

5-2018

The Reentry Experience of Saudi Scholars in a University of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and How Their Administrators Perceive the Reentry of Saudi Scholars

Yousef Mubrik Almutairi

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digscholarship.unco.edu/dissertations>

Recommended Citation

Almutairi, Yousef Mubrik, "The Reentry Experience of Saudi Scholars in a University of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and How Their Administrators Perceive the Reentry of Saudi Scholars" (2018). *Dissertations*. 483.
<https://digscholarship.unco.edu/dissertations/483>

This Text is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at Scholarship & Creative Works @ Digital UNC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarship & Creative Works @ Digital UNC. For more information, please contact Jane.Monson@unco.edu.

© 2018

YOUSEF MUBRIK N ALMUTAIRI

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

Greeley, Colorado

The Graduate School

THE REENTRY EXPERIENCE OF SAUDI SCHOLARS IN A
UNIVERSITY OF KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA AND
HOW THEIR ADMINISTRATORS PERCEIVE THE
REENTRY OF SAUDI SCHOLARS

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements of the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Yousef Mubrik N Almutairi

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
School of Leadership, Policy, and Development
Higher Education and P-12 Education

May 2018

This Dissertation by: Yousef Mubrik N Almutairi

Entitled: *The Reentry Experience of Saudi Scholars in a University of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and How Their Administrators Perceive the Reentry of Saudi Scholars*

has been approved as meeting the requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in School of Leadership, Policy, and Development, Program of Higher Education and Student Affairs Leadership

Accepted by the Doctoral Committee

Tamara Yakaboski, Ph.D., Research Advisor

Matthew Birnbaum, Ph.D., Committee Member

Harvey Rude, Ph.D., Committee Member

Randy Larkins, Ph.D., Faculty Representative

Date of Dissertation Defense _____.

Accepted by the Graduate School

Linda L. Black, Ed.D.
Associate Provost and Dean
Graduate School and International Admissions

ABSTRACT

Almutairi, Yousef Mubrik N. *The Reentry Experience of Saudi Scholars in a University of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and How Their Administrations Perceive the Reentry of Saudi Scholars*. Published Doctor of Philosophy dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 2018.

This study looked at the reentry experiences of Saudi scholars who had completed their advanced degrees at U.S. universities and had returned to Saudi Arabia to become faculty members at Saudi universities. The goal of this study was to explore how Saudi scholars experienced the phenomenon of reentry to work in Saudi universities, how these scholars described the opportunities and challenges of their reentry experiences, and how the university administrators perceived the reentry of Saudi scholars.

For this research, a case-study approach was utilized to explore the thoughts and feelings of a certain population to interpret a particular phenomenon. Data were gathered through interviews with two groups of participants. The first group consisted of 16 Saudi reentry scholars with 3 of these participants being Saudi scholars and administrators who worked at Kingdom University. The second group consisted of 14 administrators with 3 of these participants being reentry scholars working in various academic departments from 1 university.

Theories explored included reverse culture shock theory, organizational theory, and brain circulation theory. All of the Saudi reentry scholars experienced great difficulty upon reentry in the Saudi culture and in returning to the university setting. Among the

issues were reverse culture shock, the return to a tradition-bound, bureaucratic and unchanging academic atmosphere, and challenges related to Saudi culture, especially for returning women scholars. The scholarships received by all of the reentry scholars interviewed for this study supported the opportunity for increased global linkages through education abroad by helping reentry scholars develop both personally and academically. In addition to interviews with scholars, university administrators were interviewed regarding their impressions of and relationships to returning scholars. Results showed that the challenges faced by returning scholars were many and fierce as they attempted to reintegrate within the culture and their universities. Recommendations were made for both returning scholars and their university administrations.

Keywords: Saudi reentry scholars, reverse culture shock, Saudi Arabian culture, reentry scholars readjustment, University organization, brain circulation theory, organizational theory.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my deep thanks, gratitude, and appreciation to everyone who contributed to the successful completion of my Ph.D. degree and dissertation. Most importantly, I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to my great advisor and professor, Dr. Tamara Yakaboski. Thank you for guiding and supporting me during my educational journey. Thank you so much for everything you have provided to me, I appreciate your time and efforts. Dr. Matthew Birnbaum, Dr. Harvey Rude, and Dr. Randy Larkins were the members of my dissertation committee. Thank you. I appreciate all of their help through this process. I would like thank all the faculties in the Higher Education and Student Affairs Leadership department at the University of Northern Colorado for preparing me for my career in administrative and academic work.

A special thanks goes out to my parents who have always assisted and encouraged me to study abroad. To my wife, also a special thank you for her encouragement and love. Special thanks to all my brothers and sisters for their help and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Description of the Study	9
	Significance of the Study	11
	Purpose of This Study	12
	Research Questions	13
	Conclusion	13
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW	14
	Relevant Theories	15
	Culture Shock Theory	15
	Reentry or reverse culture shock.....	17
	The W-Curve Hypothesis Model	18
	The reentry experience.....	19
	Reentry barriers.....	22
	Reentry experiences in Brazil, Pakistan, India, and Saudi Arabia.....	25
	Brazil.....	25
	Pakistan	26
	India... ..	27
	Saudi Arabia.....	28
	Brain circulation relevant theories.....	31
	Brain drain, brain gain and brain circulation	31
	Relevant theory--Organizational theory	35
	Implications of Organization Theory to Faculty Socialization in Saudi Arabia	36
	The Influences of Saudi Context Culture and Religion	39
	Saudi Arabian Culture.....	40

CHAPTER

II. continued

Religion.....42
Influences on the Culture43

Summary.....45

III. METHODOLOGY47

Researcher Stance/My Story.....47
Research Questions49
Epistemology49
Methodological Framework.....50

Methodology: The Case Study.....50
The Context.....51

Setting51
Participants.....51
Potential benefits to the participants55
Consent forms56

Data Collection Methods56

Semi-structured interviews56

Data Collection Procedures.....58

Data Analysis and Coding59

Trustworthiness.....59
Data Analysis60
Theoretical Framework Used for Analysis.....61

Limitations63

Summary.....64

CHAPTER		
IV.	FINDINGS	66
	Interviews with Reentry Scholars	67
	Main Theme 1 (MT1): Reverse Culture Shock is Experienced by Returning Saudi Reentry Scholars as Difficult	67
	Subtheme 1.1 (ST1.1): There is a need for greater support from Kingdom University upon reentry ...	71
	Summary	74
	Main Theme 2 (MT2): Kingdom University Organizational Systems are Experienced as Difficult and Bureaucratic for Returning Saudi Scholars	75
	Subtheme 2.1 (ST2.1): Technology is challenging and frequently not used appropriately	81
	Subtheme 2.2 (ST2.2): Women experience readjustment differently than men and have fewer opportunities	82
	Summary	85
	Main Theme 3 (MT3): There is a Desire to Create Change	87
	Subtheme 3.1 (ST3.1): Education abroad creates greater links to the global community	89
	Summary	92
	Interviews with Administrators.....	93
	Main Theme 1 (MT1): Administrators Have a General Understanding of the Reentry Experience.	94
	Subtheme 1.1 (ST1.1): Administrators understand that the environment has changed for reentry scholars	97
	Subtheme 1.2 (ST1.2): The interaction administrators have with returning scholars as employees.....	98
	Summary	100

CHAPTER

IV. continued

Main Theme 2 (MT2): Administrators' Expectations for Reentry Scholars	101
Subtheme 2.1 (ST2.1): The need for reentry scholars to apply what they have learned abroad.....	103
Subtheme 2.2 (ST2.2): The need for reentry scholars to contribute to administrative duties and teaching	104
Summary	106
Main Theme 3 (MT3): Administrators Have Mixed Perceptions of Reentry Scholars' Contributions.....	106
Subtheme 3 (ST3.1): Administrators anticipate the return of reentry scholars with excitement.....	107
Subtheme 3.2 (ST3.2): Administrators' perceptions of reentry scholars as unproductive and uncooperative	108
Summary	110
Comparing the Findings.....	111
The Reentry Experience.....	111
Expectations, Challenges, the Need for Support, and Conflict	112
Opportunities.....	115
Conclusion	115
V. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	117
Links to Theoretical Framework.....	117
The W-Curve Theory	118
The honeymoon phase	119
The culture shock phase.....	119
Main Theme 1(MT1): Reverse culture shock is experienced by returning Saudi reentry scholars as difficult.....	119

CHAPTER
V. continued

The mental isolation phase.....	121
Subtheme 1.1 (ST1.1): There is a need for greater support from Kingdom University upon reentr	121
Organizational Culture Theory	123
Main Theme 2 (MT2): Kingdom University organizational systems are experienced as difficult and bureaucratic for returning Saudi scholars	124
Subtheme 2.1 (ST2.1): Technology is challenging and frequently not used appropriately	126
Subtheme 2.2 (ST2.2): Women experience readjustment and the university system differently than men, giving them fewer opportunities	128
Main Theme 3 (MT3): There is a desire to create change	131
Brain Circulation Theory	133
Subtheme 3.1 (ST3.1): Education abroad creates greater links to the global community	133
Summary	136
Administrators Themes Discussion	137
Main Theme 1 (MT1): Administrators Have a General Understanding of the Reentry Experience	137
Subtheme 1.1 (ST1.1): Administrators understand that the environment has changed for reentry scholars	139
Subtheme 1.2 (ST1.2): The interaction administrators have with returning scholars as employees.....	140

CHAPTER

V. continued

Main Theme 2 (MT2): Administrators' Expectations for Reentry Scholars	141
Subtheme 2.1 (ST2.1): The need for reentry scholars to apply what they have learned abroad.....	142
Subtheme 2.2 (ST2.2): The need for reentry scholars to contribute to administrative duties and teaching	143
Main Theme 3 (MT3): Administrators Have Mixed Perceptions of Reentry Scholars' Contributions.....	145
Subtheme 3.1 (ST3.1): Administrators anticipate the return of reentry scholars with excitement.....	145
Subtheme 3.2 (ST3.2): Administrators' perceptions of reentry scholars as unproductive and uncooperative	146
Summary	147
Recommendations for Practical Application	149
Future Recommendations	150
Recommendations for Reentry Scholars.....	150
Recommendations for Saudi Administrators	152
Recommendations for U.S. Universities.....	155
Recommendations for U.S. Faculty	155
Recommendations for Future Research	157
Conclusions.....	158
REFERENCES	162
APPENDICES	
A. Recruitment Email for Interviews.....	175
B. Consent Form for Human Participants in Research.....	177
C. Proposed Interview Questions for Scholars	180
D. Proposed Interview Questions for Administrations.....	183

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
1.	Higher Education in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.....	5
2.	Study Participants	53
3.	Data Alignment Between Research Question 1, Theme 1, and Participants' Responses	74
4.	Data Alignment Between Research Question 2, Theme 2, and Participants' Responses	86
5.	Data Alignment Between Research Question 2, Theme 3, and Participants' Responses	92

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The topic of this study was the reentry experiences of Saudi scholars who had completed their doctoral degrees from United States universities and had returned to become faculty members of Saudi Arabian universities and how the university administrators perceived the reentry of Saudi scholars. Reentry scholars are individuals who returned to their home countries to teach at institutions of higher education after having received a doctoral degree from universities in other host countries. For this study, the host country was the United States and the home country was the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA). The topic is important for the United States and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA) higher education institutions as the U.S. institutions train these scholars and Saudi higher education employs the returning scholars in Saudi academia. Over the last few decades, several thousand academics have been trained and completed doctoral studies in U.S. universities (Hilal, Scott, & Maadad, 2015). For example, in the 2014-2015 academic year, 12,594 scholars were enrolled in graduate programs as international students (Institute of International Education [IIE], 2015a). As Saudi students returned to their home country, there has been large increases in entrepreneurship, new ideas, and new institutions of many varieties. Because of increased education, Saudi citizens have been on track to replace the non-native labor force, those who frequently have greater access to higher education and qualifications given the current limited Saudi higher

educational system (Ahmed, 2015). Tremendous cultural change has continued to take place in the KSA, such as women's rights and education (Al-Mubarak, 2011) and the huge growth in the number of Saudi universities (three new universities in 2014 alone), have necessitated increased numbers of scholars to teach in the universities. Because of these rapidly changing patterns, and explained in more detail later, this research has significance for many stakeholders, including Saudi returning scholars, U.S. universities that educate these scholars, Saudi universities that employ them, and me personally as a Saudi Arabian student finishing a Ph.D. in Higher Education and Students Affairs Leadership at a U.S. university.

It was important to first understand the context of Saudi Arabian educational history. Saudi higher education mobility started when King Abdul-Aziz sent six Saudi scholars to acquire higher education in Cairo in 1927 (Ahmed, 2015). Under the leadership of the forward thinking King Abdul-Aziz, the country began to send students to study abroad with the hope that these students would bring new ideas to the country's education system. Saudi Arabia's first institution of higher education, King Saud University, was established in 1957. Therefore, prior to its creation, Saudi scholars had no choice but to go to established universities, primarily in Egypt, to continue their education (Ahmed, 2015). In 1951, the first group of students came to study in the United States (Saudi Arabian Cultural Mission [SACM], 2015). In the late 1970s, leaders in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia wanted to broaden education for more of the population, so more scholars were sent abroad. By 1975, studying abroad was gaining major popularity and thousands of scholars were being sponsored by the government to gain their degrees abroad (Ahmed, 2015; SACM, 2015). Saudi study-abroad enrollment in the 1980s

reached a high of 12,500; yet, this number decreased in the 1990s because of reduced Saudi government funding. In 2002, enrollment dropped 80% in response to the September 11, 2001, attack on New York City (Lennon, 2007).

However, in 2005, King Abdullah and U.S. President George W. Bush met to discuss a new and innovative scholarship program, the King Abdullah Scholarship Program, which greatly increased the enrollment of Saudi scholars in the U.S. and in other Western countries (SACM, 2015; Taylor & Albasri, 2014). As of 2014, about 60,000 Saudi scholars study in the United States alone; however, not all have been part of the King Abdullah Scholarship Program (Taylor & Albasri, 2014).

King Salman, who became the leader of Saudi Arabia in 2015, established Vision 2030, approved in April of 2016, with the goal for Saudi institutions to be among the top universities in the world (Alshuwaikhat, Adenle, & Saghir, 2016). Consequently, many universities have been funding the studies of academics so graduates would return and staff the new universities for both men and women. The result of the funding from the King Abdullah Scholarship Program and the other sources of funding have shown that Saudi Arabia has spent the largest portion of their gross domestic product (GDP) on education of any world country, which is SR 191,659 billion (Saudi Riyal, the common currency in Saudi Arabia; one SR is equivalent to approximately \$0.27 U.S.) or about 25% of the GDP (Eid, 2015).

Currently, there are 27 public universities and 9 private universities (1 of which is co-educational), with a total of 36 universities serving the population of the Kingdom (Saudi Arabia Ministry of Higher Education, 2013). Table 1 reviews current KSA institutions and their year of establishment to demonstrate the massive growth of

university in the last decade and a half. Since this case-study research focused on the return experiences, I conducted the study in the Central Region of Saudi Arabia. This region included the biggest central area in Saudi Arabia, allowing a targeted focus on 1 of the 27 public universities in Saudi Arabia. This university had 24 colleges, 2 hospitals, and 130 departments. The university had about 65,000 students, over 7,614 faculty, and 18,973 staff (Knipfer, 2013).

Table 1

Higher Education in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Year	Name of Institution
Public Universities ($N = 27$)	
1957	King Saud University
1967	King Abdulaziz University
1963	King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals
1974	Iman Mohammad Bin Saud Islamic University
1961	Islamic University
1975	King Faisal University
1979	Umm Al-Qura University
1998	King Khalid University
2003	Taibah University
2004	Qassim University
2004	Taif University
2005	Jazan University
2005	Al-Jouf University
2006	University of Hail
2006	Tabuk University
2006	Al-Baha University
2006	Najran University
2007	Northern Border University
1970	Princess Nora Bint Abdul Rahman University
2009	Dammam University
2010	Salman bin Abdulaziz University

Table 1 (continued)

Year	Name of Institution
2010	Al-Majmaah University
2010	Shaqra University
2011	Saudi Electronic University
2014	University of Jeddah
2014	Bisha University
2014	University of Hafr Abatin
Private Universities ($N = 9$)	
1999	Effat University
1999	Dar Al-Hekma University
1999	Prince Sultan University
2003	Fahd bin Sultan University
2004	Al Yamamah University
2006	Prince Mohammad bin Fahd University
2007	Alfaisal University
2009	King Abdullah University of Science and Technology
2009	King Abdullah University of Science and Technology

Source: Saudi Arabia Ministry of Education, 2013

The large number of Saudi scholarship scholars has been mutually beneficial to both Saudi and U.S. universities economically and institutionally. Saudi scholars have contributed to U.S. colleges and universities by helping them fulfill their international student goals and by providing a rich cultural diversity to the campus community (Takeuchi, 2008). In 2015, approximately 60,000 Saudi scholars in the U.S. contributed \$1.7 billion to the U.S. economy and were a major part of all international scholars who

supported more than 373,000 U.S. jobs (Institute of International Education [IIE], 2015b; National Association of Foreign Student Advisors, 2015). The benefit to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA), through the encouragement of student mobility across the globe, has promoted a better higher education system to develop the intellectual capacity of its citizens (SACM, 2015). This, in turn, has been believed to have solved many of the problems and issues facing the KSA today. Through higher education, Saudi Arabia would be able to achieve a more skilled society and become an economic driver in the global knowledge economy (Hilal et al., 2015). Other benefits that Saudi economy has received from the education of its students abroad have been to promote technology growth, build alliances, and develop the English language which have contributed to world-wide communication and helped KSA to be part of the international economic system (Saxenian, 2005; Stark, Helmenstein, & Prskawetz, 1997). Research has shown that brain circulation benefits have extended to scholars worldwide. This, indeed, has been the case in Saudi Arabia, where scholars getting advanced degrees internationally have been required to return home to use their new knowledge in their home country. Saudi Arabian culture has benefitted through evolution of values, identities, and behaviors as well as being able to think critically and community internationally.

Even with these benefits, there have been many issues to contend with when Saudi scholars return home. For example, many would experience a variety of reentry problems with their university placements and their job satisfaction, which was why this topic was a significant issue for the returning scholars. It has had important implications for U.S. higher education and student affairs professionals to gain understanding of Saudi reentry experiences as they prepare scholars to return to Saudi universities. Two

significant areas were important for this study. First, the uniqueness of Saudi culture and its effects on returning scholars; and second, the culture shock experienced by scholars who study in the U.S. culture and return to Saudi universities to work as faculty and their related reentry experiences. Reentry shock is the experience of returning to a home country or home culture after having lived, worked, or studied in another culture for an extended period of time (Uehara, 1986b; Weaver, 1987; Westwood, Lawrence, & Paul, 1986). For many scholars, coming back home was more of a shock and adjustment than leaving (Adler, 1981; Brockington, Hoffa, & Martin, 2005). The Saudi culture has a unique fusion of religious and cultural beliefs that are very different than the United States. These scholars may want to see more of the cultural and religious freedoms that they became used to when they were studying in the U.S. or they may be relieved to be back in their home country's culture. As such, it was important in this study that I explore how the uniqueness of the Saudi culture influenced reentry issues and experiences.

Additionally, KSA higher education leaders and university administrators have no research or training in scholar reentry to have a complete understanding of the problems and opportunities of the reentry scholars returning to work in Saudi universities. Home universities may not be equipped to provide the right atmosphere, thus causing the scholar to become disappointed that he/she could not share or transfer his/her new knowledge (Adler, 1981; Oddou, Osland, & Blakeney, 2008). Therefore, it is likely that, when Saudi scholars return home, they may not be prepared to face the barriers that the universities in their home country have. It has been incumbent upon higher education leadership in Saudi Arabia to welcome returning scholars, help them adapt to their new circumstances, and provide a positive work environment for them (Hilal et al., 2015). Just

as U.S. higher education faculty and student affairs professionals need to help prepare students for their departure and reintegration into Saudi workforce, it has also been important that their new knowledge be shared throughout the university. This research may help to establish groundwork of understanding to guide universities in their scholars' reentry and in helping U.S. universities prepare Saudi students for their return.

Description of the Study

In this study, I looked at the reentry experiences of Saudi scholars who had completed their advanced degrees at U.S. universities and had returned to Saudi Arabia to become faculty members at Saudi universities. In this study, I focused on the culture shock experienced. This was combined with exploring how university administrators perceived the reentry of Saudi scholars. The reentry situation for Saudi Arabian scholars has been exacerbated by the steep rise in the number of Saudi scholars who were finishing up advanced degrees and returning to faculty positions in Saudi universities (Ahmed, 2015; Alandejani, 2013). I focused on the culture shock experiences by scholars who studied in a U.S. culture. Therefore, the goal of this study was to explore how Saudi scholars experienced the phenomenon of reentry to work in Saudi universities, how these scholars described the opportunities and challenges of reentry experiences, and how the university administrators perceived the reentry of Saudi scholars.

The reentry situation is two-fold: scholars return to their universities with new ideas that they wanted to implement, while at the same time, the academic institutions are also experiencing their own cultural change. I looked at these changes and their implications for higher education and student affairs professionals as well as faculty in the United States and Saudi Arabia; those who must help the returning scholars adapt to

the work environment as well as create the change they are anxious to enact. Exploring these different perspectives was necessary because there was little literature on the return of U.S. trained scholars to Saudi universities.

The first area discussed is the uniqueness of Saudi culture and its effects on student returnees and the second is the culture shock experienced by students who studied in a US culture and their related reentry experiences. Of the phenomena studied by academics regarding students abroad, the concepts of culture shock and reentry shock were important to the current study (Uehara, 1986a; Weaver, 1987; Westwood et al., 1986). For many students, coming back home was more of a shock and adjustment than leaving (Adler, 1981; Brockington et al., 2005). Reentry difficulties tended to manifest in strained personal relationships upon return and the needed adjustments to the student's emotional well-being (Casteen, 2006). Questions about reentry have been posed by both students and higher education personnel and researchers for generations. There have been many studies regarding scholars' reentry in cultures as diverse as Thailand (Pai, 1997), Brazil (Gama & Pedersen, 1977), and India (Saeed, 1987), as well as the United States (Rowan-Kenyon & Niehaus, 2011; Wielkiewicz & Turkowski, 2010).

Another related concept has been brain circulation, which is the term used to describe the movement and mobility of higher educated people around the globe (Teferra, 2005). One of the major concerns for a country when students leave for graduate education overseas has been brain drain, which is whether these students would return and contribute their expertise to a university within their home society or whether they would find work elsewhere--potentially in the country where their education was obtained (Perna et al., 2014; Stark et al., 1997; Teferra, 2005). In the case of Saudi

Arabia, students getting advanced degrees internationally have been required to return home to use their new knowledge in their home culture; therefore, the focus in this context has been more on brain circulation. There have been benefits for all cultures with this new phenomenon and, in Saudi Arabia, the entire culture has benefitted when academics continued to communicate with Western cultures. Given that this specific topic was under-researched in the Saudi context, these broader areas of literature may help guide the conversation and future research agenda.

Significance of the Study

Since 2005, the major educational goal for Saudi Arabia has been to build a distinguished work environment with qualified Saudi personnel. The country has sent thousands of Saudi students to study in Western countries and has focused on training in the fields of medicine, engineering, science, and education with the hope of exchanging scientific, educational, research, and cultural expertise with other countries. To that end, there were 3,110 students in 2012 seeking doctoral degrees in U.S. universities (Clark, 2014; Saudi Arabia Ministry of Higher Education, 2012). As mentioned, student mobility of Saudi citizens across the globe has encouraged the development of a better higher education system, enhanced intellectual capacity of the citizenry, and has brought new ideas to the country (Ahmed, 2015; SACM, 2015). Studying abroad has had many benefits, not only for the Saudi scholar, but also for the cultures the scholar has communicated with. For example, there have been benefits in the way that ideas were exchanged. Students could carry on research across borders and cross cultures. Research skills could be honed and programs developed that would benefit both cultures, the students involved, and the academic programs the students return to lead. Reentry

scholars, by keeping connections with their study country, could keep cultural and academic ideas flowing. This communication could help both countries to continue a global partnership that would be beneficial for both countries.

However, there have also been challenges for these scholars when they returned to Saudi universities to work. Examples of challenges might include: the university environment, job satisfaction, the uniqueness of the Saudi culture and its effect on returning scholars, and the reverse culture shock experienced (Ahmed, 2015; Al-Mubarak, 2011; Uehara, 1986a). My study is important for U.S. universities, Saudi universities, and for Saudi reentry scholars. The findings offered recommendations for Saudi scholars and their reentry to Saudi university, Saudi universities to improve the reentry Saudi scholars' experiences, and reentry scholars themselves to be aware of, prepare for, and deal with their reentry experiences in the best way possible. Little research was available on the reentry of Saudi scholars at Saudi universities. This study may fill the gap in research about understanding the Saudi reentry scholars experience in Saudi universities. The goal of this research was to aid reentry scholars and the Saudi society as well as the U.S. and KSA educational institutions that educate these scholars.

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study was to understand the reentry experience of Saudi Arabian scholars returning home from U.S. doctoral education to work as a faculty member in Saudi universities and how the university administrations perceived the reentry of Saudi scholars. As such, the guiding research questions for this study were:

Research Questions

- Q1 How do reentry Saudi scholars who return to Saudi universities to work experience the phenomenon of reentry?
- Q2 What challenges and opportunities do the reentry Saudi scholars express in working in Saudi universities?

For this study, reentry scholars were generally defined as students who returned to institutions of higher education after having received a doctoral degree at U.S. universities. My findings offered a better understanding of the reentry of Saudi scholars' experiences and offered recommendations to help these scholars to have a positive environment for their work in Saudi universities. I also provide recommendations to U.S. universities who educated Saudi students and should prepare them for their reentry.

Conclusion

Saudi higher education has supported student mobility which has greatly increased the enrollment of Saudi scholars in the U.S. and in other Western countries (SACM, 2015; Taylor & Albasri, 2014). The large number of Saudi scholarship scholars has been beneficial to the Saudi universities and increased the intellectual capacity of its citizens (SACM, 2015). However, when reentry Saudi scholars returned to work in Saudi universities, they experienced many opportunities in the rapidly changing culture. They might also experience a lot of benefits, challenges, and obstacles as they re-adjusted and re-adapted to working in the Saudi universities culture and work environment. This chapter focused on introducing the topic of reentry experiences of Saudi scholars who have completed their doctoral degrees at Western universities and have returned to Saudi Arabia to become faculty members of Saudi Arabian universities. In the next chapter, I discuss aspects of reentry, including the literature review of the Saudi Reentry Scholars.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Former U.S. President George W. Bush and King Abdullah met in 2005 and put in place a new scholarship program, The King Abdullah Scholarship Program. However, as noted by Taylor and Albasri (2014), a number of the Saudi scholars studying in universities within the United States were not all part of the King Abdullah Scholarship Program. Although Saudi scholars have been coming to the U.S. since the late 1970s (Lennon, 2007), this innovative program has contributed to an increase in the enrollment of Saudi students in the U.S. as well as in a number of other Western countries (SACM, 2015; Taylor & Albasri, 2014). As noted by the IIE (2016), there were 61,287 Saudi college students studying in the United States. The increased number of universities in Saudi Arabia has created the need for more Saudi college instructors to teach at the collegiate level. Given this, a number of Saudi universities have been paying for the schooling of students with the understanding that they would return to Saudi Arabia and work at one of the universities.

Much of the changes in education, women's rights, and culture have been in response to the effects of globalization in education and the need for a more skilled workforce within Saudi Arabia (Al-Mubaraki, 2011). Nevertheless, the cultural changes taking place have been slow moving and, when newly graduated Saudi scholars return home to work in the universities, their reentries have been frequently difficult given the need to readapt to a culture that has not fully embraced democratic standards or

incorporated Western ideas. Some of the reentry issues have been directly related to finding a comfortable university environment in which to work. In line with these findings, returning Saudi scholars have been in dire need of methods, tools, and support to transverse any barriers and challenges they may experience in returning to Saudi universities to work.

This literature review supports the study on the reentry experiences of Saudi scholars who have completed their advanced degrees at Western universities and who have returned to Saudi Arabia to become faculty members of Saudi Arabian universities. Several theorists reviewed relevant theories such as the culture and reverse shock theories (Oberg, 1960), the W-Curve (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963), human capital (Perna et al., 2014), and organizational culture theories (Tierney, 2008b; Uehara, 1986b). The review considered the literature on the reentry experience and brain circulation as well as similar experiences of scholars reentering India and Brazil. The review looked at the influences of Saudi culture and religion and the pressures current faculty faced at Saudi universities as they documented their return experiences.

Relevant Theories

Culture Shock Theory

Culture shock theory is an understanding of the personal disorientation felt by a person experiencing a new culture through immigration, study, or a long visit (Pederson, 1996). Oberg (1960) was one of the first theorists to describe culture shock. He identified the five stages of culture shock. In the honeymoon phase, an individual imagined what life would be like in the new culture. This was followed by rejection as the individual began to be aware of vast cultural differences. Then, the individual resisted these cultural

differences and tried not to adapt to these changes. Fourth, the individual recovered and adapted. Oberg's fifth stage was reverse culture shock, in which the person returned home after he/she had become fully adapted to the host country's values and norms. The individual then must go through all of the first four stages again.

Sam and Berry (2010) expanded Oberg's (1960) and Pederson's (1996) research in their discussion of acculturation theory. Sam and Berry (2010) explained the process by which groups of people and their individual members engaged in intercultural contact and learned to achieve outcomes that were adaptive for all parties. They suggested that no cultural group was untouched by contact with each other, and there was a need to understand the cultural changes that ensued as individuals sought to adapt to the new culture in psychological and socio-cultural ways. These could include simple behavioral shifts, which could mean speaking, dressing, and eating. It also could produce what they called "acculturative stress" (Sam & Berry, 2010, p. 473), which might be manifested as anxiety, uncertainty, or depression.

