadala and Adorno, the methodology is based on three main steps: description, reduction, and interpretation [20]. The description step consists of expressing the participant’s experience
as they narrate it. The reduction step consists of a critical reflection by the researcher on the content of the description to identify emerging themes in relation to the project’s focus. The third step consists of interpreting the content identified in the description and reduction steps in order to give meaning to the participant’s story.

In practice, this is how the three-step method was conducted. First, the transcripts and video interviews of participants were viewed multiple times and a narrative description of the interviews were written. Second, transcripts were re-read to locate significant statements or quotes about interactions between context and faculty’s development of their teaching practices. Quotes were regarded as relevant if they explicitly included information about practice and/or context. Third, relevant statements were clustered into the three categories of instructor development provided by the theoretical framework discussed in Sec. IV. Patterns within and across interviews for both context and development of faculty’s teaching practices were identified. The patterns that emerged enabled a narrative description by the first author of what the instructor’s experience was and how they experienced it. Co-authors validated the narrative description by ensuring that the story accurately depicted the patterns identified in the data.

A brief summary of the description phase can be found in Sec. V. Then, Sec. VI presents a summary of the claims we are making. The justification for these claims from the reduction stage is presented in Sec. VII and VIII followed by the interpretation in Sec. IX. Finally, we discuss limitations of this study in Sec. X and implications of our work in our conclusion Sec. XI.

IV. THEORY

To assess the ways in which faculty negotiate the interactions between the multiple facets of their context to develop their teaching, we adopted Bell and Gilbert’s framework [1]. This framework has been part of a range of existing models of continuing professional development that account for the different ways teachers can improve their practice [21]. The model was created to assess professional development programs for science teachers in K-12 environments [1] and puts forth three distinct, yet interrelated ways one can facilitate or restrict a teacher’s growth: personal (feelings, attitudes and beliefs about teaching developed through past experiences), social (working and relating to other teachers and students who are part of their community of practice) and professional (change of classroom practices such as using new activities and attempting new instructional approaches) [1]. The creation of this framework showcased that teacher development is an on-going process that centers around each teacher’s unique journey to improving their teaching as they interact with professional development programs and other entities in their environment.

The framework’s three components: personal, social and professional emerged from the assessment of a New Zealand professional development program where science teachers participated to enhance their teaching [1]. These three components were a result of the interview data collected to analyze this adult learning process in the context of improving teaching. Fig. I taken from Bell and Gilbert’s work illustrates the overlap and interactions between these components and their potential role in a teacher’s development. As the teachers went through the professional development program, each one of them went through different phases of developing their teaching as illustrated in each sphere in Fig. I [11]. Although each teacher had their unique path within these spheres, the themes across each components in Fig. I were of similar character for the participants in the study [1].

To assess the ways in which faculty negotiate the interactions between the multiple facets of their context to develop their teaching, we adopted Bell and Gilbert’s framework [1]. This framework has been part of a range of existing models of continuing professional development that account for the different ways teachers can improve their practice [21]. The model was created to assess professional development programs for science teachers in K-12 environments [1] and puts forth three distinct, yet interrelated ways one can facilitate or restrict a teacher’s growth: personal (feelings, attitudes and beliefs about teaching developed through past experiences), social (working and relating to other teachers and students who are part of their community of practice) and professional (change of classroom practices such as using new activities and attempting new instructional approaches) [1]. The creation of this framework showcased that teacher development is an on-going process that centers around each teacher’s unique journey to improving their teaching as they interact with professional development programs and other entities in their environment.

The framework’s three components: personal, social and professional emerged from the assessment of a New Zealand professional development program where science teachers participated to enhance their teaching [1]. These three components were a result of the interview data collected to analyze this adult learning process in the context of improving teaching. Fig. I taken from Bell and Gilbert’s work illustrates the overlap and interactions between these components and their potential role in a teacher’s development. As the teachers went through the professional development program, each one of them went through different phases of developing their teaching as illustrated in each sphere in Fig. I [11]. Although each teacher had their unique path within these spheres, the themes across each components in Fig. I were of similar character for the participants in the study [1].
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of the multitude of interdependent components that play a role in moderating their physics teaching. However, we use the framework to assess faculty’s development, not only due to structured professional development programs such as the one the framework was designed for, but we take the framework a step further to analyze the impact of all the environmental factors and experiences that faculty discuss, which influence their growth as physics faculty over time. In other words, we extend the framework by considering the multifaceted context-laden trajectories of physics faculty as they develop their teaching practices.

**Note on terminology:** The social, personal and professional development spheres of the Bell and Gilbert framework [1] fall into the bigger category of educational professional development, which encompasses more than just professional development programs. The literature more often than not uses interchangeably the idea of professional development to refer to specific interventions or to broader facets of professional development [13, 23, 24]. Although research has not clearly distinguished between these two ideas, we make a distinction between our use of these words to avoid confusion. Therefore, for the rest of the paper, we use the term *professional development* when discussing development within the Bell and Gilbert framework and we simply use the term *development* to refer to the broader professional development process.

