Muslim Chaplaincy on campus

Case studies of two American universities

Thesis submitted to the University of Oxford for the degree of DPhil

Aly Kassam-Remtulla
Department of Education
Balliol College

Trinity 2012

ABSTRACT

MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY ON CAMPUS: CASE STUDIES OF TWO AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

Aly Kassam-Remtulla, Balliol College, DPhil in Education, Trinity 2012

This thesis investigates the emergence and development of Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton and Rutgers universities. It seeks to answer three questions: (1) How did university-based Muslim Chaplaincy develop? (2) What roles did Muslim Chaplains play? and (3) Why did university administrators hire and sanction Muslim Chaplains? The thesis explores these questions by examining the decision making processes of administrators through in-depth case studies based on observations, document analysis, and 64 interviews with current and former Muslim Chaplains, University Chaplains, Muslim student leaders, faculty members, alumni, and other administrators. The case studies are prefaced by a description of the national context for campus Muslim Chaplaincy based on 36 interviews with religious life professionals at 21 other colleges.

My research suggests that Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton emerged through the advocacy of Christian University Chaplains; in contrast, at Rutgers the role was created by a local community organisation and sanctioned by student affairs professionals. Campus Muslim Chaplains played a variety of roles. For Muslim students, they provided religious, pastoral, advisory, educational, programmatic, and liaisonal support. They also served other university constituents and local community members. Administrators at both institutions had multiple rationales for hiring and sanctioning Muslim Chaplains: to advance social justice for Muslim students, to provide an educational benefit to non-Muslim students, to remain competitive with peer institutions, to overcome histories of exclusion, and to avoid potential crisis situations.

The goal of this study is to make two contributions to knowledge. In terms of its subject, this thesis provides the first empirical case studies of Muslim Chaplaincy in American higher education and frames these cases within the national context. In terms of theory, this study aims to develop an understanding of the administrative rationales behind the creation of Muslim Chaplaincies. It does this through the application of the political, cultural, and adaptive sociological models of the university. In particular, it draws on the concepts of institutional isomorphism and risk mitigation/management as explanations for the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing this thesis has been one of the most rewarding and challenging experiences of my life. It is truly amazing to reflect on the varied experiences that have contributed to this long journey, which began even before I started at Oxford in October 2007.

I will begin with my academic colleagues at Oxford. First and foremost is my supervisor David Mills, who approached our relationship with a profound respect for my interests and circumstances, and who gave me the freedom to pursue this project on my terms, while keeping me on the right path. Also at Oxford, I benefited enormously from careful readings and sage advice from Ingrid Lunt, as well as rich conversations with my doctoral colleagues Vera Busse, Lindsay Burton, Hannah Grainger Clemson, Mounira Jamjoom, Chia-Ying Lee, Jang Ho "Chris" Lee, Yuen Yi Lo, Michael Loizou, Mitsuko Matsumoto, Evi Polydorou, and Jane Card Thick. A particular nod of thanks to Machi Sato. I owe a special debt to those who examined various iterations of this thesis, including Michael Biggs, the late Terrence Copley, Sophie Gilliat-Ray, Geoffrey Walford, and Sir David Watson. This project has benefited enormously from your generous and close readings.

I have many academic colleagues (around the world) to thank for their generosity and insight: Sophie Gilliat-Ray, Beth Green, Hiranthi Jayaweera, Zuki Karpinska, Azmat Khan, David Kovara, Rachel Mazyck, Nadeem Memon, Asma Mirza, Eboo Patel, Hussein Rashid, and Joan Scott. I benefited particularly from colleagues at New York University (NYU) where I spent two years as a Visiting Scholar, especially Mitchell Stevens (and participants in his qualitative methods seminar) and Harold Wechsler. Monisha Bajaj, Chitra Deshpande, Katy Evans-Bush, and Travis Wright read drafts of these chapters and provided detailed comments.

As you will see, this project involved research across the United States and frequent trips to Oxford. In so many locations I was a welcomed guest of friends and family including Maureen Darcy in Beacon, Nadia Ellis and Stephen Russell in Princeton, Ethan and Marlene Glickman in East Brunswick, Janet Greenland in Oxford, Alais Griffin and Chris Albrecht in Washington, D.C., Akhil Gupta and Purnima Mankekar in Santa Monica, Murad Hajeebhoy in London, Matt and Karen Huyck in Cambridge, Tiffany Kuo in New Haven, Kamla Mankekar in Santa Monica,

Margaret Manson and Sandy Sladen in Amherst, Donald Markwell and the staff of Rhodes House in Oxford, Christina and Mason Mills-Astley in Boston, Val Smith in Princeton, Louis Thomas in Philadelphia, David Ragland and Maria Hantzopoulos in Poughkeepsie, and Anna Touloumakos in Oxford.

A particular challenge for me was finding the time and energy to be a doctoral student while working: part-time at first, and then full-time since early 2010. I owe a deep debt to my colleagues at Princeton for their empathy, support, and flexibility. This group includes many who offered useful advice, having travelled down this path themselves: Mary Aaen, Marcia Berberian, Amy Campbell, Cynthia Cherrey, Mary DeLorenzo, Jena Dillon, Felicia Edwards, Chris Eisgruber, Karen Haskin, Matt and Tara Kinsey, Cheri Lawson, Michele Minter, Jen Neill, Hilary Parker, Terri Harris Reed, Ellen Riscoe, Val Smith, Kelly Steve, John Weeren, and Treby Williams. Special thanks to Mark Burstein, Kathy Rohrer, and Laura Strickler for being among my most ardent cheerleaders and supporters and to Karen Trainer for extended library privileges. I thank my ACLU colleagues Andrew Domingue and Dorothy Ehrlich for their support and consideration.

I am incredibly lucky to have generous and optimistic friends who offered hope, distraction, and support through emails, phone calls, and meals. These enduring individuals include Zahid Chaudhary, Mira and Alex Debs, Ashindi Maxton, Dilip Ninan and Gillian Sinnott, Lori Ormrod, and Nisha Varia. Many people offered advice and the words of Andrew Kuper and Ada Skyles were mantras, which I whispered many times along the way. I owe gratitude to my brother Tariq Remtulla and to my new family for their heartfelt support, especially Laura and Jack Nizewitz, Mark and Barbara Nizewitz, and Ethan and Marlene Glickman.

This type of research is only possible through participants and funders willing to make an investment. I owe a great debt to the almost 100 students, faculty members, alumni, and administrators from nearly two dozen campuses, who agreed to speak with me. I cannot thank them by name but I appreciate their honesty, wisdom, compassion, and commitment. I hope I have done justice to their thoughts and words. A word of gratitude to my funders, including All Souls College, Balliol College, the Institute for Ismaili Studies, NASPA Foundation, and the Oxford Department of Education.

There are five people who played a special role in shepherding me along the way: Sarah Schulman for easing me back into student life, profound conversations about methodology and theory, and bringing Texas sunshine and Southwestern cuisine to our flat in Jericho; Andrée

Marks for her indomitable spirit, generous and protective sympathy, steady encouragement, and late evening distractions in Princeton; my parents Amina and Ebrahim Remtulla for supporting me unconditionally (even when they weren't sure how or why I ended up on this journey!); and finally, my husband Lee James for academic insight, incredible patience and empathy, unending optimism and encouragement, a willingness to put so many important things 'on hold', sacrifices of our precious time together, and being by my side every step of the way.

Thank you all!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS **9**

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION **10**
1.1. RATIONALE 10
1.2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE TOPIC 11
1.3. STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS 15
1.4. NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY 16

CHAPTER 2: MINORITY STUDENT POLICIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION **18**
2.1. TYPES OF MINORITY STUDENT POLICIES 20
2.1.1. ADMISSIONS 20
2.1.2. CURRICULUM AND ACADEMIC PROGRAMMES 21
2.1.3. FACULTY 21
2.1.4. EXTRACURRICULUM 22
2.2. HOW UNIVERSITIES CREATED MINORITY STUDENT POLICIES 24
2.2.1. INTEREST GROUPS 25
2.2.2. ADMINISTRATORS 27
2.3. WHY UNIVERSITIES CREATED MINORITY STUDENT POLICIES 29
2.3.1. ADVANCE SOCIAL JUSTICE 30
2.3.2. BENEFIT MAJORITY STUDENTS 31
2.3.3. MAINTAIN/INCREASE PRESTIGE AND RESOURCES 32
2.3.4. PRESERVE ORDER 34
2.4. CONCEPTUAL MODELS 35
2.4.1. POLITICAL MODEL 36
2.4.2. CULTURAL MODEL 37
2.4.3. ADAPTIVE MODEL 39
2.5. CONCLUSION 41

CHAPTER 3: RELIGION IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION **42**
3.1. RELIGION IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION 42
3.1.1. PROTESTANT ORIGINS 42
3.1.2. CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS 43
3.1.3. SECULARISM 45
3.1.4. THE MULTI-FAITH CAMPUS 46
3.2. MUSLIM STUDENTS IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION 49
3.2.1. EXPERIENCES OF MUSLIM COLLEGE STUDENTS 50
3.2.2. MUSLIM STUDENT ASSOCIATIONS 51
3.2.3. CAMPUS TENSIONS 52
3.2.4. ACCOMMODATIONS 55
3.2.5. MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY IN THE UNITED STATES 56
3.3. CONCLUSION 58

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY **60**
4.1. RESEARCH DESIGN AND PHILOSOPHY 60
4.1.1. RESEARCH DESIGN 60
4.1.2. RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY AND PERSONAL BIOGRAPHY 62
4.1.3. CASE SELECTION 64
4.1.4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS 68