It has now become more common to address culture shock as the acculturation process, rather than the more medical terminology "shock" (Zhou, Jindal-Snape, Topping, & Todman, 2008). In the acculturation model, researchers such as Zhou et al. (2008) spoke of the ABC model, with A being "affective" or the stress and coping concept; B meaning "behavioral," utilizing a cultural learning approach; and C defining the cognitive approach where the reentry individual imagined themselves in the role of other persons. The authors believed that this ABC model was more comprehensive than culture shock models; was considered a sojourner's acculturation as a process rather than a one-time shock; was active rather than passive; and included the entire situation rather

than just the characteristics of the individual. This model “sees cross-cultural transition as a significant life event that involves adaptive change” (Zhou et al., 2008, p. 69). Thus, the sojourner had to develop stress-coping strategies as well as social skills that were socially relevant. This was also true of the reentry scholar.

Reentry or reverse culture shock. Some scholars (Uehara, 1986a; Westwood et al., 1986) have defined reentry as the experience of returning to a home country and home culture after having lived, worked, or studied in another culture for an extended period of time. For many scholars, coming back home has become more of a shock and adjustment than leaving (Brockington et al., 2005). Some writers have called the phenomenon “reentry,” while others called the phenomenon “reverse culture shock,” to separate it from entry culture shock. However, Uehara (1986b) defined reverse culture shock as “psychological difficulties (sometimes associated with physical problems) that returnees experience in the initial stage of the adjustment process at home after having lived abroad for some time” (p. 420).

Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) stated that the concept of expectations marked the difference between culture shock and reverse culture shock. When students went to live in a new culture, they were prepared to experience cultural difficulties. When they returned home, they expected to be “unchanged individuals in an unchanged homeland” (Gaw, 2000, p. 86). Those who have just returned home did not expect to experience this reverse culture shock. Most thought that they already knew all there was to know about this culture where they had lived most of their life. They did not expect to see the changes in their home towns and their home countries as well as in themselves. The more significant the cultural experience in the host country, the more significant the reverse

culture was experienced upon the return to the home country. Many wanted to just return to the experience that then was just memory (Uehara, 1986b).

Malewski (2005) suggested that “reverse culture shock is particularly insidious because it comes at a time when the returnees believe that life is finally going to go back to normal, and they discover that there is actually no going back” (p. 187). The expectation and desire of the returnee’s family for everything to be back to normal and that the returnee would settle back into family life quickly caused anxiety for the returnee. Storti (1990) said that the “condition of homeless is perhaps the central characteristic of the experience of reentry, and the confusion, anxiety and disappointment it arouses in us are the abiding emotion of this difficult period” (p. 100).

The W-Curve Hypothesis Model. This model was developed by Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) to show the five stages of the re-adaptation process: (a) the honeymoon, (b) the culture shock, (c) the initial adjustment, (d) the stage of mental isolation, and finally (e) the stages of acceptance and integration. Their model assessed the level of comfort, satisfaction, and effectiveness experienced by the transitioning returnee and returning scholars, who frequently experience the stages more severely than most because most scholars felt very secure on campus in their host country and felt more isolated when they returned home. In the Gullahorn and Gullahorn model, time was the essential ingredient. The returnees moved from “I’m so glad to be home” to the culture shock of “what have I done” to the adjustment idea that “I can manage” to “Nobody understands the experience I had” to a search for meaning, readjustment, and synthesis of the study abroad experience leading to a final acceptance and integration. Gullahorn and Gullahorn further noted that many institutions in their international education offices gave

instruction to try to prepare study abroad students for the possibility of “culture shock.” While many universities focused on what students would feel when they were abroad, few focused at all on how students would feel when they came back home, unless it was returning back to the U.S.

The reentry experience. The theories of culture shock and reverse culture shock and the W-Curve hypothesis have all played out in the research regarding the reentry experience of scholars all over the world. The themes illustrated by the hypothesis have been reiterated several times in the research that was developed by Lysgaard (1955), Oberg (1960), Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963), and Gaw (2000) for the U.S. culture. Much of the research was culture specific (Hansel, 1993; Labrack, 2005; Saeed, 1987). These studies should be investigated to see whether or not they could apply to other cultures, particularly the Saudi culture for this research, to see if the themes could apply equally to cultures which were very different than the United States.

The reentry difficulty has tended to show itself in strains in personal relationships upon return and needed adjustments to the scholar’s emotional well-being (Casteen, 2006). These returning scholars have often felt like they were being misunderstood by those around them, found that they may have had an inability to connect with family and friends, may have felt sadness, and sometimes may have felt resentment of their surroundings. While scholars fully expected problems in cultural adaptation when they first moved overseas, they did not expect to face it when they returned home (Adler, 1981; Storti, 1990; Sussman, 1986).

Austin (1983, 1986) studied reentry problems of American students studying abroad and found that, for decades, organizations such as the National Association for

Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) and the Society for Intercultural Education Training and Research (SIETAR) have addressed reentry issues, but the primary focus was international study and reentry problems of U.S. scholars. He developed a concept diagram called the reentry worm, which described the reentry challenges faced by U.S. students who had studied abroad. The Reentry “Worm” is a figure curving down to an emotional bottom before rising back to equilibrium. The downward emotional journey started with the initial excitement that came from being home. That stage was quickly replaced by the judgmental stage, where nothing at home seemed good or right any more. The returnee found constant fault with life at home. He/she continued the downward emotional spiral until he/she reached the realization stage. In this stage, the returnee began noticing significant changes in home but, more significantly, intense personal changes. The full impact of the study abroad finally hits and the returnee experienced a reverse culture shock leading to intense frustration. It was not until this reverse culture shock was understood that the returnee could rise out of the “funk” and begin to readapt to life at home, cope with reentry, and integrate the experience abroad with living at home.

LaBrack (2005) provided many examples of reentry challenges for American scholars returning to their homes and schools. His results were similar to the results illustrated by the Reentry Worm diagram. His research has been used by many universities to help scholars understand and be prepared for what their reentry problems might be. The challenges that he described have included boredom and missing the excitement and challenges of being in a new culture, along with the fact that many of the scholar’s friends and family would not want to hear about the trip abroad and were not as

excited about the experience as the scholar was. LaBrack's study was similar to other studies done for international students, documenting their experiences when they returned to their home countries. Saudi scholars, of course, have been facing many of these same challenges (Al-Mehawes, 1984).

As an international Saudi student who would in the future be a Saudi reentry scholar, I believed that LaBrack's (2005) literature related to Saudi reentry to some extent. For example, I agreed with the challenges that Saudi scholars may face (boredom, missing the excitement and challenges of being in a different culture after being home). I disagreed with the notion that family members would not want to hear about the Saudi scholar's experiences abroad. While this may have been the case in some instances, in other cases, in my experiences, Saudi families might be excited for their children and the experiences that they had and would be willing to listen to their stories when they returned. I believed that might also be the case when it came to their friends as well. In relation to that, I agreed with LaBrack that communication with people could be very difficult, especially between friends.

In my experience, Saudi reentry scholars have had less privacy from their friends and family than students returning to Western cultures. There was also the point that friends or co-workers of Saudi reentry scholars may seem jealous, fearful, or have feelings of superiority or inferiority due to his/her experiences abroad and the changes they went through. Saudi reentry scholars may have felt frustration when adjusting to life at home due to feelings of alienation and feeling like they could not apply newly gained knowledge and skills to their work at home. This was reflected in the research of Al-Mehawes (1984) who found that young Saudi scholars had a tendency to have

considerably more trouble readjusting to Saudi culture, while older, more seasoned sojourners had more issues with their employment assignments and adapting the changes in their chosen fields to the reality of their work in the Saudi culture.

There have been few studies regarding returning Saudi academics (Alandejani, 2013; Blanchard, 2009). Specifically, there have been few studies about the return of Saudi academics following the establishment of the King Abdullah Scholarship Program in 2005, which has enabled more than 100,000 students to engage in foreign study (SACM, 2015). While these Saudi scholars have been returning in large numbers to teach in universities across the country, their reentry experiences have not been documented or studied. It is important to understand the reentry experiences of Saudi scholars as they return to their jobs in Saudi universities and to discern whether administrations at Saudi universities want to accept and integrate those experiences within the structure of the university.

Reentry barriers. When scholars return home, they may not have been prepared to face the barriers created by the universities in their home country. For example, a major problem facing many returning scholars has been the desire to transfer the knowledge they acquired in the different culture and in a different context to their home environment. There has been significant research (Adler, 1981; Cannon, 2000; Oddou et al., 2008) that has shown that businesses, governments, and universities have put barriers in the way of their returning colleagues that did not allow them to communicate or share their experiences.

Oddou et al. (2008) reported that a home university may not have been equipped to provide the right atmosphere, and the scholar became disappointed that he or she could

not share or transfer the new knowledge. In a study by Cannon (2000), the most important disadvantages of getting an international education was a perceived lack of connection between the education and training and the application of that training in a professional work setting. For example, due to cultural barriers and differences in facilities, some knowledge learned abroad could not be applied in the home country due to lack of facilities or different cultural norms. Therefore, some modifications of these skills may be necessary before being used. This problem may have been caused by incorrect policies in the home country's education system.

An additional cause of these problems for Saudi students could be the culture (Alandejani, 2013; Cannon, 2000). Institutions and organizations have been structured as an Islamic vision of education where religious values and heritage were very important and highly valued with an authoritarian of teaching, making the sharing of new ideas difficult and classroom interaction non-existent. For example, a Saudi scholar returning from study in the United States could be very excited about comparative religion (including atheism) using a team-based research for class projects. This has not been done in Saudi universities, where the learning has been professor/textbook based with little interaction between instructor and students, so introducing the idea of team-based learning could be difficult.

One of the major problems has been the lack of communication that repatriates have with their university colleagues (Lazarova & Tarique, 2005; Oddou et al., 2008). This, of course, was understandable since the colleagues were not also abroad to share in the learning experiences. When colleagues did not share experiences, there could be misunderstandings because of the differences in backgrounds and that could cause the

potential for hostility and repercussions. The scholars who studied elsewhere needed to understand the attitudes and behaviors of the existing members of the work group to be able to fit in and be able to share and transfer knowledge (Oddou et al., 2008). Lazarova and Tarique (2005) suggested that these communication problems and the possibility of repercussions could make the repatriate afraid to share their new knowledge. Cannon (2000) stated that graduate students, on their return to professional life from their overseas training, may experience “reverse culture shock,” the shock of reentry into one’s own culture and re-establishing relationships after a period of adaptation to the foreign culture. This could happen when the graduate and their colleagues or friends changed without the others realizing it. Each group expected the other to be the same on their return, but many things had changed during the study period. I believed that was true in the case of both sides having developed and changed without knowing and both might have different ideas or perspectives than before. In addition, the Saudi scholar may not want to share their experiences or perspectives to avoid a misunderstanding.

Another issue may be the organizational climate to which the scholar returns. The research of Holton and Baldwin (2003) indicated that the transfer of knowledge could only be implemented in an appropriate climate and in a positive organizational environment. Often times, the right climate was not available. Repatriates often reported that the organizations where they did their graduate work were a better “fit” for the work that they did than the organization to which they had returned. Alandejani (2013) stated that, when repatriates came from conservative backgrounds, such as Saudi Arabia, they may find the organization to have too great a hierarchy, and it was difficult to share new ideas after the free exchange of information in the Western university (Alandejani, 2013).

Holton and Baldwin (2003) asserted that a positive organization environment was the key to an easy transition for Saudi scholars to be able to share their knowledge and experiences that they gained from studying in Western universities. In most cases, where the scholar was returning to their home country, they became very disappointed in the way that their new ideas were not appreciated. Organizations in their home country had a political structure and hierarchy that made it difficult for the young scholar to share their ideas in an environment where they would not be respected and that made it hard for the new knowledge to become part of the university's knowledge base. Lazarova and Tarique (2005) found that, in addition to those struggles, repatriates may think that their knowledge would be more beneficial to their co-workers than it actually was; so without good collegiality, the knowledge did not get shared.

Reentry experiences in Brazil, Pakistan, India, and Saudi Arabia. Although there was little research regarding reentry experiences of Saudi scholars (Corey, 1986, being the exception), there were studies about other scholars returning to other countries. Appropriate studies were found about Brazil, Pakistan, and India, and these studies were appropriate and helpful when comparing them to the Saudi scholars' experience.

Brazil. A study by Gama and Pedersen (1977) focused on 31 Brazilian scholars who returned to Brazil after graduate study in the United States. Although this study has become dated now, it was cited by more recent studies (for example, Arouca, 2013) and the information that was gained still seemed relevant to the topic today. In this study, many of the scholars returned home and had few adjustment problems, but some reported problems with the lack of privacy that they had come to expect. They also had conflicts with their parents over family values. Gama and Pedersen (1977) reported that:

Sixty-eight percent of returnees experienced difficulties with their work; 51.6% had some difficulty adjusting to their role as professors; 67.7% complained about the lack of intellectual stimulation; 81.1% felt that there was a lack of facilities and materials; 83.9% complained about administrative red tape; 54.8% encountered jealousy from colleagues; 80.6% complained that there was little opportunity to do research, while at the same time, 74.2% acknowledged that they didn't have much time to do the research they sought to conduct. (p. 56)

In a similar vein to the experiences shared by Brazilian scholars, Al-Mehawes (1984) reported that Ph.D. returnees to Saudi Arabia found that there was a lack of opportunity for insightful research when they returned home. They became frustrated by the lack of facilities, assets, and offices at their universities. Additionally, returnees complained about the lack of individualism they had learned to rely on in their time in the United States. These studies pointed to a possible issue shared by scholars across nations.

Pakistan. Saeed (1987) focused on two aspects of Pakistani government scholars returning to their homes and their careers--their relationships at home and their relationships at work. She found that there was little or no stress experienced by the 18 scholars as they returned to their families. Most found that they had no conflict with their families upon their return. The Pakistanis felt that the greatest stress and role strain was with co-workers and supervisors (Saeed, 1987). They became disenchanted with the concentration of administrative authority within a small group and with what they considered to be a lack of new responsibilities. They were also disenchanted with the poor facilities, in opposition to those facilities where they had studied in the U.S. (Saeed, 1987).

I believed that Saudi scholars that came back home from studying abroad might also face problems such as stress and role strain with co-workers and supervisors. Their supervisors have not gained the same experience that reentry scholars have and that may

cause the supervisor to feel threatened by the reentry scholar. This has caused negative emotions and jealousy among the supervisors and peers of the reentry scholar (Al-Mehawes, 1984; Corey, 1986).

India. Indians have a great sense of identity--they value community rather than individuality (Hansel, 1993). So, most Indian scholars who have returned home do so because of a sense of family loyalty. On the other hand, they have spoken to Hansel (1993) of a loss of the individuality and privacy that they had experienced in the United States. The women were especially concerned about those changes in their lives. It was also difficult for Indian returnees to find jobs that matched their training. Some scholars had studied communications, political science, and policy studies while they were abroad and they found that this training was not important in the Indian job market. They were also frustrated by rampant bureaucracy and inadequate office facilities. The work ethic they experienced when they returned home was also quite different. Hansel (1993) reported that they were also frustrated by pollution, crowding, intolerance, and other conditions specific to Indian culture.

I agreed with Hansel's implications that this might also have happened to Saudi women. Saudi women may have faced an even more difficult reentry than men and voiced higher concerns about their lives after being in Western society for the time of their study (Alandejani, 2013). They may have found it more difficult to find a sense of belonging and to understand who they were when they first reentered Saudi Arabia. While abroad, women were allowed to drive cars and did not have to depend on their husbands or male guardian, so readjustments to their home situation were hard. They attempted to go back to their old ways of living but were afraid of losing what they had

learned. Focusing on work and a sense of belonging has helped with the readjustment process and some reentry women have been able to find work in private universities that has housed a diverse culture similar to the one they experienced while abroad (Alandejani, 2013).

Saudi Arabia. Corey (1986) taught at a university in Saudi Arabia during the 1970s when the country was still considered to be third world. He chronicled the return of several young Ph.D.s who returned from the United States with the intent of moving “Saudi Arabia into industrial utopia and out of cultural backwardness” (p. 48). One of the young Ph.D. students he studied questioned the cultural traditions that shocked him with their backwardness. For instance, if his Ph.D. was in business, he saw exploitation by the unscrupulous and the paying of the men of influence as the accepted way a business operated. The young Ph.D. student saw it all but could do very little about it. Corey observed the returning Saudis as living in two worlds; the cultural world they grew up in, but also the Americanized world they had grown to love. This produced a reverse cultural shock containing unresolvable tension.

Corey (1986) suggested some steps to help allay the reverse culture shock that enveloped many international students. First, foreign graduate students should be encouraged to go home frequently, so that they could reintegrate themselves to their culture on a timely basis. Second, courses should be taught in ways that encourage scholars to compare the content of the course with applications in their own country. Finally, the scholar must realize that the American legal system of dealing with problems may not be the way problems would be solved in the home country. Although this study was dated, its applications may work well in the current Saudi culture. The King

Abdullah Scholarship Program (SACM, 2015) brought thousands of Saudi scholars to the United States and turned 10 years old in 2015. The first students from that program have started to reenter the Saudi work environment at Saudi schools and universities.

Researchers have agreed that reverse culture shock or reentry may be problematic (Corey, 1986; Gaw, 2000). Generally, there have been problems that students returning to all cultures experience, and then there have been problems that were more culture specific. Researchers have agreed that repatriates have shared several problems that were common among all cultures. Excitement rose when the repatriate returned home, but home was rather intangibly different, so he or she became disappointed and angry and may have experienced depression before they would begin to rebound from the many readjustments that they had to make. Of course, the longer they were away, the more adjustments they may have had to make (Gaw, 2000; Malewski, 2005; Storti, 1990).

Another problem was that repatriates did not feel they were receiving support and appropriate feedback from their workplace. Lazarova and Tarique (2005) suggested that, for this to happen, the organization needed to provide the right incentives so that co-workers would want to learn the new information. Along those same lines, social networking has been scarce in many organizations, making it difficult to share new knowledge informally. Organizations have needed to rely on feedback and debriefing to help in the sharing of all this new information and knowledge (Crowne, 2009). Crowne (2009) indicated that the debriefing mechanism, whether formal or informal, made the repatriate feel that his or her experience had value.

Al-Mehawes (1984) studied Saudi returnees in the 1980s and found that, while the most difficult period of their return was the first 3 months, there were long-term

workplace effects that continued to plague them. They felt socially alienated when they returned, but they also felt they were not given tasks and assignments that lined up with what they learned while studying abroad. The scholars felt that they were not given assets, offices, or permission to engage in meaningful and insightful research when they returned home. In other words, their new academic assets were not fully appreciated. This caused frustration and disengagement (Al-Mehawes, 1984).

It was important to note, based on the review of literature, that reentry experiences for U.S. scholars studying abroad were similar to those of other international scholars, except that most U.S. scholars generally had shorter study experiences than did international scholars who were more likely to earn a full degree overseas. For example, Rowan-Kenyon and Niehaus (2011) interviewed students 1 year following a short-term study in the Czech Republic. The researchers found that even short-term study abroad experiences greatly influenced U.S. students' perspectives. Because of this experience, many scholars participated in additional international educational experiences, while others reported new understandings of the global community.

Another study (Wielkiewicz & Turkowski, 2010) looked at the reentry of U.S. scholars and its effect on their interpersonal relationships upon their return. A surprising result of Wielkiewicz and Turkowski's (2010) study was that students who had studied abroad had higher grade point averages (GPAs) than did those students who did not. Another result of these studies of U.S. students showed that they were more skeptical about their home culture after the experience than were those who did not study abroad at all. While these experiences came from shorter stays in study abroad countries, the

benefits and challenges Saudi reentry scholars experienced may be even more pronounced, considering their lengthier experience in U.S. universities.

Brain circulation relevant theories.

Brain drain, brain gain and brain circulation. These have been terms that have often been used simultaneously when discussing the movement of students, academics, and scholars as they left their homes to study abroad, when they remained in their host countries, and when they continued to work both at home and internationally. Brain circulation has been the term used to describe the movement and mobility of higher educated people around the globe. It has been an increasing phenomenon that has affected the socio-economic and socio-cultural progress of a society and a country, as well as the world (Teferra, 2005). Ozden and Schiff (2005) along with Stark et al. (1997) discussed the concept of brain circulation, a term they used in opposition to the concepts of brain drain. For decades, brain drain has referred to what happened to a culture when educated and trained people left a country and did not return. Another term often used was brain gain which was just the opposite of brain drain (Hunter, 2013). Stark et al. (1997) and Hunter (2013) modified the concept of brain gain to the idea of scholars returning to their home countries with the knowledge gained in another culture.

The research of Perna et al. (2014) reiterated the concept that brain circulation was especially important in countries with "transitioning economies" (p. 173). They indicated, "Government-sponsored student mobility programs may also promote human capital development in the home nation, as students returning from study abroad may contribute to faster creation of new knowledge and help other people acquire skills without any direct costs" (Perna et al., 2014, p. 174). This would have been the case in

Saudi Arabia, where scholars getting advanced degrees internationally were required to return home to use their new knowledge in their home culture.

Brain circulation has extended the concept of brain gain to include the idea of “human capital” as it was defined by Becker (1983). This concept included the idea that an educated workforce was like human capital increasing the benefits of the sending country and the receiving country in a global market (Saxenian, 2002, 2005). Individuals gained from the study and the society gained from the knowledge and skills those students needed. This was matched by the time and money that was spent on them during their schooling and job training. Saxenian (2002, 2005) suggested that there were huge advantages to brain circulation because repatriates could be in their home country while they continued to maintain social and professional ties with their host country

Scholars argued repeatedly about the effects of brain drain, brain gain, and brain circulation upon various countries involved in their studies. Some would question the authenticity of this circulation of talent (Harvey 2012; Saxenian, 2005). Harvey (2012) referenced Kapur and McHale (2005) who worried that the highest ranking scholars from Indian universities emigrated from India to the United States in higher numbers than those scholars who graduated with lesser degrees from lesser universities. In other words, they argued that the very top professionals tended to be the ones to leave. Others would say that this was not negative because innovation tended to flow to and from the host country and increased the resources and knowledge in the home country (Harvey, 2012).

Perna et al. (2014) looked at the cost benefits for an emerging economy as scholars returned from international study. In Kazakhstan, a government-sponsored scholarship program (the Bolashak program), found that participating scholars created an

economic benefit for the country, although the program currently has only been available for graduate study. That fact has left the scholarship primarily in the hands of middle-to-upper-class scholars. The researchers found that there was great economic benefit in using this scholarship program because the education system within Kazakhstan remained relatively inferior. The requirement that scholars must return to their country to work when their study was complete worked to the country's advantage and its educational infrastructure. This was particularly relevant to Kazakhstan as it became an innovation-driven economy (Perna et al., 2014). This was reiterated by Saxenian (2005) who studied the implications for a country's Internet technology (IT) and engineering infrastructure. Brain circulation, in this situation, would allow scholars to be exposed to educational, cultural, and professional opportunities currently unavailable in their home country. This has had long-term benefits for economic development in the sending country (Perna et al., 2014; Saxenian, 2005).

Certainly, this has been the case for Saudi Arabia, as it has sought to expand its engineering capabilities through education of Saudi engineers and Internet technology (IT) personnel internationally. Saxenian (2005) also made a point in saying that these scholars did not necessarily need to return to their home country permanently to contribute to its economic development. For example, there have been many Internet technology (IT) professionals that started companies in the U.S., where they would be more successful and then, in turn, made substantial investments in their home countries. They maintained a hold in both communities, moving between their home countries and their host countries easily and in entrepreneurial ways.

Altbach and Bassett (2014) asserted that the international government-sponsored scholarship programs for global study abroad accounted for only a small number of overall international students. But, for the countries that did have them, they were quite important. Brazil, Saudi Arabia, and the European Union have been a few of the countries that have had government-sponsored programs that provided mobility for many of scholars. The most common motivation to develop these scholarships has been to further develop native expertise in fields such as science and technology, but this could not be accomplished without student mobility due to the lack of quality universities teaching those subjects internally. Also, they wanted to improve their own economic growth through global competitiveness. Overall improvement of governments and education infrastructure has been another common goal, in addition to improving civic regulations and human resources. These goals all have resulted in an effort to increase collaboration with universities abroad, contribute to improvements in teaching and research, and encourage administrative reform. They wanted to advance their career prospects and improve their communication skills, especially in English. Government scholarships have increased engagement with the global higher education. These scholarships also were a worthy investment in the public good (Altbach & Bassett, 2014; Altbach & Engberg, 2014b).

The studies by Altbach helped to affirm that the Saudi Scholarship (or King Abdullah Scholarship) was important for global student mobility. It was needed to further develop native expertise in key fields of study like science and technology. It was also useful in increasing collaboration between universities, both at home and abroad, and encouraged these universities to engage in global higher education.

Relevant theory--Organizational theory. The theories of Tierney (2008a) built a framework upon which the organizational culture of university scholars could be identified. He believed that an organization's culture was replicated in the attitudes and composure of its members, so that the group had a cultural norm with which all members identified. Tierney (1988) theorized:

This internal dynamic has its roots in the history of the organization and derives its force from the values, processes, and goals held by those most intimately involved in the organization's workings. An organization's culture is reflected in what is done, how it is done, and who is involved in doing it. It concerns decisions, actions, and communication both on an instrumental and a symbolic level. (p. 28)

In the culture of higher education, Tierney (2008b) suggested that the environment, mission, socialization, information, strategy, and leadership were the "key dimensions of culture themselves" (p. 27). By understanding the organizational culture of a university, the administration would better understand the changes that needed to be made within the organization. He called this the "Organizational Mission." This has been how all the stakeholders have defined the ideology of the university.

Tierney (2008a) considered leadership to be one of the key components in university organization and, depending upon the culture, the leadership could be only formal or it could be informal. Similarly, strategy and information have been included in the cultural context as well and were most likely contingent on cultural norms, such as who knew about how the decisions were being made as well as who was making the decisions. Additionally, cultural context determined how the information was disseminated. His discussions about socialization were useful for the purposes of this study because, within his theories, the actors helped to determine what was important within the organization. Newcomers to the organization may not have understood the

organization or what was valuable to the organization, and finally, how they should act within the organization.

In the case of reentry Saudi scholars, they might not be aware of the possible disconnects between the cultures of their U.S. institution and their Saudi institution. When Saudi scholars knew the mission of the university, they might be able to understand the direction and the purpose of the organization and be able to better identify the environment of the organization by its social construction. However, when schools would fail to initiate scholars in the mission of the school, the scholars could identify the problems in the school's leadership. When scholars would develop an understanding of the organizational framework, he/she could find a place in the organization through the mission, environment, socialization, information, strategy, and leadership.

Implications of Organization Theory to Faculty Socialization in Saudi Arabia

The integration of Western-trained faculty members into Saudi Arabian universities has been one of the weak links in the study of reentry, brain circulation, and repatriation. There has been very little available literature or research; thus, the focus of this study.

Parveen (2013) studied faculty stress at a Saudi government university, although he did not study the effect of international study on faculty stress. He looked at rewards and recognition, time constraints, professional identity, departmental influences, and student interactions. The study concluded that the university needed to have a larger focus on an enhanced sense of belonging for both the university and the individual. He showed that faculty had very little say in departmental or institutional decision making. Additionally, the Saudi university had no clear-cut criteria for research and publication

activities, causing a further imbalance in the work-life priorities. This study was echoed by Zakari (2012) who did a similar study of the nursing faculty at King Saud University and Iqbal and Kokash (2011) who studied faculty satisfaction at the private Prince Sultan University

Parveen's findings would concur with current theories of socialization, including those of Tierney (1988, 2008a, 2008b). Crisogen (2015) spoke of adaptive or integrative socialization in which participants expected that their personal capabilities would integrate them to the institutional framework. He also spoke of anticipatory socialization in which participants had certain expectations for how they would prepare for future roles--such as leadership in a university department. Certainly for Saudi scholars returning to their home universities, there has been an expectation that their new knowledge and their new status would be welcomed in the school that paid for their international education.

Zakari (2012) studied the workforce of the academic field of nursing, a field which has had a great number of expatriates in the teaching workforce. She found that, while the academic nurses had high commitment levels to their careers, they had a hard time engaging with the rest of the faculty. She proposed that this happened because the staff had been educated in many places around the world. This may have caused the faculty and staff to be unable to enjoy the social environment of the nursing schools. Faculty at King Saud University has undertaken the task of becoming "learning process managers" (Zakari, 2012, p. 73), and many of the faculty have earned doctorates in their studies abroad. This has all been part of the need to improve the educational quality of King Saud University's nursing staff. Zakari called for further study to help integrate the

locally trained and the repatriates so that they were working together to improve the nursing school.

The university system in Saudi Arabia has been expanding rapidly (Krieger, 2007) with many more Western-trained faculty members in all the universities including the new King Abdullah University which would specialize in science and technology. This university has also been calling for scholars from around the world to fill out their classrooms with a more Western way of learning and studying. The mix of Western-trained faculty, Western students, and a Western-style of teaching could have a profound effect on the faculties of Saudi universities.

As a consequence of the rapid expansion, other effects have been noted in addition to teaching and learning innovations. Iqbal and Kokash (2011) reported on faculty stress at private universities in Saudi Arabia. Their findings showed that, as the culture and the academic climate changed, more must be done to reduce the stress faculties were facing. Currently, little has been done to alleviate the stress on the two major aspects of the higher education system where the most stress was exhibited (student interaction and professional identity). They found that the majority of the stress “derives from faculty rewards and recognition, inadequate rewards, insufficient recognition, and unclear expectations in all three areas of faculty responsibility--teaching, research, and service” (p. 140).