### V. CASE STUDY SUBJECTS

Our first case study subject is Cleopatra, who is a tenure-track Assistant Professor of Physics at a military institution. She did her PhD after she retired from the military. She uses her hands-on experience in the military and her prior teaching experience outside physics to inform her physics teaching. Cleopatra taught her third and fourth years at her current institution while taking part in these interviews, which spanned a year and a half. Throughout the interviews, Cleopatra emphasized how much she cares about her students and the way she adjusts and develops her physics teaching based on student understanding and her local context’s constraints.

Our second case study subject is Sphinx, who is a tenure-track Assistant Professor of Physics at a small liberal arts college. He uses his prior teaching experience as a graduate student teaching assistant to inform his physics teaching. He was in his second and third years of teaching at this institution while we conducted the three interviews. Throughout the interviews, Sphinx highlighted how much he cares about his students and the ways he is working on developing his physics teaching to improve student learning by adapting research-based methods to his context.

Cleopatra’s and Sphinx’s contexts were identified in an organic way from the data based on their self-reported interactions with entities in their respective environments. Natural hierarchical interactions existing in higher education structures allowed us to identify and group pertinent context entities. For instance, student-instructor interactions and the way they both discuss their engagement with different individuals were identified as relevant context elements. Three levels of context were identified having an impact on their professional development: department, institution, and programs outside of their institution. Table I summarizes the details of those contextual layers. Both Cleopatra and Sphinx have similarities in the members and experiences that make up their respective context such as colleagues inside and outside the department and their graduate school experience. However, some members and experiences are unique to their respective context such as the course director for Cleopatra and the college wide initiatives for Sphinx. The role played by these context entities will be discussed in the subsequent sections as we analyze the interactions between context and their social, personal and professional development.

### VI. CLAIMS

To assess the impact of our case study subjects’ context on their development, we identified layer from Bell and Gilbert’s framework in which the context elements were discussed. This classification in the spheres of development enabled us to characterize the evolution of the role of context for our case study subjects.

The characterization for each case study subject is detailed separately in the following sections (Sec. VII and VIII). Claims are summarized in Table II. The first claim for both case study subjects is about the contrast in their development process and the second claim is about each case study subject’s increased context expertise.

Both types of claims are a result of the analysis below in the Bell and Gilbert framework, which culminates in Fig. 2 for Cleopatra and in Fig. 3 for Sphinx. As the developers of the framework established (Sec. IV), and our data analysis suggests (Sec. VII and VIII), there is clear interconnectedness between the types of development spheres.

### VII. CLEOPATRA DISCUSSION

#### A. Cleopatra Claim 1

*Cleopatra Claim 1:* Cleopatra’s process of development as a physics faculty varies over time. Tensions with context members create agitation in her social development arena, which echo in her personal and professional arenas.

Over time the way Cleopatra interacts with her context impacts her three arenas of development differently. Her most significant developments happen mainly in the professional and social development arenas as her personal development is rich and solid.
TABLE I: Elements of the three levels of context for Cleopatra and Sphinx

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Context</th>
<th>Cleopatra</th>
<th>Sphinx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>Colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Colleagues in other departments</td>
<td>Colleagues in other departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td>College wide initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Programs</td>
<td>New Faculty Workshop for Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>New Faculty Workshop for Physics and Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate School Experience</td>
<td>Graduate School Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past Professional Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II: Claims about Cleopatra’s and Sphinx’s development

1. *Interview 1*

Central to Cleopatra’s development is her growth mindset towards personal development with a focus on improving her teaching practices. In tandem, the tensions in the social sphere, moderated by different interactions with members of her context, echo into her personal development and professional development spheres.

Her professional development is centered around using student-centered practices and finding ways to develop them. In her classroom, she uses what she refers to as candy clicker questions, an instructional strategy inspired by some colleagues in her institution. Simultaneously, her interactions with her students give her immediate feedback on how to continue to enhance her classroom practices. The level of engagement and the design of the course are elements of her teaching that are moderated by the students’ feedback that she values. For example, she incorporates instructional tools that students enjoy:

“The kids are more into the YouTube videos, Khan Academy, and stuff like that, and I give that to them all the time. I’m very heavy into the demos, and the internet videos, and then the PhET website, and stuff like that.”

Additionally, when she engages with students to contextualize problems, she draws on her past real experiences in the military, which showcases how her rich and strong professional experience informs the ways she develops her classroom practices:

“The kids are always asking for what they call war stories. Being retired military myself, I’ve got lots of stuff I can share, that’s actually physics related.”

Her personal development is also supported by her close colleagues and teachers in other departments who share her perspective on student-centered teaching and offer her insight on ways to continue to grow as an instructor. For example, she reaches out to department colleagues to reflect on her teaching practices:

“If I ever have a philosophy question about teaching I usually go and talk to [another female colleague in the department].”