4.2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 69
4.2.1. PILOT RESEARCH 69
4.2.2. DATA SOURCES 71
4.2.3. ACCESS 75
4.2.4. DATA ANALYSIS AND VALIDITY 80
4.3. ETHICS, PERSONAL CONSIDERATIONS, AND LIMITATIONS 83
4.4. CONCLUSION 88

CHAPTER 5: MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION 89
5.1. DEVELOPMENT OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY 90
5.1.1. CHRONOLOGY 90
5.1.2. CATALYSTS/ORIGINS 94
5.1.2.1. ADMINISTRATION-INITIATED 95
5.1.2.2. ADMINISTRATION-EXPANDED 99
5.1.2.3. ADMINISTRATION-SANCTIONED 101
5.1.2.4. THE EFFECTS OF 9/11 104
5.2. STRUCTURES, ATTRIBUTES, AND ROLES OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINS 105
5.2.1. STRUCTURES OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY 106
5.2.1.1. MODELS 106
EXCEPTIONAL MODEL 108
INCLUSIVE MODEL 110
EXCLUSIVE MODEL 111
5.2.1.2. FINANCIAL INVESTMENT 112
5.2.2. ATTRIBUTES 113
5.2.2.1. JOB TITLES 113
5.2.2.2. DEMOGRAPHICS 115
5.2.2.3. TRAINING AND CREDENTIALS 117
5.2.3. ROLES OF CHAPLAINS 121
5.2.3.1. SERVING MUSLIM STUDENTS 121
5.2.3.2. SERVING THE UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY 125
5.3. CONCLUSION 133

CHAPTER 6: MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY AT PRINCETON 135
6.1. PRINCETON UNIVERSITY 135
6.2. EMERGENCE OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY 139
6.3. ROLES OF THE MUSLIM CHAPLAIN 147
6.4. RATIONALES TO HIRE A MUSLIM CHAPLAIN 151
6.4.1. SUPPORT MUSLIM STUDENTS 152
6.4.2. OVERCOME HISTORICAL REPUTATION 155
6.4.3. BENEFIT NON-MUSLIM STUDENTS 157
6.4.4. MAINTAIN PRESTIGE AND RESOURCES 158
6.5. CONCLUSION 161

CHAPTER 7: MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY AT RUTGERS 163
7.1. RUTGERS UNIVERSITY 163
7.2. EMERGENCE OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY 167
7.3. ROLES OF THE MUSLIM CHAPLAIN 172
7.4. SANCTIONING MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY 177
7.4.1. LIMITATIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT 177
7.4.1.1. LEGAL LIMITATIONS 177
7.4.1.2. FINANCIAL LIMITATIONS 179
7.4.1.3 CULTURAL LIMITATIONS 180

7.4.1.4. STRUCTURAL LIMITATIONS....181
7.4.2. RATIONALES TO SUPPORT A MUSLIM CHAPLAIN....182
7.5. CONCLUSION....184

CHAPTER 8: ANALYSIS....186
8.1. CONCEPTUAL MODELS REVISITED....186
8.1.1. POLITICAL MODEL....186
8.1.1.1. NATIONAL FINDINGS....187
8.1.1.2. CASE STUDY FINDINGS....190
8.1.2. CULTURAL MODEL....191
8.1.2.1. NATIONAL FINDINGS....191
8.1.2.2. CASE STUDY FINDINGS....192
8.1.3. ADAPTIVE MODEL....193
8.1.3.1. NATIONAL FINDINGS....193
RESOURCE DEPENDENCY THEORY....193
INSTITUTIONAL ISOMORPHISM THEORY....194
STRATEGIC CHOICE THEORY....198
8.1.3.2. CASE STUDY FINDINGS....200
RESOURCE DEPENDENCY THEORY....200
INSTITUTIONAL ISOMORPHISM THEORY....201
STRATEGIC CHOICE THEORY....202
8.2. RISK MANAGEMENT AND THE ANTICIPATORY UNIVERSITY....203
8.2.1. THE ANTICIPATORY UNIVERSITY....203
8.2.1.1. CONCERN FOR RISK AND PROACTIVE RISK MANAGEMENT....203
8.2.1.2. REPUTATIONAL RISK....205
8.2.1.3. RISK AND PEER COMPETITION....208
8.2.2. MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY AS RISK MANAGEMENT....210
8.2.2.1. MUSLIM CHAPLAIN AS LEADER....211
8.2.2.2. MUSLIM CHAPLAIN AS AMBASSADOR....214
8.3. CONCLUSION....217

CHAPTER 9: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS....219
9.1. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS....219
9.1.1. HOW DID UNIVERSITY-BASED MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY DEVELOP?....220
9.1.2. WHAT ROLES DID MUSLIM CHAPLAINS PLAY?....221
9.1.3. WHY DID UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS HIRE AND SANCTION MUSLIM CHAPLAINS?....222
9.2. EVOLUTION AND POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY....224
9.2.1. EVOLUTION OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY....224
9.2.2. POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY....229
9.3. FURTHER RESEARCH AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS....231
9.3.1. FURTHER RESEARCH....231
9.3.2. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS....234
9.3.2.1. FOR MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY....234
9.3.2.2. FOR RELIGIOUS AND SPIRITUAL LIFE ON CAMPUS....237

APPENDIX A: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES....240
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE....243
APPENDIX C: CUREC FORMS....246
GLOSSARY....250
WORKS CITED AND BIBLIOGRAPHY....252

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAUDE – American Association of Universities Data Exchange

CAMERA – Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America

CILRU – Center for Islamic Life at Rutgers University

CJL – Center for Jewish Life (Princeton University)

COFHE – Consortium on Financing Higher Education

IFAW – Islamo-Fascism Awareness Week

ISRU – Islamic Society of Rutgers University

LGBT – lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered

MIT – Massachusetts Institute of Technology

MSA – Muslim Students Association

NYU – New York University

OMCRU – Office of the Muslim Chaplain of Rutgers University

ORL – Office of Religious Life

RLA – Religious Life Association (Rutgers University)

RLC – Religious Life Council (Rutgers University)

UCLA – University of California at Los Angeles

USC – University of Southern California

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 2000 there were only a handful of Muslim Chaplains working in American higher education. A dozen years later there were more than 40 people on campuses across the United States serving in this role. This number now includes eight full-time employees at some of America's most selective universities. In this thesis, I aim to understand how Muslim Chaplaincy emerged at Rutgers and Princeton universities, what roles these Muslim Chaplains played, and why university administrators hired or sanctioned them. What follows is an attempt to answer these questions, and to provide some broader insight into decision making in American higher education.

In this chapter I articulate the rationale, development of the topic, and structure of the thesis. The rationale will describe the importance of the study, by exploring the topic, method, and context in relation to the current state of research. In the next section, I explain my motivation for doing this research based on my personal experiences and research interests. In the final section I describe the structure of the thesis by summarising each of the remaining eight chapters. I end with a note on terminology.

1.1. RATIONALE

This study describes the emergence and development of Muslim Chaplaincy in American higher education, a phenomenon that now exists on more than 40 college campuses across the United States. As the literature review in Chapter 2 and 3 will demonstrate, while research on minority student initiatives has focused on access, curriculum, and faculty, research related to the non-academic aspect of the college experience lacks scholarly attention. Furthermore, the literature about religion in higher education has been overwhelmingly focused on Protestantism and

Catholicism, with some recent attention to Judaism. Very little has been written about Islam in higher education, and almost nothing has been published about institutional policies towards contemporary religious minorities in the United States. This dissertation will be among the first to begin to address these gaps in the literature.

I have attempted to make two contributions to knowledge through this study. First, the thesis chronicles the emergence of university-based Muslim Chaplaincy in the United States. Drawing on 100 semi-structured interviews, observations, and documents, it details the phenomenon on two contrasting campuses and then frames those cases within a national context. Second, by applying three sociological models this study aims to develop an understanding of the mechanisms and rationales behind institutionally-created Muslim Chaplaincies. It presents a new model of the 'anticipatory university', which is increasingly concerned with mitigating reputational and other forms of risk.

The methodology used for this inquiry is the dual case study, which is well-suited to research that explores a new phenomenon. I selected contrasting 'leading edge' cases to understand how Muslim Chaplaincy developed and functioned in new and different institutional contexts and to increase the likelihood of surfacing a broad range of themes and issues associated with Muslim Chaplaincy.

At the time I began my research, Rutgers was the only public institution with a full-time Muslim Chaplain, and Princeton was one of five private institutions with such a position. While the cases were not meant to be representative of the full spectrum of schools with Muslim Chaplains, this methodology allowed me to surface insight which could have value in understanding the phenomenon in other contexts. These detailed cases were supplemented with a broader context for Muslim Chaplaincy based on interviews with religious life staff members at 21 other institutions.

1.2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE TOPIC

This research topic evolved from the confluence of two areas of interest. The first was a curiosity about the dramatic changes that have occurred at America's selective colleges and universities since the 1960s. Women's colleges were formed in the colonial era, historically

black colleges and universities began in the 1850s, land-grant institutions for working class students started in the late 1800s, and Jewish higher education emerged in the 1920s. However, it is only in the last half century that these and other 'minority students' have been welcome at the nation's more prestigious institutions of higher learning which had been traditionally reserved for wealthy, white, Christian men. As important sites for cultural, economic and political mobility and change, these institutions have served as critical venues for social movements in the last half-century, including the black civil rights movement, protests over Vietnam, the South African divestment movement, and the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered) rights movement – to name a few. The opening up of universities in the 1960s took place in a tense and sometimes violent environment, but decades later the attitude towards 'difference' had changed. In the 1990s and beyond, 'difference' was valorised by some through movements for diversity, multiculturalism, and internationalisation; it also created a vocal backlash. Today, not only are minority students eligible for access to the top institutions, but colleges and universities have created special programmes to identify, admit, recruit, educate, house, retain, and graduate them, and later turn them into active alumni.