The reentry of Saudi scholars into Saudi Arabian universities has been one of the weak links in the study of reentry and repatriation. Organization theory and its component of socialization theory (Crisogen, 2015; Parveen, 2013; Tierney, 2008a) could help us connect these theories to the topic previously discussed with the reentry

environment of the Saudi scholars by examining the cultural and environment impacts faced by a reentry scholar. Politics, communications, and social environment have all been issues that have impacted the university's culture, particularly a culture as insular as the Saudi culture. At the same time, the university culture scholars have left when beginning international studies may not have been the culture upon their return. Saudi culture has been changing very rapidly, but the university culture may not reflect the Saudi culture in general.

The Influences of Saudi Context Culture and Religion

Currently the population of Saudi Arabia has been approximately 27 million and growing at a rate of about 3.7% per year (Blanchard, 2009). In Saudi Arabia, approximately 37.0% of the population has been under the age of 14 compared to the United States, where that number has been 20.0%. When raising the statistic to 29 years and younger, young people have made up 51.0% of the Saudi population and only 41.0% of the U.S. (Murphy, 2011). The population figures, alone, have indicated that the growth of the Saudi university-eligible population has increased the importance of educating many more educators to teach the rising student population.

Additionally, there has been a great emphasis placed on the development of human resources and, as a result, the number of scholars in general and higher education has "multiplied by ten times, from about 547,000 in 1970 to over 5.37 million in 2005" (Al-Mubaraki, 2011, p. 417). One of the results of the emphasis on education has been the growth in the number of women being educated and the number of institutions of higher education has multiplied from 8 public universities in 2002 to 21 in 2006 as well as a variety of other institutions including teachers colleges, health-related colleges,

junior colleges, technical and vocational colleges, and industrial colleges (Al-Mubarak, 2011).

The goal of the scholarship program, as defined by the Saudi Arabian Cultural Mission (2015), has been to develop Saudi human resources to be world competitive in the work market and academic research and to provide a high quality work force for Saudi universities and the public and private sectors. As a condition of the scholarship, however, scholars must return to Saudi Arabia following their educational program to be assisted by the government in finding a suitable job placement. The program was designed to create opportunities for both brain gain and brain circulation. Although the scholarship program has been in effect for 10 years, the research on the program has just begun to trickle in regarding the economic and cultural implications of the program.

Several factors have influenced the effects of the King Abdullah Scholarship Program and international education upon the repatriates. The biggest influencers were the Saudi Arabian culture, the Muslim religion that guides the culture, and the values that influence all behavior. For many, the reentry effects were strong as returning scholars attempt to reacquaint themselves with Saudi culture and values (Long, 2005; SACM, 2015).

Saudi Arabian Culture

Long (2005) studied the influence of family on Saudi culture and said that, “virtually all Saudis consider themselves members of an extended family” (p. 35). meaning a type of tribe, whether or not there was a blood connection. The extended family bonded Saudi citizens together socially, economically, and politically into one collective unit that behaved similarly. All the traditional Islamic social, economic, and

political values could be seen in the traditional Saudi family. Because the society has been male dominated, men have traditionally viewed their role as the provider and protector of the family. In this traditional society, women managed the household and cared for the children. In the era following the oil boom, these traditional values and roles have been slowly changing (Long, 2005). Le Renard (2008) reported that Saudi women were becoming “more visible within the national media and the national state” (p. 617). This shift could be seen in the number of Saudi women who were studying abroad as part of the King Abdullah Scholarship Program, as well as the number of women studying in Saudi Arabian universities. Currently, Saudi women have constituted 51.8% of Saudi university students and more than 35,000 women were studying abroad (Saudi Gazette, 2015). The Saudi Gazette (2015) reported that there were more than 15,000 women faculty members at Saudi universities for women. However, the only co-educational Saudi university was The King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), demonstrating how women were not encouraged to participate in education alongside men.

On the other hand, in most of Saudi Arabia, gender segregation has been a strict social norm. The segregation of unrelated men from women has been one of society’s highest values and the law in all of the country’s public life (Doumato, 2003). This societal norm has not so much been religion-based as tradition-based in Saudi Arabia (Haddad & Esposito, 1998). Because of this social norm, men and women have not been permitted to work or go to school in the same buildings. This too has been changing, as women have begun to see their roles in society changing. Young Saudi women who have been exposed to Western culture through international study have shown interest in Saudi

Arabian jobs in less segregated environments, wanting to have more independent professional lives, like women in the West (Doumato, 2003; Le Renard, 2008). However, many women have reported that they preferred the segregated environments, as it allowed them to feel more comfortable and relaxed (Le Renard, 2008). Returning Saudi scholars have noticed the increasing tension between the trend toward modernization and the longstanding traditions in Saudi culture (Alandejani, 2013).

Religion

“Religion (within a society) has always helped to define what is proper and fitting, and that is no different in Islamic societies” (Rice & Al-Mossawi, 2002, p. 5). Almost all of Saudi Arabia has been comprised of people of the Islamic faith. Unlike most faiths, believers of Islam have incorporated the Quran into their daily lifestyle. The stores would close at prayer times, and buying and selling was regulated according to religious and cultural laws. In higher education, for instance, there were certain times for prayers each day and classes were arranged to ensure that students were able to pray outside of class time. Frequently, classes would pause to allow everyone in the university to take a prayer break before class resumed. The Saudi government has been quick to impress a strict Islamic behavior and code of conduct on the people because of their inherent religiousness and ethnicity. This code of conduct has been called Shar’iah Law and affected the Saudi people both socially and politically (Robertson, Al-Khatib, Al-Habib, & Lanoue, 2008). Likewise, some topics such as atheistic philosophical beliefs have been forbidden in Saudi universities because they were felt to be against or critical of religious beliefs.

The Saudi people have assumed the religious leadership position for Muslims around the globe, as Saudi Arabia was the birthplace of Islam. Robertson et al. (2008) asserted that, due to this, Saudi Arabia was very likely the most pious and fundamental Muslim country in the world. Muslims believed that the Quran was the exact word of God, revealed to the prophet Muhammed through the Angel Gabriel, and so the Quran has been seen as not just a religious text but a constitution on how to live every aspect of your life. Followers believed that all the important aspects of human behavior were described in the Quran, and it was the law by which every Muslim must live (Robertson et al., 2008). Due to the way Islamic religion was engrained into the society, these beliefs could shape Saudi Arabian college students' attitudes and the way they behave in a Western culture. For example, Saudi students may not feel as free to engage in certain social settings, as U.S. college students frequently feel free to take part in, such as parties or coeducational athletic events.

Influences on the Culture

Saudis have known that the overall perspective of the Islamic lifestyle encompassed the beliefs of human well-being, piety, living in harmony, and socio-economic justice for all. The Muslim faith promoted a balance between spiritual and material needs (Chapra, 1992). Rice and Al Mossawi (2002) stated that most Muslims do not make any distinction between their religion and their secular activities. This extended to their business dealings, and those who dealt with Saudis in business noticed that their system of economics was fair and impartial. The effects of Shari'ah law could be seen in all business dealings among buyers and sellers, including "interest, taxation, fair trading, and the accumulation of wealth" (Rice & Al-Mossawi, 2002, p. 5).

Tolerance for change, on the other hand, could be affected by traditional and religious beliefs. For example, beliefs about a woman's role in society have hampered the role of women in the workplace--even women educated in Western settings through the King Abdullah Scholarship Program. Women's roles and status in society came from an interpretation of Islamic texts and, therefore, any change caused conflict between modernists and fundamentalists (Al-Mehawes, 1984; Haddad & Esposito, 1998; Robertson et al., 2008). According to Almunajjed (2010), the traditional role for women in Saudi Arabia could be seen in women still comprising less than 15.0% of the workforce. Traditional and religious Saudi beliefs are still evident in the legislative, educational, social, and occupational restrictions women experience. However, Jawad (2003) posited that Muslim feminism was beginning to play an important role in the lives of women in Saudi culture. New developments and exposure to Western culture was increasing the changes associated with women having more rights in Saudi culture (Jawad, 2003). Nevertheless, to other cultures and faiths, Islam has often been seen as confusing and could be misunderstood. Saudi students have tended to be marginalized by other cultures around the world, and these misunderstandings could cause stress while studying in Western universities (Neider, 2011). For example, different from the changes starting to take place for women in Saudi culture in Saudi Arabia, there has been evidence that Saudi women students have suffered discrimination when they wore traditional dress on U.S. campuses (Yakaboski, Perez-Velez, & Almutairi. 2017a, 2017b).

This cultural and religious perspective, in my opinion, was the most difficult reentry problem scholars may have had to face in the U.S. and upon returning, especially

for women. Scholars came to other cultures to learn, where they were accepted. Their minds began to change. They learned to question. They spoke to people of other faiths. When they got back to Saudi Arabia, they may have seen their culture and religion differently. They may have wanted to see more of the cultural and religious freedoms that they had become used to. But they were not allowed to question as freely as they may have wanted to in this restricted society. In this study, I hoped to explore how difficult that reentry issue may have been. However, the people I interviewed may not have felt free to share this aspect of their reentry because of possible consequences they may find.

Culture shock theory, reverse culture shock, reentry barriers, brain circulation theories, Islamic values, and Saudi culture were all important issues in the Saudi scholar's reentry to Saudi Arabian universities. When Saudi scholars returned home to teach at Saudi universities, they would have experienced culture shock and then later entertained thoughts of remaining in the culture where they had studied, creating a brain drain on their own culture. On the other hand, they would assume that they would be able to continue to collaborate with the people of the university where they studied, thus, creating brain circulation. Scholars were eager to return home and share what they had learned. Always at play, however, was the overwhelming Saudi culture and Islam, which guided every Saudi's movement. Home and family were preeminent and would guide the decision making for the scholars' return.

Summary

Gaining insight into the Saudi scholars' experience of reentry into Saudi universities to work has been a rich topic and has warranted further exploration. The literature related to the research topic for this study was reviewed. In assessing the

experiences of reentry Saudi scholars with advanced degrees from U.S. universities, a number of theories were examined. Theories such as the reverse shock theory, the W-curve theory, and varying organizational-cultural theories were explored. This review reflected on topics such as brain circulation as well as the similar reentry experiences shared by students from both India and Brazil. Also explored were the influences of Saudi culture and religion, through the documentation of returning Saudi scholars to work in Saudi universities. While this literature has explored aspects of research regarding the Saudi scholars' reentry experience, it was my belief that a more complete exploration of this topic through my research may better prepare Saudi scholars to manage any obstacles or challenges they may encounter when beginning to work as faculty in Saudi universities. In Chapter III, I describe the methodology in terms of participants, types of methods used, research procedures, and plan of analysis.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Researcher Stance/My Story

I have heard about other reentry scholars' experiences and found myself wondering what my experience would be like as I reentered the Saudi academic world. I wanted this research to assist me as well as other reentry scholars and Saudi universities in the process of easing the transition upon reentry into the work force in the Saudi universities. If the Saudi government provided scholarships to Saudi scholars to study in Western cultures and become educated from Western institutions of higher education, how would these reentries transfer the information to Saudi universities and Saudi culture? Also, how would the work environment in Saudi universities support these reentry scholars in transferring their knowledge that they received from Western universities? I sometimes have wondered if the relationship between reentry scholars and faculty who had never been abroad would be filled with miscommunication and mistrust.

Other scholars have told me stories about feeling very stressed and how they experienced reverse culture shock. After reading literature about the experiences of reentry scholars, I was able to identify some of the experiences I and other reentry scholars might be facing, including stress, boredom, no privacy, stress with colleagues who had not been abroad, and stressful work environments in the Saudi universities. So, I was very interested in my research and wanted to investigate more, not just because of curiosity but because it would personally affect me as well.

Sometimes I heard from others and read in the literature that reverse culture shock could be worse than the first culture shock that international students faced when they came to a new country. I asked myself, if it was worth it to travel to a new country in the first place? But in America, I came to a university with students from 100 countries and met with them and talked to them. I saw people who did not interact with international students, who wanted only to be with students who looked and talked like themselves. I felt sad that they were missing the opportunity to meet someone different. So I thought that the culture shock and reverse culture shock were worth it, but I felt unprepared. I would have liked to know how to deal with the problems such as initial culture shock and reentry that I was (and am) facing.

I shared with my participants that I would soon be identified as a reentry scholar in a Saudi university myself. I also acknowledged my other identities as an Arab, a heterosexual man from Saudi Arabia, and a middle-class professional with an advanced education. I paid attention and became aware of my biases and assumptions that may have affected my questions, conversational interviews, and interpretations. Also, I was very careful when I interviewed Saudi women because I was afraid that they might misunderstand my intentions by conducting this research, because the culture separated men and women back home. I was aware of how all of this might affect my research.

Because of my identity as a reentry scholar from Saudi Arabia, holding a Master's degree as a student affairs professional, I believed that my identity put me in a special place to conduct this research. I did spend one semester in Saudi Arabia after my Master's degree and have experienced a small amount of reentry myself. Therefore, I was able to better identify with the people I was speaking to, as long as I was aware that I

needed to listen to their voices and what they were trying to tell me without trying to influence their stories with my own situation.

Research Questions

In this study, I used a case-study methodology to further explore the research questions in this study (Merriam, 2001; Yin, 2009), which were:

- Q1 How do reentry Saudi scholars experience the phenomenon of reentry in Saudi universities?
- Q2 What challenges and opportunities do the reentry Saudi scholars express in working in Saudi universities?

Epistemology

This study explored the experiences of Saudi Scholars reentering into Saudi universities. As such, addressing my research question through an interpretivist lens facilitated greater understanding of the experience of reentry. Interpretivism posits that meaning is a social construct based on the interpretations individuals held as participants in the world (Broido & Manning, 2002; Merriam, 2009). Because of the limited literature on the experiences of reentry Saudi scholars in Saudi universities, interpretivism was the best paradigm to use to try to understand the Saudi reentry scholars' experiences and make meaning of it to give facts and information for practice (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011). I wanted to find out how this reentry was experienced in order to assist universities in helping others who were facing reentry, and I could do this best by finding out how others made meaning of their own reentry experiences.

Interpretivism has been closely related to relativist teachings that echoed the idea that humans understand their worlds in many different ways and, in essence, created multiple realities (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Using an interpretivist lens, along with a

small amount of subjectivism in which the researcher and participants could mutually define a shared reality, warranted the use of a case-study approach (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). A case-study design was most appropriate for this study, given its ability to interpret a particular phenomenon (Stake, 2000; Yin, 2009). The intention of this study was to comprehend and successfully interpret and analyze the individual experiences of Saudi scholars reentering into Saudi universities. I wanted to use interpretivism with which to align my study, because interpretivism would allow for greater understanding and how the participants, and I, made meaning of the reentry experience. Together, the participants and I made meaning of our realities through our interpretations. In this study, I used the multiple voices of the participants to understand the reality of reentry. Interpretivism was used to understand the voices, together with the researcher's interpretation, to build meaning (Lincoln et al., 2011). Therefore, interpretivism was the most appropriate tool for understanding the work and social experiences of Saudi scholars upon reentry into Saudi universities. Although this research used theoretical foundations to explore the topic of reentry, each theory had at least one component where the individual had individual choices, feelings, and emotions they must face. Each theory would allow for individual thoughts and actions, depending on their interpretation of what was occurring.

Methodological Framework

Methodology: The Case Study

For this research, I chose a case-study approach because it has the ability to interpret a particular phenomenon. Case-study designs focus on a technique that is a process, as well as a method, that offers a product of inquiry (Stake, 2000). Questions

such as “how” and “why” have been frequently pursued in case-study designs as a means to successfully interpret the thoughts and experiences of study participants (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2013; Yin, 2009). In line with Yin (2009), a “case” could represent an individual or individuals in one setting who made up a “case study.” For this study, I used a case-study design involving multiple individuals in one setting at Kingdom University in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. A case-study approach could be useful when exploring the thoughts and feeling of a certain population, such as Saudi scholars upon their return to Saudi universities. Consistent with Merriam (2009), the extent of this design was bound by a prominent university located in Saudi Arabia, in which the reentry scholars for this study were found. The university has a long record of experiencing reentry scholars. Currently, it has more reentry faculty than any other university in Saudi Arabia.

The Context

Setting. My study took place in Kingdom University in Saudi Arabia. In 2017, the university had a student population of about 65,000 students of both men and women. It was one the oldest universities in the country. The university had about 65,000 students, over 7,614 faculty, and 18,973 staff (Knipfer, 2013). The Kingdom University mission focused on education and research as well as helping to assist the society and in using technology and connects with the world.

Participants. The participants for this study were Saudi scholars who held a U.S. doctoral degree upon reentry into Saudi Arabia and who were employed at Kingdom University and administrators who worked at Kingdom University as the head of a department, a vice dean, or dean. The Saudi reentry scholars were those who had reentered within the last 5 years and those whom I approached for the study. The

interviews with each participant were conducted face-to-face with men and by phone with women. All conversations were one-on-one in a location of their choosing and preference--a place where they felt safe and comfortable. As one of the oldest, most prominent universities in the country with the largest population of reentry scholars, this institution was able to provide much information regarding the reentry experience of these scholars. Purposeful sampling, where participants were chosen based on their characteristics (in this case, Saudi reentry scholars who had re-entered within 5 years) and administrators were used to recruit the participants for this study (Merriam, 2009). Sampling also included snowball sampling in that participants from Kingdom University were also asked to refer other potential participants (Merriam, 2009). To achieve the best results in terms of data saturation, qualitative researchers have often suggested a minimum of 10 participants to collect enough data of the reentry experiences of participants (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 2009).

The primary goal was to gather as much rich data as possible of the experiences Saudi scholars had upon reentry into the university workforce and to interview a greater number of participants from various academic departments and colleges to ensure validity and the appropriate level of data saturation (Creswell, 2013). I interviewed 16 Saudi reentry scholars, including 3 reentry scholars and administrators, and 14 administrators, also including the 3 reentry scholars, from various academic departments from one university (see Table 2).

Table 2

Study Participants

Name	Gender	Graduation Year	Position
Reentry Scholars			
Dr. Ahmed	Male	2016	Assistant professor
Dr. Yousef	Male	2015	Assistant professor
Dr. Salah	Male	2016	Assistant professor
Dr. Fahad	Male	2014	Assistant professor
Dr. Essa	Male	2015	Assistant professor
Dr. Nasser	Male	2016	Assistant professor
Dr. Majed	Male	2016	Assistant professor
Dr. Rana	Female	2016	Assistant professor
Dr. Ghada	Female	2014	Assistant professor
Dr. Saif	Male	2016	Assistant professor
Dr. Jamila	Female	2016	Assistant professor
Dr. Maha	Female	2013	Assistant professor
Dr. Meriam	Female	2014	Assistant professor
Reentry Scholar and Administrator			
Dr. Ali	Male	2015	Head of department
Dr. Saad	Male	2013	Head of department
Dr. Bander	Male	2014	Vice Dean
Administrators			
Dr. Atif	Male		Head of department
Dr. Dalal	Female		Rector Advisor
Dr. Arwa	Female		Vice head of department

Table 2 (continued)

Name	Gender	Graduation Year	Position
Dr. Afaf	Female		Dean
Dr. Mohanad	Male		Head of department
Dr. Yaser	Male		Head of department
Dr. Muqrin	Male		Head of department
Dr. Nayef	Male		Head of department
Dr. Abeer	Female		Vice head of department
Dr. Mansour	Male		Head of department
Dr. Aljoharah	Female		Vice Dean

To begin the recruitment of participants, an email (Appendix A) was sent to known reentry Saudi scholars using informants I had met and networked with in the United States as co-students. Also, I went to various department websites at the university and emailed Saudi reentry scholar who met the criteria of being Saudi reentry scholars who had returned to Saudi Arabia to teach at a university within the last 5 years and administrators. I also recruited participants who were suggested by friends through phone calls. After they responded to me and provided their number, I made a call to the participants and gave a brief description of the study. If the participants agreed to participate, an email was sent to them with full description of the study. To facilitate the recruitment process, potential Saudi reentry scholars and administrators received an invitation to participate via email. I used an informed consent form, which was reviewed at length with potential participants (see Appendix B). The impetus for using an informed consent form was to inform participants about any possible concerns surrounding the

well-being of the participants. Additional information that was imparted included explaining to the interviewees that they may withdraw from the study at any time and how much time may be required to complete the interviews. Finally, I gave participants my email address and phone number and welcomed them to make contact at any time. For the safety of the study, and of the participants' information, all materials were kept in a secure, password-protected computer only accessible to myself as the researcher. In terms of confidentiality, I respected and protected my participants' confidentiality the best I could; I only used pseudonyms and did not describe any details concerning their appearance, major field of study, or other details that may identify them.

Potential benefits to the participants. A benefit to conducting this research was to understand the experience of reentry Saudi scholars in a Kingdom University. Saudi scholars returning home after acquiring an international doctoral degree may experience challenges in transitioning into the Kingdom University workplace environment. Gaining a deeper understanding of the reentry experience of Saudi scholars, into Saudi universities, may provide others the help they need to effectively adapt to the Saudi university workplace environment. Another benefit to understanding the Saudi scholar experience would be to give both international and Saudi universities the tools they would need to support students in the transition from one environment to another, via support services, as these scholars may struggle with readjusting or adapting to the Kingdom University environment. Still another benefit was to create a safe positive environment for the reentry scholars so they would be able to apply what they had learned abroad to assist the university and the community. This study intended to inform larger bodies of research, and the academic community as a whole, to find more effective

ways to support Saudi scholars. On a broader scale, this study sought to provide meaningful information to support the reentry of Saudi scholars into the Kingdom University environment by making a fundamental contribution to the body of literature pertaining to these types of issues in higher education.

Consent forms. Before interviews began, the researcher openly discussed the informed consent form and addressed the ability of participants to withdraw from the study at any time. All participants were also informed of any expectations of them (for example, to share their knowledge of their experience as completely and honestly as possible), and privacy and confidentiality would be assured. In agreeing to take part in the study, the participants were given the contact information of the researcher and an interview time and location were scheduled. Along the lines of Creswell's (2013) recommendations, the interview took place in an area that provided minimal distraction, such as in the university library. A conference room or office on campus was also an ideal location. At the start of the interview, the researcher reviewed the consent form with the participants, discussed expectations, and answered any questions the interviewee may have had. As always, the materials gathered from the interviews were stored securely and confidentiality was assured. A digital recording device was used which was also discussed with participants prior to the official start of the interview. The use of both pseudonyms and code words were used, as recommended by Creswell (2013), in an attempt to further protect the participants.

Data Collection Methods

Semi-structured interviews. My data collection consisted of semi-structured interviews. For the interviewing process, the participants were asked a series of

open-ended, semi-structured questions based on the information obtained in a review of the literature and from the W-Curve, organization's culture theory, and brain circulation theories (see Appendices C and D). The data for this study were gathered through semi-structured interviews. The interviews were conducted face-to-face with the male participants of the study. For the women participating in this study, the interviews were conducted over the phone. The interviews lasted approximately 60 to 90 minutes to ensure that the participants had the opportunity to fully share their thoughts and experiences. Participant responses were recorded with the permission of the interviewees and through following the appropriate university protocol (Mertens, 2010). The use of open-ended questions allowed for more to be teased out in the interview process and allowed the interview to proceed in a more flexible and exploratory nature (Creswell, 2013). A semi-structured interview facilitated posing specific questions about the realities of university work for reentering Saudi scholars into Saudi Universities. I recorded all interviews with the permission of the participants through a signed consent form.

The use of semi-structured interviews allowed me to explore the experiences and perceptions of Saudi scholars reentering Saudi Universities in a flexible manner. Semi-structured interviews were a verifiable tool for allowing participants to share their thoughts and opinions related to the research topic (Yin, 2009). The semi-structured interviews were guided by an interview protocol that allowed room for open-ended questions. Semi-structured interviewing of this type allowed for greater participant and researcher dialogue surrounding the experiences of Saudi scholars reentering into Kingdom University.

The face-to-face semi-structured interviews occurred at a safe and mutually agreed upon location by both the researcher and the participants. During the semi-structured interviews, I attempted to provide a comfortable climate in which the participants felt free to share their experiences and stories and came to trust me to share openly (Jones et al., 2013). In a further attempt to help the interviewees feel even more comfortable, I listened intently and shared parts of my own story of reentry when it seemed appropriate to encourage sharing. This helped the participants feel safe to share. However, I was careful not to influence my story with the participants' perspective. As recommended by Seidman (1991), I focused on relating to the participants based on details of their experiences, what made up their experiences, and by seeking to understand their experiences. In the beginning, the interview asked introductory questions to allow the participants to feel more comfortable. For the main interview questions, the participants were asked questions about their reentry and work experiences at the Kingdom University. I asked the administrators how they perceived the reentry scholars. I also asked questions based on the W-Curve, organization's culture, brain circulation theories, and W-Curve models introduced in Chapter II (see Appendices C and D).

Data Collection Procedures

After I obtained Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval from the University of Northern Colorado, I went to the department website at Kingdom University and found potential participants that met the criteria of being Saudi reentry scholars that reentered Saudi Arabia to teach at a university within the last 5 years. I emailed them explaining the study and, if they were interested, asked them to respond by giving me their phone numbers so I could follow up with a phone call. I then called them and set up a time and

place they found comfortable and convenient to meet. I asked for referrals of other potential participants. Through using this snowball sampling method, I also asked to be referred to other potential female participants when having interviews on the phone. For the administrators, I also found their information on the University's website and sent an email out to various department heads, Vice Deans, and Deans to see if they were able to participate in the study. After ensuring that they were willing to participate, and met the criteria, we set up a time to meet for the interview. I interviewed the men first in person, and then spoke to the women by phone. The men signed the consent form at the time of the interview and the consent forms were sent to the women via email. Before I interviewed the women, I ensured that they signed the consent form and emailed it back to me. I recorded the interviews with men in person and with the women on the phone with a speaker. Both men and women participants gave their permission to be recorded.

Data Analysis and Coding

Trustworthiness

To support the integrity of the findings in this study, I used three components to ensure trustworthiness. First, to strengthen the credibility of the findings, data from multiple participants were used for triangulation purposes to validate the work. Second, an audit trail, created via my researcher journal, was used to increase the dependability of the findings. Utilizing an audit trail also allowed for data collection and decision making to be tracked throughout the research process. “An audit trail in a qualitative study describes in detail how data were collected, how categories were derived, and how decisions were made throughout the inquiry” (Merriam, 2009, p. 223). I kept a personal journal with notes on everything I did in the study--when I interviewed, when I analyzed

the data, and when I tried to make meaning of the data--to help myself and others understand the decisions I made (Merriam, 2009). For instance, after each interview, I made notes in my journal about what I thought was the atmosphere of the interview, what the main points were, what my general thoughts were, and what direction I took in analyzing the interview data. Third, thick descriptions of the results were used to allow for the transferability of the findings to other areas and circumstances. I used enough details to match the participants' descriptions with the literature so others could see whether or not this study applied to their situation (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 2009).

Data Analysis

As noted, all the interviews were conducted in Arabic. After the interviews were complete, I personally transcribed them into Arabic and then translated them into English. As noted by Polkinghorne (2005), transcribing "is to allow the detailed to-and-fro reading in the analysis of the qualitative data" (p. 142). The use of transcription allowed common themes to be extracted from the interviews to aid in analysis (Gibson & Brown, 2009). After being transcribed into Arabic, the interviews were read at least three times to find common themes. The transcripts and themes were then translated into English. Before I began with the transcripts, I also generated a framework of initial themes for my analysis that were deductively obtained from the theories I was using in the study. Then I turned to my transcriptions and began coding these documents. After listening to the participants' stories many times, I used the constant comparison analysis method to identify codes based on the stories (Creswell, 2013).

Qualitative analysis of data requires a commitment to an ongoing process that is both thoughtful and consistent (Creswell, 2014). As a means to accurately begin data

analysis, I transcribed the interview data and, more specifically, began typing up the interview notes within 24-48 hours of conducting interviews. Once the interviewing portion of the study was complete, I reviewed the transcripts a minimum of three times to begin a preliminary assessment of the data. I inductively used open coding to generate other codes. Then axial coding was used to organize those codes into initial themes and selective coding was used to refine the themes. Together, the deductive and inductive themes were used to support my interpretation. My interpretation was based on the interview data to provide additional detail and depth about the experiences Saudi scholars had upon reentry and work at Kingdom University. I triangulated the data through comparing and contrasting different people's interviews and built common themes to understand the unique experiences of the reentry of Saudi scholars into Saudi universities (Merriam, 2009).

Theoretical Framework Used for Analysis

This study used qualitative methods to explore reentry scholars' experiences when they returned to Saudi universities. It used the W-Curve hypothesis model, which was developed by Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963), to show the readaptation process. This theory explored five stages of readaptation: the honeymoon, the culture shock, the initial adjustment, the mental isolation, and finally the stages of acceptance and integration. These five stages have often been most severe for scholars, because most scholars felt very secure on the campus of their host country and more isolated when they returned home. Many institutions gave instruction to their students to try and prepare their students before they studied abroad for the possibility of "culture shock" (Zhou et al., 2008). While universities focused on what students would feel while they were abroad, few

focused at all on how students would feel when they came back home. The W-Curve hypothesis was used to help to explain and understand the Saudi reentry experience to Saudi universities.

Components suggested by Tierney (2008b) were also utilized in my analysis. Tierney believed that an organization's culture was replicated in the attitudes and composure of its members. The group had a cultural norm with which all members identified. Tierney (2008b) suggested that the environment, mission, socialization, information, strategy, and leadership were the "key dimensions of cultures themselves" (p. 27). By understanding the organizational culture of a university, the administration would better understand the changes that needed to be made within the organization. Tierney's theories helped to understand the institution to which the returning scholars found themselves.

The third theory that was used in my analysis was the brain circulation theory (Perna et al., 2014). This theory was used to describe the movement and mobility of higher educated people around the globe. It was an increasing phenomenon that affected the socio-economic and socio-culture progress of a society, a country, as well as the world (Perna et al., 2014). This theory helped readers to understand the Saudi scholars' experience in Saudi universities when they connected back with other Western countries and universities. It also helped to understand the social and economic benefits to reentry scholars and the Saudi Arabian education system because reentry scholars would feel they were contributing to society.