Furthermore, Cleopatra explains that instructors who teach the same introductory courses meet regularly to discuss the content of the class. As part of her community of practice, her course colleagues are the heart of her teaching environment and she attempts to find ways to collaborate with them when they meet bi-weekly to discuss course material. Cleopatra’s mutual engagement with others is focused on helping her refine her ways of thinking as opposed to focusing on the development of those relationships themselves.
Moreover, Cleopatra’s professional development is supported by how she draws ideas for new activities from her participation in professional development programs such as the New Faculty Workshop for Physics and Astronomy. Cleopatra uses activities such as worksheets and ranking tasks she learned about at the New Faculty Workshop for Physics and Astronomy to create conceptual multiple-choice questions. Her interactions with the wider physics community enables her to put into perspective her teaching experiences and learn about new methods such as tutorials that she could potentially implement in her teaching. From her participation in the New Faculty Workshop, Cleopatra learned about the purpose of guided worksheets.

Lastly, her personal and professional development are also moderated differently by another set of people in her context—the higher level administrators within her department and institution. Cleopatra explains how the instructional design of the course is coming from higher level members in the department or the administration. There is a clear hierarchical structure to the department. The course director and his assistant have full authority on creating, testing, and disseminating the in-class materials. This structure defines a limit to her agency in her professional development.

“I really wanted to do that [get rid of Project-Based Learning activities, PBLs] this semester, and I had kind of the approval of the course director to do it on a here-and-there kind of a basis, not “no PBLs and you replace them with tutorials,” but maybe one or two, maybe three, we could do that.”

She reiterates the idea of continuing to collaborate with course colleagues, which showcases the central role of these constant and regular interactions to her development in her social sphere:

“Every two-ish weeks we had what we call a ‘course meeting’ where all the teachers from 110 regular [...] and we would talk about [class content related to teaching practices].”

Cleopatra also discusses how she uses what she got from the New Faculty Workshop for Physics and Astronomy to supplement her teaching and create good clicker questions for students:

“I was borrowing pieces [from ranking tasks book from AAPT workshop] when I wanted a good clicker question, a good solid one, I would flip through the book and go, ‘Oh yeah, I like that, but I’m going to change it in this way and add it to my slides and have it as a clicker.’”

She also continues to value informal feedback from students to tailor her instructional methods in the best way possible for them:

“I took the opportunity to actually ask my students after the first day I got back, I said, ‘I have a unique opportunity to get feedback from you guys’ and then the two questions were, ‘I like it better when Dr. Cleopatra...’ ‘I like it better when the substitute teacher...’. Then I could get, ‘Oh, we really like it when you do this, but boy, they really did a great job doing that.’ ”

Furthermore, based on students’ feedback and preferences, she makes adjustments to her instructional design strategies and attempts new ways to structure her classroom time with students:

“I found I had to actually break the class, so teach them one dimensional kinematics, send them to the boards, practice that, then come back to two dimensional kinematics, then send them to the boards instead of all at once, all at once, which is what I was doing before.”

Nevertheless, some of the tensions that exist within the department between members who are reluctant to new ideas and those who are not, persist:
Her attempt to enlarge collaborative ways of working (social development) gives her a sense of empowerment (personal development), and stronger agency over her teaching and her place at her institution (professional development), despite some of these persistent constraints that she understands more and more with time.

3. Interview 3

In interview 3, Cleopatra faces greater tensions and constraints from members of her social sphere who restrain her possibilities for professional development growth, so she narrows her focus to try to continue improving her teaching within the constraints of her context.

She moves towards acknowledging and accepting the constraints of her atypical situation and she focuses on what she can actually develop, which is her student-centered in-class practices:

“I am still not seeing so much benefit. It’s, um, it’s a little crazy. I feel like just when I’m getting them into the board work, and we’re, we’re ready to go into the next harder problem. I go, Oh, I gotta stop and we got to go do this discovery exercise. And a lot of times I feel like the material doesn’t actually line up with what we’re doing very well. So it almost feels like busy work to me. I’m still trying to reconcile that. I’m trying to figure out how do I make them better? What could I do? How could I help make them better? Well, how would I change them and stuff and I’m usually just barely grading them on time and then I don’t even think about them anymore.”

Her interactions with the course director continue to be a key aspect in defining what she can and cannot do. There is a clear structure and power in place that inhibit instructors from making changes to certain in-class material, despite the self-reported ineffectiveness of some the teaching materials:

“We talked about it [the cons and pros of discovery projects] all the time in our group meeting. So all in all in the teachers that teach the same course, will meet and talk about it. […] so people aren’t loving it. Instructors aren’t loving it. Students aren’t loving it. But somebody in charge says let’s keep doing it.”

In parallel, new enforced departmental rules inhibit her from continuing to use her candy clicker questions, an instructional strategy that used to increase student engagement in the classroom:

“So what’s happened this semester, which is very sad is that the department head and the upper ups have locked down the food in the classroom. So I can’t even have the candies in the classroom, I would have to wait to give it to them like on the way out the door or something.”