I am interested in how and why this change occurred. Why did these selective institutions go from keeping minority students out to actively bringing them in? How did their needs differ from students from the cultural majority, and how did institutions respond to, understand, and accommodate those needs? How did universities manage and control these students? Did students advocate for themselves, and were they successful? Who else advocated for these students? What accommodations did they receive, and why? Who did these accommodations serve? These questions have broad relevance for American society. Our selective colleges have long been access points to positions of power in government, business, higher education, and the non-profit sector. Well into the twenty-first century, they remain critical to gathering, developing, and connecting what will become the nation's elite. That function of selective universities has not changed – even though the gender, race, class, and religion of their students have.

My second area of interest was the status of Muslim-American youth after the events of 9/11. The terrorist attacks were a watershed moment for Muslims in the United States. The demographic destiny of that population had been set in motion with the 1965 change to U.S. immigration law, which reversed a decades-long ban on immigrants from outside Europe. This legal breakthrough allowed thousands of Muslim immigrants from South Asia, the Arab world, Iran, Turkey, Southeast Asia, and Africa to come to the U.S.. As students, workers, and

immigrants, they joined the existing population of African-American Muslims who had been practicing for decades as well as earlier waves of twentieth-century immigrants from Lebanon, Turkey, Yemen, and Palestine. The children of post-1965 immigrants, who grew up in the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s, were profoundly affected by America's 'War on Terror' and the government's foreign policies towards Muslim-majority countries.

I was curious about the experiences of young Muslim-Americans coming of age during this time. Beyond the expected challenges faced by those who were the children of immigrants, converts, and people of colour, Muslim-American youth in general were exposed to a host of additional challenges and complexities in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. How did 9/11 affect the way they viewed themselves and were perceived of by others? How were they treated by non-Muslim friends, teachers, neighbours, and classmates after 9/11? How did they navigate and balance the cultures of their homes with the cultures of their schools? With which groups and countries did they identify? Who were their allies and opponents? How did they practice their faith; were they more or less observant than their parents? How did they express their Muslim identity?

As I began to consider how these two interests might intersect, I was struck by the activity and engagement of Muslim youth on college and university campuses. One manifestation of that was the hundreds of Muslim Students Associations (MSAs) that developed across the country. As student-initiated and student-led groups, MSAs supported religious, educational, social, and interfaith activities for Muslim students. On some campuses MSAs engaged with university administrators to advocate for accommodations such as prayer rooms and halal food (permissible by Islamic law). MSAs were loosely connected through an organisation with affiliates in Canada and the United States, which helped to initiate, train, and sustain clubs, and united them in advocacy and fundraising. Given their existence on college campuses, MSAs were comparatively integrated along ethnic, sectarian, and gender lines. In aggregate, they formed the largest and most widespread formal Muslim-American organisation – although they have not been acknowledged as such.

In the course of my research, I made an interesting discovery: a few colleges and universities had individuals serving as 'Muslim Chaplains'. I had never heard the term before, but it seemed to be an oxymoron, since the word 'chaplain' so clearly came from the Christian tradition and there was no analogous role in Islam. I assumed that these individuals were local Imams (Muslim religious leaders usually associated with a mosque) volunteering to provide occasional

support to MSAs. As I read more, however, it became clear that most of these chaplains were not mosque Imams. They were predominantly 20 and 30-year old American-born children of immigrants, paid by universities to serve as advisors and leaders. I was intrigued by the types of institutions that had hired Muslim Chaplains: for example, Mount Holyoke (a small women's college in rural Massachusetts), Georgetown (a large Jesuit Catholic university in Washington, D.C.), and Princeton (among the most patrician of the Ivy League schools). This development was especially puzzling because the institutions with Muslim Chaplains generally had few Muslim students. I wondered how the positions developed. What roles these individuals played? What their relationships to MSAs were? Had there been resistance to hiring these religious leaders?

As I reviewed the literature, I found that very little had been published about Muslim Chaplaincy in the United States. As a result, although I had initially expected my research to focus on the experiences and identities of Muslim students, I shifted my emphasis to understanding why college and university administrators had hired and sanctioned Muslim Chaplains. I wanted to examine the development of Muslim Chaplaincy within the context of increasing access and accommodation that had become a hallmark of American higher education in the last few decades. In particular, I wanted to explore how and why university administrators made policy decisions about minority students and how those decisions were influenced by their institutional culture and history, the interests of various groups within the university, their relationship to peer institutions, and the broader socio-political context.

As I will describe in more detail in Chapter 4 ('Methodology'), this project is concerned with answering three primary research questions:

- How did university-based Muslim Chaplaincy develop?
- What roles did Muslim Chaplains play?
- Why did university administrators hire and sanction Muslim Chaplains?

This thesis does not aim to fully explore questions about the motivations, training, credentials, experiences, or practice of campus Muslim Chaplains, nor does it seek to understand the benefits and drawbacks of the relationships between Muslim students and Muslim Chaplains. These topics are noted in the final chapter as areas for further exploration.

1.3. STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

In this section I provide brief summaries of the eight remaining chapters in the thesis.

Chapter 2 ('Minority Student Policies in Higher Education') does four things. First, it reviews *which* higher education policies relate to minority students, revealing a gap in academic attention to policies in the extracurriculum (what students do outside of the classroom). Second, it explains *how* such policies have been created. Third, using historical examples it describes *why* colleges and universities adopted policies targeting minority students. Finally, it introduces three conceptual models from the sociological literature – political, cultural and adaptive – to explain the empirical information described in the chapter.

Chapter 3 ('Religion in American Higher Education') provides an overview of religion in American higher education from Protestant origins, to rising secularity, and finally to religious renewal and the multi-faith campus. The second half of the chapter describes the dearth of research about Islam and Muslims in American higher education, and highlights the opportunity to explore the uncharted phenomenon of campus Muslim Chaplaincy.

Chapter 4 ('Methodology') outlines the methodological approach, procedures, and considerations for this study. In three sections, it describes research design, research philosophy, case selection, and research questions; case study methodology, data sources, access, and data analysis; and ethics, personal considerations, and limitations.

Chapter 5 ('Muslim Chaplaincy in American Higher Education) is the first of three results chapters. It is not meant to be a comprehensive overview of Muslim Chaplaincy in American higher education; rather it provides a national context through which to better understand the case studies that follow in Chapters 6 and 7. It is based primarily on interviews and visits to 21 institutions that was conducted concurrently to the case research. The first half of the chapter charts the chronological emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy and describes the catalysts and origins of these developments. The second half of the chapter details various models of Muslim Chaplaincy and develops a typology of institutional approaches to structuring these positions. It also describes some of the attributes and roles played by Muslim Chaplains.

Chapter 6 ('Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton') is the first full institutional case study and is divided into four parts. The first part provides a description of Princeton and a brief history of

minority students at the university. The second part chronicles the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy. The third part details the roles played by Muslim Chaplains at Princeton. The fourth and final part provides an analysis of the rationales that motivated Princeton administrators to develop the role of Muslim Chaplain.

Chapter 7 ('Muslim Chaplaincy at Rutgers') is the second institutional case study and is divided into four sections. The first section discusses Rutgers's history and the role of religion at the university. The second section traces the development of an independent, community-sponsored Muslim Chaplaincy and its relationship with the university. The third section describes the roles that the Muslim Chaplain played on campus. The final section details the rationales to support Muslim Chaplaincy and the limitations of that support.

Chapter 8 ('Analysis') is divided into two sections. The first section revisits the political, cultural and adaptive models, to determine if – and how – these approaches provide a framework to support the findings detailed in the previous three chapters. The second section introduces a new framework – the anticipatory university – which emphasises risk mitigation and peer competition in explaining administrative decision making. This section explores the role of Muslim Chaplaincy in risk management.

The final chapter, Chapter 9 ('Discussion and Conclusions'), has three parts. It begins by summarising the three findings chapters. It then considers the evolution and potential impact of Muslim Chaplaincy. Finally it makes suggestions for further research and provides policy recommendations for campus religious provisions.

1.4. NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

Before proceeding, there are three notes that I would like to make about terms used in this thesis. First, in keeping with American practice, I use the terms 'college', 'university', and 'school' interchangeably to refer to institutions of higher education. Second, I use the term 'minority student(s)' to refer broadly to any group of students that belong to a racial, ethnic, gender, religious, sexual orientation, or class group that has been under-represented or marginalised in higher education. This includes women, for example, who are not currently under-represented but who have faced, and continue to face, discrimination of various sorts in

the American academy. Third, when I first use an Arabic or Hebrew word I will define it in context; future uses will not include a definition. All such terms are included in a glossary at the end of the thesis.

CHAPTER 2

MINORITY STUDENT POLICIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

In this thesis I aim to uncover how and why American university administrators have hired and sanctioned Muslim Chaplains. While the mechanisms of, and rationales for, developing these new roles are complex and multi-layered, they are tied to the presence and visibility of Muslim students on campus. It is useful to view this contemporary phenomenon within the context of the expanding access of mainstream higher education to minority populations in the twentieth century, and the development of institutional policies and practices to recruit, support, and manage these new, and newly recognised, minority student communities.