These theories were all used to align with the main theme and subthemes to ensure the data could be organized and analyzed. If the theories were complete enough,

they would help me to understand my findings and organize them in such a way that my data findings could be organized, understood, and explained easily. However, if the theories were not complete enough to explain everything I found, I was able to develop a more complete understanding through the inductive use of coding. Each theory had at least one component where the individual had their own choices, feelings, and emotions they must face. Each theory allowed for individual thoughts and actions, depending on their interpretation of what was occurring. My data enriched those theories by generating new themes which enhanced the understanding of those theories.

Limitations

Limitations represented the possible weaknesses associated with decisions the researcher made in conducting this study, which were difficult to control (Yin, 2009). As such, there were a couple of possible limitations in the design of this study and potentially within the methodology used. The first potential limitation was that this study was carried out by only one researcher. In some way, this showed that there was only one viewpoint in interpreting the data. Second, and connected to the last point, the same researcher who collected the data, as well as who conducted the interviews, was the sole interpreter of the data collected. Conducting research in such a fashion could be a point of entry for possible researcher bias. Typically, it would be better if researcher tasks were separated; nevertheless, caution was taken in remaining objective throughout the study. Another possible limitation could have been the participants' ability to fully understand the purpose of the study and to be able to fully identify with the interview questions. However, the participants had a more than appropriate level of knowledge regarding their experiences and their ability to communicate their feeling and knowledge was sufficient.

Another potential limitation was that the interviews with the female participants were all conducted over the phone, which was more appropriate in Saudi culture. Given this constraint, having the opportunity to analyze body language and face expressions limited my ability to access what was being shared through all methods. Nonetheless, the phone conversations were clear and what was shared was both heartfelt and seemingly authentic. As another possible limitation, it should be noted that all of the interviews were in Arabic, which I then translated to English. Given that, I am not a native English speaker; certain information may have been lost in translation. However, being aware of this potentiality helped me try to capture every single detail. As a final point, case studies could be difficult to generalize to other populations and geographic areas (Yin, 2009). As not all individuals or groups function similarly, to make certain the findings in this study were accurate, further research and documentation may be needed.

Summary

In this chapter, the interpretivist paradigm was used for this study. The main use of this paradigm was to allow for the clear understanding of the participants' experiences. In this chapter, focus on the methodology was used to understand Saudi scholars' perspectives to understand their experience returning to work in Saudi universities after obtaining a doctorate degree from a U.S. university. The case-study design was chosen as the method for this study because it allowed the researcher to accurately assess experiences of others in a holistic and meaningful manner. The ability to analyze a phenomenon through a case-study approach allowed for a deeper understanding about how or why certain phenomenon had taken place. The next chapter will address my own

experience, in brief, more about the participants, the setting, and further discussion on data collection. Finally, an analysis of the data is explored further.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to understand the reentry experience of Saudi Arabian scholars who had completed their doctoral degrees from United States universities and had returned to become faculty members of Saudi Arabian universities and how the university administrators perceived the reentry of Saudi scholars. For this study, reentry scholars generally were defined as students who returned to teach at institutions of higher education after having received doctoral degrees at U.S. universities.

This chapter presents the data gathered through interviews from the two groups of participants. The first group was Saudi reentry scholars who had obtained a doctorate degree in the U.S. and had returned to work at Kingdom University within the last 5 years. The second group was made up of administrators who worked at Kingdom University as the head of a department, as a vice dean, or dean. The overall findings were: (a) Saudi reentry scholars experienced reverse culture shock upon returning, (b) there was a need for greater support from Kingdom University upon reentry, (c) the Saudi organizational system was a difficult experience and bureaucratic for returning Saudi scholars, (d) technology was challenging and frequently not used appropriately, (e) women experienced readjustment differently than men and had fewer opportunities, (f) there was a desire to create change, and (g) education abroad created greater links to the global community.

For the administrators, the overall findings were: (a) administrators had a general understanding of the reentry experience, (b) the environment had changed for reentry scholars, (c) the interaction administrators had with returning scholars as employees needed to be addressed, (d) the administrators' had certain expectations for reentry scholars, (e) the reentry scholars needed to apply what they had learned abroad at the university, and (f) reentry scholars needed to contribute to administrative duties and teaching. Finally, the last theme for administrators explored that the administrators' had mixed perceptions of reentry scholars' contributions, that administrators anticipated the return of reentry scholars with excitement, and there existed a general perception of reentry scholars as unproductive and uncooperative.

Interviews with Reentry Scholars

Main Theme 1 (MT1): Reverse Culture Shock is Experienced by Returning Saudi Reentry Scholars as Difficult

In relation to the main theme of reverse culture shock, all 16 scholars agreed that reentry was a difficult experience for them. Whether the scholar had just returned to Saudi Arabia to work at the university or had been back a number of years, all shared similar stories about their experiences. Rana had only been back for one semester at the time of the study. She noted, "I have only been here for just one semester. I am very tired from all the work here, and honestly, I feel that I am still shocked by everything." She continued:

When I went to the U.S. the first time, the culture shock was there for 3 months and then I adjusted to U.S. culture. But, when I returned [to Saudi Arabia], it took me a long time and still I have been here for 8 months now, and honestly, I feel this feeling of being homeless and I feel strange. I cannot believe that I am back to my own country. I expected the shock to be less, but unfortunately, for me it is still a big shock.

It was clear that reverse culture shock played a role in Rana's experience and that she was disappointed by how she felt upon return. It appeared that it was hard for her to integrate. Another reentry scholar, Ahmed, stated that, when he graduated and returned to one of the universities in Saudi to work, he wished he had not graduated because the student life in the United States "was excellent" and that he was "not prepared to return." Having adjusted to life in the U.S. did not prepare him for reentry. It was obvious that he did not expect to experience reverse culture shock in returning to work at the university. Yousef also shared his experience of being shocked. He and his family had stayed in the U.S. for a long time, nearly 4 1/2 years, and had experienced severe cultural shock. He shared that, "I have been here for almost 2 years and I am almost adjusted to the culture again. But, my family suffers from culture shock. My children only speak English and [they] are weak in Arabic." It was apparent that, not only did reentry scholars experience reverse culture shock, but so did their families upon return. Ultimately, this would affect the work performed by the reentry scholars.

Reentry scholar, Salah, shared, "When I came back I felt alone here in this country and I felt, this country is not my country." Majed also experienced a rough reentry and Ghada explained that she had a very difficult time when she returned. She was expecting good things in the beginning of her return, however, she "did not get what she expected," as she shared:

I expected there would be a small book there in the department that directed me and is supposed to explain the system because the system, rules, and things changed and did not stay the same. For example, the name of the buildings, the technology, and many things had changed.

All three of these scholars experienced reverse culture shock, were expecting a lot, but were shocked by their experience on their return. Another reentry scholar, Saif, spoke about his stress and difficulty in the beginning. He stated, “There was a lot of pressure and stress [from the university and work]. It was a difficult time and I was worrying about how to prepare for classes, and adapt.” In speaking with Saud, it appeared that he was not integrating well into the environment due to reverse culture shock.

In the beginning, the reentry scholars were initially very excited to return and share what they had learned in the United States. For an example, Yousef noted, “Honestly, I felt excited and happy, I would like to serve the university.” Ahmed also explained, “I felt excited and very optimistic, and I tried to develop and bring new things to the department and to the college in general.” Fahad also shared that he had a “feeling of enthusiasm and desire and willingness to apply what I have learned in the U.S.” Another reentry scholar at Kingdom University, Essa, expressed that, “In the beginning, I was very excited and now I am tired from all the work.” Ghada also shared that, at first, she was “very excited and now I feel less excited.” She went on to express:

I came with excitement, [and with] the hope that I could apply all that I have learned about teaching in the U.S. to everything here. But, I find myself shocked, and even more shocked. But, I’m still trying to apply what I have learned.

Lastly, Saif echoed Ghada's thoughts by sharing:

In the beginning, there was an excitement in the sense of joy and achievement. I felt happy that I achieved [success] in my study abroad, so far from my family, and that now it was time to come back, return to my parents. I planned on returning to the normal life. I felt a sense of happiness and I was very proud of my achievements, but I gradually faced [more and more] shocks, and I felt that everything here was bureaucratic. There was just no end to it.

It appeared that the excitement to obtain a degree and return to their lives, as they remembered them, was a common theme across participants. However, their excitement was short lived, as they all experienced intense reverse culture shock. Examples like this were plentiful, even with a few of the administrators who were also reentry scholars themselves at one point. Past reentry scholars who then became administrators also experienced the same type of difficulty with reverse culture shock as did the scholars interviewed for this study. Bander shared that, "There were a number of shocks when I returned. I thought the work would be faster and that [everything would] administratively work faster." It appeared that Bander faced reverse culture shock within the Kingdom University system. Salah also shared that, in returning to Saudi Arabia, "The different environment was very annoying. When I was at the beginning of my work here, I missed the environment that I lived in, in the U.S." Salah continued by saying, "I miss everything there and sometimes I feel that, ok, I am settled in this country, and I need start to merge and adapt into this environment and [the] education programs here." Salah concluded by saying it was easier when he could "begin to forget the previous memories." Although Salah experienced reversed culture shock, he was doing his best at reintegrating and working at the university.

Essa shared his feelings of reverse culture shock by saying, "It changed me and affected me. I feel a lack of communication with people." Essa continued, "I feel the

environment and the system have changed. I did not have any idea that I would have a problem speaking Arabic even in my own country.” Jamila finished up by saying, “I felt that I was strange, even with my family. I think differently than they think now.” Without question, all of the reentry scholars who participated in the study experienced reverse culture shock and difficulties when returning to teach at Kingdom University.

Subtheme 1.1 (ST1.1): There is a need for greater support from Kingdom University upon reentry. In revealing information regarding how reentry scholars felt about the support they received at Kingdom University, all 16 participants felt they needed more support for reentry. In answering the interview questions related to if the Kingdom University provided a transition program, Majed stated, “Yes. But, it was focused on enhancing teaching skills, but did not cover psychological issues and reentry issues.” Majed was not alone in his interpretation and, when asked the same question, Jamila answered, “Honestly, there was no help or transitional programs.” She further shared:

They did not give me a house or an apartment and I tried many times to get an apartment since my family lives far away from the city. I said to them please help me, and they said I need to write a letter.. There is no transitional program, but there are workshops [they give] at the end of the semester. Workshops for new faculty members about what courses are available but it does not focus on the transition, and focuses only on the university’s facilities, the available resources in the university, and workshops on teaching styles.

It appeared to me that the University did not support the reentry scholars to reintegrate and readjust to working at the university. The program they offered focused more on the teaching styles that Kingdom University wanted the reentry scholar to follow. Further sharing on the subject, Yousef explained his experience like this, “When I arrived, I felt that there were so many unknown things that I needed to look for, and ask

for. All of my responsibilities are still not clear to me.” Ghada shared her experience in this way:

I always asked for help from my colleagues. I went to their offices and asked how to do this and how do I do that. The reason I ask my colleagues was that no one would give me the exact rules and tell me the right things . . . what I can do, where I can go, and how I can get my paperwork done. Everything was unclear for me and there was too much confusion. I was stressed, and that first year I suffered and suffered a lot.

Ghada continued sharing her frustration by explaining:

The simplest thing I was expecting, when I returned home was that the faculty members would have a meeting with faculty like me and would welcome us. But honestly, it is been almost a year now--it took almost a year until I met all my colleagues in the department. I really did not know what everyone was talking about when we did finally meet.

Ghada finished sharing by stating, “There was not even a welcome back, not even congratulations.” The scholars perceived a lack of leadership at the University for the reentry scholars, no clear procedures to follow, and the result left reentry scholars feeling unsupported and confused. The returnees were left to find their own way without any support and did not receive acknowledgment from the departments at the University. Although one or two of the reentry scholars expressed that there was some support, such as Fahad who said, “In the department they were happy when we returned and they welcomed [those] who returned from U.S., especially most of old faculty here who graduated in the U.S.” However, this depended on the department. Ghada also shared, “When we had the program, it was not an appropriate program for reentry. It focused on resources in the university and what the university expects from us. They did not talk about what reentry faculty need and want.”

The need for greater support of reentry scholars who taught at Kingdom University became apparent. All participants felt they needed more support, and it was imperative that returnees receive the appropriate help to adapt to their new circumstances and be able to work in a positive and supportive work environment. Without the needed support, such as an appropriate transitional program, reentry scholars felt lost in their positions as professors at Kingdom University. This lack of support may negatively impact what they could offer to students and the academic community, and they may not be able to apply what they have learned.

All participants felt that supports specific to adapting back to Saudi life and culture was not present. As an example, Ali shared,

I did not think that I was going to come back to the university's responsibilities and seriousness of the work. You have to do administrative work, follow up with discussions, and there are too many meetings. It was a [big] change for me and I thought, is it necessary to [have it] be like that to develop as a teacher?

Clearly, there was a lack of support and the reentry scholars were not prepared to work at Kingdom University. They all needed clear expectations, understanding, and ongoing help. Ghada also noted this when she shared:

After I returned from studying in the U.S., the department gave us administration roles. I was a member on the quality committee and I did not know what they meant when they said quality. I did not know what they wanted me to do, I did not understand. I did not like working on this committee, and sometimes I even found my name on a new committee and I did not [even] ask to work there.

Ghada also explained, "I noticed that if a new reentry scholar came back, they just gave them teaching and administrative work--the scholar cannot focus on the research and develop themselves in [regards to] publishing." It was obvious that the level of work needed from the reentry scholars was not something they felt able or prepared to do. In returning, the reentry scholars needed to be supported by learning one task at a time and

not pushed to do the variety of roles that were asked of them. The reentry scholars did not expect or understand what was needed from them to perform administrative duties and this made them feel very unsupported.

Summary. Clearly, MT1 and the subsequent subthemes reflected the need for greater support from Kingdom University upon the reentry of scholars. Using the audit trail and the three forms of coding for this study (open, axial, and selective), it was revealed that the reentry scholars felt strongly about the shock they experienced upon returning to teach at Kingdom University. The need for greater support from Kingdom University upon reentry was obvious. To further demonstrate how the reentry scholars perceived their reentry into the Saudi college system and their experience with a Kingdom University explicitly, Table 3 shows the alignment of the data between Research Question 1, theme 1, and some of the participants' responses.

Table 3

Data Alignment Between Research Question 1, Theme 1, and Participants' Responses

Research Question	Theme	General Participant Response
Main Theme 1: Reverse culture shock is experienced by returning Saudi reentry scholars as difficult		
Q1: How do reentry Saudi scholars who return to Saudi universities to work experience the phenomenon of reentry?	ST1.1: There is a need for greater support from Kingdom University upon reentry.	"The classes and the work given to us [by] administrators were unclear and had disorganized explanations."

**Main Theme 2 (MT2): Kingdom University
Organizational Systems are Experienced
as Difficult and Bureaucratic for
Returning Saudi Scholars**

In discussing the difficulties of working in the Kingdom University's organizational system, a number of the reentry scholars expressed their frustration with not having their needs met at Kingdom University after returning home. According to Saif, "The first year was hard, tiring, and unorganized. I felt like I was lost and I made many mistakes within the system." Saif continued by saying:

I did get used to the U.S. system--in the way of distributing grades. [I] tried to apply this stuff, but unfortunately, I made mistakes. There was no one to help us at the beginning, or [to] guide us in the existing procedures of the system. I did not know the requirements for my promotion to assistant professor, and actually, my promotion to assistant professor arrived four months late. I had a problem with the procedures [around] post-graduation. The procedures were unclear. Honestly, I felt that I worked and worked at the beginning as if I [were] blind, but could not find the road.

For Jamila, who was gone for 10 years, upon her return to work at Kingdom University, she noted that it was, "hard, very hard. No one accepted me and I felt like I was a foreigner to this country." She continued by saying, "I spoke to Saudi language and used Saudi customs, but I felt that I was foreign in this country. I discovered the system was different, not the system was before I went to the U.S." Although all systems change, the shifts in Saudi culture were pronounced in the last 10 years. For Jamila, it changed without her knowing it could shift so rapidly. Salah seconded Jamila's feelings about being back in Saudi Arabia. For example, he noted, "The issue is that there is no freedom in the process of selection, no freedom [around] decision-making, no freedom in testing, and no freedom to choose external sources." It was apparent that, after becoming accustomed to the U.S. higher educational system, seeing what was lacking in the Saudi

educational system became clear. The differences in the organizational systems were pronounced and was a difficult experience for the reentry scholars.

Fahad echoed a lot of what others shared by saying, “The conditions we have at . . . [the University] are not good, and we want to bring the experience from the U.S. to the educational system here because we want to change the system.” Fahad shared that his experience of studying abroad “influenced me in a positive way and it gave me new skills.” Nevertheless, he also shared that studying abroad:

Made me want to try and change the old traditional reality. I feel I grew up on one side and after I returned, I saw many old things in the system. It made me ask myself, why do we do this a lot? And, I do not know what to say. I always think about developing our department as I saw good things at the U.S. university that we can apply here.

Fahad explained to me further how reentry scholars have new skills and abilities, and they were willing to change the system for the betterment of the reentry scholar experience and for Saudi Arabia as a whole. Fahad finished his explanation by asking, “If change is possible, why not change?” However, he expressed his disappointment with the organizational system because the system did not allow change very easily. Overall, most of the participants agreed that the academic method of teaching, and the system as a whole, at Kingdom University was very much the same as before they went abroad to study. While there may have been a little renewal, the consensus was that the system was “still the same” despite the overall changes in Saudi culture outside of the university setting, and perhaps even more challenging to work in, given the experiences abroad that changed the reentry scholars’ perspectives. Most felt that they were sent abroad to learn ways to change the Saudi educational system but they had no idea upon their return that

the system would be so difficult to change. Although they wanted the system to be less rigid, they felt that they were simply supposed to follow the rules

To further explore the phenomenon of Saudi scholars having to contend with the Saudi culture and organizational system upon their return, almost all participants discussed bureaucracy as a significant problem. Again, the Saudi scholars viewed the bureaucratic system as negative and that it limited them in making changes. For example, higher education in Saudi Arabia was centralized and very few people had the power to create real change. Usually, only the department head, vice dean, or dean could make decisions and this seemed contradictory to the idea that change was welcomed.

For instance, Yousef shared that, “All the negative experiences here at the university come from bureaucracy. I remembered that my paperwork was delayed 6 1/2 months before I was able to start teaching as an assistant professor.” Yousef continued, “I do not know the cause of it, but it is bureaucracy and uncaring of the administration.” Yousef also offered that the department environment, in his field of study, was not at all organized. He felt that, “Bureaucracy has been rooted for a long time at [the University]. The procedures and work should be timelier. This is unjustified and unfair behavior in an unfair system.”

For Majed’s experience, he admitted that, “The administrative side of things in Saudi Arabia and in the U.S. are usually different.” He further shared:

For me to change anything I need to change, or if I want a computer, I have to write a letter to request what I want. The bureaucracy is very annoying, annoying, annoying. [I] miss the way that it worked in the U.S. It was so smooth. The work here at the university is always delayed and takes a long time.

Saif commented, “If you want to change your study plan for a course, develop a program, add more courses, or change a program, you’d be surprised at [how] complicated it is to

change anything.” Saif further explained, “This makes you say to yourself, OK, I will do what they want me to do, but when I get a leadership position it will be in my hands to change the bureaucracy here that kills the work.” Clearly, Saif understood that a serious problem existed at University Kingdom relating to bureaucracy and old organizational approaches, and he sought to make changes when he obtained a position of greater power.

To further illuminate how reentries scholars felt about the bureaucracy at Kingdom University, two of the scholar/administrators also had something to share in this regard. Saad explained that his experience with bureaucracy at the University was negative. In his own words:

I came from abroad, and of course, our administrative operations here are very old. They did not do a good job of providing an office or computer for reentry faculty members. I waited to have an office, and for a period of time I had to wait for a computer. It was strange to have to wait for so long to get an office, and I feel that it is all from the bureaucracy at work.

Another joint reentry scholar/administrator, Bander, noted:

I see things here and I would like to change, but I do not have the power or the budget. For example, I am now the vice dean and if I have the resources and they give me a special budget to work on it, I will be able to move forward. But, I just have a \$7000 budget and this is not enough. I feel there is a lot of bureaucracy, and I wish I had more freedom in my work.

Jamila had the following to say:

The first semester after I came back, the classes and the work given to us [by] administrators was unclear and had disorganized explanations. When I asked them to fix something or if I needed anything from office administrators, I was surprised that they needed me to write an official letter. I [also] had to go by myself not by email, by myself, and hand [the letter] to the administrators.

As clearly seen in the responses of the interviewees, their experiences in returning to Kingdom University’s organizational system were difficult and were met with the

layers of confusion and inefficiency frequently found in bureaucratic systems. Finally, Majed shared that he felt excited about returning to work at Kingdom University and, in his own words, he offered,

I would go to the department head and ask them which committees I [could] participate in because I would like to work more. I was motivated to work and participate in the committees. I went to the different departments at the university that relate to my specialty, and tried to work on those committees. But, they refused me, in a good way, but I did not get the opportunity to work in these other areas. I did not have permission to work on other committees within my department [either]. Instead, they just gave me administrative things to work on.

It was apparent that although Majed had high expectations, he instead experienced a difficult bureaucratic system that left him feeling disappointed. On an associated topic, conflict conditions in relationships with coworkers and administrators, many of the reentry scholars felt that relationships between themselves and new colleagues were strained and that they were not receiving the appropriate attention. It was evident from listening to what the scholars had to say that the system at Kingdom University was highly competitive and feelings of jealousy and fear were frequent. For example, Majed shared the following:

There are some administrators [with many] years at the university and I feel more qualified than them and that I am more knowledgeable than them. But, because I graduated from a prestigious U.S. university, they do not want me to work with them [non reentry scholars]. They are jealous, and they do not want a person [there] who has a higher degree than them.

Clearly, many faculty members were trying to either remain in a position of power or trying to achieve more power, and this level of competition created conflict in a system that seemed limited in its ability to create change. Saif echoed this as well by sharing that, "I felt a weakness in cooperation with the faculty members. They want to work as individuals and not as a team. There is jealousy among members and they do not

want to tell anyone about their work.” Ghada also shared her experience in this way, “I love the work as a collective, as a team. Now I am working with my colleague to publish some research, but I am careful with whom I work because I don’t want anyone to steal my research.” Ghada continued sharing, “There was a faculty member who stole some of my research. She did not cite my work. When I complained about the theft, the head of the department said to me ‘Don’t waste your time.’” Without question, the limitations of the organizational system at the University limited the scholars’ ability to do authentic work and potentially made a difference in the system. Salah also pointed out,

Here at [the university], the system is limited. There are rules here to use many of the things and you feel that although it is not possible to get the resources you need. . . . The system does not allow many changes, and this is the most difficult thing to apply that I have learned.

Jamila also explained her feelings toward working with colleagues in the U.S. versus the conflict conditions with colleagues at Kingdom University. For her U.S. experience, she shared, “I loved the cooperative work in the U.S. This was the most important thing.” However, in sharing about her time back in Saudi Arabia, she explained, “But here at the University the individual is more important than working as a team. There is fear that faculty members are going to steal their ideas and thoughts.” Clearly, Jamila’s experience in the U.S. was different than what she experienced upon returning home to work at the University. Finally, Salah shared, “I’m not allowed to change anything in the syllabus except only 20.0%. But, 20.0% does not change anything, so these are some of the things that blocked me.” These findings pointed to a clear conflict and distrust between both new and old faculty members of Kingdom University, thus, impeding smooth operation on multiple levels and provided evidence that the organizational system at Kingdom University did not allow the reentry scholar to create change easily .

To further explore this issue, the use of the personal journal and the coding process, especially selective coding, revealed the following subthemes: (a) technology is challenging and frequently not used appropriately and (b) Women experience readjustment and the university system differently than men, giving them fewer opportunities. These two subthemes are presented below.

Subtheme 2.1 (ST2.1): Technology is challenging and frequently not used appropriately. Another common theme noted by most of the reentry scholars was the need for more technology at Kingdom University. This was mixed because a combination of factors played a role related to using technology. Some of the issues were that the technology related to computers being available and a willingness to use technology were challenging. This seemed to be a system problem as the university culture did not encourage the use of technology. Faculty members were accustomed to writing letters by hand and delivering them, rather than using email. Additionally, the organizational structure of the system has not yet made it common to teach using new technology.

In responding to the issue of technology being challenging to use, Fahad noted, “It [technology] has been here for decades, but what I seek with my colleagues who have returned from abroad is to change the procedures and try to make work more electronic, through using email and blackboard.” Jamila reiterated this point by sharing, “Well, we do have technological development in Saudi Arabia, [but] we have a problem with the connections in the networks.” Additionally, some reentry scholars were told there were no computers available until they wrote letters to the administration. Usually individuals eventually got what they needed, but it was a hard and difficult process without a lot of support. It appeared that there was basic, if not more advanced, technology at the

University, but the administrators and faculty members did not use it commonly as this went against what was the norm for the university culture of bureaucracy.

Furthering the conversation about technology, Fahad shared, “I try to make the work easier and electronic, like through email and blackboard. These are some of the many things that we seek to change when returning from abroad.” Clearly, Fahad meant that he would like to take what he learned in the U.S. about using technology and apply it at Kingdom University. However, the nature of the system at the university did not make the change to using technology easy to adopt because of the limits of old, bureaucratic ways of thinking. Nasser also shared that he was trying to “apply what I learned from the U.S., in terms of developing the technology for teaching, such as blackboard. I try to use technology in all the lectures I provide.” Lastly, Essa shared that, “Using blackboard, using discussions in blackboard and using new technology is a positive experience and students interact with it a lot.” It seemed evident that the reentry scholars wanted to apply the positive experiences they had in the U.S. related to using technology, as it would speed up their work and make it easier.

Despite the Kingdom University’s mission to enhance the technological capabilities of the University, many of the participants in this study felt that this shift was not yet in full evidence. Having become comfortable with using the technology more common in the U.S. has made returning to teach at Kingdom University more challenging than any of the participants would have preferred. As the status quo has been maintained and technology usage was minimal.

Subtheme 2.2 (ST2.2): Women experience readjustment differently than men and have fewer opportunities. In relation to this subtheme, women having fewer

opportunities, the five female reentry scholars who participated in the study had quite a bit to say about their experiences as women upon reentry and in their experiences as assistant professors at Kingdom University as a whole. Generally, all five women felt they were not given the same opportunities as men in their departments. Rana found that the head of the department in the women's section was frustrating to deal with and more negative than helpful. She noted, "I avoided talking to her." Rana continued sharing about the women's department by saying, "Honestly there was no cooperation, and there was no one to tell me the procedures that were required and necessary, so I had to call and ask colleagues to explain everything I needed to do." Clearly, Rana felt that she had minimal power upon returning to the University, even in a department with other women.

Additionally, and in the work of one male reentry scholar, Salah, he shared:

I teach female students, and I communicate with them through the network and there are great challenges to do this. I was not able to teach, explain the ideas, or deliver affective learning as it required a more open method of learning in Saudi Arabia. It is not the same as in the U.S., although maybe online.

This was an excellent example of the differences between men and women in Saudi culture and in the University as well. Men could only teach female students through a network and not face-to-face in one location. It was apparent that the divide between men and women was still very strong in Saudi culture, and this affected the way women experience education, whether as students or teachers.

Maha also shared her experience by saying, "Honestly, the men's section has all the power in our department, but the women's section here, and they are tools, just workers. The men are the decision-makers and we should be the one to do the decision-making too." Maha continued by saying, "I saw this and I experienced it before I returned, but when I returned I did not find that anything had changed, even though I

wished it had.” Maha also expressed that she “found it very challenging because the women work hard on projects, and at times get surprised when one of the male faculty members cancels the project, refuses it for some reason.” Maha further explained, “The committee chairs in the heads of the departments are men, not women. Women have never become the head of department here at [the University].” Jamila also noted there was a “basic problem at the University.” She continued to say there was a separation between male and female faculty and “The men have all the power, but women are the strong working element, the ones who work more. We are like factory workers and the men do the planning, have the power, and have the last word on something.” It was apparent that the men did the decision-making at the University and within the organization.

Jamila concluded this portion of the interview by stating, “The budgets and the management are all under the men’s power, and all the distinctive work belongs to the department of the women.” She further contended, “It is really the women who do the best work, and even some men say so. . . . The men’s work has a lot of mistakes.” In an obvious desire to create change, Jamila said, “And honestly the work is differences here. I feel that there is a lack of understanding about some of the work and I hope to be the head of a department [and can oversee the] work of men and women.”

Jamila also had a lot to say about her experience being a woman in Saudi culture overall. In discussing her life in the United States, she said:

I got used to my house and I was very comfortable and adapted. I took my car to Starbucks when I wanted to go and everything was close and easy. Then I came back here and I was faced with the most difficult system. The female reentry experience is much harder than the men's because I cannot drive a car and I need to look for drivers. I got used to driving myself in the U.S. and I always ask myself, why [do] I have to pay a driver 2000 Riyals when he can press the gas and drive just like me. It was very hard for me to adjust here.

Clearly, women have a lesser voice and impact in Saudi culture, and this was further evidenced in what Meriam shared about her experience as a women returning to Saudi Arabia.

My experience as a women returning from the U.S. was more difficult than for men. Transportation for women is very difficult here and things here for women [are more] complex. For example, when I speak with a male school principal, [as] a woman, they ask me [for so] many papers to verify who I am and this is frustrating “

In speaking with the other female participants during the interviews, Meriam's experience was common and not something experienced by men. It was apparent that men and women were not treated equally in Saudi Arabia and this was very difficult for women who had returned from a culture where they experienced so much more freedom. This theme was easily seen in the thoughts and feeling expressed by these five reentry scholars. Their lives have been extremely difficult in returning to a culture and a work environment where they were not treated as equals.