It is not surprising that course directors, higher-level members in departments and institutions are pivotal in Cleopatra’s context because the structure of institutions of higher education gives them vital power to shape and shift practices. More specifically, Cleopatra is at a military institution, which has even more peculiarities than other institutions. Previous studies have shown that departmental and institutional structures are decisive factors in instructional change in physics [10]. Nevertheless, the interesting and noteworthy highlight in Cleopatra’s case is what and how she decides to navigate this environment. Cleopatra turns her focus on the facets of her context that allow her to continue to grow as an instructor. She continues to engage with students to get informal feedback about their preferred methods of teaching and learning. Students wanted to implement a strategy they use in other courses called “the wheel of fortune” where the instructor turns the wheel with student names on and calls upon the student the wheel stops at to answer the question.

“[Interviewer: do you think you should use this new teaching idea because it’s a really great idea or because it would just be fun?] I think both actually, because the students that I was talking to, I got some informal feedback from them […] that this would be pretty cool to implement.”

Cleopatra runs this idea about a new instructional method by her colleague who she considers an expert with a similar mindset:

“And I was just talking to another person, another civilian in the department [who has experience in] physics, education and research.”

Furthermore, she continues to engage with supportive colleagues in the wider physics community to continue to grow as an instructor. For instance, she reiterates in her third interview how the wider physics community gave her the idea to implement tutorials in her classroom to help scaffold student learning of new concepts.

We see that she focuses her attention on finding ways to continue to engage in improving student learning and engaging with supportive colleagues (social development). As her understanding of the constraints of her context settles (personal development), Cleopatra narrows her focus to her classroom, where she can enact her agency and continue to improve her teaching within her broader restrictive context (professional development).
4. Claim 1 Synthesis

Our detailed analysis of Cleopatra’s development trajectory within the Bell and Gilbert framework illustrates how Cleopatra’s process of development as a physics faculty varies throughout her three interviews. Her unique local context gives rise to both peculiar and common tensions with her context members. Consequently, we observed the creation of agitation with some aspects of her context (social development). Nevertheless, she continues to find ways to better her teaching despite her frustrations and her need to accept certain restraints (professional & personal development).

B. Cleopatra Claim 2

Cleopatra Claim 2: Cleopatra’s increased understanding of her context enables her to focus on what she can actually change in her teaching such as helping new instructors and focusing mainly on her classroom practices. Throughout her interviews, Cleopatra expresses an increasing frustration towards her restrictive context, which continuously presents challenges and barriers to her professional development. Concurrently, her better understanding of this unique context supports her by allowing her to refine her practice and also mentor and help newer instructors. Her recognition of her more experienced local teaching status allows her to gain more agency in improving her practice.

At first, Cleopatra explains how she fits into the instructional design already established at her institution. She uses strategies already implemented in the department before her arrival such as Just In Time Teaching:

Int.1: “We have a Just In Time Teaching system. So they come in with these questions already answered, and that gives me a feeling for how well they understand the material, or not, and then I can adjust my lecture.”

Later, she understands some of the barriers of her institution and how they affect her development. This better understanding of her context allows her to focus on what she can actually do and also allows her to guide some of the newer instructors. This change is illustrated in interviews 2 and 3, where she recognizes her own context-dependent expertise and her role as a resource to help newer instructors develop their teaching within the same context. For instance, with time she understands the rules that make her context atypical and give her insight at the power dynamics at play:

Int.3: “Yeah, and I do volunteer for this position [course director] but it doesn’t seem like any civilians are getting picked for these jobs. So I’m assuming anyways at this point that they’re keeping it military for course directors only for some reason.”

1. Claim 2 Synthesis

Although she cannot be in a position of power such as course director, she finds ways to have a supportive leadership influence by helping newer instructors navigate the terrain of this atypical institution:

Int.2: “People like me with experience, then, can offer it to the new guys, and a lot of times, they’ll actually come and watch us teach.”

Int.3: “One of the two new instructors who just showed up this semester is shadowing me, and watching my class to see how the labs go and how the discovery exercises go.”

Thus, her better understanding of restrictive context allows her to focus on what she can actually do and also allows her to mentor newer instructors.

C. Cleopatra Summary

Figure 2 summarizes the key features of Cleopatra’s context-laden development trajectory within the Bell and Gilbert’s framework. In the professional development sphere, Cleopatra engages in negotiating between teaching practices and the constraints of the system in order to find ways to implement new or better practices. In the social development sphere, she starts by attempting to enlarge her collaborative ways of working, then she
focuses on what she can actually change. In her personal development sphere, she starts with a growth mindset, which leads her to feel empowered in her ability to change her practices, but then she grasps the limits of what she can actually do and attempts to deal with the constraints due to the nature of her context.

Our analysis of subtle changes in the way Cleopatra discusses her practice and her context across interviews suggests an overarching pattern that indicates a growing context-expertise in developing her physics teaching, but her growth as an instructor is tumultuous due to her context. Her recognition of her more experienced local teaching status allows her to gain more agency in improving her practice. However, through interactions with actors in her social sphere, she better understands the unique restrictions of her institution and she focuses more deeply on ways to develop the instruction of introductory physics that she can control.

VIII. SPHINX DISCUSSION

A. Sphinx Claim 1

Sphinx Claim 1: Sphinx’s development process as physics faculty is steady. Harmony in his interactions with his context creates a smooth development process in his social, professional and personal development arenas with the most significant growth occurring in his personal development arena.