The term 'minority' is widely used in American higher education. It gained ascendancy through the policy of affirmative action through which the federal government

> ... declared certain groups [as] 'minorities' – an undefined term embraced by policymakers, advocates, and activists alike – and needed new rights and programmes for equal opportunity and full citizenship. In the parlance of the period, minorities were groups seen as 'disadvantaged' but not defined by income or education. African Americans were the paradigmatic minority, but there were three other ethno-racial minorities: Latinos, Asian Americans, and American Indians. Immigrants, women, and the disabled of all ethnic groups were also included (Skrentny 2002, p. 2).

In addition to those listed above, other groups that have been deemed, in varying contexts, to be minorities include LGBT students, first-generation college students, military veterans, international students, religious minorities, mature students, and athletes. Many of these groups have been the beneficiaries of policies and practices to provide advancement, equity, accommodation, engagement, consideration, or other support. How minority students are defined and viewed varies dramatically within and between institutions. One complexity of this broad definition is that some of these groups (or members of these groups), have been

disadvantaged in some ways and privileged in others.

Some might question whether policies developed in the 1960s to support African-Americans are related to the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy in the 2000s. Despite the obvious differences, I believe the two are connected. First, the experience of African-Americans created a paradigm through which other minority communities were understood and viewed. This 'black analogy', as Skrentny describes it, facilitated the formal extension of affirmative action to Hispanics and Native Americans in employment and college admissions (2002, p. 12). More recently, the tactics, strategies, and outcomes of the racial civil rights movement have become templates for LGBT and other minority populations (Ross 2002, p. 271; Lenhardt 2008, p. 844). Muslim-Americans are one of the newest minorities benefiting from the 'black analogy,' part of this may be due to the racialisation of Muslim-Americans (Howell 2009, p. 16-17). Second, admissions and accommodation are interrelated: once members of a certain group have access to an institution, policies are often developed to accommodate those students. While Muslim students were never specifically denied access to higher education, there is value in understanding the accommodation of their religious needs in relation to accommodation policies developed for other minority groups especially Jewish students. Third, the literature on affirmative action is much richer and deeper than on any other minority student policy; this increases the value of looking for relevant data and insight in that literature for the Muslim Chaplaincy case.

In this chapter, I review the history of minority student policies in mainstream American higher education.[1] I discuss how different minority groups have become recognised on American campuses since the 1960s, and I describe the active interest groups and institutional policy changes that have supported and promoted their presence. While there is an extensive literature about such policies in American higher education, much of it is descriptive, evaluative or prescriptive. Surprisingly little scholarship has focused on *why* university administrators created minority student policies, or *how* such policies were established and institutionalised. In the latter part of the chapter, I describe key theoretical concepts that help us in explaining these developments.

[1] My focus on mainstream higher education will exclude attention to historically black colleges and universities, women's colleges, Hispanic-serving institutions, and Native American tribal colleges and universities.

2.1. *TYPES OF MINORITY STUDENT POLICIES*

Over the last fifty years, institutions of higher education have enacted a broad range of policies to create environments that are supportive and inclusive of minority students. There is a massive literature on such policies, and an exhaustive approach to this topic could fill many volumes. To make sense of this literature, I provide a brief overview of the four main types of policies including those related to: access, curriculum, faculty, and the extracurriculum. There is a robust literature about access, modest literatures about curriculum and faculty, and a weak literature about the extracurriculum.

2.1.1. ADMISSIONS

In the first half of the 20th century, very few racial minorities and women attended mainstream colleges and universities. This was due both to active discrimination against such applicants, and to a limited pool of candidates with appropriate credentials. Access was increased dramatically for both groups through affirmative action policies which began in the 1960s and 1970s, and weathered significant challenges in the 1990s and 2000s (Anderson 2004, p. 150-1; Pusser 2004, p. 27; Chen & Stulberg 2007, p. 9-17).[2] Most private, and many public, institutions still have affirmative action policies for student admissions. Early affirmative action programmes evaluated high-school achievement in the context of available opportunities to give fair consideration to African-Americans, and later Hispanics, from low-income backgrounds. A number of institutions also created policies to strengthen the minority-student pipeline by investing in promising high-school students, actively identifying and recruiting talented applicants, and admitting and funding students with the potential to succeed (McCormick 1990, p. 28-30; Karabel 2005a, p. 381, 385, 399-400).

Originally, affirmative action was aimed at increasing the number of African-Americans in higher education. Soon after, it was extended to include Hispanic and Native American students. These policies were adopted by colleges and universities voluntarily, as 'no federal guidelines or legislation have mandated affirmative action in admissions' (Skrentny 2002, p. 168). While affirmative action in admissions began with a focus on specific racial minorities and women, an unintended consequence of the policy has been to increase consideration of other

[2] Affirmative action is a policy which involves 'positive steps taken to increase the representation of women and minorities in areas of employment, education, and business from which they have been historically excluded (Fullinwider 2010).

minority statuses in admissions decisions at some schools – including class, sexual orientation, religion, and first-generation college status (Jaschik 2006).

2.1.2. CURRICULUM AND ACADEMIC PROGRAMMES

There is a substantial literature about the impact of efforts to foster inclusivity and diversity in the curriculum. In the 1960s there was a widespread demand for Black Studies, and other courses to teach the history and experience of minority, colonised, and Third World peoples (Rooks 2006, p. 17-18; Rojas 2007, p. 32-34). In response to this, some institutions created new courses or departments in Black Studies, Jewish Studies, Hispanic Studies, Asian American Studies, and Native American Studies (Yamane 2001, p. 76-106; Rojas 2007, p. 177). The second wave of feminism in the 1970s inspired a number of institutions to create Gender Studies or Women's Studies, Queer or Sexuality Studies, and Disability Studies (Stimpson & Cobb 1986). In the 1990s and 2000s, Whiteness Studies, Masculinity Studies, and Working Class Studies emerged on a few campuses.

In addition to creating new courses and academic divisions, there have been efforts to make traditional curricular programmes more inclusive by challenging and updating disciplinary canons, and requiring students to take courses that explore issues of diversity or difference (Yamane 2001, p. 76). The syllabus of contemporary a American history course might, for example, include more texts written by women, more substantial treatment of Native American genocide, or more information about Asian immigration in the twentieth century. A history department could now require all majors to take at least one course in non-Western history or one course in comparative international history. In addition to curricular changes, some institutions created academic support programmes such as tutoring, supplementary coursework, counselling, and mentoring to support minority students. This included retention and graduation programmes aimed at women in science and engineering, athletes, racial minorities, and those who were first in their families to attend university (Valentine et al. 2011, p. 219).

2.1.3. FACULTY

There is a small but growing literature on faculty diversity which describes efforts to educate and encourage a broader pool of African-Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, and women to enrol in doctoral programmes, and then to recruit, retain, and promote them through the

faculty pipeline into the professoriate (Harvey & Valadez 1994; Castellanos & Jones 2003; Stanley 2006).[3] Changes in the curriculum and the development of new academic programmes (mentioned in the previous section) have attracted significant numbers of minority faculty members. A survey of professors of Black Studies found that 78% of them identify as black (Rojas 2007, p. 183). Given this association, some argue that ethnic and area studies are a critical way to expand faculty diversity (Hine 1990, p. 103). The push for a diverse faculty has two key justifications: to expand or fundamentally re-think what is taught, researched, and valued in the academy (based on the premise that some minority professors may have unique scholarly and educational interests), and to increase the number of mentors and role models for minority students to encourage them to pursue academic careers. Research suggests that minority students relate better to mentors who share their experiences and backgrounds (Gardner et al. 1996, p. 20-1; Price 2010, p. 901).

Beyond recruitment, many institutions have policies and programmes to retain minority faculty members, mentor them in reaching tenure, and provide them with additional opportunities for leadership in the academy (Daley et al. 2006, p. 1438-9; Helm et al. 2010, p. 112-3).

2.1.4. EXTRACURRICULUM

The term 'extracurriculum' was popular in the early part of the twentieth century; I resurrect it from Horowitz (1987, p. 12-15). It refers to structured, non-academic, student-centred activities and services that are generally managed by the university under the rubric of 'student life' or 'campus life'. This includes athletics, student clubs, sororities and fraternities, student government, non-academic education or activities in residential facilities, and religious life. The literature suggests that these non-academic experiences, especially on residential campuses, have an impact on the academic as well as the overall college experience (Holdsworth 2006, p. 517-9).

Extracurricular policies and initiatives aimed at promoting, supporting, and accommodating minority students on campus include a wide variety of programmes (Gardner et al. 1996, p. 21; Sidanius et al. 2004, p. 96) including:

[3] Much less attention has been paid to non-faculty staff diversity, though there is a small literature about minority university presidents and other senior leaders.

- Student clubs or groups – these are student-led but institutionally-financed organisations that are critical social, cultural, artistic, and political hubs for many minority students. Groups often have a faculty or administrative advisor.
- Resource centres/offices – these often include physical space, staff, and programme funding – to serve racial minorities, women, international students, veterans, LGBT students, religious minorities, and disabled students
- Dormitories or other residential settings with specific themes or an ethnic, cultural, religious, or gender focus
- Financial aid policies to assist low-income students, especially relevant given the disproportionate number of first-generation and minority students whom they benefit
- Alumni relations and fundraising efforts including affinity groups or initiatives targeted at minority alumni
- Infrastructure investments to support specific groups, which include mobility accommodations for disabled students or prayer spaces and special eating facilities for religious minorities
- Mentoring or enrichment programmes for women in science, technology and mathematics
- Central administrative offices responsible for training, monitoring and supporting equity and inclusion efforts

Both the descriptive and theoretical literatures on the extracurriculum are weak. There are several possible reasons for this. First, the predominant research focus has been on minority student *access* to higher education and not on the *experience* of minority students during their college and university experiences. This is changing as more minority students attend college, but access remains a significant policy and academic concern. Second, the nature of accommodations varies dramatically; this makes it difficult to make comparisons within and between institutions. Furthermore, these policies and programmes are initiated by individuals and they are not necessarily coordinated among colleges. Third, the relevance of these policies to a broad audience is limited because they generally do not impact non-minorities. In contrast, affirmative action affects the whole process of admissions and thus has an impact on and a relevance to all applicants.