Summary. The themes relating to MT2, the notion that Kingdom University organizational systems are experienced as difficult and bureaucratic for returning Saudi scholars, was clarified in the experiences shared by many of the reentry scholars. Furthermore, there was ample evidence that ST1.1 and ST1.2, technology was challenging and frequently not used appropriately and that women experience readjustment differently than men and had fewer opportunities, were also common

themes found throughout the data shared by the participants. Although some of the issues regarding technology related to issues taking place at the system level, many of the reentry scholars felt that the university culture did not encourage the use of technology, especially as a teaching aid. For the final subtheme, all five female reentry scholars exhibited strong feelings and opinions about their experiences as women upon reentry, and in relationship to their experiences as assistant professors at Kingdom University in general. Ultimately, these women felt they were not given the same opportunities as men in their departments or in the University. These findings, as well as those surrounding the other areas related to the general topic of the participants' perceptions of working at Kingdom University, are demonstrated below in Table 4.

Table 4

Data Alignment Between Research Question 2, Theme 2, and Participants' Responses

Research Question	Subtheme	General Participant Response
Main Theme 2: Kingdom University organizational systems are experienced as difficult and bureaucratic for returning Saudi scholars		
Q2: What challenges and opportunities do the reentry Saudi scholars express in working in Saudi universities?	ST2.1: Technology is challenging and frequently not used appropriately	"I remembered that my paperwork was delayed 6 1/2 months before I was able to start teaching as an assistant professor."
	ST2.2 Women experience readjustment and the university system differently than men, giving them fewer opportunities	"The men's section has all the power in our department, but the women's section here, and they are tools, just workers."

Main Theme 3 (MT3): There is a Desire to Create Change

Despite the negative experiences and apparent limitations for reentry scholars, several of the participants believed that change could take place and that there were opportunities for that to happen at Kingdom University. For example, Ali shared, “I am very optimistic. I tried to develop and bring new things to the department and to the college in general.” He continued, “I want to change things [for] the better, even if it is a simple change. I want to try to change the college in and the department for the best.” Although many of the reentry scholars, like Ali, had a desire to create change and were seemingly sent to study abroad for this purpose, the organizational structure of bureaucracy limited their ability to actually make changes. Ghada echoed this desire when she said, “I have changed because I saw different teaching [methods], different evaluation methods, and I used technology. I want to use many [of these] things here and also want to use foreign references and translated articles”

Fahad hoped and believed that the conditions they had at Kingdom University would eventually begin to change because he noted, “They required us to study abroad,” indicating that he felt the University must be interested in having the system change. He went on to share:

Studying in the U.S. is known as the number one in the world within the academic system for higher education. The goals are to take that excellent experience and move the experience to our society, into the educational system here, because we want to change the system. It has been the same here for decades, but when I speak with my colleagues who returned from abroad, the [idea] is to change the procedures, and try to make it work better.

Clearly, the reentry scholars wanted the change, they felt they were sent to learn about and bring back change to the University. Nevertheless, change was sometimes a slow

process, and this seemed to be especially true within the Saudi university culture. Rana also shared, “The experience there in the U.S. changed me a lot. I benefited a lot from it, and the most important thing [I took] from my experience is that I wanted to change things when I returned home.” Rana continued by saying, “I want to implement [the] things that I have learned. I hope that I will be able to apply what I have learned with all the changes that I still face.” Jamila also shared that, “Returning teachers offer new and transfer students the U.S. experience at Kingdom University, and can teach the desire for development--people are excited to change.”

Similarly, Essa shared, “I’m trying to apply what I learned from the U.S. in terms of developing the technology of teaching, [such] as using Blackboard and I try to use technology in all the lectures that I provide.” While the changes the reentry scholars would like to make were about the use of technology, shifts in the university culture, the roles faculty played, or related to gender issues, all seemed to want to change the system, believe it could happen and felt strongly that this was why they were given the opportunity to study in the U.S. However, it was happening at a slower pace than many seemed to want.

Change could take place in an appropriate setting and in a positive organizational culture. It seemed likely that brain circulation, in the form of brain gain, was taking place, but slowly in the university. Without question, the findings from this study revealed that many reentry scholars believed in change and wanted things to look different at Kingdom University. To further explore this issue, the use of the personal journal and the coding process, especially selective coding, revealed the following subtheme of education abroad

creating greater links to the global community. This subtheme is presented and explored below.

Subtheme 3.1 (ST3.1): Education abroad creates greater links to the global community. Exploring the responses from the participants in the study, there was great support for having studied and for having made connections to the global community. Related to how the reentry scholars experienced their stay abroad and the relationships they developed with professors, all 16 reentry scholars had something to share. One reentry scholar in the Department of Education, Nasser, expressed, “The experience was very rich at both the scientific and cultural levels.” He continued by saying, “I keep in contact with the doctors at the university in the U.S.” Although Nasser did not initially think he would be working with his professors in the future, he now felt, “It is possible in the future.” Saif also noted that his experience in the U.S. “was beautiful” and shared that “there is contact between me and my advisor.” He further explained, “My advisor is thinking [about a] visit to Saudi Arabia soon with other Ph.D. students from a [US University].” Lastly, Saif shared that he planned to work with his advisor doing research and, in his own words, “I am going to publish an article with other faculty members from the U.S. next year.”

Ghada acknowledged that her experience “was very, very excellent. All the staff and faculty were helpful,” and that she communicated “with them sometimes and if I feel sad, I contact them. I also want to do research with them.” To further express how reentry scholars felt about studying in the U.S. and about keeping in contact with those with whom he formed relationships, Majed noted that his experience allowed him to gain “personal skills and study with students from all over the world with different cultures

and different ideas, so we can look at issues from different angles.” He continued by sharing, “After my return here I felt that I needed to communicate with my advisor and one of the faculty members, to consult them in academic things. Maybe we will work together in the future.” Essa shared that his experience “was very unique and my studies in the U.S. gave me many opportunities in research and [to experience] the cultural side of the community. They all help you there with scientific research so you can focus on education.” However, he has not stayed in contact with the associations he made in the U.S.; the only scholar who did not sustain the links he created.

Yousef shared that his experience of attending a U.S. university was “very rich in terms of the things presented and provided to the students. I have benefited a lot.” Yousef continued sharing by stating that, “The contact continues at different periods of time. I send an email to follow up with the department, and emails come from the department [to announce] important events in the department.” Strictly related to contact with those he met abroad, Ahmed explained, “Other students have contact with me on a daily basis, and I communicate with the faculty [members]. I have good relationships and I have future work [plan] with a member of the faculty in a U.S. university.” Salah also shared, “I continue [to] communicate with my doctors and many colleagues. I have future work with them.” Jamila echoed the other reentry scholars by explaining, “I am close a friend of my supervisor’s and other U.S. students. Now, I am working with them on three research projects. I consult with my advisor in the U.S. on everything.”

Finally, Rana shared that her experience in the U.S. was “very beautiful and very positive in terms of involvement as an international student in research. The professors involved me in the research process.” Rana also shared:

The faculty, students, and [the] academic advisor--we all continue to have contact with each other and work [together] as well. We will be publishing research very soon, and I work with the academic supervisor to conduct the research as well.

Bander also felt this way and shared, “I [stay in] contact with my colleagues, faculty members, and supervisors and we communicate a lot. I made sure to keep in contact with my advisor and the relationship between us must remain strong.” It was apparent that the reentry scholars wished to continue staying linked to the global community through the relationships they developed outside Saudi Arabia. Bander continued by saying,

I made sure that we work together in the field of the research, and that we publish a research together, my advisor and I. We work together, and I have sent students from here to do workshops in the lab over there [during] the summer. After that, my advisor [in the U.S. sent seven American students here to give them overview on the Saudi university and geology in Saudi Arabia. I explained everything to them and actually got them from the airport, I prepared hotels for them, and I [did] everything for them. I explained [about] the Geology in Saudi Arabia. I have continued the relationship with them and it was great experience.”

Clearly, there were significant links to the global community being created, as seen through the interactions between members of U.S. and Saudi universities. Nevertheless, Bander’s example of students coming from the U.S. to visit Saudi Arabia was less common than Saudi students going to study in the U.S. and maintaining the connections they made while abroad. Although global linkages were coming out of Saudi universities, they were not yet as strong as the information and linkages coming into Saudi Arabia. This has been slowly changing. Through exploring the findings in this study, appropriate coding the interviews, and through the use of the personal journal, Saudi Arabia could achieve a more skilled society and become a world-class driver in the global knowledge economy.

Clearly, the scholarship received by the reentry scholars interviewed for this study supported the opportunity for increased global linkages through education in Saudi Arabia. While not all the interviewed scholars maintained their international relationships, the university should encourage those relationships because of the possibilities for increased collaboration and growth for Kingdom University.

As demonstrated from the findings of this study, and in an exploration of MT 3 shown below in Table 5, there was a desire to create change and, from exploration of Subtheme 3.1 (Education abroad creates greater links to the global community) which suggested the reentry scholars in this study had created relationships that could facilitate change, significantly contributing to the findings in this study. Clearly, the promotion of a better higher education system to develop the intellectual capacity of its citizens would be desirable.

Table 5

Data Alignment Between Research Question 2, Theme 3, and Participants' Responses

Research Question	Subtheme	General Participant Response
Main Theme 3: There is a desire to create change.		
Q2: What challenges and opportunities do the reentry Saudi scholars express in working in Saudi universities?	ST3.1: Education abroad creates greater links to the global community	"I am going to publish an article with other faculty members from the U.S. next year."

Summary. Given the interviews with the Saudi reentry scholars used in this study, the findings related to all three main themes and their associated subthemes were telling. Supported in the interviews with the reentry scholars and from the literature, the

three main findings were that Saudi reentry scholars experienced reverse culture shock as difficult upon returning, that the Saudi organizational system was experienced as difficult for returning Saudi scholars, and that there was a desire to create change. As understood from exploring the perceptions of the participants, the needs and concerns of reentry scholars were valid and must be explored in an effort to ensure that students, teachers, and Saudi cultural in general have the opportunity to benefit from dynamic study abroad programs.

Interviews with Administrators

How the university administrations perceive the reentry of Saudi scholars? This section of Chapter IV provides information on the 14 Kingdom University administrators interviewed for the study. Main Theme 1 was related to administrators having a general understanding of the reentry experience. The first subtheme addressed administrators' understanding that the environment had changed for reentry scholars, and the second subtheme addressed the interaction that administrators had with returning scholars as employees. Main Theme 2 discussed administrators' expectations for reentry scholars. The first associated subtheme related to the need for reentry scholars to apply what they had learned abroad at the University. The second subtheme addressed the need for reentry scholars to contribute to administrative duties and teaching. For the last theme for administrators, Main Theme 3, the administrators' mixed perceptions of reentry scholars' contributions was discussed and was followed by two subthemes. The first subtheme related to administrators anticipating the return of reentry scholars with excitement. The final subtheme discussed the perception of reentry scholars as unproductive and

uncooperative. All of the main themes and subthemes associated with the administrators' perceptions are presented below.

Main Theme 1 (MT1): Administrators Have a General Understanding of the Reentry Experience.

In discussing how administrators had a general understanding of the reentry experience, several of the administrators interviewed felt that they could understand what the Saudi reentry scholars were experiencing, given their own experiences. While not all of the administrators studied abroad, many of them had the opportunity to do so and, therefore, were able to relate their own reentry experiences to that which the reentry scholars in this study experienced. Atif shared that he studied “in the U.S. before and I have gone through the experience.” He continued by saying, “The first [time] I went to America, I tried to adapt to the environment, and when I returned I felt culture shock. The process [was] difficult and I feel their experience.” Arwa shared, “I understand the experience very much because I came back from abroad as well, and I suffered from reverse cultural shock.” Dalal also related, “I understand their experience.” For Afaf, she had this story to tell:

[My] father was studying abroad and I was ten, [so] I went abroad. Later I went abroad to study and [when] I returned I was 36 years old. I lived the culture shock [twice]. As a child and I was shocked to return to a country in the 70s [where] there was no technical techniques and there was nothing; this was the real cultural shock. But, when we returned now the technology is there and there is sophisticated scientific research. I do not feel as [strong] a cultural shock at this time as in the old time.

Although Afaf did experience culture shock twice, it seemed likely that her experience as a child prepared her for her later experience with culture shock as an adult. Nevertheless, both times she returned to Saudi Arabia, she experienced this phenomenon and could,

therefore, relate to the reentry scholars' experiences. To further explore the administrators' experiences with culture shock, Mohanad had this to share:

I understand their experience and cultural shock. I work with [them] to adapt and adjust to the environment here before we start to give any work. We give him the freedom and the time to adapt himself for one semester and after one semester, we start giving him classes and work.

Yaser also participated in the conversation by adding, "I understand especially that they feel very bad because they go out and study 7 years abroad, and [when] they return they start from scratch, from zero." Mansour echoed the sentiments of the other administrators in this regard by asserting, "I understand, and I have lived the experience. I support and encourage them when they come back. I communicate and meet [with them]." Nayef also explained his understanding of the reentry scholars' experience with returning by sharing:

We understand their experience and we know that when they return, they deal with the people here the same as they are used to in the country of their study. They might be shocked at the students' levels. Actually, we now explain to reentry faculty some of the problems they may face before starting teaching to avoid problems with the students.

Nayef understood the reentry experience and tried to give returnees the tools they needed to acclimate to Kingdom University work. For example, he shared that they needed advice related to teaching so that it would match the university's teaching style. Saad, one of the administrators and scholars interviewed, also discussed his familiarity with reentry by stating:

I understand because the first time I returned, my colleague contacted me and said if you need help or anything, let me know. When I returned before I did not know anything. I did not know how the system worked. So, I totally understand the experience of Saudi scholars because I had the same experience.

Finally, Abeer also shared, "I certainly understand their experience. Yes, I understand their experience [because] I have gone through this experience." Without question, the administrators and administrator/scholars that participated in the study had a general

understanding of the reentry experience and were, therefore, able to relate to the feelings of returning Saudi reentry scholars. Yet, and while many of the administrators, such as the department heads, vice deans, and deans, obtained degrees outside of Saudi Arabia, there were a few who had not obtained degrees abroad.

For example, Yaser shared that he understood how the reentry scholars felt, yet, he said two very different things in his sharing. At first, he shared, “I understand that they (reentry scholars) feel very bad because they go out and study seven years abroad, and when they return, they start from scratch.” At the same time, Yaser said that reentry scholars “expect that they get their [preference in] everything and they should be [treated better] than others who graduated from here (Kingdom University). I see that the non-reentry faculty [are] treated unfairly and there is no justice [in this].” Yaser went on to say that,

Some of the reentry faculty consider themselves scientists, [that] they know everything, and that they think they are higher than those who studied at home here in Saudi Arabia. [They think] they have better knowledge. But, some of those who returned said that the programs in Saudi Arabia are far better than the ones in the U.S.

Clearly, Yaser, as well as a couple other administrators, had much different opinions of the reentry scholars, despite saying they understood their experiences related to returning home. Seemingly, the administrators with mixed opinions of the reentry scholars and their experiences were those who did not study outside of Saudi Arabia. These findings suggested that there was a lack of compassion for the reentry scholars’ experiences and feelings and that, perhaps there was some competition occurring, common within the Kingdom University’s bureaucratic culture.

Subtheme 1.1 (ST1.1): Administrators understand that the environment has changed for reentry scholars. In reviewing Subtheme 1.2, there was general agreement that administrators understood that the environment in Saudi Arabia had changed for reentry scholars. Most of the administrators understood that the reentry scholars returning to teach inside the university had a shifted perspective on what it meant to be in, and to teach in, the Saudi culture. The perception of the reentry scholars was not simply based on the culture shock they experienced in returning from a Western culture to teach at the university, but rather the environment itself had changed. For example, most reentry scholars left their home country for periods of time extending up to and beyond 10 years. In returning to Saudi Arabia after their studies, quite a bit had typically changed, especially given the rapid technological changes taking place globally (Altbach & Engberg, 2014b).

Administrator understanding of this experience was exemplified through Mohanad's assertion related to the social culture of Saudi Arabia, when he shared, "When faculty returns, there is a difference in the environment at home and in the environment abroad." He further shared, "The social situation, family, school, and the environment is changing. It was not the same as [when] we left and I understand the experience totally." Another administrator, Muqrin, also related, "We understand how the environment changed for them and we know it's hard for them. We try to advise them and guide them." As gathered from interviewing the administrators, as well as the reentry scholars, Saudi culture as a whole had changed, yet the culture within the University itself had not shifted so much. While some administrators wanted to support the Saudi reentry scholars, they were limited in what they could do because the university culture

had changed so little and the administrators seemed to have limited influence on helping the reentry scholars adjust to Saudi culture as a whole.

Yaser confirmed this sentiment by simply sharing, “I remember the past, and I compare the situation between the past and now, [between] cultures in the U.S. and here.” In interviewing Yaser, it was clear that he understood very well that, not only were Western and Eastern cultures different, but so too was the environment that the reentry scholar returned to after having been gone for a number of years. Mansour also contended, “After studying abroad and returning carrying knowledge, they will be feel strange in the original environment,” inferring that the culture outside the university was met with difficulty for the Saudi scholars. Nayef echoed this thought by saying:

As the head of the department, the interaction with them [reentry scholars] is important. I communicate with them because the returnees’ [original] environment has changed. They need some guidance. The university asks them to give a lot and they must be aware of these things. They need to know the system, and reentry faculty members need support and advice in many [areas].

Ultimately, the majority of the administrators understood that reentry scholars came to work in the university in an environment that looked different from when they left. While not all administrators shared that they understood, the majority did, whether or not they had experienced studying abroad. Nevertheless, Yaser clearly did not understand how the reentry scholars felt, despite saying that he did understand.

Subtheme 1.2 (ST1.2): The interaction administrators have with returning scholars as employees. In relation to Subtheme 1.2, the interaction regarding how reentry scholars experienced administrators appeared to be viewed as more one-sided and formal, with interactions primarily occurring at the university. This too was supported by a number of the administrators who shared that most of their interactions with the reentry

scholars were limited and that it was up to the scholar to reach out to them. This was evidenced by Saad, a reentry scholar and administrator, who shared, “We meet with them [reentry scholars] in the Deanship of Skills Development and most of this program is [about] returning from abroad. The program is [for] new faculty members.” Arwa further explained, “I interact with them, but the interaction depends on age.” In interviewing Arwa, it was apparent that she felt she interacted more fully with those her same age as she was in her 20s. She shared that she believed the older female faculty members discounted her because of her youth. However, this was not necessarily true as seen from Afaf, an older and prominent faculty member who shared,

The nature of my work does not prepare [me for] interaction with the reentry faculty because my work in the college is all about administrators, not with the students and with the head of the departments. In fact, I just interact with the head of the department of the women’s section only.

It was clear that Afaf was simply very busy, rather than discriminating based on age. Nonetheless, what she shared did suggest that the system limited what was being offered to the reentry scholars. Afaf’s communication suggested that interaction with the reentry scholars was limited not just by position but also by gender, further complicating the issue of frequent and supportive interaction between administrators and reentry scholars, as the relationship between women and men was constrained due to cultural norms.

Further related to the interaction administrators had with returning scholars as employees, Mansour noted, “I interact with some of them in their field of specialization. We hear about their experiences and what they have gone through. We exchange information in the discussions.” Yaser shared about more consistent interaction, yet still within the realm of formal relationships. He shared, “I interact with them and communicate with them daily, either in the courses that they teach or in the committees

that they work in.” This was also true with Muqrin who explained, “I communicate with them even before they return to the department. The communication is through modern social communication [systems]. We provide them with any support needs, whether administrative or informational.”

Three of the administrators, Bander, Dalal, and Abeer, and Saad, a reentry scholar and administrator, shared interactions of a more personal nature. For example, Saad contended:

I interact with those who graduated from America because [if] you lived there more than seven years, you are certainly attracted to the person who graduated from there. He understands me and understands my experience. He knows the environment and he knows my perspectives and ideas, and maybe we will be [friends].

Dalal related to this assertion by stating, “I interact and communicate with them because I am one of them.” Finally, Abeer shared, “We interact and communicate. We share some ideas about research and translate English books to Arabic. We have a strong relationship.” As only three of the administrators related interacting with the reentry scholars in a less formal and professional manner, the general finding from this part of the study revealed that interaction with reentry scholars was limited. Although administrators claimed to understand the reentry problems of their professors, they were limited in their response to reentry needs and expected the scholars to reach out to administration for their needs.

Summary. In exploring MT1 and the associated subthemes using my personal journal and the coding process, it was apparent that administrators felt they had a general understanding of the reentry experience. Administrators also contended that they were aware reentry scholars returned to a changed culture in Saudi Arabia upon returning to

work at the university. However, this did not necessarily indicate an enhanced interaction between administrators and reentry scholars for the benefit of making the work and cultural transition easier for scholars. Several of the administrators made themselves available for the reentry scholars, yet the general lack of interaction between administrators and returnees was surprising in that most of the administrators appeared to understand how difficult it could be to return from a very different culture to another culture that had also undergone changes.

Main Theme 2 (MT2): Administrators' Expectations for Reentry Scholars

Concerning MT2 (administrators' expectations for reentry scholar), all 14 administrators noted that they wanted reentry scholars to bring back insights, new ideas, and the potential for change. In this sense, reentry scholars were welcomed back because the administrators were interested in learning what they had learned while being abroad. It has only been somewhat recently that Saudi Arabia has truly begun to modernize. In this respect, many administrators at Kingdom University were eager to adopt many of the strategies and approaches used in western universities. Mohanad's first point was that:

Reentry faculty must continue to study and do research after graduation. He needs to start his specialization and research and publish for promotions. In a social sense, he should communicate with others, make an effort to work in the department, and propose new ideas.

Aljoharah felt similarly to Mohanad by sharing, "I always make them join all the committees in the department, so the departments can have faculty members who studied abroad. And of course, if any opportunity in leadership is available, I make sure they take those leadership positions." Aljoharah continued explaining that recently she "met one reentry scholar in particular who she felt had new ideas to contribute." She immediately

announced that this reentry scholar would “be head of the committee because she had so many things to offer.”

Dalal also insisted that reentry scholars go to conferences to hear what was new, in terms of science and knowledge in the department, something experienced by both men and women and frequently paid for by the University. She also shared in her interview that she “makes them [reentry scholars] participate in workshops on their new teaching methods and new things related to the university.” In relation to Dalal, Mohanad felt that, “The department needs new energies and many committees. New faculty need to contribute in this area. When they return, they really add new energy to the department, create movement, and help relieve many of the problems [that existed].” He went on to share, “The department really looks for the reentry faculty to bring new knowledge and to add to the diversity of culture. I expect a lot from them and we get them to work in teaching and on the administrative [side as] chairmen of committees.” Unfortunately, this forward-thinking attitude was not helpful for the reentry scholar who was rejected when wanting to work on numerous committees. In this case, the administrator may have felt that the reentry scholar was not yet ready to embrace so much responsibility, was feeling threatened by the reentry scholar, or perhaps was stopped by the nature of the slow bureaucratic system.

Nevertheless, Muqrin also expected reentry scholars to add to his department based on what they had learned in their time abroad. He expected them to participate both administratively and academically. To further support the idea of expectations, Bander noted that he “expected them [reentry scholars] to use modern teaching methods and use new technology in the classroom.” There existed a clear need for Saudi universities to

both grow as the culture changed in Saudi Arabia and, at the same time, that the member of the university contributed to the changes taking place in Saudi Arabia, culturally and academically. In this manner, the administrators had strong expectations about what reentry scholars should bring back to the classroom, to the University, and to Saudi culture as a whole.

Subtheme 2.1 (ST2.1): The need for reentry scholars to apply what they have learned abroad. In relation to Subtheme 2.1, administrators wanted to see reentry scholars take part in all matters administrative. Administrators also expected reentry scholars to teach well, stay current with what they had learned, publish, and help develop the university. According to Afaf, reentry scholars should do two things:

They should apply what they have learned when they were abroad, in terms of teaching methods to their students. They should do this practice effectively. They should also bring back with them new knowledge and new information. They should conduct new research on new things in their majors and bring that information back with them here to further develop.

Afaf was not alone in her interpretation as noted by Mansour.'s point of view,

We expect them {reentry scholars} to give a lot in the academic fields, administration, service, and in community participation [such as in] terms of holding exhibitions to transfer our voice. I expect them [reentry scholars] to be great in [doing] research and in publishing.

Arwa also responded to this query by saying, "I hope that reentry faculty have changed and can apply what they have learned, not only come with [just] a certificate. The university sent everyone [to study abroad] so we can change for the best." Finally, Abeer shared more that she expected reentry scholars "to apply what they have learned in the U.S. and that they should have a positive impact on the students." She believed, "They

should make the students love reading and they should try to teach the students in the same way they were taught in an American university. We are trying to change the attitudes of student here.” Abeer believed that some reentry scholars only went to the university abroad only to get a certificate in order to get a job. In her own words, she felt that some, “students are not serious about their studies.” Yet, she expected that “faculty who returned from abroad should have a good impact on students here.”

Muqrin shared along similar lines in noting, “I expect them [the reentry scholars] to add new [information] from what they have learned abroad. Muqrin continued by stating, “Education technology is developing and everyday there is something new about the technology. I expect them to support the department and [make] a good contribution.” Without question, both men and women administrators feel very strongly about reentry scholars applying what they learning abroad.

Subtheme 2.2 (ST2.2): The need for reentry scholars to contribute to administrative duties and teaching. Regarding Subtheme 2.2, and although briefly mentioned previously, this could be explored more deeply given the administrators’ concern that reentry scholars were too focused on research and not enough on teaching and administrative responsibilities. These findings once again pointed to the organizational limitations experienced at Kingdom University and the challenges that come with navigating cultural differences. In returning to the need for reentry scholars to contribute to administrative duties and teaching, Atif shared,

Working at the university is based on three basic tasks. The first is based on research. We expect returnees to do their own research and to contribute to the entire department. They should cooperate with the members of the department in each research project. The second task is the teaching process. Reentry scholars

must be able to fully teach. Third, reentry scholars should offer services to the university. They should be able to work on committees and work in the department at the departmental level. We expect these three basic things from all reentry scholars.

With less detail, but the same sentiment, Muqrin added, “I expect them to support the department, and make a good contribution to the administrative and academic sides.”

Muqrin continued by sharing, “The reentry scholar has a role in reforming society, its progress, and development. The country has served them while they were there and now it is time that they must serve the country.” Mohanad also shared:

We train reentry scholars in courses on teaching methods. We train them to join the committees and help with the work, and we try to help them adapt here. Usually in the beginning, we start training them in doing administrative and academic tasks.

Finally, Muqrin further explained:

As head of the department, from the beginning of their arrival abroad to the department I try to enter and put them in administrative work and in committees. They need to know how the work is going to be in the department. I give them Academic work and they give them some classes to teach so they can develop their teaching skills. We need more experience in work because they have spent enough time studying abroad. They did not get enough work experience abroad so that is why I give them work in teaching and in administrative matters.

Clearly, all of the administrators’ had solid expectations for reentry scholars and expected them to take a role in administration, such as becoming committee members and the heads of departments, along with teaching. Although this was not typical in U.S. universities, this was a common expectation in Saudi universities. Most of the participating administrators believed scholars needed to contribute to administrative duties and teaching. However, there were mixed opinions from administrators regarding what work Saudi scholars actually did when they returned to Kingdom University.

Summary. Without question and regarding Concerning MT2, administrators' expectations for reentry scholar, all 14 administrators shared that they wanted reentry scholars to bring back new thoughts, ideas, and the potential for change. As such, the administrators at Kingdom University, who wished to adopt many of the strategies and approaches used in western universities, anticipated the return of the reentry scholars with enthusiasm. Relative to Subtheme 2.1, administrators wanted to see reentry scholars play an active role in administration, and administrators also expected the reentry scholars to teach effectively, stay informed in their fields, publish, and contribute to the development of the university. Lastly, Subtheme 2.2 gave voice to the administrators' concerns that reentry scholars were too focused on research and not on teaching and administrative responsibilities to the extent that was wanted. All of the findings related to MT2 suggested that the relationship between the administrators and reentry scholars, while anticipated with excitement, was also disappointing to the administrators to some degree.

Main Theme 3 (MT3): Administrators Have Mixed Perceptions of Reentry Scholars' Contributions

The mixed perceptions of reentry scholars' contributions, as expected by the administrators, were significant. For example, some administrators discussed how they were happy that reentry scholars had so much to contribute. However, other administrators felt quite differently. Without question, there was diversity in the opinion about what reentry scholars were contributing to the university. Below, two subthemes addressed the positive and negative perceptions that administrators related to what reentry scholars to the university.

Subtheme 3 (ST3.1): Administrators anticipate the return of reentry scholars with excitement. A number of the administrators shared that they were very happy to have the reentry scholars returning and that they believed the scholars were now experts in their majors. Therefore, they had something to contribute. The administrators were interested to learn about what scholars could bring to teaching at the Kingdom University, especially in having attended different universities abroad.

According to Saad, the scholars “had a positive experience as a department head with a Saudi faculty member who just returned.” Saad shared that the returnee “was very excited about the work, took initiative, and was willing to work. He got his work done in a professional way, so this was a positive experience.” I think some of the administrators felt excited and happy to work after they returned, and some who returned received good positions in the university. I believed this was especially evident in the administrators who themselves had studied abroad and who were interested in creating change within the University. Dalal added to the conversation by noting that some members who just returned were very enthusiastic and excited. In her own words, she shared, “They love the university here, and want to work and interact in a positive way.” Another contributor to the discussion had positive experiences with excited reentry scholars, Arwa, shared that some of the returnees were “active and I feel they are enthusiastic and excited.”