Over time the way Sphinx interacts with his context impacts the three arenas of development similarly. Of his three arenas, his growth is most noticeable in his personal development sphere, which echoes through his social and professional development arenas.

1. Interview 1

During the initial phase of the study, Sphinx has conflicting ideas about the best way to teach. Nevertheless he discusses exploring activities and practices in order to figure out what might work in his environment. He is strongly influenced by members of his social sphere during this exploratory phase.

In interview 1, we notice that Sphinx holds some ideas that knowledge of physics is constructed partially through transmission from instructor to the students and emphasizes the need for lecturing:

“I’m still a little bit in the camp where I think there should be a little bit of lecturing. I don’t think it has no place in the classroom.”

However, his discussion of his teaching practices reveals that his practices are largely student-centered, which is in contrast with his idea about knowledge transmission.

In his student-centered approach, he takes formal and informal feedback from students to better understand them and refine his teaching accordingly:

“I wanna be fluid, I wanna respond to them. I’ll even ask them for feedback at certain points, after exams and whatnot. I’ve looked at their surveys and what it is they want.”

His student-centered teaching techniques also come from his experiences as a teaching assistant in graduate school. In particular, Sphinx explains that the biggest takeaways from his graduate school teaching experience are reflected in his grading and his relationship with his students. In terms of grading, he learned to implement frequent low risk assessments instead of a few high risk assessments. In terms of student-instructor interactions, he tries

“just to be compassionate, not take it personally if a student is upset with you.”

These instructional approaches to teaching shape his student-centered classroom.

Furthermore, Sphinx explains how he uses some of his college wide initiatives to shape his approach to teaching. He gets involved in activities initiated by the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) at his institution. For example, during this phase of our study, he had participated in workshops organized by CETL:

“They have other things they do, different workshops. We have a workshop to start the fall semester where we talk about teaching practices and mentoring and advising practices. They sent out an email and I thought it would be good to dive into that.”

Concurrently Sphinx’s approach and thinking about teaching evolves as he interacts with colleagues outside the department about ways to improve his pedagogy, where he seems to seek out interactions that help develop his teaching. For example, he participates in a campus wide reading group where he meets regularly with other faculty members from campus to discuss common readings that they do about best teaching practices. In addition, Sphinx is in a small department and discusses regularly with the other two faculty how things are going and how to make changes to improve their current teaching methods.

“We talk about things like this a little bit in department meetings. It’s a small department. There’s only three full-time faculty. We talk about these things a little bit. How is this year’s cohort doing? How’s everything going?”

Despite some personal conflicting ideas about how to best teach (personal development), Sphinx seeks out ways to continue to improve his practice and his discussion of his practice suggests a strong emphasis on
student-centered teaching and learning (professional development). His interactions are facilitated by supportive social interactions in his environment (social development).

In this initial stage, we found that Sphinx interestingly presents a different case from findings of previous work. Henderson [9] highlighted the disconnect between instructors’ conception of their practice, which often happened to favor student-centered approaches, and their actions in the classroom, which were often more instructor-centered practices. On the other hand, Sphinx’s conception seems to be somewhere between student-centered and instructor-centered strategies, but his self-described practice suggests that he more strongly aligns with the student-centered approach in the classroom.

2. Interview 2

Over time, Sphinx interacts with new members of his context (social development), which opens new possibilities for his own conception of teaching (personal development) and new possibilities for his classroom practices (professional development). His context also continues to give him flexibility in what he can do.

During the second phase of this study, Sphinx’s recent interaction with members of the wider physics community at the New Faculty Workshop for Physics and Astronomy is at the forefront of his discussion. He highlights the ways in which the workshop benefits his practice:

“After the workshop happened, I used them [PhET simulations] a couple times in the fall, but I definitely used them more in the spring. I thought that was a good one, it’s a nice visual. Some of them are good visual representations.”

His participation in the workshop and interactions with the wider physics community lead him to be more convinced and proactive in making labs more student-centered with his colleague in the department.

“The other thing was how we structure the labs. Our labs at the moment, well, I guess we’re already in the midst of making a change. There are two new faculty members in my department, so the other one went as well to the workshop, and we both kind of were talking about some of the stuff we learned from it. And then, in the department meetings, we’re a small department, so the two of us, we’re two-thirds of the department, and then we came back and said, well, these are things we would like to maybe change, and we sort of gauged receptiveness to it.”

While working closely with his colleagues in restructuring their labs, Sphinx continues to reflect upon his experience in graduate school to negotiate how to best improve his classroom practices. In graduate school, Sphinx was a lab instructor and a recitation instructor. Reflecting upon his approach to these teaching assignments, he realized how the one-sided approach he had adopted then did not create an engaging environment for learning for his students. In the lab, he would show students how to use the equipment in his pre-lab lecture and answer questions during the lab. In recitation, he was talking and working through the problems, without many interactions with students. His recent interactions with the wider physics community and with members of his own college made him realize how this strategy to teaching was unhelpful to students because

“It was really one-sided where they didn’t get to talk so much.”