2.2. *HOW UNIVERSITIES CREATED MINORITY STUDENT POLICIES*

The literature suggests that many governmental policies and programmes are developed in response to the initiative and advocacy of interest groups that advance their agenda by lobbying the state. In this section I explore how universities went about creating policies to support minority students. I examine the role of students and other interest groups in advocating for change, and the ways in which those demands were negotiated by university administrators.

In the university context, 'interest groups' are drawn from several obvious constituencies that include students, faculty members, alumni, and trustees. Rarely do all members of a constituency act in unison; more often, an interest group comprises a subset of constituency members who are particularly concerned with a specific issue. In many cases, interest groups advocating for change draw members from several constituencies, as do rival interest groups resisting those changes. The literature describes a political model of change to which I will return in the last section of this chapter. In that framework, change begins with agitation or mobilisation by an interest group, followed by engagement and negotiation with the administration. This results in a decision, followed by a change in the status quo, and the reactions it engenders (Baldridge 1971, p. 19-26). The process then begins again, as the same or another interest group responds to the outcome of the last process. This model represents change which can take years or decades to run its course. While students have historically been the most visible interest group advocating for minority student policies, external actors such as alumni, donors, community members, corporations, non-profit organisations, and the state have also been influential in this respect.

The role of university administrators has been under-appreciated in this context, as described in Pusser's updated political model and the strategic choice theory of the adaptive model – both of which are discussed at length in the last section of this chapter. Administrators are responsible for responding to and negotiating with student interest groups, and then crafting and implementing student policies. As such, they have significant power in determining the form that those policies take. In addition, in many cases they may be articulating and advancing their own interests. In the remainder of this section, I describe the role of both interest groups and administrators in developing minority student policies.

2.2.1. INTEREST GROUPS

The first significant and widespread minority student policies and programmes, in the 1960s, were initiated by student interest groups. Scholars agree that affirmative action for African-Americans, and the subsequent development of Black Studies programmes, were institutional responses to widespread social unrest across the nation as well as to student-led protests, sit-ins, and violence on hundreds of campuses (McCormick 1990, p. 3-6; Karabel 2005a, p. 381-4, 406; Rojas 2007, p. 177-181). In an especially dramatic case

> black men and women students at Cornell University, wearing bandoliers and carrying rifles, took over a campus building to protest various incidents of racism on campus, including insensitive remarks from a professor and harassment by white students. Among the student demands were 'black studies' courses and an African American student centre on campus. They got their wishes. (Skrentny 2002, p. 167)

In explaining how affirmative action took hold at Harvard, Yale and Princeton, 'there is little question that the mobilisation of black students on campus was a major factor behind the sharp increases in black enrolment in 1968 and especially 1969' (Karabel 2005b, p. 75-6).

In addition to affirmative action, during the 1960s and 1970s, other policies and programmes were created or promised in the areas of ethnic studies, student and faculty recruitment, residential life, governance, scholarships and financial aid, community programmes, and so on. Many of these policies are still with us today. At many institutions, demands made by students during the protests were either agreed upon outright or became the starting point for negotiations with university administrators and trustees (McCormick 1990, p. 41-2, 59; Rojas 2007, p. 69-73; Collisson 2008, p. 2). This can be understood as an acute administrative response in the wake of widespread violence and threats of violence.

Although protests on this scale are now rare in American higher education, student interest groups remain active in advocating for minority student policies. Challenges to affirmative action at public universities initiated widespread activism from minority student groups in California, Texas, Michigan, Wisconsin and other states (Pusser 2004, p. 20, 104-5, 151-6; Lipson 2007, p. 998, 1006, 1017). Similarly, students pushed for multicultural initiatives including curricular reforms in a variety of states, including California, Michigan, New Jersey, and Wisconsin (Rhoads 2000 p. 18-9; Yamane 2001, p. 26-75).

A number of non-student interest groups have played a role in advancing minority student

policies. The roles and agendas of these actors, as well as the impact of broader social changes, have been under-appreciated in the literature on minority student policies. Such external interest groups were critical to the emergence and development of Black Studies in the 1960s and 1970s. Though many consider black student mobilisation as the catalyst, a closer look reveals that this was only the most visible aspect of a multi-decade effort to create a sustainable and legitimate academic discipline. It began with engagement between students and non-university intellectuals and activists.

> Between 1966 and 1973, black studies was a pressing issue on college campuses as a direct result of the civil rights movement, a rise in nationalist sentiment, and student mobilisation. Groups such as the Black Panthers and chapters of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) became prominent features on campuses and were at the front of the black studies movement. (Rojas 2007, p. 4)

After universities agreed to create such programmes, efforts to develop and stabilise the nascent discipline were supported by a number of sources including the Ford Foundation, which invested $10 million in the field between 1970-1978 (Rojas 2007, p. 130). That philanthropic support was critical to developing and institutionalising Black Studies as a legitimate field of study.

These external interest groups can thus be seen to have made a fundamental impact on the field of Black Studies as it is currently configured. Although both black nationalists and the Ford Foundation supported Black Studies, they had very different agendas. The black nationalists wanted universities to be responsive to community needs and to create programmes that were focused on community engagement and empowerment. In contrast, Ford began its funding as an extension of support for the civil rights movement. Its initial goal was to support racial integration by sponsoring Black Studies at predominantly white universities. Ford later extended support in the 1980s and beyond to bring academic legitimacy and heft to the field.

In addition to the lack of attention to interest groups outside higher education, the literature on the development of minority student policies has often conceived of colleges and universities as closed units. The development of Black Studies would not have been possible outside the larger context of the civil rights movement, and it was only as a result of that movement that black students were able to act as internal agents. *De jure* segregation ended in 1954 with *Brown v. Board of Education*, and this allowed a few black students to attend predominantly white schools. Without a critical mass of such students, protests and sit-ins would not have occurred,

and Black Studies courses would not have had any audience (Rojas 2007, p. 28). To advance their agenda on campus, students borrowed the tactics, symbols and rhetoric of the broader civil rights movement. In addition to opening doors to black students, the civil rights movement changed social attitudes, and this allowed administrators, trustees, and fellow students to support and take seriously the claims of student protestors. Other curricular developments, such as Women's Studies and LGBT/Queer Studies, have also emerged out of social movements that brought increased legal and social rights to minority communities (Boxer 1998, p. 9-10; Kirsch 2006, p. 22).

Another interest group that has displayed support for minority students is the state. More specifically, key individuals and government agencies have championed policies relating to minority students; others have monitored or audited compliance to laws or responded to specific complaints and lawsuits. An interesting example is the passage of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which created civil rights legislation for people with disabilities. The law required all colleges and universities to provide auxiliary educational aids for 'students with impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills'.[4] This bill marked an acknowledgement of the challenges faced by people with disabilities, and a new responsibility for institutions of higher education. Scotch described the inclusion and passage of Section 504 as the 'result of a... group of Senate aides who had little experience with or knowledge about the problem of discrimination against disabled people' (2001, p. 139). While it was the product of an unusual interest group, it mobilised the more traditional interest group of disability and civil rights advocates, which lobbied heavily for the subsequent Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. This newer law had several provisions including a requirement for physical accessibility in most old, and all new, buildings. The bill had a significant impact on campus construction and thus on the ability of disabled students to fully participate in higher education.

2.2.2. ADMINISTRATORS

The development of minority student policies in higher education has been understood as a process through which internal or external interest groups make demands of university administrators. Once those demands are articulated, it is up to administrators to mediate and respond. Regardless of the origin of the demand, administrators implement and institutionalise

[4] See United States Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights: http://ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/auxaids.html. Accessed on May 20, 2012.

change. As a result, they exercise a great deal of authority and control in translating demands into policies.

This can be seen in the case of Black Studies. Though student interest groups generally articulated a long list of demands, the specific initiatives that universities chose to adopt and implement were selected, negotiated, and translated into formal policies by administrators. In his model of how movements change bureaucracies, Rojas emphasises the emergence of alternatives in the context of conflict (p. 16). He also notes that

> Black students usually agitated for concessions such as black housing and increased black enrolments... For the most part, these protests were not carried out with the intention of forming a Department of Black Studies, but they created an opportunity for interested individuals to introduce black studies at a later time. (Rojas 2007, p. 96)

University administrators and faculty members took primary responsibility for deciding which of the many demands from protestors and which of their own ideas would be instituted, and for choosing how this would be accomplished. As a result, the development of Black Studies took a particular form – of an interdisciplinary, academic programme that was research-intensive and focused on elite education. Proposals for Black Studies that included community education, nationalist inclinations, or independent think tanks were unsuccessful, possibly because they were too far outside what was considered 'acceptable' to the academy (Rojas 2007, p. 215-6). Administrators were responsible for taming the radical ideas of student protestors and transforming them into palatable academic programmes.