Mohanad shared by noting:

I think that the faculty [members] who graduated from America are very enthusiastic and excited about the work. They can achieve things quickly. I noted if they graduated from a university that is known to be prestigious, they will be active in scientific research and in scientific achievement, and this is a positive experience

It was clear that a number of administrators felt very positive about the reentry scholars' contributions and potential contributions they could make at Kingdom University and perhaps to Saudi culture overall. Most administrators were excited to have the reentry scholars return and share what they had learned in their field while out in the global community. Nevertheless, there were also administrators who felt negatively about what the reentry scholars could contribute as discussed more fully below.

Subtheme 3.2 (ST3.2): Administrators' perceptions of reentry scholars as unproductive and uncooperative. Certain thinking within the administrator population at the university level agreed with the perception of reentry scholars as unproductive and uncooperative. Some administrators, mainly those who had not studied abroad, shared they felt as though reentry scholars were not productive, tended to show off, did not take the help that was offered to them, and did not keep in touch while they were abroad. Furthermore, several administrators had shared that they perceived certain reentry scholars to be dishonest, impatient, and unwilling to serve on committees.

In line with these findings, Arwa shared that:

Some of the incoming scholars are not active. They do not work and do not publish. I asked some of them, "Why are you like that?" but they usually have special circumstances, such as a woman who is responsible for her home and her children. The responsibilities are different for men and women.

Arwa's responses pointed again to the challenging circumstances that women faced upon return in particular. They are starting to be supported, slowly, in the academic world as faculty members, yet the culture still dictates that they perform the more traditional role of the woman at home with the children. This could serve to explain some of the negative perceptions surrounding how some of the women did not seem to give back as much.

Nevertheless, and in thinking similar to some of the male administrators, Arwa noted:

In another experience, one reentry scholar was excited to work with me on research and in publishing a book. But when it came to time to work on all of that, I felt that she wanted to throw all the work on me, and I was surprised.

Bander also shared his experience with some reentry scholars in that, “Some of them are negative and they want everything here to become like the U.S. Some of them show off with faculty members who did not study [abroad]. They may isolate themselves and not interact with other people.” In discussing her own negative experiences with reentry scholars, Abeer shared, “I noticed one of the reentry faculty came late for her classes and she dealt with the students in an inappropriate manner. She accuses the students that they are not honest.” In this case, the issue of honesty related to the non-existence of a system that protected the rights of authors and plagiarism, as in the U.S. It seemed clear that this reentry scholar was operating under what she learned about plagiarism in the U.S., yet the Saudi student would not know about this. It was apparent that differences in the systems between Saudi Arabia and the U.S. have caused difficulties.

Atif also shared his negative experiences with some of the reentry scholars. He believed that, not only did some of them show off, but they “may not be interested in academic work at the university. Some of them do not want to work at the university and they try to work outside the university in companies.” Atif further explained that, “The reality is that the university is paying for their tuition and gave them a scholarship, but when they return they do not want to serve the college and the university.” This was another example of how the influence of an outside culture, the U.S. culture, changed how the reentry scholars behaved upon return, without full understanding of this on the part of the administrators.

Dalal also expressed his dissatisfaction in this way, “Some members of the reentry faculty are very selfish, frustrating, and have a negative outlook. They do not work and they laugh at those who work a lot.” Also, Muqrin explained with this story:

I noticed a number of reentry faculty members from the U.S. sitting in a garden in the housing area. They did not clean up their garbage. I wondered, “Why this negative behavior.” I also noticed reentry faculty who graduated from the U.S. driving his car in the street at the university without care.

Muqrin also noted that some of the reentry faculty members were very negative and they always said to him, “Why are you like this? Why do you do this? And Reentry scholars had a role to play in reforming society, it’s progress and development.” He went on to discuss that reentry scholars did not open their email and that it was very difficult to get them to be engaged and proactive if they were not reading their emails, asking questions, or expressing what they needed. While frequently administrators were excited about the reentry scholars’ potential contribution, many seemed to become disillusioned over time. Without question, the administrators’ mixed perceptions of reentry scholars’ contributions was clear and there was perhaps even more evidence for negative reactions to Saudi reentry scholars than positive reaction.

Summary. Given the interviews with the administrators used in this study, the findings related to all three main themes and their associated subthemes were interesting and varied. Supported in the interviews with the reentry scholars and through the audit trail used in my personal journal, the administrators had a general understanding of the reentry experience. In the first subtheme, which addressed that administrators understood the environment had changed for reentry scholars, the majority of the administrators agreed on this point. The second subtheme addressed the interaction that administrators had with returning scholars as employees, which were more formal than not.

Nevertheless, three administrators felt they did connect with reentry scholars more strongly than the others. It seemed this related to those administrators also having had study abroad experiences.

In discussing the MT2 (the administrators' expectations for reentry scholars), all the participants agreed that reentry scholars should apply what they had learned abroad at the university. Likewise, as seen in Subtheme 2.1, there was a need for reentry scholars to contribute to administrative duties and teaching. For the last theme for administrators, MT 3, the administrators' mixed perceptions of reentry scholars' contributions was obvious. Although a majority of the administrators anticipated the return of reentry scholars with excitement, this excitement appeared to either lessen over time or it was met with an equal, if not more, perceptions of reentry scholars as unproductive and uncooperative.

Comparing the Findings

The Reentry Experience

In comparing the findings through careful examination of my personal journal notes on everything that took place in the study, as well as by creating an effective audit trail in coding and analyzing the data, I was able to reflect on what I learned. I triangulated the data through comparing and contrasting different participant's interviews and built common themes to understand the unique experiences of reentry of Saudi scholars, administrators, and reentry scholar/administrators in Saudi universities. Through selective coding, it was apparent that both reentry scholars, administrators, and the three reentry scholar/administrators understood the reentry experience as a difficult process for reentry scholars. All of the Saudi reentry scholars experienced great difficulty

upon reentry in the Saudi culture and in returning to the university setting. Reentry shock, or reverse culture shock, was prevalent in scholars and all reported feeling altered perceptually upon reentry.

Many of the administrators interviewed in the study had a general understanding of the reentry experience for scholars because many of them were also reentry scholars at one point. These findings were particularly true for the administrator/scholars that took part in this study. The administrators also related to the reentry scholar experience of returning to a changed environment. While not all of the administrators had the same experiences, they were aware that the culture in Saudi Arabia had been changing significantly and that returning to a changed environment was challenging. Nonetheless, several administrators, those who did not experience studying abroad, seemed not to fully understand the reentry scholar's experience, whether they were aware of this or not. Furthermore, and as noted throughout the exploration of the findings, women had an even more difficult experience surrounding reentry and coming to work at Kingdom University. They had to contend with more cultural and organizational restrictions than the men, making the overall experience more difficult.

Expectations, Challenges, the Need for Support, and Conflict

Through analysis of the data, there were a number of differences between the perspectives of the reentry scholars and the administrators. The reentry scholars experienced a general lack of support from administration and considerable problems concerning bureaucratic processes and not receiving the appropriate essentials, such as office space and computers. Furthermore, most of the reentry scholars became frustrated by the seeming lack of opportunities to do the type of work, generally in research and

publishing, which they had wanted done upon return. Along similar lines, most reentry scholars found that the method of teaching at the Kingdom University was very much the same as before they went abroad to study, namely slow, traditional, and lacking in technology. These findings were also consistent with the data from the reentry scholar/administrators. Lastly, women reentry scholars were disappointed in still having to contend with being in a culture and work environment in which they were not treated as equals. As seen frequently throughout the exploration of the findings in this study, female reentry scholars experienced reentry in a much more challenging manner than men given the cultural climate in Saudi society as a whole. Furthermore, women experienced more hardship than men in relationship to the University given the organizational setting.

Alternatively, the administrators had a set of strong expectations about what reentry scholars should bring back to the university and to Saudi culture as a whole, as well as the roles they should perform at the university. Administrators felt that reentry scholars should apply what they had learned abroad and endeavor to shift the attitudes of the students to be more globally oriented. Most of the participating administrators thought reentry scholars should contribute to administrative duties and teaching, despite the experiences of the one reentry scholar who felt he/she was unable to participate in the way he/she would have liked to participate. Clearly, administrators had mixed perceptions of what reentry students brought back with them versus what roles they should play at the university in fulfilling expectations. Although administrators, and reentry scholar/administrators as well, were very pleased that reentry scholars had so much to contribute, other administrators had negative perceptions related to what reentry

scholars actually brought back to the university. Many administrators felt as though the reentry scholars did not welcome the guidance and instruction offered them upon return and were instead unmotivated and arrogant.

It should be noted that the opinions of both reentry scholars and administrators were very dissimilar in this regard. While some administrators felt the returnees were not doing the jobs they had been assigned, many of the scholars felt they were not given enough support (physical, emotional, and psychological), direction, and the opportunity to do work they were interested in doing. Another indication of disconnect was that of lack of interaction between administrators and reentry scholars. Several administrators admitted to limited interaction with the returnees yet wanted them to perform in a particular manner. However, the reentry students felt they were not given the support they needed, despite the administrators' admission that they understood the difficulty of the reentry process. Most reentry scholars felt this lack of support impeded their ability to perform well. The mix of both similar and dissimilar perspectives was also apparent in what the reentry scholar/administrators had to share.

As seen in the findings and through careful analysis of the interview material, reentry scholars experienced notable conflict in relationships with coworkers and administrators. Several returnees were concerned about colleagues stealing their work and a number of administrators felt that the reentry scholars were not very serious about doing research, publishing, teaching, participating in administrative duties, and taking part in committees. While administrators were frequently excited about the reentry scholars' potential contribution to the Kingdom University and to academia, many seemed to also perceive the reentry scholars' contributions as generally lacking.

Opportunities

Despite the many areas of dissatisfaction for both reentry scholars, administrators, and reentry scholar/administrators, there were positive components to reentry scholars at Kingdom University. For example, significant brain circulation, in the form of brain gain, was taking place given the influx of new information and methods brought back by the reentry scholars and brain gain was also experienced by the interchange and collaboration that took place between U.S. and Saudi faculty. The scholarships received by all of the reentry scholars interviewed for this study supported the opportunity for increased global linkages through education abroad by helping reentry scholars develop both personally and academically. Regardless of any feelings to the contrary, several administrators felt positively about the reentry scholars' contributions and potential contributions they could make in Saudi universities and in Saudi society. Many administrators appeared to be excited to have reentry scholars share what they have learned abroad. Nevertheless, these findings were not entirely consistent with all the perceptions of administrators and were not clearly demonstrated in the support, or lack of support, given the reentry scholars.

Conclusion

As a whole, Chapter IV presented data gathered from the three groups of participants, Saudi reentry scholars, administrators, and reentry scholar/administrators at Kingdom University. The interviews were used to explore the research questions for this study. The chapter presented the findings that emerged from data collected and through the use of an audit trail using my personal journal and various coding techniques. The use of the research journal, complete with notes on interviewing to coding and analyzing the data, gave me the ability to honestly reflect on what I learned in interviewing the

participants for this study. Open coding and axial coding was used to disaggregate and rearrange the material by initial theme and selective coding was used to refine each theme. I triangulated the data through comparing and contrasting the participants' interview material and built common themes to understand the unique experiences of both reentry scholars and administrators in Saudi universities. Ultimately, the findings suggested that there were considerable differences in the perceptions held by reentry scholars and administrators. While not all negative, there were significant discrepancies between the feelings of reentry scholars and administrators that warranted further discussion. In the following Chapter V, the concluding chapter, further discussion on the findings and recommendations are presented.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore the reentry experience of Saudi Arabian scholars returning home from U.S. doctoral education to work as faculty members in Kingdom University and how university administrators perceived the reentry of Saudi scholars. This chapter offers a deeper understanding of reentry scholars' experiences and offers recommendations to help reentry scholars to experience a more positive reentry and have a better work environment experience in Kingdom University. In the chapter, I discuss the findings as related to the themes and those links to theoretical framework and make connections to the literature review and then offer recommendations for Saudi reentry scholars and administrators for Kingdom University and U.S. university administration. As discussed throughout this study, the reentry scholar experience into the Kingdom University workforce has been challenging on many levels. The most pressing concern that instigated the need for this study was the experiences reentry scholars have had when returning to Saudi Arabia to work in Kingdom University and the long-term consequences of this experience.

Links to Theoretical Framework

I analyzed the themes that emerged in this study using three main theories that helped understand the findings and organize them in such a way as to be explained easily. These theories were the W-Curve theory (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963), organizational culture theory (Tierney, 2008b), and the brain circulation theory (Perna et al., 2014;

Saxenian, 2002). Each theory had at least one component where the individual had their own choices, feelings, and emotions they had to face. Using these theories allowed for understanding individual thoughts and actions, as dependent on their interpretation of what was occurring. This study was critically important to explore work experience, the phenomenon of reentry, and the perceptions of reentry scholars and administrators to understand the challenges and opportunities this phenomenon presented so that all involved had an opportunity to get their individual needs met as well as successfully contributing to the wider university culture and explore how administrators perceived the Saudi reentry scholars. The following chapter presents a discussion on the major themes and how they could be interpreted using the W-Curve (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963), organizational culture theory (Tierney, 2008b), and brain circulation theory (Perna et al., 2014; Saxenian, 2002). Recommendations for Saudi reentry scholars, Saudi administrators at Kingdom University, and U.S. higher education administration are given based on the experiences of the reentry scholars. The chapter concludes with recommendations for future research and conclusions.

The W-Curve Theory

The primary theory analyzed in this portion of Chapter V is that of the W-Curve model, which was developed by Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963). This theory allowed for the discovery of themes and explored and interpreted the thoughts, feeling, and perceptions of the reentry scholar participants. This model uses five stages of the re-adaptation process: (a) the honeymoon, (b) the culture shock, (c) the initial adjustment, (d) the stage of mental isolation, and finally (e) the stages of acceptance and integration. The five stages have often been present for reentry scholars given that most were moving

between very different cultures. Additionally, some scholars spent 10 or more years studying abroad, further compounding their experiences of the 5 stages. While many Saudi universities focused on what students felt while they were abroad, few focused on how students felt when they returned. Some components of the W-Curve phases were experienced by the majority of the reentry scholars and the reentry scholar/administrators interviewed. The phases are further explored below.

The honeymoon phase. In the honeymoon phase, an individual would experience excitement and anticipation regarding a return, or new encounter entirely, in which they would expect to be enjoyable and heartwarming (Oberg, 1960). This sentiment was very apparent in all the reentry scholars. Many of the reentry scholars expressed feeling very happy to be returning to their home country. Also, all reentry scholars said they felt excited because they were done with their doctorate degree and were ready to return, therefore, all they went through this stage when they are finished school. They all felt optimistic and willing to apply what they had learned. A common theme across all the participants was that of excitement in obtaining a degree and returning to their lives, as they remembered them. However, their excitement was short lived. Therefore, all Saudi reentry scholars went through this stage in a short time after they graduated.

The culture shock phase.

Main Theme 1 (MT1): Reverse culture shock is experienced by returning Saudi reentry scholars as difficult. Malewski (2005) suggested that “reverse culture shock is particularly insidious because it comes at a time when the returnees believe that life is finally going to go back to normal, and they discover that there is actually no going back” (p. 187). In the culture shock phase, individuals would begin to be aware of the vast

cultural differences they were experiencing after the initial excitement of returning home. While scholars fully expected problems in cultural adaptation when they first moved overseas, they did not expect to face it when they returned home (Adler, 1981; Storti, 1990; Sussman, 1986). The full impact of the study abroad finally hit and the returnee experienced a reverse culture shock leading to intense frustration. Therefore, all the reentry scholars experienced reverse culture shock, were expecting a lot, but were shocked by their experience on their return. Some shocked by the culture difference. They were experiencing a difficult time and were clear that reverse culture shock played a role with reentry scholars and some were disappointed by how they felt upon return. They did not expect to experience reverse culture shock in returning. They felt a lack of communication with people and being a strange person. The participants felt tired and less excited and depressed from the work at the university.

Lazarova and Tarique (2005) suggested that these communication problems and the possibility of repercussions could make the reentry scholars afraid to share their new knowledge. Cannon (2000) stated that graduate students, on their return to professional life from their overseas training, may experience “reverse culture shock,” the shock of reentry into one’s own culture and re-establishing relationships after a period of adaptation to the foreign culture. This happened when the Saudi reentry scholars returned to Kingdom University and their colleagues or friends changed without the others realizing it. Some reentry scholars expected to be the same on their return, but many things had changed during the study period. They had developed and changed while they were away and had gained new ideas and perspectives. In addition, the Saudi reentry

scholar may not want to share their experiences or perspectives to avoid a misunderstanding at the Kingdom University.

The mental isolation phase.

Subtheme 1.1 (ST1.1): There is a need for greater support from Kingdom University upon reentry. For this phase in the W-Curve theory, many reentry scholars had felt a sense of isolation. Having adapted enough to have some stability, the realization of how different they felt could have begun to become apparent (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963). Without question, the majority of the reentry scholars felt a keen sense of isolation upon returning to their country of origin, some more strongly than others. The reentry difficulty has tended to show itself in strains in personal relationships upon return and needed adjustments to the scholar's emotional well-being (Casteen, 2006). These returning scholars have often felt like they were being misunderstood by those around them, found that they may have had an inability to connect with family and friends, may have felt sadness, and sometimes may have felt resentment of their surroundings.

Therefore, all reentry scholar participants shared that there was a lack of leadership at the university for the reentry scholars, no clear procedures to follow, and the result left them feeling unsupported and confused. The returnees were left to find their own way without any support and did not receive acknowledgment from the departments at the university. Participants complained there was no guide and support. Some felt unaccepted and isolated in their own country. The need for greater support of reentry scholars who teach at Kingdom University was also apparent. Relating to the need for greater support from the Kingdom University upon reentry, all 16 reentry scholars felt they needed more support for reentry than what they had received for Kingdom

University. All participants felt they needed more support. It was seen as imperative that returnees receive the appropriate help to adapt to their new circumstances and work in positive and supportive work environment, as noted by Hilal et al. (2015) in the literature. Without the needed support, such as an appropriate transitional program, reentry scholars would feel lost in their positions as assistant professors in Kingdom University which may negatively affect what they could offer to students and the academic community. The W-Curve theory addressed some elements to understand the experience of Saudi reentry scholars in working at Kingdom University. The theory addressed the reverse culture shock experience and the stages that Saudi reentry scholars had gone through during the reentry, however, the theory W-Curve failed to address organizational culture system and gender differences and the benefits of the global links. The W-Curve theory has certain limitations, which warrant a critique of the theory as applied to this study. For example, the W-Curve was initially designed to address the experiences of U.S. students who study abroad, and then return to the U.S. and attempt to assimilate back onto U.S. culture. All the analysis was from the returning U.S. student perspective and consequently inadequately addressed the experiences had by Saudi reentry scholars. Saudi culture is very different from that of U.S. culture; therefore, leaving Saudi Arabia to study in the U.S and then returning to Saudi Arabia for reintegration may be experienced differently for the two distinct groups of students returning to different countries. Saudi reentry scholars have faced many similar challenges as to students experiencing U.S. reentry. Nevertheless, Saudi scholars have been returning in large numbers to teach in Saudi universities and their experiences have held some of the basic ideas of W-Curve theory.

Organizational Culture Theory

Every university has an institutional ideology and organizational culture as reflected in the environment, socialization, information, strategy, and leadership as defined by (Tierney, 2016), who asked several questions which could serve to create the framework for the organizational culture. They were:

Environment: How is it defined? What is the attitude toward the environment?

Mission: How is it defined and articulated? Is it used as a basis for decisions? How much agreement is there?

Socialization: How do new members become socialized? How is that socialization articulated? What do members need to know to survive and excel?

Strategy: How are decisions made and what strategy is used? Who makes the decisions and what is the penalty for bad decisions?

Leadership: Who are the leaders? Are they formal? Informal? What is expected from the leaders? (p. 30)

When a university's administration and faculty understood the organizational culture of the university, they could more clearly develop the changes that needed to be enacted within the organization. Tierney (2016) called this the "organizational mission" (p. 27). He suggested that, if the academic culture was not carefully cultivated, there could be "destructive conflicts between faculties, loss of professional morale, and personal alienation" (p. 39). Educational theory expresses the mission of the institution as the overarching ideology of the university, the ideological and interpretative act that provides meaning, direction, and purpose. How this mission was articulated depended, in part, on the history of the institution and the environment developed. Tierney (2008a) suggested that the mission was culturally defined and socially constructed; it was not so much a given fact as it was constantly considered, redefined, and reinterpreted.

When Tierney (2008a) considered the leadership component, he suggested that this key component of a university could exist in a range from formal to informal. Indeed,

who the leaders were and whether the organization permitted only formal leaders or relied on informal leaders were contingent on the culture. Cultural norms surrounding key issues, such as who made the decisions, who were privy to the information, and how the information was disseminated, were dependent upon the institution's style of leadership. Socialization, according to Tierney, was another key component, because socialization helped administration and staff to determine what would be important to the organization. Newcomers to this university culture may have difficulty understanding what and who would be important.

Main Theme 2 (MT2): Kingdom University organizational systems are experienced as difficult and bureaucratic for returning Saudi scholars. An organization was in great part dependent upon the internal culture of the organization, according to Tierney (2016). While the institution was influenced by external forces, it was often the internal dynamic that dominated the culture. "An organization's culture is reflected in what is done, how it is done, and who is involved in doing it" (Tierney, 2016, p. 24). He went on to mention that much of the internal culture was historically produced, but it included the decisions, actions, and communications--both instrumental and symbolic.

The interviewed reentry scholars found themselves in the morass of university culture upon their return--a culture that they did not understand or appreciate. A number of the reentry scholars expressed their frustration because their needs were not being met at Kingdom University after returning home. All reentry scholars complained about the system. The differences in the organizational systems were pronounced and the experience was difficult for the reentry scholars. The major disappointment was that the

culture of Kingdom University did not allow change very easily and that the system was very bureaucratic. This related well to Tierney's (2016) theories about the culture of the university. This culture, history, bureaucracy, and old organizational approaches limited Kingdom University in its ability to create change. Because of this, many faculty members were trying to either remain in a position of power or trying to achieve more power, and this level of competition created conflict in a system that seemed limited in its ability to create change.

In debating whether it was challenging to work within the current Saudi educational system, many of the reentry scholars expressed their frustration after returning to work there. Most felt that they were sent abroad to learn ways to change the Saudi educational system, but they had no idea upon their return that the system would be so difficult to change. Ultimately, many felt they were now a part of "an unfair system." Iqbal and Kokash (2011) confirmed that reentry scholars experienced significant stress and resistance when returning to work at Kingdom University after having been abroad. This was a common theme reiterated throughout this study and in other studies, as well. Hansel (1993) suggested that rampant bureaucracy was detrimental to returning Indian scholars and fights over office facilities and an inadequate work ethic added to the cultural stress as it was defined by Tierney. Therefore, Saudi reentry scholars were disappointed with organizational system because it did not allow change and the bureaucratic system was negative and limit to make changes.

Another major problem facing returning scholars has been their desire to transfer the knowledge they acquired during their studies abroad. Significant research (Adler, 1981; Cannon, 2000; Oddou et al., 2008) showed that businesses, governments, and

universities placed significant barriers in the way of returning colleagues that did not allow them to communicate or share their experiences. Alandejani (2013) stated that, in a hierarchical system such as the Saudi educational system, there seldom was a free exchange of information when compared with Western universities, and scholars returning to Saudi Arabia found great frustration in their inability to share ideas and knowledge because of university system.

Subtheme 2.1 (ST2.1): Technology is challenging and frequently not used appropriately. It was obvious that Saudi reentry scholars were frustrated because they felt that their needs were not being met; they were disappointed with the organizational system because it did not allow change and, finally, the bureaucratic system was negative and limited the changes that could be made. It was a difficult environment for reentry scholars. The discussion thus far has addressed the difficult environment for reentry scholars at Kingdom University. One would think that, if the university could express its mission, information, strategy, and leadership to the returning scholars, their reentry would be made easier.

Tierney (2016) outlined several steps to broaden the perspective of an organizational culture. These included:

- Considering real or potential conflicts, not in isolation but on the broad canvas of organizational life;
- Recognizing structural or operational contradictions that suggest tensions in the organizations
- Implementing and evaluating everyday decisions with a keen awareness of their role in and influence on organizational culture;
- Understanding the symbolic dimensions of ostensibly instrumental decisions and actions; and
- Considering why different groups in the organization have varying perceptions about institutional performance. (p. 27)

The use of technology was a case in point for the returning scholars. Although expansions in technology had occurred in the larger Saudi culture (Krieger, 2007), the technology was not yet what was typically experienced in the reentry scholars' study abroad countries. The findings related to the challenges and opportunities reentry Saudi scholars expressed in working at Kingdom University were illuminating. Through the interviews and the literature reviewed in this study, reentry scholars found it challenging to work within the current Saudi system. Likewise, the need for more technology and technological infrastructure, more support for working returnees, limited bureaucracy, and even more opportunities would be needed. Along similar lines, most reentry scholars found that the method of teaching at the Saudi university was very much the same as before they went abroad to study, namely slow, traditional, and lacking in technology. These findings were also consistent with the data from the reentry scholar/administrators. Some of the issues were that the technology related to the lack of computers being available and a willingness to use technology was challenging. This seemed to be a systemic problem as the university culture did nothing to encourage the use of technology.

Most reentry scholars found that the method of teaching at the Saudi university was very much the same as before they went abroad to study, namely slow, traditional, and lacking in technology. These findings were also consistent with the data from the reentry scholar/administrators, who found that they had to fight for basic computer usage, let alone the use of technologies such as Blackboard that they had become familiar with at the university where they studied. Having become comfortable with using the technology more common in the U.S. had made returning to teach at the Kingdom

University more challenging than any of the participants would have preferred. The status quo has been maintained and technology usage was minimal.

Subtheme 2.2 (ST2.2): Women experience readjustment and the university system differently than men, giving them fewer opportunities. Tierney (2016) spoke powerfully about the cultural conditions and influences that enter into the daily decision making of university administrators. Everyone was dimly aware of codes, symbols, and conventions of society, and it was only when those codes and conventions were broken that they were called to the attention of the administrators. Then, most likely, they had to be dealt with via crisis management rather than through discussion and consensus. Such was the case of gender in organizational theory.

Gender organizational theory according to Acker (2015) spoke to the patterned differences that were part of the daily life of work organizations as well as other parts of life. It involved the “advantage and disadvantage, exploitation and control, action and emotion, meaning and identity. . . in terms of a distinction between male and female, masculine and feminine” (p. 420). In gender organizational theory, there are constraints, both material and ideological, that “set the limits of possibility” (p. 421). These constraints manifest themselves in gender divisions that include jobs, wages, hierarchies of power, and subordination. Nowhere were gender divisions more complete or more divisive than in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

According to Long (2005), men have traditionally viewed their role in Saudi society as providers, protectors, and decision-makers. Typically, women managed the household, cared for the children, and had less power. Nevertheless, this has been shifting (Long, 2005). Data from a review of the literature supported the findings that women

were becoming more visible overall through their participation in the study abroad scholarship programs, such as the King Abdullah Scholarship Program (Saudi Gazette, 2015) and as shifts have occurred in Saudi Arabian universities and society (Le Renard, 2008).

On the other hand, in most of Saudi Arabia, gender segregation has been a strict social norm. The segregation of unrelated men from women has been one of the society's highest values and the law in all of the country's public life (Doumato, 2003). This societal norm has not so much been religion-based as tradition-based in Saudi Arabia (Haddad & Esposito, 1998). Because of this social norm, men and women have not been permitted to work or go to school in the same buildings. This, too, has been changing, as women have begun to see their roles in society changing. Young Saudi women who have been exposed to Western culture through international study have shown interest in Saudi Arabian jobs in less segregated environments, wanting to have more independent professional lives, like women in the West (Doumato, 2003; Le Renard, 2008). For example, beliefs about a woman's role in society have hampered the role of women in the workplace--even women educated in Western settings through the King Abdullah Scholarship Program. Women's roles and status in society came from an interpretation of Islamic texts and, therefore, any change caused conflict between modernists and fundamentalists (Al-Mehawes, 1984; Robertson et al., 2008).

Le Renard (2008) reported that Saudi women were becoming "more visible within the national media and the national state" (p. 617). This shift could be seen in the number of Saudi women who were studying abroad as part of the King Abdullah Scholarship Program, as well as the number of women studying in Saudi Arabian

universities. Currently, Saudi women have constituted 51.8% of Saudi university students and more than 35,000 women were studying abroad (Saudi Gazette, 2015). The Saudi Gazette (2015) reported that there were more than 15,000 women faculty members at Saudi universities for women. Currently, the only co-educational Saudi university was The King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST).

The five female reentry scholars who participated in the study felt they were not given the same opportunities as men in their departments. It was apparent that the divide between men and women was still very strong in Saudi culture, and this affected the way women experienced education, whether as students or teachers. It was apparent that the men do the decision making at the University and within the organization. It was very difficult for women who have returned from a culture where they experienced so much more freedom. This theme was easily seen in the thoughts and feeling expressed by these five reentry scholars. Their lives have been extremely difficult in returning to a culture and a work environment where they were not treated as equals. Returning Saudi scholars have noticed the increasing tension between the trend toward modernization and the long-standing traditions in Saudi culture (Alandejani, 2013).

The cultural and religious perspective was the most difficult reentry problem scholars have had to face--particularly the women. Scholars came to other cultures to learn and found that they were accepted. Their minds began to change. They learned to question. They spoke to people of other faiths. When they got back to Saudi Arabia, they may have seen their culture and religion differently. They may have wanted to see more of the cultural and religious freedoms that they had become used to. But they were not allowed to question as freely as they may have wanted to in this restricted society. Some

of the women interviewed were hesitant to express their opinions freely because of possible consequences they faced. Those who spoke in the interviews had many opinions they wanted to express.