Additionally, this one-sided approach did not allow him to adapt to students’ needs and let them have agency over their own learning of the material. Thus, in his current faculty position, he is making sure to engage with his students. In fact, he discusses some of the interactions he values such as conversations with students on ways to better tailor classroom practices to students’ needs. For instance, he discusses how getting feedback from students is an important aspect of his assessment and development of his teaching:

“In talking with some of the Physics majors that are seniors, some of them think like, I’d rather have it be more interactive, go through less things but in depth more, rather than cover every single chapter.”

Simultaneously, we learn the opportunity to easily engage with colleagues and students is one of the reasons he decided to work at this small liberal arts institution.

In interview 2, thanks to new and continued interactions with his environment (social development), Sphinx reflects on his trajectory as an instructor and tries new teaching strategies that favor student-centered practices and looks for ways to keep improving his practice (personal & professional development).

3. Interview 3

During interview 3, Sphinx focuses his attention back to particular facets of his teaching as he is being evaluated for promotion (personal development). It seems that programmatic factors such as the New Faculty Workshop for Physics and Astronomy and his graduate school experience continue to easily integrate into Sphinx’s discussion of all facets of his teaching. As previously mentioned, his graduate school teaching experience made him realize the importance of student engagement for learning. As he moved forward in his journey in graduate school, Sphinx also had the opportunity to attend some teaching workshops that highlighted the
value of student engagement. Then, recently in his development trajectory, attending the New Faculty Workshop for Physics and Astronomy brought back this idea to the forefront of his teaching and developed it even further. In fact, Sphinx acknowledges the pivotal role of his interactions with the wider physics community at the workshop played in his conception, assessment, and discussion of his physics teaching:

“I would say it [the New Faculty Workshop for Physics and Astronomy] definitely influenced how I teach. So when I was in graduate school, I had taken some kind of teaching workshop or something for graduate students and so there they had already kind of sort of impressed upon me maybe the importance of getting the students to be more active. But I think that was definitely brought home at the New Faculty Workshop for Physics and Astronomy.”

Additionally, Sphinx’s department as a whole is trying to improve their teaching practices, which means Sphinx finds himself in a department where constantly finding ways to develop one’s teaching is encouraged and valued. He continues to support one of his colleagues who is in the process rewriting some of the introductory labs to make them more inquiry based. He is increasingly appreciating that his small department offers the opportunity to develop new and better teaching practices.

Given that Sphinx was being evaluated for promotion during interview 3, his discussion on his teaching focuses significantly on the day to day classroom activities and practices:

“I have a candidate committee who reviews me in my class, my classes. I am also this year getting evaluated college wide, so I had someone from the college as well evaluate […]”

The simultaneous occurrences of the evaluation by the college wide committee evaluating his teaching and his interactions with the wider physics community at the New Faculty Workshop for Physics and Astronomy seem to further shift Sphinx’s focus to his student-centered in-class practices. More specifically, he discusses in detail strategies he uses to engage students in the classroom. For example, he uses ABCD cards (cards with the letters A B C and D that allow students to respond to questions an instructor asks in class) to include more conceptual questions to gauge student understanding and increase their engagement:

“And so, for those conceptual questions, that’s where I use the ABCD cards. And so I’ll have them you know, I use them for pre questions, so basically before I go over the topic just to see where everybody’s at. And so when it looks like everybody’s on the same page. Like, I’ve tended to go a little quicker through those topics. If ever there’s kind of a mixed response then like, I usually hold off on telling them the answer then we go through the material and then I ask them again.”

His discussion on his in-class teaching strategies showcase how he tries to adapt to students’ level of understanding and create a pedagogical structure that centers around student interactions. He also details his thought process behind his use of certain instructional methods:

“If I see differences in answers, like I’ll try to get either two people to talk to each other or to talk through me about what they’re thinking and then or sometimes I’ll have them talk to each other as well and read, discuss their answers.”

The value of peer instruction is a facet of his teaching that is strongly nurtured by his supportive environment. His personal past experiences, his interactions with the wider physics community, his college and his colleagues all strongly encourage this mode of instruction.

As we can see, in interview 3, Sphinx shifts his attention to day to day practices (personal & professional development) but continues to engage in collaborative ways of working with students and colleagues, which is facilitated by the inherent flexibility of his type of institution but his discussion also suggests that his work is strongly nurtured by a supportive environment (social development).

4. Claim 1 Synthesis

Over time we saw how Sphinx’s development trajectory continuously evolves. Through positive and supportive interactions with his context, Sphinx has a relatively smooth development process in his social, professional and personal development arenas with the most significant growth occurring in his personal development arena, where he articulated over time his own significant growth mindset towards changing instructor-centered teaching to student-centered practices.

B. Sphinx Claim 2

Sphinx Claim 2: Sphinx’s increased understanding of his context allows him to realize that he has flexibility in what he can focus on day to day to keep developing his practice.