While this paradigm – interest group agitation and subsequent institutional response – was widespread, examples can be found of university administrators taking action to create minority student policies *without* pressure from internal or external interest groups. For example, recent archival research suggests that administrators at a number of selective universities initiated a first wave of affirmative action policies between 1961-1965 *prior* to widespread student mobilisation (Chen & Stulberg 2007, p. 28). Such action was mirrored by the federal government's programme of affirmative action in employment. According to Skrentny:

> Policymakers sometimes simply anticipated what minority constituents wanted. They created an 'anticipatory politics' based on these policy tools and the new legitimacy of minority targeting. (2002, p. 8-9)

A striking example of this was the emergence of co-education at men's colleges in the 1950s and 1960s. Although they were often joined by trustees, and sometimes by faculty members and male students, it was male administrators who took the lead in advocating for the admission of women to historically male colleges (Poulson & Miller-Bernal 2004, p. 311). Interestingly, potential female applicants and women's rights groups played a minimal role in this endeavour.

2.3. WHY UNIVERSITIES CREATED MINORITY STUDENT POLICIES

In the previous section, I explored how minority student policies developed at universities. I examined the role of internal and external interest groups in agitating for change, and the way those demands were meditated and negotiated by university administrators. I also discussed the role of administrators themselves in changing minority student policies. In this section, I ask why universities adopted such measures. What were the motivations and rationales that compelled administrators to institute such change?

While institutions cannot have rationales, interest groups and individuals within them do. I believe that such rationales are central to the framing and articulation of demands, and provide meaningful insights into the true interests of a group. Understanding why an interest group is advocating for a certain position is especially valuable in cases where the rationale is obscure.

In reviewing a large literature on minority student policies, I distilled four primary rationales in support of minority student policies that have been articulated by or assigned to interest groups. I paid particular attention to three historical policy and programme changes that occurred in the latter half of the twentieth century: the development of affirmative action in undergraduate admissions, the expansion of Black Studies as an academic field, and the emergence of co-education at historically male schools. Assigning rationales is a highly subjective undertaking, and I bring a healthy scepticism both to first-person accounts and to scholarly analysis on the subject. I will return to the question of rationales in Chapters 5, 6 and 7 to understand how they function in my case studies.

2.3.1. ADVANCE SOCIAL JUSTICE

Expanding access and accommodating minority groups has often been framed as an issue of social justice, a concept predicated on equality and solidarity, with particular attention to those on the economic and political margins of society. There are various strands of social justice: compensatory 'for past forms of societal discrimination;' corrective in 'exposing and eliminating unjustifiable barriers' to minimise future discrimination; redistributive to 'equalise the extreme imbalance between the haves and have-nots'; and morally justifiable as 'the correct policy to implement' (Green 2004, p. 376-7). The prevailing notions of equal opportunity and widening access characterise the dominant discourse in higher education, given the resonance of social justice tenets with American values of social mobility and equality. Although many supporters of this philosophy might not use the term 'social justice', invocations of fairness and 'levelling the playing field' would all fall under this rubric.

Historically, a college or university education provided privilege to a small stratum of elite people; in recent years it has become increasingly available to a broader swathe of Americans including members of historically marginalised groups. This shift began with the G.I. Bill after World War Two, the black and other civil rights movements, and the 1965 broadening of federal immigration law. As a result of these changes and others set in motion by them, more low-income, racial minority, female, immigrant, LGBT, and physically disabled individuals began attending universities. The social justice rationale was most prevalent and well-articulated during the civil rights and black student movements of the 1960s.

While some administrators were primarily motivated by a desire to provide opportunities to individuals from historically marginalised populations, others viewed this as a strategy to build the capacity of students who could eventually use their education to bring social justice and leadership to their communities. In 1965, Princeton's Director of Admissions Alden Dunham

> ... issued a strong public defense of Princeton's policy of seeking out 'qualified Negroes' in the alumni magazine, arguing that Princeton had long 'felt a responsibility to be responsive to the nation's need for men who can fulfil important leadership roles' and that, 'from the national point of view, the call for Negro leadership at this time in our history is clear.' The same year, the Admissions Committee institutionalised special consideration for black applicants by giving them a special category (and round in the admissions process) next to such groups as alumni sons and Naval ROTC candidates. (Karabel 2005b, p. 68)

This position mirrored Yale's goal to 'create a new stratum of black leadership' (Karabel 2005b,

p. 66). As institutions that had been training America's elite for centuries, administrators at Princeton and Yale may have felt a particular commitment to providing leadership opportunities for black students.

2.3.2. BENEFIT MAJORITY STUDENTS

Policies aimed at increasing access to, and support for, minority students have long been understood as benefiting those who have not previously had such opportunities. While many people have written about the value of diversity for minority students, recent research shows that both minority and majority students derive benefits from exposure to each other (Chang 1999, p. 391; Antonio 2001, p. 611-13; Gurin et al. 2002, p. 331, 351-3). This notion contends that contact with people from different backgrounds promotes open-mindedness, tolerance, empathy, comfort, and compassion. It also provides an opportunity to gain both knowledge about specific communities and general cultural competencies that can be applied in dealing with all types of difference.

These lessons and skills prepare young people for life in an increasingly diverse country and a globalised world. Those who are equipped to work in multicultural and international environments are more attractive and valuable as employees. In this way, student exposure to difference in a university setting can have benefits for individuals and the broader society (Gurin et al. 2002, p. 339, 353). Cynics contend that the real benefit for students to have broad experiences may be to provide them with cachet, cultural capital, and competencies, which can give them advantages in graduate education and employment. The idea that contact with any and all kinds of difference is beneficial to majority students has come to be known as the 'diversity rationale'.

Long before the diversity rationale gained traction for race, a similar argument about the benefit of co-education had been advanced by university administrators. They suggested that male students would benefit from the introduction of female peers through increased academic competition and exposure to the arts; improved morale and social opportunities; and inducements to be more polite, attentive to their appearance, and religious (Donley Forcier 2004, p. 153, 159; Ihle 2004, p. 191; Miller-Bernal 2004, p. 6; Miller-Bernal & Pevar 2004, p. 87). In addition, intellectually capable and gifted women would energise the new generation of ambitious, young faculty members who were disappointed by the anti-intellectualism of their male students (Donley Forcier 2004, p. 158-9). There was little conversation about the benefit

of co-education for women as described by Poulson and Miller-Bernal:

> What is missing in this litany of reasons for adopting co-education is a salient concern for the education of women... There was no initial discussion about equity for women or about admitting women to redress their subordinate role in society. As Douglass dean Marjory Foster argued before the Rutgers board of trustees, talk about co-education at Rutgers seemed mostly about 'the uses of women for the education of men.' (2004, p. 310)

Thaddeus Seymour, a senior administrator at Dartmouth, echoed this point by invoking moral obligations:

> 'No one has talked about educating women,' he said, 'Every discussion about coeducation at Dartmouth has asked, 'Would coeducation make this a better men's school?' To be talking about it in those terms is to totally miss the point of coeducation. This issue is this: does Dartmouth have an obligation to offer its resources equally to men and women? And in taking the step, the institution should ask itself, 'Do we morally have the obligation to educate women?'...I think most women would be quite insulted by most of the discussion of coeducation that goes on up here.' (Unknown 1965, p. 1-2)

While it is possible that social justice arguments were deliberately avoided to make co-education more palatable for resistant trustees and alumni, the quotes above suggest that the primary rationale was based on the self-interest of administrators and male students.

2.3.3. MAINTAIN/INCREASE PRESTIGE AND RESOURCES

Issues of prestige are closely bound to market forces, and are by their nature relative. The two most important levers of university prestige are the 'selectivity of undergraduate students and the scholarly reputation of its faculty' (Geiger 2002, p. 85). Immense resources are spent on both attracting and actively recruiting students – especially those who bring academic talent, athletic prowess, or diverse backgrounds. Historically, for example, one of the most persuasive arguments for co-education was that the most highly qualified male students were drawn to co-educational institutions. Thus, remaining single-sex might have meant losing top male students and others interested in being in a co-educational environment (Miller-Bernal 2004, p. 11). This could have had long-term implications for an institution's prestige and finances. A similar logic can be seen in the recent widespread increase in financial aid by dozens of universities in the United States, which was a response to generous new policies announced by Princeton and Harvard (Greenberg 2008). This policy, targeted at low-income students, was part of the 'arms race' to attract the best students and thereby increase institutional prestige. Prestige is also a

consideration when universities are recruiting and retaining faculty members, especially those that are 'stars' in terms of their intellectual capabilities, ability to attract funding, or membership in an under-represented minority group.

In the United States, funding is inextricably linked to prestige – there is an undeniable correlation between academic reputation and financial endowment. Wealthy institutions have the resources to attract top students and faculty members through generous financial aid and scholarship packages; competitive salaries, benefits, and research leave policies; and broad and deep academic, recreational, and cultural resources.

To expand resources, some universities have participated in aggressive efforts to recruit and attract full-paying out-of-state or international students who augment a critical revenue stream (Groen & White 2004, p. 1794; Lewin 2009). Historically, international students have been most common among graduate student populations, and are relatively rare among undergraduates. In the last few years, with the growth of the middle class in China and India and the economic downturn in the United States, many more international students are attending American universities as undergraduates (Hecke 2010). Institutions with large numbers of international students often invest resources in international student centres, visa services, orientation and transition assistance, special programmes and initiatives, and social opportunities.