Main Theme 3 (MT3): There is a desire to create change. Despite the negative experiences and apparent limitations for reentry scholars, several of the participants believed that change could take place and that there were opportunities for that to happen at Kingdom University. The reentry scholars felt they were sent to learn about changes and bring back that change back to the university. Nevertheless, change could be sometimes a slow process, and this seemed to be especially true within the Saudi university culture. Change could take place in an appropriate setting and in a positive organizational culture. It seemed likely that brain circulation, in the form of brain gain, was taking place, but slowly in the university. Without question, the findings from this study revealed that many reentry scholars believed in change and wanted things to look different at Kingdom University. The scholars needed to understand the attitudes and behaviors of the existing members of the work group to be able to fit in and be able to share and transfer knowledge (Oddou et al., 2008). Lazarova and Tarique (2005) suggested that these communication problems and the possibility of repercussions could make the repatriate afraid to share their new knowledge.

According to Tierney (2008a), by understanding the environment, information, strategy, and leadership in the organizational culture of Kingdom University, it would be less difficult for reentry scholars to understand how to make changes and create development. The reentry scholar needs to understand much about the organization and its environment. This would include: how the organization defined its environment; what

the attitudes were toward the environment; the mission of the organization, and how it was defined. Also important was the socialization in the organization, how the members became socialized and how the members survived. Leadership concerns included the strategy of the organization, how decisions were made, what strategy was used, and who made decisions in the university. Other leadership questions included what the organization expected from its leaders, who the leaders were, and how formal or informal the leadership was.

So, if the Saudi reentry scholars understood all these issues, they would be able to work well, develop, and change the system. By understanding all these elements, the reentry scholars would know about how the decisions were being made as well as who was making the decisions. They would even understand how they should act in a system as difficult as Kingdom University. However, when schools have failed to initiate scholars in the mission of the school, the scholars would be able to identify the problems in the school's leadership.

When scholars develop an understanding of the organizational framework, he/she would be able to find a place in the organization through the mission, environment, socialization, information, strategy, and leadership. The organization cultural theory failed to address reverse culture shock experience and gender differences and the benefits of the global links, and that organizational culture theory was primarily designed to address U.S. organizations. However, organizational theory can be different when considering the organizational structures of U.S. and Saudi cultures. Political, socialization, leadership, and social environments have all impacted Saudi university culture, which would be experienced even more differently for reentry scholars given the

insular culture of a Saudi university, in comparison to universities in U.S. culture.

Although, the organizational culture theory should be addressed cautiously as it was initially developed through the lens of U.S. culture, it has been beneficial to studying Saudi organizations as well.

Brain Circulation Theory

Subtheme 3.1 (ST3.1): Education abroad creates greater links to the global community. The third theory that was used in my analysis was the brain circulation theory (Perna et al., 2014). This theory was used to describe the movement and mobility of higher educated people around the globe. It was an increasing phenomenon that affected the socio-economic and socio-culture progress of a society and a country, as well as the world (Perna et al., 2014). This theory helped readers to understand the Saudi scholars' experience in Saudi universities when they connected back with other Western countries and universities. It also helped to understand the social and economic benefits to reentry scholars and the Saudi Arabia education system because reentry scholars would feel that they were contributing to society. This theory allowed for revealing themes and interpreted the feelings, thoughts, and perceptions of the reentry scholar participants. As previously noted, brain circulation theory describes the movement and mobility of individuals, educated in higher learning institutions, sharing information as they moved around the world (Perna et al., 2014; Saxenian, 2002). The theory of brain circulation, and brain gain, has been useful in describing what could occur when new information and ideas were introduced into an environment (Hunter, 2013; Stark et al., 1997; Teferra, 2005). These theories have been used to explain the Saudi scholars' experience in Saudi

universities in keeping in touch with those they met while in U.S. country and universities.

There was great support for having studied and for having made connections to the global community. Related to how the reentry scholars experienced their stay abroad, most of reentry scholars kept connections with their university and had good relationships that led to significant links to the global community being created, as seen through the interactions between members of U.S. and Saudi universities. Clearly, the scholarship received by the reentry scholars interviewed for this study supported the opportunity for increased global linkages through education in Saudi Arabia. While not all the interviewed scholars maintained their international relationships, the university should encourage those relationships because of the possibilities for increased collaboration and growth for Kingdom University.

Without question, this telling interview data were consistent with the opportunities and positive changes that were possible to achieve. Generally, and in exploring the responses from the participants in the study in relation to this subtheme, reentry scholars made connections to the global community. Related to how the reentry scholars experienced their stay abroad, and in the relationships they developed with professors, all 16 reentry scholars had something to share. These findings linked directly to brain circulation theory.

Brain circulation, in this situation, allowed reentry scholars to be exposed to educational, cultural, and professional opportunities currently unavailable in Saudi Arabia. The reentry scholars in this study had the advantage of being a part of two communities, moving between their home countries and their host countries. Consistent

with Saxenian (2002), Stark et al. (1997), and Hunter (2013), brain circulation, in the form of brain gain, has also been taking place and returning scholars may have had the opportunity to create the type of change they wished to see as well. In exploring the responses from the participants in the study, there was great support for having studied and for having made connections to the global community. It has been found that education abroad did create greater links to the rest of the world (Altbach & Engberg, 2014a). Related to how the reentry scholars experienced their stay abroad and the relationships they developed with professors, all 16-reentry scholars shared thoughts

Through exploring the interviews and the literature associated with this topic, Saudi Arabia could achieve a more skilled society and become excellent drivers in the global knowledge economy (Hilal et al., 2015). These findings have been further affirmed by the work of Altbach and Basset (2014) and Altbach and Engberg (2014b) who asserted that the government scholarships received by scholars have increased engagement with global higher education as well. However, the brain circulation theory failed to address reverse culture shock experience and gender difference and culture environment work. Most returning scholars, however, moving smoothly between their home countries and their host countries, were uniquely equipped to create the type of change they wanted to see happen in their universities and their country. Many of the participants in the study believed that change could happen and that it could happen at Kingdom University.

Similar to the W-Curve theory and organizational culture theory, brain circulation theory was also developed through a U.S. perspective (Perna et al., 2014; Saxenian, 2005). While this was not to imply that this theory could not be used to address the

meaning of brain circulation for Saudi scholars and universities, it should be approached thoughtfully. What one culture interprets as brain circulation, or the sharing of knowledge, may have different meanings in different cultures. Nonetheless, this theory, out of the three primary theories presented in this study, was most relatable to both U.S and Saudi cultures. Brain circulation is a desire of the Saudi Arabian economic community as it has sought to expand engineering capabilities through the education of Saudi engineers, primarily by sending them all over the world to receive further education.

The general improvement of government and educational infrastructure has been a common goal in Saudi Arabia as well as improving civic regulations and human resources expanded by collaborating with other states. Despite the terminology used to describe brain circulation, these aspirations would not have been possible with universities abroad if the desire to learn, grow, and develop was lacking in Saudi Arabia (Altbach & Bassett, 2014). Last, although continuing to understand that brain circulation theory is an American theory, the desire to encourage the transfer of information, especially in the fields of science, technology, and education was actively promoted in Saudi Arabia by the government offering students the opportunity to study abroad through the King Abdullah Scholarship program (Altbach & Bassett, 2014). In this sense, brain circulation theory was an appropriate theory with which to approach an exchange of information between Saudi Arabia and the rest of the world.

Summary

Gaining insight into the Saudi scholars' experience of reentry into Kingdom University to work has been a rich topic and has warranted further exploration. The

literature related to the research topic for this study was reviewed. In assessing the experiences of reentry Saudi scholars with advanced degrees from U.S. universities, a number of theories were examined. Theories such as the W-C theory, organizational-cultural theory, and brain circulation were explored. While this literature has explored aspects of research regarding the Saudi scholars' reentry experience, it was my belief that a more complete exploration of this topic through my research may better prepare Saudi scholars to manage any obstacles or challenges they may encounter when beginning to work as faculty at Kingdom University.

Administrators Themes Discussion

Main Theme 1 (MT1): Administrators Have a General Understanding of the Reentry Experience

Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) developed the W-Curve hypothesis to explain the study abroad experience for scholars and the problems associated with readaptation that scholars experienced when they returned to their home university. The W-Curve theory works in both directions--at the host country upon entry and at the home country upon return. The five stages, as illustrated by a W-shaped diagram included: the honeymoon, culture shock, initial adjustment, mental isolation, and finally acceptance and integration. The reentry scholars all expressed these stages in their interviews.

For most of the Saudi scholars, the return to the home culture was more of a challenge than the experience in the host culture. Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) believed that the main difference was in expectation. The scholars believed that they would be unchanged and their culture would be unchanged. They did not expect to see these changes in either themselves or their culture (Gaw, 2000; Uehara, 1986b). The

psychological stress was particularly difficult when the scholar had been away for several years (Uehara, 1986b),

Through the exploration of this main theme for administrators, administrators had a general understanding of the reentry experience. Furthermore, analysis of the findings showed that administrators understood the environment had changed for reentry scholars. Finally, the manner in which the administrators interacted with the returning scholars as employees was relevant to the way reentry scholars experienced their reentry. As seen in the interview, several of the administrators reported that they could understand what the Saudi reentry scholars were experiencing, given their own experiences with reentry. While not all of the administrators went abroad to study, many of them had this opportunity and were able to share their own reentry experiences in relation to the reentry scholars' experience. In particular, one of the reentry scholar/administrators felt very strong about his ability to relate to the reentry experience, as he too had the same event occur in his own life.

Knowing this, many of the administrators admitted giving plentiful support to the reentry scholars upon their return. The administrators who studied abroad understood the reentry scholars experience and those who did not study abroad did not understand reentry scholars experience. They could understand what the Saudi reentry scholars were experiencing, given their own experiences, the administrators with mixed opinions of the reentry scholars and their experiences were those who did not study outside of Saudi Arabia. These findings suggested that there was a lack of compassion for the reentry scholar's experiences and feelings and that perhaps there was some competition occurring, common within the Kingdom University's bureaucratic culture.

Subtheme 1.1 (ST1.1): Administrators understand that the environment has changed for reentry scholars. One component of organizational theory that applied to the relationship between administrator and returning scholar was that of environment. Oddou et al. (2008) reported that universities may not be equipped to provide an enriched environment for the scholars. The scholars found themselves unable to transfer their new knowledge, and as a result, they experienced a sense of desperation, boredom, and disease. Cannon (2000) reported that the university's environment caused the scholar to feel a lack of connection between their education and training and the application of that training in their returning environment. The environment had shifted, and the scholars had a shifted perspective on what it meant to be in and to teach in the Saudi culture, which had changed significantly over the years the scholar had been gone (Altbach & Engberg, 2014b).

The administrators were aware that, when a scholar was gone from the country for up to 10 years at a time, they would return to an altered culture, especially given the rapid changes that had come with technology and globalization (Altbach & Engberg, 2014b). Stated within the interviews, the majority of the administrators seemed to understand that reentry scholars came to work in the university in an environment that looked very different from when they left (Altbach & Engberg, 2014b).

Most of the administrators understood that the reentry scholars returning to teach inside the university had a shifted perspective on what it meant to be in, and to teach in, the Saudi culture. While not all administrators shared that they understood, the majority did, whether or not they had experienced studying abroad. Nevertheless, administrators

who did not study abroad clearly did not understand how the reentry scholars felt, despite saying that they did understand.

Subtheme 1.2 (ST1.2): The interaction administrators have with returning scholars as employees. The second component of organizational theory that applied to the views of administrators dealt with the concept of socialization. Tierney (2008a) discussed socialization in his studies on organizational theory. In this theory, the actors helped to determine what was important within the organization. Unfortunately, unless newcomers were appraised of the important aspects of the organization, they may not understand what was valuable within the organization, nor how they should act within the organization. Parveen (2013), while not discussing returning scholars specifically, looked at the stress levels in Saudi universities, particularly for faculty members. Most of this stress came from socialization issues.

Crisogen (2015) researched adaptive and integrative socialization. He found that the participants he studied expected that their personal capabilities would integrate them into the institution. He reported that there was a great deal of anticipatory socialization; that the participants would be equipped to prepare for future roles in the organization. For returning Saudi scholars, there was the anticipation that they could assume leadership roles at the university, including administrative roles or department leadership.

It may be that the socialization aspect of Kingdom University's organization was one-sided and traditional. What was reported by the administrators was that many of them felt that the majority of their interactions with the reentry scholars were limited and that it was the reentry scholar's responsibility to reach out to them when needed. Some of the administrators and reentry scholar/administrators appeared to interact with the reentry

scholars based on age, gender, and position. Some of the administrators in higher positions even admitted no interaction with the reentry scholars. Only three of the administrators and one reentry scholar/administrator shared about having personal interactions with reentry scholars and related interacting with reentry scholars in a less formal manner. The general finding from this part of the study exposed that the interaction between administrators and reentry scholars was limited, despite what had been shared to the contrary.

However, this did not point toward increased interaction between administrators and reentry scholars, which would have made the work and cultural transition easier for scholars. A few of the administrators made themselves available for the reentry scholars beyond the most basic interaction, if any at all, yet the general lack of interaction between administrators and returnees were surprising. While most of the administrators appeared to understand how difficult it could be to return from a very different culture to another culture, and especially one that had also undergone changes, there existed a disconnect between what was being shared by administrators versus what was being experienced by reentry scholars.

Main Theme 2 (MT2): Administrators' Expectations for Reentry Scholars

One of the key components of organization culture theory was that of leadership. Tierney (2008a) discussed the types of leadership as being both formal and informal. The understanding of the leadership of an organization was crucial for both administration and faculty. Returning scholars must have an awareness of hierarchy of leadership and its formality. The university leadership in Saudi Arabia was both formal and hierarchical, and returning scholars have had difficulty finding their place in the leadership culture.

Within that leadership framework, there was a clear need for Kingdom University to both grow as the culture changed in Saudi Arabia, the administrators needed to tell the reentry scholars what they expected from them, and at the same time, that the members of the university faculty would understand and contribute to the changes in Saudi Arabia, both culturally and academically. Because of the cultural changes, the administration's mission has included the need for reentry scholars to bring back insights, new ideas, and the potential for change. Theoretically, administrators have had the expectation that returning scholars would participate both administratively and academically. At the same time, the formalistic leadership structure in place inhibited the free exchange of knowledge and the potential leadership of the returning scholar.

Subtheme 2.1 (ST2.1): The need for reentry scholars to apply what they have learned abroad. One major component of leadership is the sharing of knowledge, but as Oddou et al. (2008) and Cannon (2000) reported, there is a perceived lack of connection between the education the scholars received and the application of that knowledge in the university they return to. Additionally, these findings tied into the theories of brain circulation and brain gain (Hunter, 2013; Stark et al, 1997) as administrators' expectation revolved around the mobility of higher educated individual and ideas (Perna et al., 2014).

For many years, Saudi university administrative leadership has sent their faculty members to study abroad, expecting them to bring new knowledge and fresh insights back to the university. This was the main reason why university-sponsored scholarship recipients were required to return to their home university. All of the administrators, as well as the reentry student/administrators, noted that they wanted reentry scholars to bring back awareness, new concepts, and the potential for change. In this manner, reentry

scholars were welcomed back enthusiastically, because the administrators were interested in learning what they had learned while being abroad.

Most administrators at Kingdom University were ready and willing to adopt many of the strategies and approaches taught in U.S. universities so that Saudi universities and culture could continue to implement the changes taking place in Saudi Arabia. As such, administrators had intense expectations regarding what reentry scholars should bring back to the classroom, the University, and Saudi society, in general. There were social and economic benefits to having a program where reentry scholars returned to Saudi Arabia and contributed to society, that which was very much expected of them from administrators.

These findings in both the literature and in the interview data coincided for administrators, the need for reentry scholars to apply what they have learned abroad. Additionally, administrators would have liked reentry scholars to take part in many administrative tasks and activities. Administrators expected reentry scholars to teach well, stay current with what they had learned, publish, and help develop the university, all within the context of applying what they had learned in their studies abroad. The major difficulty seemed to be in the leadership being willing to allow this new leadership to take hold within the university.

Subtheme 2.2 (ST2.2): The need for reentry scholars to contribute to administrative duties and teaching. Within the leadership component of the organizational culture theory (Tierney, 2008a), there was the expectation of the sharing of leadership and the smooth succession from one leader to the other. Also included in Tierney's (2016) theory was the implication that information sharing and socialization

were aspects of leadership that played into the contributions that faculty needed to make. In the interviews with Kingdom University's leadership, this was made clear--the leadership of the university expected the returning scholars to take a role in administration, such as becoming committee members and heads of departments, along with teaching. Although this was not typical in U.S. universities, this was a common expectation in Saudi universities. Often, however, this information was implicitly understood by the administration but not communicated to the scholars. Most of the participating administrators believed scholars needed to contribute to administrative duties and teaching. This was one of the main expectations that administrators had of reentry scholars, and even the reentry scholar/administrators held this opinion.

Clearly, all of the administrators had solid expectations for reentry scholars, and there was a strong need for reentry scholars to apply what they had learned abroad at the university. Most of the participating administrators felt that reentry scholars should contribute to administrative duties and teaching. Although there were some mixed opinions from administrators regarding what work Saudi scholars should do when they returned to the Saudi university, all felt it was the responsibility of the returnees to bring knowledge back to the university and be ready to contribute on multiple levels. However, there seemed to be both agreement and conflict present based on the administrators' responses to some of these issues, in that not all administrators felt that this was what was occurring.

Main Theme 3 (MT3): Administrators Have Mixed Perceptions of Reentry Scholars' Contributions

Stress is one offshoot of organizational theory--both in studies of leadership and socialization. The integration of Western-trained faculty members into Saudi Arabian universities has been ongoing, and administrators have mixed perceptions of the contributions of the reentry scholars at their university, causing stress for both administration and faculty. Parveen (2013) studied this stress and discovered that there were many sides to the issue. He looked at rewards, recognition, time constraints, professional identity, and departmental influences. His studies on university stress were echoed by Zakari (2012) and Iqbal and Kokash (2011).

Anticipation and actuality led to stress from both sides. The confusion and stress experienced by the scholars has already been discussed. It was quite different than that experienced by the administration. While the administrators were pleased to have the reentry scholars return and bring new knowledge to the university, they also found the reentry scholars to be unproductive and resistant. The interview data showed that administrators anticipated the return of reentry scholars with excitement which then led to disappointment. Opinions were varied. Some felt that the reentry scholars had much to offer the university, while other administrators felt quite differently.

Subtheme 3.1 (ST3.1): Administrators anticipate the return of reentry scholars with excitement. In looking at administrator anticipation for the reentry of scholars studying abroad, organizational theory could be enhanced by understandings of brain circulation (Perna et al, 2014; Saxenian, 2005). Within brain circulation theory, there would be the understanding that knowledge was circulated through study in a

culture different from the home culture. This expectation created excitement in the leadership of the university. The anticipation, of course, was that reentry scholars would augment the environment of the university and contribute to the change of the culture.

A number of interviewed administrators shared that they were very happy to have the reentry scholars returning and that they believed the scholars were now experts in their fields of study, thus, having great things to contribute. The administrators were interested in learning what the scholars could bring to the University, particularly because of the diverse universities that the scholars had attended. Administrators who had studied abroad had an enhanced level of interest because they knew what the scholars could contribute. On the other hand, some administrators expected the scholars would be more expert in their fields of study, and they were hesitant in affirming the scholars and what they could contribute to the university.

Subtheme 3.2 (ST3.2): Administrators' perceptions of reentry scholars as unproductive and uncooperative. Organizational theory presupposes that socialization could be both adaptive or integrative (Crisogen, 2015). In a hierarchical organization such as the administration of Kingdom University, there was likely to be distrust of new ideas and new faculty, causing a lack of adaptive or integrative socialization. Zakari (2012) found this to be true at the Saudi university she studied. She discovered that much more needed to be done to integrate the administration and staff so that they were working in concert. Saeed (1987) discussed how there was great stress and role strain among Pakistani reentry scholars because of administrative distrust and dislike. This was most likely true with the administrators at Kingdom University. The very mixed

perceptions of reentry scholars' contributions may be, in many ways, the result of the socialization aspect of organizational theory.

Several administrators shared that they felt as though reentry scholars were unproductive, were arrogant, did not take the help that was offered to them, and did not stay in contact while they were abroad. Furthermore, several administrators shared they perceived certain reentry scholars to be dishonest, impatient, and unwilling to serve on committees or contribute to administrative work--this being one of the institutional requirements. While frequently administrators were excited about the reentry scholars' potential contribution, many seemed to become disillusioned over time. The two subthemes for the administrators under this MT3 (administrators anticipating the return of reentry scholars with excitement and the perception of reentry scholars as unproductive and uncooperative) were noteworthy. The administrative perception of reentry scholars as unproductive and uncooperative warrants further exploration.

Summary

Relating to the experiences of reentry scholars and the perceptions of administrators, several themes were obvious in coding and analyzing both the interviews and literature used in this study. While the majority of the participants agreed that study abroad had many positive aspects, there were conflicts and differences in opinion. Theme analysis was conducted theme-by-theme for reentry scholars, and directly corresponded to the related themes and subthemes for the administrators. The themes were discussed within the context of the research questions and the findings for the reentry scholar/administrators were included. The research questions explored in reference to all of the themes were: (a) How do reentry Saudi scholars who return to Saudi universities to

work experience the phenomenon of reentry? and (b) What challenges and opportunities do the reentry Saudi scholars express in working in Saudi universities?

The themes extrapolated using the audit trail via journal use and the appropriate coding and analysis of all data, incorporated the use of the primary theories, the W-Curve model (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963), organizational theory (Tierney, 2008a, 2008b) and brain circulation theories (Perna et al., 2014; Saxenian, 2005). These theories, as well as the other available literature and the interview data, allowed for the creation of a framework within which the data was organized and analyzed. In consideration of the interviews with the Saudi reentry scholars, administrators, and reentry scholar/administrators used in this study, the findings related to the main themes and their associated subthemes were revealing. Supported by the interviews with the reentry scholars and from the literature, Saudi scholars' experience of reentry was difficult, as they found it was challenging to work within the current Saudi system, and believed there were opportunities for creating change in Saudi universities through study abroad programs.

Ultimately, it was found that administrators had a general understanding of the reentry experience, had a number of expectations for reentry scholars, and had mixed perceptions of reentry scholars' contributions. Nevertheless, as reiterated throughout the study, the findings demonstrated that there were considerable differences in the perceptions held by reentry scholars and administrators. While not all negative, there were significant discrepancies between the feelings of reentry scholars and administrators that led to the discussion below on recommendations.

Recommendations for Practical Application

The findings from this study supported a number of recommendations for practical application on varying levels. However, the most significant recommendation for practical application came from my own intentions for how to share this study with others and to create an easier transition for Saudi reentry scholars. First, I plan to share this study with other reentry scholars, other Saudi universities, with more than just the University to which I will return. Additionally, I intend to participate in conferences in both the U.S. and in Saudi Arabia as I have gained a certain level of expertise relating to the experiences of Saudi reentry scholar returning home to teach in a university. Finally, I plan to share this study with the International Office at the U.S. University and share it with all Saudi reentry scholars.

As a second source for disseminating the information learned in this study, I will create an appropriate and helpful transition program after returning to Saudi Arabia. The creation of this manual will help reentry scholars to understand more fully what their experiences will be when returning to Saudi culture, especially in returning to a Saudi university work environment. The manual I plan to create, and perhaps teach, will very clearly define what expectations and needs the University will have of the reentry scholars upon their return as well as how reentry scholars can best approach administrators to obtain what they need from the university to do their jobs in an effective manner. Creating and using this manual, sharing my study with others, and holding seminars should be extremely helpful in preparing Saudi reentry scholars for a challenging experience. Below, other practical applications for the future benefit of reentry scholars will be provided based on specific recommendations to Saudi

administrators, U.S. university administration, and U.S. faculty members hosting students from abroad.

Future Recommendations

Recommendations for Reentry Scholars

I will offer recommendations for reentry Saudi scholars to better understand their experience and help them readjust to working at the Kingdom University. First, Saudi reentry scholars must be made aware of the institutional expectations before they arrive home as new faculty members. This can include asking administrators any questions they have and must prepare themselves for reverse culture shock. However, if the faculty is unsure of what to ask, the reentry scholars must also be aware that reentry will take them through a number of difficult stages and having acceptance around the shock and understanding of the process it takes to adapt could be helpful and attempting to approach everything slowly and cautiously would be recommended.

Second, the reentry scholars should gain information on the university system, and organizational culture including environment, socialization, and leadership. The system at the university could be different than the U.S. system so it would be helpful for the reentry scholar to be aware of the bureaucratic work at the university and ask for support upon return. Through informal discussions with other faculty members, particularly those who have returned from study abroad, the returning scholar can gain an understanding of the organization to which they are returning. When Saudi scholars are familiar with the mission of the university, they might be able to understand the direction and the purpose of the organization and be able to better identify the environment of the organization by its social construction (Parveen, 2013; Tierney, 1988, 2008a, 2008b).

Third, reentry scholars should remain in communication frequently with their supporting universities at home and return at least twice, if not more, to learn about the university culture they would be entering into upon return. On those visits home, the scholar might arrange a meeting with department heads or other faculty members in the department to discuss concern questions. Asking questions and staying aware of the procedures, regulations, and rules within the university would be paramount to remaining stable upon return.

Fourth, the reentry scholars must make an effort to learn the departmental expectations of roles and responsibilities. It was mentioned in the interviews with administrators that reentry scholars should attempt to connect more fully upon their return by reading emails and answering inquiries and be aware of the exceptions. Also, one important procedure to learn quickly is if the administrators at the university expect the reentry scholars to work in the academic and in the administrators duties as well.

Fifth, keeping in contact with the host department and advisors from the study abroad experience would help to facilitate remaining updated on current research and would foster brain circulation. It would also be helpful to write articles in cooperation with faculty members at the host university to publish in peer-reviewed journals and to contribute globally.

Sixth, several administrators shared that it would be helpful if Saudi scholars recognized that things would be done in a vastly different manner than they experienced in their U.S. university. It would also be appropriate for scholars to be uncomfortable with this change. Taking things slow will allow for a period of adjustment, as well as allow reentry scholars to determine the best ways to begin applying what was learned

while studying abroad. It would be imperative that reentry scholars recognize how different the American culture was from the culture of Saudi Arabia. Administrators believe that for the transition to be successful, reentry scholars must be patient and work to adjust themselves to the culture and not the other way around by expecting the culture to change for them. Acceptance of the differences between U.S. university campuses and those located in Saudi Arabia, rather than judgment, would be helpful to bridge the gap between reentry scholars and their coworkers and administrators. Sincere participation in campus life would further assist reentry scholars in adjusting to the differences between U.S. and Saudi university settings. Furthermore, this participation would provide opportunities for both coworkers and administrators to connect with the reentry scholar, enabling for a deeper understanding of everyone involved.

Recommendations for Saudi Administrators

For administrators, the goal should be to understand that, when they fail to initiate scholars into the mission of the university or give them the appropriate support, the scholars would assume the problem was with bureaucracy. . In response to this thought, the administrators should understand fully Tierney's (2016) five roles of an organization, and apply them to their understanding of their own personal roles: how do they personally understand the environment, mission, socialization, information, strategy, and leadership of the university. They must also have developed a philosophy of leadership that is open to those who might think of these five roles differently. Also, Administrators must create a manual that states the what administrators expects from reentry scholars and provide the information that needed.

Other recommendations for administrators would include: (a) listening openly to the reentry scholars' experience, (b) giving the new arrivals the needed time and space to adapt and adjust, (c) providing a welcome environment, and (d) actively attempting to engage in friendships with the returnees. Furthermore, administrators should be aware that the perspectives of the reentry scholars will be very different, given their unique experience. Encouraging the scholars to participate more fully, making the experience as easy as possible, and being willing to help and support the reentry scholars, even if they did not ask for help directly, would be beneficial to the successful adaptation of the returnees.

Finally, administrators could enhance their role and level of commitment by studying journals; viewing instructive videos; seeking information; engaging in discussions on education centered websites; and by attending presentations, classes, and conferences related to the phenomenon of reentry and what reentry scholars experience. Although some of the administrators, and certainly the reentry scholar/administrators, have experienced reentry, they may be too removed from their experience to truly relate to the reentry scholars. Additionally, societal circumstances change, and today's reentry scholars do not return to the same Saudi Arabia administrators may have experienced upon their reentry. For that reason, creating a transition program that not only focuses on teaching skills but focuses on social, emotional, and psychological reentry issues would be beneficial to reentry scholars. Being aware that the reentry scholars experience different stages of reverse culture shock and may need support, having acceptance around the shock and process it takes to adapt could be helpful. Attempting to approach everything slowly and cautiously would be recommended.

Regarding recommendations for the university administration as a whole, this could be quite broad and policymakers and practitioners would have a choice about what to incorporate into their willingness to accommodate the needs of reentry scholars. Willingness would be critical in successful collaboration and would mean a shift must occur in the way in which information is presented. The global environment has established a framework for working with a more complex set of circumstances than in the past, and for those areas still in the process of developing, administration would need to step up in their ability to lead (Altbach & Engberg, 2014b).

Parveen's (2013) study addressed the rewards, recognition, time constraints, professional identity, departmental influences, and student interactions and concluded that the university needed to have a greater focus on a heightened sense of belonging for both the university and the individual. Administrators and other faculty members need to be able to contribute to departmental and institutional decision-making. Furthermore, many Saudi universities do not have clear criteria for research and publication activities, an aspect which troubles many reentry scholars. Instituting some type of programs and criteria for conducting research and publishing would be warranted. On another topic, given that the goal of the scholarship program as defined by the Saudi Arabian Cultural Mission (2015), has been to develop Saudi human resources to be competitive in the marketplace and in academia, and to provide a high quality work force for Saudi universities and in public and private sectors, brain circulation should be encouraged on all levels (Perna et al., 2014). Government-sponsored student mobility programs would foster development in home countries in which scholars getting advanced degrees internationally would be required to return and use their new knowledge, as in the case of

Saudi Arabia, and make it imperative for administration to support reentry scholars and associated programs.