Sphinx’s expanding flexible context enables him to decide what to focus on at any given time in order to keep developing. Sphinx’s context-expertise translates into his ability to develop his physics teaching through implementation of incremental changes. His social sphere is
growing, dynamic and flexible, which allows him to easily try and implement little changes in his practice. Given the nature of small departments, Sphinx easily discusses with his department colleagues how his teaching is going and has flexibility in implementing new strategies as he sees fit. For example, as discussed earlier, after attending the New Faculty Workshop for Physics and Astronomy, he immediately incorporated PhET simulations in his course:

Int.2: “After the workshop happened, I used them [PhET simulations] a couple times in the fall”

We also learn that the opportunity to easily engage with colleagues and students is one of the reasons he decided to work at this small liberal arts institution:

Int.2: “I chose to apply to a place like that because I wanted to work closely with people, with students. There’s a small student to faculty ratio and then also I could do some summer work with them.”

The flexible environment provides him with continued support in his development. Later on, he tries to make adjustments as he gets feedback from colleagues from outside his department:

Int 3. “This semester a colleague […] said, to make sure you know, when you call on people, you know, try not to always call on the same people […] try to like distribute it out a little more.”

In the same interview, he also details his thought process behind his use of certain instructional methods and describes how he implements incremental changes in his classroom to encourage methods such as peer instruction. Sphinx’s experiences and interactions with his community strongly encourage continued improvement of his teaching. Over time, his growing context-expertise gives him the opportunity to keep finding ways to develop his practice to create the best possible learning environment for his students. Sphinx’s increased understanding of his flexible and supportive context enables him to decide what to focus in his day to day practice. He chooses to implement incremental changes and strategies to keep developing his practice. The growing number of entities that easily become part of Sphinx’s context provide him with the opportunity to further enhance his teaching and be more confident in his approach and development of his practice.

1. Claim 2 Synthesis

Sphinx’s increased awareness of his flexible and supportive environment provides him the opportunity to work on improving his teaching in the way he views most suited to his current needs. Over time Sphinx’s context-laden development trajectory continuously showcases the salient role members of his environment and his experiences play in providing tools and support to keep developing his daily teaching practices.

C. Sphinx Summary

Figure 3 summarizes Sphinx’s steady development within the Bell and Gilbert framework. In the professional development sphere, Sphinx engages in negotiating between classroom practices in order to find ways to implement new or better practices. In the social development sphere, he increasingly engages in collaborative ways of working. In his personal development sphere, he starts with a conflicting mindset, which through interactions with his context shifts to being open to new ways of teaching, but then he focuses on particular facets of his teaching.

Our analysis of how Sphinx discusses his practice and his context among interviews suggests an overarching pattern that indicates a growing context-expertise and growing confidence in his ability to develop his physics teaching through implementation of incremental changes. His interactions with his context over time allow him to gain agency in improving his practice. The flexibility of his context enables him to have a steady development trajectory. Through his interactions with the wider physics community and his colleagues, he engages and takes more concrete actions about ways to restructure introductory physics courses in his small department. His personal, social and professional spheres are being incrementally aligned with his approach to develop his teaching, which facilitates his ongoing development as a physics instructor.

IX. INTERPRETATION

Instructors’ unique experiences undoubtedly leads to the development of their physics practices. Nevertheless,
our case study subjects show some of the interesting nuances that exist in the interactions between context and the development of their physics teaching. Both Cleopatra and Sphinx decide to focus on developing their largely student-centered in-class practices. However, the reasons they focus on these practices are different because of the nature of their distinct contexts, which creates the opportunity to examine the interesting nuances that moderate faculty change. For Cleopatra, her experience in her local context enables her to navigate tensions and focus on the aspects of her teaching she is able to develop. For Sphinx, his experience in his local context enables him to coordinate his teaching practices to best fit his current needs such as the current assessment of his teaching by his college.

A closer look at both case study subjects’ characterization in the Bell and Gilbert framework (Figs. 2 and 3, respectively) shows growth in their professional development spheres by finding ways to implement new and better practices, yet this development is moderated differently by their social and personal development spheres. Sphinx’s environment fosters collaborative ways of working, which is the central aspect of his social development over time, whereas Cleopatra’s efforts to enlarge collaborative ways of her working are not as suited for her atypical context, which leads her to narrow down the areas of collaborative work in her social sphere over time. Moreover, in their respective personal development spheres, Cleopatra and Sphinx have contrasting trajectories. Cleopatra’s trajectory goes from growth and empowerment to accepting and dealing with the constraints of her context, whereas Sphinx’s development is directed towards a growth and focused mindset after exhibiting conflicting signs on his approach to teaching. These context-laden characterizations in our extension of the Bell and Gilbert framework illustrate two ways physics faculty develop over time.