Similar factors can be seen in the commitment of colleges and universities – especially the selective ones – to protecting the interests of their alumni. At such schools, alumni are directly and indirectly responsible for a significant portion of institutional budgets; in addition to new gifts, alumni historically made the vast majority of gifts to institutional endowments (Leslie & Ramey 1988, p. 115; Clotfelter 2003, p. 110-1).[5] As an example: alumni at male-only schools were vocally opposed to the co-education proposals put forward in the 1950s and 1960s. A primary reason was their fear that competitive female students would reduce the opportunities for their sons and other male relatives to attend their alma mater. Given this concern, the introduction of co-education at almost all institutions involved increasing the student body rather than allowing women to compete for existing slots. This was meant to protect the number of male students in the entering class. Yale, for example, was explicit in reassuring its alumni that their sons would continue to enjoy a 'special...hearing' despite the advent of co-

[5] An example may illustrate the scope of alumni generosity. In 2010-2011 Stanford University had an operating budget of $3.8 billion. Twenty percent of that (approximately $750 million) was income from its $14 billion endowment (which represents thousands of endowed funds, given almost exclusively by alumni). In addition, Stanford raised $600 million in new funds in the previous fiscal year.

education (Synnott 2004, p. 116). In this way, institutions were able to become co-educational without adversely impacting their alumni, many of whom were their most generous donors.

Beyond the economic considerations of admissions, donors, non-profits, corporations, foundations, and governments can influence the academic policies or programmes that a college will choose to implement (Chait 2002, p. 308-9). These actors can have a significant impact on the student body, through programmes to support specific populations such as immigrants, international students, low-income students, and under-represented minorities; through particular academic or pedagogical interests; and through certain research agendas and restrictions (Aronowitz 2000, p. 157-9; Gould 2003, p. 96-102; Rojas 2007, p. 130-3).

2.3.4. PRESERVE ORDER

In the 1960s, the desire to minimise violence and the threat of violence seems to have played a critical role in motivating university administrators to respond to black student mobilisation. A series of violent protests occurred at dozens of college and university campuses across the country; an eight-day occupation of Hamilton Hall at Columbia University ended with almost 250 injuries and more than 800 arrests (Trimberger 1968, p. 31), and an extended student strike at San Francisco State College resulted in hundreds of arrests and the eventual creation of an Ethnic Studies programme (Rojas 2007, p. 45-6, 81). In this context, university administrators were motivated to limit or prevent such events on their own campuses (McCormick 1990, p. 51; Bradley 2009, p. 111-115). The potential costs in terms of facilities, finances, and disorder were too large to ignore: administrative leaders were left with little choice but to negotiate with protestors. The results were dramatic. In 1960, there were fifteen new black students in a collective freshman intake of over 3,000 at Princeton, Yale and Harvard; by 1970 this number was up to 280 (Karabel 2005a, p. 379). As Karabel explains, '[to] many men of the Establishment, taking strong measures to rectify racial injustice was not simply a moral imperative; it was also a matter of enlightened self-interest at a time when the existing order was under challenge both internationally and domestically' (2005b, p. 61).

Since the black student movement, there has not been a similar level of widespread unrest on university campuses. It is not that students have relinquished their political agendas, but rather that the lessons of the 1960s have taught administrators to actively engage far before students feel it necessary to take public action. Beyond a new level of responsiveness, administrators have become increasingly anticipatory about student needs such that some possible tensions

have been completely averted. There are numerous examples of this new relationship between students and administrators. A case in point was the student movement to push for divestment of university endowments from South African companies. This issue was advocated on campuses beginning in the late 1970s; by 1988 over 150 institutions had partially or fully divested from the apartheid state (Knight 1990, p. 69). Despite significant resistance from administrators and board members, some form of divestment took place at Harvard, Columbia, Hampshire, University of Michigan, and University of California. Another example is the living wage campaign to ensure reasonable minimum wages for campus workers, which proliferated on college campuses in the 1990s and 2000s (Stripling 2009). As with the black student movement, there were strong moral considerations for both of these campaigns. However, the desire of universities to appease students and maintain order was the primary rationale for acquiescing to student demands.

2.4. CONCEPTUAL MODELS

In this section I provide three models from the sociological literature to aid in conceptualising the empirical information about *how* and *why* institutions of higher education created minority student policies and programmes. Multiple models may be useful in understanding a single organisation. I will describe the value and limitations of the political, cultural, and adaptive models. The first two are focused primarily on examining institutions from the inside, while the third pays more attention to the interaction of colleges and universities with each other and with the environment.

The application of models to explain the behaviour of colleges and universities began in the 1950s in the transition from traditional to mass higher education. As Peterson explains:

> a model provides a set of concepts or constructs and of relationships among them that can be defined and systematically examined. A model can be examined as to whether it fits real organisational behaviour and whether, in comparison to other models, it contributes best to understanding the phenomenon (2007, p. 147)

I consider these models to be tools to enable insight and analysis. In Chapter 8 ('Analysis'), I will return to them to explore if and how they help to explain the findings of Chapters 5, 6, and 7. At that time, I will also propose an additional model to aid our understanding of this phenomenon.

2.4.1. POLITICAL MODEL

The political model was developed by Baldridge through a case study of cataclysmic conflict at NYU in the 1960s. He advocated for viewing universities as political systems:

> ...if student riots cripple the campus, if professors form unions and strike, if administrators defend their traditional positions, and if external interest groups and irate governors invade the academic halls, all these acts must be seen as political (1971, p. 20).

This model is premised on the idea that the university is made up of various interest groups, whose values and goals can sometimes place them in conflict with each other. These groups articulate their interests to influence legislative bodies, which negotiate multiple pressures and translate multiple positions into formal policies. These policies commit the institution to certain outcomes, and their implementation can lead to the articulation or re-articulation of interests by discontented stakeholders – causing a new cycle of conflict (Baldridge 1971, p. 24). After the original political model was published, Baldridge and others recognised a fundamental shift. They initially conceived of pressure for change as largely endogenous to the institution (Baldridge & Deal 1983, p. 5). However, there was a new appreciation that 'interest groups are located both inside and outside the university and often external interest groups – for example, political parties or trade unions – may have a powerful influence on what happens inside the university' (Miller 1995, p. 102).

The political model has some important features. First, the unit of analysis is the interest group: this signals an awareness that an institution is not a monolith, and that it may be inhabited by multiple groups with different interests (Bacharach & Lawler 1980, p. 79-84). Second, conflict is natural, endemic, and expected; it is not seen as a sign of dysfunction (Baldridge 1971, p. 15-6; Morgan 2006, p. 163; Bush 2010, p. 90). Conflict occurs simply when interest groups pursue policy aims that clash with the goals of other interest groups. Third, the goals of an organisation are fluid, contested, and set through negotiations among interest groups. They can change drastically if one group is able to frame or hijack the conversation (Bolman & Deal 1997, p. 159-161). Finally, the outcomes of decision-making processes are fundamentally influenced by power. As Morgan explained, 'power influences who gets what, when and how' (2006, p. 166).

Pusser applied the political model to the University of California, where affirmative action was overturned despite overwhelming support from the leadership, faculty members, students, and staff of the nine-institution system. Based on this research, he identified five limitations with

the model as conceptualised by Baldridge:

> (a) Decision-making and organisational processes are seen as fundamentally endogenous processes, (b) there is little attention to the role of public institutions as both sites of contest and instruments in broader political and economic struggles, (c) there is little attention to the dynamics of external interest articulation or the structural politics of higher education governance and decision making, (d) there is little attention to the role of the administrative hierarchy as an interest group in its own right, and (e) the political frame assumes an essentially pluralist decision-making context. (2003, p. 122-3)

These critiques highlight some of the weakness of the political model in explaining decision making processes, especially at public universities. In earlier articulations, the state is virtually absent; yet in Pusser's case study it is a central force which acts through the regents who are politically-appointed trustees (*Ibid*, p. 136). Even more broadly relevant is Pusser's notion that the administration is an interest group in itself. In the original model, the administration simply mediated and negotiated the interests of other groups (i.e. faculty members, students, trustees); it was not seen to have its own interests (Pusser 2004, p. 212).

An updated political model could provide a valuable framework for understanding the development of Muslim Chaplaincy. The emphasis on interest groups suggests an analysis of different constituencies within the institution, to understand their values and how those values might be in conflict or harmony. It also suggests attention to various forms of interest articulation around this issue, especially from Muslim students and other religious constituencies. Pusser's notion that consideration should be paid to the interests of administrators suggests a close look at the processes by which administrators develop policies, and at the bargains or negotiations involved.

2.4.2. CULTURAL MODEL

Research on culture in higher education began with studies of student behaviour and cultures (Becker et al. 1961; Lunsford 1963; Wallace 1966; Feldman & Newcomb 1969), which have blossomed in recent decades (Horowitz 1987; Moffatt 1989; Holland & Eisenhart 1990; Nathan 2005; Seaman 2005; Syrett 2009; Stuber 2011). This later expanded to examining the university itself as a cultural entity. Clark was an early proponent of this perspective. He described several factors that influence the strength of organisational culture: smaller, centralised, and older institutions tended to have stronger cultures than larger, decentralised, and younger ones

(1983, p. 81-82). The cultural model is premised on the notion that an organisation is a social system, and that culture is an 'amalgam of beliefs, ideology, language, ritual, and myth' (Pettigrew 1979, p. 572). As Masland described it, 'organisational culture induces purpose, commitment, and order; provides meaning and social cohesion; and clarifies and explains behavioural expectations' (1985, p. 157-8). The culture of an organisation is reflected in its instrumental and symbolic actions, decisions, and communications.

Although the concept of culture is diffuse, the benefit of the cultural model is that

> ... understanding the culture of a particular institution may further explain campus management because culture appears to influence managerial style and decision practices. Analysis of culture may expose conflicting cultural elements... It might also help explain variations in curriculum and resistance to curricular change (Masland 1985, p. 166).