Recommendations for U.S. Universities

In this section, I offer recommendations for U.S. universities with Saudi scholars who would participate in reentry upon graduation. From the interviews, the scholars mentioned little support from their host university about what to expect when a student returns to their home country. As noted by some of the participants, it may be difficult for U.S. universities to provide such a program to all visiting scholars as many come from very diverse parts of the world. Offering support for what to expect in each culture may be difficult. Nevertheless, the availability of general programs to help prepare students for reentry to their home country may be in order. However, the U.S. universities must offer a presentation for all international students and explain how life would be different than what they got used to here in U.S. and that international students would go through different stages of reverse culture shock when they returned. The administrators interviewed suggested that U.S. universities provide mandatory therapy sessions throughout the year in order to help international students adjust to U.S. culture, as well as ensuring they were aware of the necessary adjustments they would be required to make when they return to their home culture. Furthermore, the use of student groups and organizations, developed for scholars from a same or similar culture, could also prove helpful in assisting reentry scholars prepare to assimilate back into their original culture.

Recommendations for U.S. Faculty

In recommendations for U.S. faculty, I offer several ways in which faculty members in the U.S. could directly assist Saudi reentry scholars in the reentry process as

well as in adapting to student life in the U.S. From the interviews, some information existed relating to the interactions between Saudi scholars and the faculty members they worked with while abroad. It was evident that a number of the reentry scholars have been staying in contact with their advisors after returning home, that brain circulation was taking place, and that many of the participants felt supported by their advisors in the U.S. after their programs have ended. Many conversations have taken place in reference to planning to stay in contact after a Saudi reentry scholar returns to Saudi Arabia, which would foster brain circulation. Some participants have discussed plans they have made with their U.S. and faculty members to conduct research together and their intentions to publish together. However, there has been minimal discussion regarding what U.S. faculty members could do to aid Saudi scholars while studying in the U.S.

For example, it might be helpful if faculty in the U.S. were given the opportunity to attend seminars, recommended by a university's administration upon hiring, in which they could learn the best ways to connect with, and assist, students from other countries. A potential opportunity for faculty members to recognize and acknowledge students from abroad would also be to hold international student events and celebrations, perhaps put on by distinct international student clubs, in which faculty members were invited to attend. A final important recommendation would be to impress upon faculty members that international students are frequently limited in English, and other skills, that native-born students may have. In adopting one or more of these strategies, U.S. faculty members could play a much larger role in providing a welcoming atmosphere for students from around the world.

Recommendations for Future Research

Three recommendations for future research were revealed from the study. The order of these recommendations is random and does not specify a greater level of importance for any recommendation. All recommendations for further study are meaningful, valid, and would contribute to the reentry scholar experience and the consequent knowledge these individuals bring to their home country after studying abroad.

1. Consider conducting a quantitative or mixed-methods study. This study employed a qualitative case-study methodology, which facilitated capturing rich details pertaining to the information taken from the interviews with reentry scholars, administrators, and reentry scholar/administrators. However, the sample used in the study was not overly large. Granted this aspect, generalizability may have been inadequate. In situations such as this, using a quantitative methodology could potentially provide a more inclusive set of data, allowing for added discovery regarding the reentry scholar experience.

2. Repeating the study at multiple universities in Saudi Arabia, as well as repeating the study in a manner that focuses more on women, as the women in this study were interviewed via phone. Although this study was conducted comprehensively, it would be valuable to explore if repeating the same study, in different locations, would provide the same, or similar, findings and results. For example, in an area with different cultural values, socio-economic conditions, and more or less study abroad occurring, would the results be equal to the study conducted here? Additionally, would duplicating the study with different countries within the Middle East provide different findings?

These are appropriate and valid questions and could be revealing if this study were conducted under different conditions.

3. Creating a longitudinal study that observes the long-term outcomes of the reentry experience and consequent reintegration into the Saudi educational system could be informative. It would be informative to discern what reentry scholars do professionally in the future, either by choice or circumstance. Exploring the differences among those who integrate successfully versus those who do not, and express this through contention, could be very revealing in determining the level of effectiveness of implementing changes at universities, and in the Saudi Arabian society in general.

Conclusions

Several themes emerged when considering the experiences of reentry scholars, perceptions of administrators, and an analysis of both experiences and perceptions of the reentry scholars/administrator interviewed for this study. While the majority of the all participants agreed that study abroad was positive in many respects, there were some conflict and differences in opinion. Relative to the feelings of reentry scholars, themes such as the reentry experience was considered difficult by Saudi scholars and the associated subthemes were discussed. The first set of themes taken from the reentry scholar data were followed by a discussion relating to Main Theme 1 for administrators, that they had a general understanding of the reentry experience, which was then followed by associated subthemes, which helped me interpret the varied perceptions and experiences of both reentry scholars and administrators.

Main Theme 2 for the reentry scholars (it is challenging to work within the current Saudi system) was discussed, along with the associated subthemes. These themes

were subsequently related to the third theme, collected through the data from administrators, which discussed the administrators' mixed perceptions of the reentry scholars' contributions. This primary theme was then followed by a discussion on the subsequent subthemes associated with Main Theme 3 for administrators. The finally, Main Theme 3 for reentry scholars was that of the existence of opportunities for creating change in the study abroad experience. The associated subthemes analyzed were discussed, followed by an exploration of the administrators' Main Theme 2 regarding their expectations for the reentry scholars. This second main theme for administrators was then followed by two subthemes.

All theme analysis was conducted theme-by-theme for reentry scholars, parallel to the related themes and subthemes for the administrators. The themes were discussed within the context of the research questions and the findings for the reentry scholar/administrators were included. The themes were all discussed framed within the theories reviewed in the literature. The theories were used to generate themes and created a framework within which the data were organized and analyzed. The primary theories used were those of the W-Curve model (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963), organizational theory as presented by Tierney (2008a, 2008b), and brain circulation theories (Perna et al., 2014; Saxenian, 2005). Each theory allowed for an exploration and interpretation of the thoughts, feeling, and perceptions of the participants interviewed for this study.

As reiterated throughout this study, the reentry scholar experience into Saudi Arabian universities to work was challenging on many levels. There were a number of practical, cultural, social, and economic reasons for this phenomenon, as discussed by Tierney (2008a, 2008b). Clearly, the most pressing issue was the experiences reentry

scholars had when returning to Saudi Arabia to work in a university and the long-term consequences of this experience. As noted above, the study sought to help understand the feelings and perceptions of reentry scholars, administrators, and both scholar/administrators. Exploring the research questions via an interpretivist framework enabled greater understanding of the feelings and experiences of the study's participants. As interpretivism has been associated with the idea that human beings understand their worlds in many different ways (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011), discerning how reentry was experienced by reentry scholars, and how administrators perceive reentry scholars, was useful. Together, the participants shared their thoughts and made meaning out of their own unique interpretations.

Using a case-study design to gather information on reentry scholars and administrator allowed for understanding what took place at King Saud University when reentry scholars returned to teach. This study was critically important for exploring the perceptions of reentry scholars, administrators, and reentry scholar/administrators to understand the challenges and opportunities this phenomenon presented. Ultimately, culture shock theory, reverse culture shock, reentry barriers, brain circulation theories, common Islamic values, and Saudi culture as a whole were all important issues in addressing the Saudi scholar reentry into Saudi Arabian universities to work. These theories and considerations were also used in assessing the perceptions of administrators at Kingdom University.

The topic of this study was the reentry experiences of Saudi scholars who had completed their doctoral degrees from United States' universities and returned to become faculty members at Saudi Arabian universities. Likewise, the study explored how

university administrations perceived the reentry of Saudi scholars. This phenomenon would be important for the United States and for Saudi Arabia both. Over the last few decades, thousands of academics have completed doctoral studies in U.S. universities (Hilal et al., 2015). As Saudi students return to their country of origin, there has been an increase in new ideas, entrepreneurship, new institutions, and shifts in consciousness. Potent cultural change in Saudi Arabia, such as women's rights and education (Al-Mubaraki, 2011), have demanded increased numbers of scholars to teach in the universities. In observing and incorporating the recommendations made in this study, these changes could continue to unfold in a manner that would contribute to the well-being of reentry scholars, administrators, the greater administration, and for Saudi society as a whole.

REFERENCES

- Acker, J. (2015). Gendering organizational theory. In J. M. Shafritz, J. S. Ott, & Y. S. Jang (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Adler, N. (1981). Re-entry: Managing cross-cultural transitions. *Group & Organization Management*, 6(3), 341-356.
- Ahmed, M. A. (2015). Outward mobility of Saudi students: An overview. *International Higher Education*, 83, 19-20.
- Al-Mehawes, M. A. (1984). *Saudi Arabian graduate returnees: Their readjustment, stress and coping to adapt and re-integrate into Saudi Arabia* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI Number:8411922)
- Al-Mubarak, A. A. S. (2011). National and global challenges to higher education in Saudi Arabia: Current development and future strategies. In S. Marginson, S. Kaur, & E. Sawi (Eds.), *Higher education in the Asia-Pacific* (pp. 413-430). London, England: Springer Science.
- Alandejani, J. (2013). *Coming home after studying abroad: How Saudi female scholars re-adapt, re-adjust, and transfer their knowledge* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO.

- Almunajjed, M. (2010). *Women's employment in Saudi Arabia: A major challenge*. Retrieved from https://www.arabdevelopmentportal.com/sites/default/files/publication/235.womens_employment_in_saudi_arabia_a_major_challenge.pdf
- Alshuwaikhat, H. M., Adenle Y. A., & Saghir, B. (2016). Sustainability assessment of higher education institutions in Saudi Arabia. *Sustainability*, 8, 750-766.
- Altbach, P. G., & Bassett, R. M. (2014). Nix the BRICs--At least for the higher education debate. *International Higher Education*, 77, 2-5.
- Altbach, P. G., & Engberg, D. (2014a). Bright, young and mobile things. *New Statesman*, 6-9. Retrieved from <http://www.newstatesman.com/sites/default/files/files/New%20Statesman%20Going%20Global%20report.pdf>
- Altbach, P. G., & Engberg, D. (2014b). Global student mobility: The changing landscape. *International Higher Education*, 77, 11-13.
- Arouca, R. A. (2013). *A qualitative study of returning study abroad students: The critical role of reentry support programs* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Montana, Missoula, MT.
- Austin, C. N. (1983). *Cross-cultural reentry: An annotated bibliography*. Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press.
- Austin, C. N. (1986). *Cross-cultural reentry: Readings*. Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press.
- Becker, G. S. (1983). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Blanchard, C. M. (2009). Saudi Arabia: Background and U.S. relations. In D. R. Nagunian (Ed.), *Saudi Arabia: A hotbed of unrest?* New York, NY: Science, 1-57.
- Brockington, J. L., Hoffa, W. W., & Martin, P. C. (Eds.). (2005). *NAFSA's guide to education abroad for advisors and administrators* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: NAFSA Association of International Educators.
- Broido, E. M., & Manning, K. (2002). Philosophical foundations and current theoretical perspectives in qualitative research. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43, 434-445.
- Cannon, R. (2000). The outcomes of an international education for Indonesian graduates: The third place. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19(3), 357-379.
- Casteen, L. D. (2006). *Immersion and reentry: The undergraduate experience of foreign study*. Richmond, VA, University of Virginia.
- Chapra, M. U. (1992). *Islam and the economic challenge*. Herndon, VA: International Institute of Islamic Thought, Islamic Economics Series.
- Clark, N. (2014, Nov. 3). *Education system profiles: Higher education in Saudi Arabia*. Retrieved from the World Education News and Reviews website: <http://wenr.wes.org/2014/11/higher-education-in-saudi-arabia>
- Corey, J. R. (1986). Cultural shock in reverse. In C. Austin (Ed.), *Cross-cultural reentry: A book of readings* (pp. 155-159). Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Crisogen, D. T. (2015). Types of socialization and their importance in understanding the phenomena of socialization. *European Journal of Social Sciences Education and Research*, 5(1), 331-336.
- Crowne, K. A. (2009). Enhancing knowledge transfer during and after international assignments. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 13(4), 134-147.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Doumato, E. A. (2003). Education in Saudi Arabia: Gender, jobs, and the price of religion. In E. A. Doumato & M. P. Posusney (Eds.), *Women and globalization in the Arab Middle East* (pp. 239-258). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Eid, A. G. (2015). *Working paper series: Budgetary institutions, fiscal policy, and economic growth: The case of Saudi Arabia* (Working Paper No. 967). Giza, Egypt: The Economic Research Forum.
- Gama, E. M. P., & Pedersen, P. (1977). Readjustment problems of Brazilian returnees from graduate studies in the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 1(4), 46-59.
- Gaw, K. F. (2000). Reverse culture shock in students returning from overseas. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24(1), 83-104.
- Gibson, W. G., & Brown, A. (2009). *Working with qualitative data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Gullahorn, J. T., & Gullahorn, J. E. (1963). An extension of the U-curve hypothesis. *Journal of Social Issues, 19*, 33-47.
- Haddad, Y. Y., & Esposito, J. L. (1998). *Islam, gender, and social change*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hansel, B. (1993). An investigation of the reentry adjustment of Indians who studied in the U.S.A. *Occasional Papers in Intercultural Learning, 17*. The AFS Center for the Study of Intercultural Learning. Retrieved from <http://bettinahansel.com/OPIL17-Hansel.pdf>
- Harvey, W. (2012). Brain circulation to the UK? Knowledge and investment flows from highly skilled British expatriates in Vancouver. *Journal of Management Development, 31*(2), 173-186.
- Hilal, K. T., Scott, S. R., & Maadad, N. (2015). The political, socio-economic and socio-cultural impacts of the King Abdullah Scholarship Program (KASP) on Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Higher Education, 4*(1), 254-267.
- Holton, E., & Baldwin, T. (2003). *Improving learning transfer in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hunter, P. (2013). Brain drain, brain gain or brain sharing? *EMBO Reports, 14*(4), 315-318.
- Jawad, H. (2003). Muslim feminism: A case study of Amina Wadud's "Qur'an and woman." *Islamic Studies, 42*(1), 107-125.
- Institute of International Education (IIE). (2015a). Open doors data: Fact sheet by country 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/Fact-Sheets-by-Country/2015>

- Institute of International Education (IIE). (2015b). *Open doors data*. Retrieved from the Institute of International Education website: <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/Economic-Impact-of-International-Students>
- Institute of International Education (IIE). (2016). *Open doors data: Fact sheet by country 2016*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/Fact-Sheets-by-Country/2016>
- Iqbal, A., & Kokash, H. (2011). Faculty perception of stress and coping strategies in a Saudi private university: An exploratory study. *International Education Studies*, 4(3), 137.
- Jones, S. R., Torres, V., & Arminio, J. (2013). *Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education: Fundamental elements and issues*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Kapur, D., & McHale, J. (2005). *Give us your best and brightest: The global hunt for talent and its impact on the developing world*. Washington, DC: Center for Global Development.
- Knipfer, C. (2013, December 31). *King Saud University: A journey to Saudi Arabia, pt. 4* [Web Log Post]. Retrieved from <http://www.reallycoolblog.com/king-saud-university-a-journey-to-saudi-arabia-pt-4/>
- Krieger, Z. (2007). Saudi Arabia puts its billions behind western-style higher education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(3), A1.

- LaBrack, B. (2005, October 15). *Top ten immediate reentry challenges*. Retrieved from Resources from the Metro Boston Students Study Abroad Reentry Conference website: http://www.nafsa.org/_/File/_/byexample_2013/Chapter%2010/BASAA%20Coming%20Home.pdf
- Lazarova, M., & Tarique, I. (2005). Knowledge transfer upon repatriation. *Journal of World Business, 40*(4), 361-373.
- Lennon, A. T. (2007). *The epicenter of crisis: The new Middle East*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Le Renard, A. (2008). Only for women: Women, the state, and reform in Saudi Arabia. *Middle East Journal, 62*(4), 610-629.
- Lincoln, Y. S., Lynham, S. A., & Guba, E. G. (2011). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 97-128). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Long, D. E. (2005). *Culture and customs of the Middle East: Culture and customs of Saudi Arabia*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Lysgaard, S. (1955). Adjustment in a foreign society: Norwegian Fulbright grantees visiting the United States. *International Social Science Bulletin, 7*, 45-52.
- Malewski, M. (2005). *Genxpat: The young professional's guide to making a successful life abroad*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (2001). Case studies as qualitative research. *Qualitative Research in Higher Education: Expanding Perspectives, 2*, 191-201.

- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mertens, D. M. (2010). An introduction to research. In *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (3rd ed., pp. 1-45). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Murphy, C. (2011). *Occasional paper series: Saudi Arabia's youth and the kingdom's future*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- National Association of Foreign Student Advisors. (2015). *NAFSA international student economic value tool*. Retrieved from NAFSA Association of International Education website: http://www.nafsa.org/Explore_International_Education/Impact/Data_And_Statistics/NAFSA_International_Student_Economic_Value_Tool/
- Neider, X. N. (2011). "When you come here, it is still like it is their space:" Exploring the experiences of students of Middle Eastern heritages in post-9/11 U.S. higher education. *Journal of International Education and Leadership*, 1(1), 1-19.
- Oberg, K. (1960). Culture shock: Adjustments to new cultural environments. *Practical Anthropology*, 7, 177-182.
- Oddou, G., Osland, J., & Blakeney, R. (2008). Repatriating knowledge: Variables influencing the "transfer" process. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40(2), 181-199.
- Ozden, C., & Schiff, M. (2005, October 31). *International migration: Brain drain or brain gain?* Retrieved from the Yale Global Online website: <http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/display.article?id=6428>.

- Pai, H. C. (1997). *Reentry difficulty, life satisfaction, and psychological well-being of Taiwanese students who have returned from the United States* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.
- Parveen, M. (2013). Faculty stress in a Saudi government university. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(18), 261-264.
- Pederson, P. (1996). *The five stages of culture shock: Critical incidents around the world*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Perna, L. W., Orosz, K., Gopaul, B., Jumakulov, Z., Ashirbekov, A., & Kishkentayeva, M. (2014). Promoting human capital development: A typology of international scholarship programs in higher education. *Educational Researcher*, 43(2), 63-73.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(20), 137-145.
- Rice, G., & Al-Mossawi, M. (2002). The implications of Islam for advertising messages: The Middle Eastern context. *Journal of Euromarketing*, 11(3), 1-16.
- Robertson, C. J., Al-Khatib, J. A., Al-Habib, M., & Lanoue, D. (2008). Beliefs about work in the Middle East and the convergence versus divergence of values. *Journal of World Business*, 36 (3), 223-244.
- Rowan-Kenyon, H. T., & Niehaus, E. K. (2011). One year later: The influence of short-term study abroad experiences on students. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 48(2), 213-228.
- Saeed, F. (1987). *Social consequences of overseas education: Readjustment of returning Pakistani scholars* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

- Sam, D. L., & Berry, J. W. (2010). Acculturation: When individuals and groups of different cultural backgrounds meet. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(4), 472-481.
- Saudi Arabia Ministry of Higher Education. (2012). *King Abdullah scholarships program*. Retrieved from <http://www.mohe.gov.sa/en/studyaboard/King-Abdullahstages/Pages/default.aspx>
- Saudi Arabia Ministry of Higher Education. (2013). *The current status of higher education*. Retrieved from <https://www.moe.gov.sa/ar/Ministry/Deputy-Ministry-for-Planning-and-Information-affairs/The-General-Administration-of-Planning/Documents/777.pdf>
- Saudi Arabian Cultural Mission (SACM). (2015). *Welcome to SACM*. Retrieved from the SACM website: <http://www.sacm.org/default.aspx>
- Saudi Gazette. (2015, May 28). *More women than men in Saudi universities, says ministry*. Retrieved from the Saudi Gazette website: <http://english.alarabiya.net/en/perspective/features/2015/05/28/More-women-than-men-in-Saudi-universities-says-ministry.html>
- Saxenian, A. (2002). Brain circulation: How high-skill immigration makes everyone better off. *The Brookings Review*, 20(1), 28-31.
- Saxenian, A. (2005). From brain drain to brain circulation: Transnational communities and regional upgrading in India and China. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 40(2), 35-61.
- Seidman, I. E. (1991). *Interviewing as a qualitative research*. New York, NY: Teacher College Press.

- Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 435-454). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stark, O., Helmenstein, C., & Prskawetz, A. (1997). A brain gain with a brain drain. *Economics Letters*, 55(2), 227-234.
- Storti, C. (1990). *The art of coming home*. London, UK: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- Sussman, N. M. (1986). Re-entry research and training: Methods and implications. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10, 235-254
- Takeuchi, A. (2008). *Issues related to female study-abroad returnees: A comparative analysis of Japan and Thailand* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI Number:3308099)
- Taylor, C., & Albasri, W. (2014). The impact of Saudi Arabia King Abdullah's scholarship program in the U.S. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 2, 109-118.
- Teferra, D. (2005) Brain circulation: Unparalleled opportunities, underlying challenges, and outmoded presumptions. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9(3), 229-250.
- Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 59(1), 2-21.
- Tierney, W. G. (2008a). Trust and organizational culture in higher education. In J. Valimas & O. Ylijoki (Eds.), *Cultural perspectives on higher education* (pp. 27-41). New York, NY: Springer.
- Tierney, W. G. (2008b). *The impact of culture on organizational decision-making: Theory and practice in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

- Tierney, W. G. (2016). *The impact of culture on organizational decision-making: Theory and practice in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Uehara, A. (1986a). *Comparison of reentry adjustment between Japanese and American students: An interactionist perspective* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.
- Uehara, A. (1986b). The nature of American student reentry adjustment and perceptions of the sojourn experience. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10(4), 415-438.
- Weaver, G. R. (Ed.). (1987). *The process of reentry. (Originally) Readings in cross-cultural communication* (2nd ed.). Lexington, MA: Ginn Press. Retrieved from: https://www.berry.edu/uploadedFiles/Website/Academics/Majors_and_Minors/International_Programs/_Assets/Documents/WeaverArticle.pdf
- Westwood, M. J., Lawrence, W. S., & Paul, D. (1986). Preparing for re-entry: A program for the sojourning student. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling*, 9(3), 221-230.
- Wielkiewicz, R.M. & Turkowski, L. W. (2010). Reentry issues upon returning from study abroad programs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51(6), 646-664.
- Yakaboski, T., Perez-Velez, K., & Almutairi, Y. (2017a). Collectivists' decision-making: Saudi Arabian graduate students' study abroad choices. *Journal of International Students*, 7(1), 49-112.
- Yakaboski, T., Perez-Velez, K., & Almutairi, Y. (2017b). Breaking the silence: Saudi graduate student experiences on a U.S. campus. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*.

- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Zakari, N. (2012). The Influence of academic organizational climate on nursing faculty members' commitment in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice, 12*(1), 66-76.
- Zhou, Y., Jindal-Snape, D., Topping, K., & Todman, J. (2008). Theoretical models of culture shock and adaptation in international students in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 33*(1), 63-75.

APPENDIX A
RECRUITMENT EMAIL FOR INTERVIEWS

RECRUITMENT EMAIL FOR INTERVIEWS

Greetings,

My name is Yousef Almutairi and I am a Ph.D. student at the University of Northern Colorado in the Higher Education and Student Affairs Leadership program. I am in my fourth year in the Ph.D. program and conducting research in an effort *to understand how reentry Saudi scholars experience their organizational work in Kingdom University and how the university administrators perceive the reentry of Saudi scholars*. In speaking with _____, it is my understanding that you may be willing and able to meet with me for an interview.

I am interested in speaking with you to learn more about your work environment experiences in your organization work (university). Your participation in this study will provide knowledge and information around the experiences of reentry of Saudi scholars. The interview will consist of a digitally recorded sixty to ninety minutes one-on-one interview with me. The recorded interview will be kept confidential. Participation is voluntary and also [I will put IRB approval] has approved the research study.

If you would or (still would you like to participate) like to participate in this study, please contact me at almu4680@bears.unco.edu or yousefalmutairi@yahoo.com. The location and time of the interview is flexible to fit your availability and convenient. Thank you very much for your time and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Yousef Mubrik N Almutairi, Ph.D. Student
Higher Education & Student Affairs Leadership
University of Northern Colorado

APPENDIX B
CONSENT FORM FOR HUMAN PARTICIPANTS
IN RESEARCH

UNIVERSITY of
NORTHERN COLORADO



CONSENT FORM FOR HUMAN PARTICIPANTS IN RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

Project Title: The reentry of Saudi Scholars experience in Saudi Universities how the university administrations perceive the reentry of Saudi scholars

Researcher: Yousef Mubrik N Almutairi, Higher Education & Student Affairs Leadership Ph.D. student at University of Northern Colorado

Email: almu4680@bears.unco.edu or yousefalmutairi@yahoo.com

Phone: 001269-267-1820 or 00966508993518

Supervising Professor: Dr. Tamara Yakaboski

Email: tamara.yakaboski@unco.edu

Purpose and Description:

The purpose of study will be to understand the reentry experience of Saudi Arabian scholars returning home from U.S. doctoral education to work as a faculty in Saudi university how the university administrations perceive the reentry of Saudi scholars . Reentry scholars are generally defined as individuals who return to teach at an institution of higher education after having received a doctoral degree from a U.S. university. By understanding the experience of reentry Saudi scholars in Saudi universities, the study will offer a better understanding of the reentry of Saud scholars' experiences and offer a recommendation to help these scholars and institutions improve the transition and readjustment period.

By participating you agree to conduct a semi-structured, open-ended interview that will last anywhere from 60 to 90 minutes. The interview will take place in a location that is agreed upon by both parties, and will be recorded with a digital device. I will do everything possible to maintain your confidentiality by assigning a pseudonym, or you may choose to use another if you wish. Lastly, the data gathered during the interview, and the study as a whole, will be kept in my personal, password-protected computer, to which only I will have access.

The benefit to you in participating in this study is an opportunity to share your experience, which may provide other U.S. and Saudi universities the tools needed to

support students, like yourself, in the transition from one environment to another. This study will also be used to inform larger bodies of research, and the academic community as a whole, to find more effective ways to support Saudi graduates returning from abroad to work in Saudi Universities.

The risks associated with participating in this study are minimal, and there are no foreseeable future risks in being a part of this study as well. I am in no way in a position to influence your position as a Saudi university employee, and I will join you in signing the consent form and will keep our conversation confidential.

Your participation is completely voluntary. At any time, you can choose not to participate in the study, and you may also begin the process and then decide to opt out. Whether you choose to continue to be a part of the study until the end, your decisions will be respected. In having read the entirety of this document, and in having had the opportunity to ask any questions or clear up any concerns, please sign in the appropriate area below if you are willing to participate. Lastly, you will receive a copy of this form to keep for your own personal reference. If you have any concerns about your selection or treatment as a research participant, please contact the Office of Sponsored Programs, Kepner Hall, University of Northern Colorado Greeley, CO 80639; 970-351-2161.

 Participant's Signature

 Date

 E-mail

 Researcher's Signature

 Date

APPENDIX C
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR SCHOLARS



INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR SCHOLARS

1. Tell me about your educational and work background.
2. What was your overall experience like in attending a U.S. university?
3. Did your institution sponsor you while you attend a U.S. university? If so, what type of support did you receive? If not, why?
4. Why did you decide to get a doctoral degree in a U.S. university? What were your intentions and did you fulfill your goals?
5. Tell me about your current position and how long you have been in it. Can you describe how your reentry experience into Kingdom University for work has been like?
6. How did you feel when you first came to the Saudi university as a reentry employee?
7. Did the institution/department at the Kingdom University you are working at have any transition program?
8. Has your study abroad experience changed your perspective of working in a Saudi university?
9. How has your study abroad experience affected your academic perception of the university?
10. Have your experiences abroad affected your involvement with others and programs at the university?
11. Based on your experiences abroad and in your reentry, how do you view your work life now compared to when you initially returned to work at the university?

12. Tell me about a positive reentry experience in the university? Tell me about a negative experience?
13. How would you describe your interactions with faculty from who attended Western universities compared to those who did not study in the West?
14. Do you interact with faculty who got their degree from inside Saudi universities? If yes, why? If no, why do not you?
15. Tell me about the environment in your department program and in the university? Did you find it welcoming? Collaborative? Individualized? Helpful?
16. Tell me about your department head, dean, and university administrators? How do you describe your experience with them? Have they provided the support you need to feel welcome?
17. What goals do you have since you returned to work in the university?
18. How would you describe the culture environment of the university? In the department?
19. Has your western university helped and prepared you to ease the transition back home and your work in Kingdom University? If yes, how?
20. How do you wish your US university had prepared you for your reentry experiences into Kingdom University?
21. What is your perception about the uniqueness of the Saudi culture in terms of reentry as a male/female reentry scholar?
22. Do you still have contact with your various department, school, and friends in the U.S.? Yes, who? No, why not?
23. There is some literature regarding reentry scholars that suggest they feel homeless at times. How would you respond to that?
24. What kind of impact did your reentry process have on your immediate and extended family relations?
25. What else would you like to share about your return?
26. How do you think your reentry experiences were different because you are a female?

APPENDIX D
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR
ADMINISTRATIONS



INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR
ADMINISTRATIONS

1. Tell me about your experience with Saudi scholars who received their doctorate degree from U.S. universities.
2. How do you perceive reentry Saudi scholars?
3. Do you interact with Saudi reentry scholars? If yes, how are these interactions like, and if not, why not.
4. What do you expect from Saudi scholars who received their doctoral degree from U.S. universities?
5. Tell me about a positive experience with Saudi scholars in the university? Tell me about a negative experience?
6. What do you think of the reentry of Saudi scholars returning to King Saud University?
7. Do you still have contact with Saudi scholars who are in the university? Yes, who? No, why not?
8. Do you have an understanding of the experiences of Saudi scholars in U.S. universities and in Kingdom University when they return here?
9. What else would you like to share about your return?