Understanding the experiences of these two physics instructors gives perspective to physics education researchers about the ways physics faculty negotiate their myriad experiences to continue to develop as physics faculty. In particular, it highlights the benefits of the lens by which we conducted the analysis of this study. First, using the classical narrative of faculty change which aims to assess adoption and persistence of use of established research-based strategies in instructional change would have missed key parts of both Cleopatra and Sphinx’s stories. Second, using an established framework for transforming departmental culture might have been applicable for Cleopatra, but it would not have been as applicable for Sphinx. Although the classical narrative would have captured some of the research-based strategies our case study subjects use, it would not have captured how they moderate the use of these strategies in light of their interactions with different facets of their context. Additionally assessing the impact of a particular intervention such as the New Faculty Workshop for Physics and Astronomy (NFW) would have captured quite well Sphinx’s professional and social development, but would not have as clearly characterized his mindset growth over time. In fact, NFW has played an incredibly positive role for Sphinx who has discussed its benefits at length in our study. This is concurrent with recent assessment studies of NFW’s positive impact on faculty. However, to capture the growth in conception of Sphinx we would have needed to use an additional framework such as Henderson and Dancy’s conception framework. In contrast, assessing the impact of a particular intervention would not have been as helpful for Cleopatra. She greatly benefits from programs such as NFW but a more crucial layer of Cleopatra’s story is the significant role played by her institution and how she is learning to navigate the tensions of her context to continuously grow as a physics instructor. In Cleopatra’s case, the department action teams (DAT) model would have been a more suitable framework to highlight the complex interrelated nature of her university system. However, the DAT model would not have showcased Cleopatra’s personal and social trajectories in trying to navigate her complex environment. Additionally, the DAT model would not have been a good fit for analyzing Sphinx’s context because of its size and its much simpler structure as compared to Cleopatra.

Thus, using the Bell and Gilbert framework allowed us to use similar theoretical grounds for both case study subjects that highlight similarities and differences in both instructors’ development. The framework was valuable for analyzing faculty growth as it was used to look at the different aspects of their context that can impact their development. Then, our extension of the framework enabled us to show the nuances and the multifaceted factors that come into play in moderating faculty change over time. By studying faculty growth from this lens, we attempted to look at faculty development holistically by analyzing physics’ faculty context-laden development trajectories. Hence, our case study shifts the lens by which previous research has discussed physics faculty’s development.

X. LIMITATIONS & FUTURE WORK

There are limitations and possible areas of further exploration in our study.

Our analysis is based on self-reported data by our case study participants. On the one hand, this limitation enabled us to do an in-depth phenomenological-case study to narrate the complexity of the trajectory of faculty’s lived experience. On the other hand, the identified patterns and interplay of faculty’s lived experience cannot be generalized across all physics faculty. Although this feature is an inherent part of any case study, this limitation has shifted the purpose of our study into a scope broadening one, where we broaden the community’s awareness of the ways physics instructors develop their teaching.

Furthermore, our case study subjects’ institution
played an evident role in their contrasting experiences. The inherent size and type of institutions clearly had a significant role in moderating their practice. The deliberate choice we made in choosing two participants with different environments contributes to the purpose of the paper, which is to show the complex and evolving role of context in faculty’s professional development. Our analysis shows that context-laden faculty development goes beyond the type of environment they find themselves in, which highlights the value of a faculty-centric approach to better understand the nuances of their lived experience.

In the future, given our case study subjects’ illustration of the different, complex, and context dependent expertise instructors bring to their classrooms to help student learn physics, we hope to expand this work to more physics instructors in different environments to enlarge the discussion of physics faculty professional development, focusing on the strengths of their context-dependent teaching, beyond their physics, or even pedagogical knowledge.

XI. CONCLUSION

Our study illustrates the growth of physics faculty, specifically non-PER faculty. Our methodological approach showed how Cleopatra and Sphinx’s physics faculty experiences enabled them to utilize their communities’ influences and their physics expertise to navigate their physics teaching to best fit their local circumstances. Although studies in physics education research have shown the importance of context in instructional change and the need for continued support for faculty while implementing research-based methods [2, 3, 5–8, 11], they have not focused on the varied, context dependent expertise instructors bring to their classrooms, and they have not always taken a faculty-centric approach to physics faculty’s development. Therefore, by highlighting two different possible ways physics faculty’s growth is enacted in their local context, we contribute to a current trend in physics education focusing on asset-based models that support the different ways physics faculty navigate their professional development in their local context [14]. Shifting the way we view and discuss physics faculty by taking this faculty-centric approach enables a more holistic and tailored analysis of their experience, which creates the possibility of creating more ways to help moderate continued support for physics faculty.

In addition, as physics education researchers continue to develop resources and find ways to best disseminate their findings to the broader community of physics educators, they have the opportunity to highlight two concrete ways junior physics faculty navigate very different contexts to develop their teaching. Cleopatra and Sphinx’s stories are two examples of how the process of becoming a physics faculty member is a multifaceted and ongoing journey. The contexts of our case study subjects provide concrete examples of how junior faculty utilize explicit and implicit interactions with their surroundings and experiences to develop their physics teaching. This case study could be used to help other junior faculty navigate this stage of their career. Through the contrasting examples of Cleopatra and Sphinx, other junior physics faculty have two different, yet successful, examples of how to navigate their unique circumstances to develop their physics teaching.

The contrasting stories of this study enables us to broaden the community’s awareness of the ways physics instructors develop their physics teaching. The subtleties of how context has a salient, complex, and evolving role in moderating faculty’s professional development can contribute to a more faculty-centric approach in the ways the physics community views, discusses and supports the professional development of physics faculty.
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