Tierney provides some additional reasons to apply the cultural framework:

> [to] consider real or potential conflicts not in isolation but on the broad canvas of organisational life; recognize structural or operational contradictions that suggest tensions in the organization; implement and evaluate everyday decisions with a keen awareness of their role in and influence upon organizational culture; understand the symbolic dimensions of ostensibly instrumental decisions and actions (1988, p. 6).

The literature provides specific elements through which one can identify and understand an organisation's culture. Tierney describes six of these elements: environment, mission, socialisation, information, strategy, and leadership (1988, p. 8). Institutional culture can also be identified through analysis of its sagas, histories, heroes, languages, norms, symbols, rituals, campuses, assumptions, metaphors, and values.

The value of the cultural model in understanding the development of Muslim Chaplaincy is in its attention to the specific context of the institution and how that impacts decisions and choices. Paying close attention to the various elements of culture, and how they were invoked by those with whom I spoke, has been critical in understanding both the instrumental and the symbolic meaning of this new phenomenon. One thing that has been particularly valuable has been to trace the history of other minority student policies and programmes on a specific campus to understand if – and how – they are relevant to the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy.

2.4.3. ADAPTIVE MODEL

The third framework I believe to be relevant to this project is the adaptive model. In contrast to the political and cultural models, an underlying premise of the adaptive model is that universities are open systems, profoundly influenced by – and dependent on – their environment. Broadly speaking, this model is concerned with how universities respond to and engage with environmental pressures, and how those pressures make demands on the institution (Peterson 2007, p. 170). Through various feedback mechanisms, institutions have dynamic, homeostatic, and evolutionary relationships with the environment (Gumport & Sporn 1999, p. 119-122).

There are three theories associated with the adaptive model that have significant potential value in understanding the development of Muslim Chaplaincy: resource dependence theory, institutional isomorphism, and strategic choice theory. While the adaptive model's constitutive theories have been discussed at length in sociology, economics, and business, their application to higher education has been unsystematic (Gumport & Sporn 1999, p. 117). These theories may have the potential to provide valuable insight into our understanding of the policies and programmes that support minority students.

The first theory, resource dependence, rests on the basic assumption that organisations are dependent on the environment for resources, and on the interest group environment for policies and values. 'The need to acquire resources creates dependencies between organisations and external units and the scarcity of resources determines the degree of dependency' (Gumport & Sporn 1999, p. 124). Adaptation in a resource-dependent context involves either changing the organisation to fit environmental requirements, or changing the environment to fit the organisation's capabilities (Pfeffer & Salancik 1978, p. 70). Resource dependence theory details the processes by which institutions buffer and bridge to protect their resources. Buffering minimises dependencies and their attendant constraints, while bridging maximises inter-organisational connectivity to spread risk.

Much has been written about this theory in higher education since universities have dependencies on a vast number of individuals – including students, donors, alumni, and faculty members – and on organisations such as high schools, universities, governments, and corporations. Empirical research shows that university structures adapt to resource availability (Gumport & Pusser 1995, p. 502-4). The same pressures apply to developments affecting

minority students. In recent years, donors have made critical investments in certain fields such as Ethnic Studies and Jewish Studies, which have influenced the development of academic programmes at various institutions. To test this theory in the context of Muslim Chaplaincy, it would be valuable to examine the resources that interest groups – both inside and outside the university – are providing to influence the creation of these roles. In particular, are external interest groups such as alumni, parents, donors, or governments influencing if and how Muslim Chaplaincies are formed?

The second theory is institutional isomorphism, which predicts a movement toward homogenisation as organisations respond to an uncertain environment (Meyer & Scott 1992, p. 28-30). There are three mechanisms for isomorphism: coercive, which operates through formal and informal pressures exerted by organisations that control resources, political power, or legitimacy; mimetic, which operates through organisations that model themselves on others that have greater legitimacy or success; and normative, which operates through the imposition of professional standards and values, through peers or gate-keeping agencies (DiMaggio & Powell 1983, p. 150).

In the isomorphism framework, organisations are dominated by interest groups, which adapt to their environment to ensure legitimacy and survival (DiMaggio & Powell 1983, p. 150, 157). As a result, 'organisations are increasingly homogenous within given domains and increasingly organised around rituals of conformity to wider institutions' (Gumport & Sporn 1999, p. 122). Once institutions become part of an organisational field, isomorphic forces encourage homogeneity through the development of professional networks and experts (DiMaggio & Powell 1983, p. 152). These individuals, many of them occupying administrative roles, enact mimetic and normative isomorphic processes by sharing strategies and best practices (Gumport & Sporn 1999, p. 123). In considering the value of isomorphism to understanding Muslim Chaplaincy, I will explore how and why the role developed among a set of peer colleges and universities. Institutions that hired Muslim Chaplains may have had contact with each other before they committed to hiring for these positions. I will explore what types of contact occurred and how this influenced institutional decisions.

The third theory – strategic choice – emphasises the role of institutional decision makers to

> ...choose which environment or market to operate in, manipulate and control their environment, choose technologies that grant them subsequent control, employ control systems to deal with large size, and perceive and re-evaluate

> their environments in ways that enable them to adapt creatively to contingencies. (Sporn 1999, p. 42)

This theory echoes the updated political model, which considers administrators as an interest group. Strategic choice theory highlights the agency and power of administrators, rather than portraying institutions as beholden to environmental variables and pressures. It allows for proactive adaptation (Gumport & Sporn 1999, p. 123), notably in the idea that the role of university administrators is to create, manage, and implement strategies and plans (Cameron 1983, p. 360-1; Chaffee 1985, p. 94). Leaders can determine the destiny of institutions and profoundly shape institutional agendas. I will apply strategic choice theory to understand the role of university administrations in hiring and sanctioning Muslim Chaplains.

2.5. CONCLUSION

Over the last fifty years, institutions of higher education have enacted policies to create environments that are increasingly supportive of minority students. In this chapter, I reviewed four key types of policies: those related to access, curriculum, faculty, and the extracurriculum. I explored the role of students and other interest groups in advocating for these policies, and discussed the ways in which those demands were negotiated by university administrators. I attempted to understand *why* university administrators supported these changes, and I distilled four rationales from the literature: advance social justice, benefit majority students, maintain or increase prestige and resources, and preserve order.

I then explored three models of institutional decision-making from the sociological literature, to aid in conceptualising the empirical information about minority student policies. The political model is based on the idea that various groups, both inside and outside the university, influence legislative bodies, which translate their various interests into formal policies. The cultural model is premised on the notion that an organisation is a social system, and that its decisions are rooted in beliefs, ideologies, rituals, expectations, orders, and meaning specific to the institution. The adaptive model emphasises the relationship between institutions and the environment, and includes the sub-theories of resource dependency, institutional isomorphism, and strategic choice. These models will provide a valuable framework through which to analyse and interpret the data generated from my research.

CHAPTER 3

RELIGION IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

3.1. RELIGION IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first half provides a brief overview of religion in American higher education, beginning with its origin in Protestantism and describing how changing demographics and the rise of secularity have led to the development of the modern multi-faith campus. The second half delves into the limited literature about Muslim students in American higher education, including their experiences in college particularly after 9/11, the emergence of MSAs on hundreds of campuses, tensions between Muslim and non-Muslim students, accommodations provided by university administrators, and the emerging role of Muslim Chaplains.

3.1.1. PROTESTANT ORIGINS

For most of its history, higher education in the United States was considered a religious enterprise (Marsden 1994, p. 3-4). Many early settlers were European dissidents, who came to escape religious persecution in their home countries; they founded colleges to train clergymen for their religious denominations, and those institutions maintained that ethos well into the twentieth century (*Ibid*, p. 48). The colonial colleges 'set the pattern for Church influence in guiding the directions and setting the standards for American higher education until the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries' (Stamm 2006, p. 73).[6] Other private colleges followed

[6] The colonial colleges (in order of the date of their collegiate charters) are: Harvard (1636), William and Mary (1693), Yale (1701), Princeton (1746), Columbia (1754), University of Pennsylvania (1755), Brown (1764), Rutgers (1766), and Dartmouth (1769).

this pattern, as did many public institutions, such as the University of Michigan and the University of California at Berkeley in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Although schools that were recipients of state funding were obliged to be open to students from all religious backgrounds, the founding and initial years of all early colleges were heavily influenced by religion. Until the twentieth century, almost all colleges had strong denominational affiliations; a few were non-sectarian from inception, but almost none were secular. Almost all of these institutions, including the public ones, required daily chapel and mandated courses in Christian moral philosophy. Most of the early presidents and board members were ministers, or at least fervent religious believers. Although religious and moral instruction was central to the college experience, it often took the form of lectures and courses, rather than an academic specialisation in Christian theology (Stamm 2006, p. 77).

3.1.2. CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, significant numbers of Catholic and Jewish migrants came to the United States. Faced with discrimination by mainstream Protestant-dominated institutions (Eck 2001, p. 9; Borsch 2012, p. 130) and increased secularisation, Catholic orders and individuals created their own universities which number almost 250 today. Jewish immigrants and their children faced similar discrimination – including admissions quotas, ineligibility to join social clubs and fraternities, restrictions on religious observance, and other practices, which kept them on the periphery of elite higher education (Karabel 1984, p. 8, 12; Kolko 2002, p. 11; Karabel 2005a, p. 172, 196-7, 229, 243). In response, many Jewish students attended public universities where discrimination was less overt. A few Jewish universities were also created.

By the middle of the twentieth century, the dominant Protestant society was beginning to come to terms with a religious pluralism extending to Jews and Catholics. This has been described as a 'tripartite settlement' (Wuthnow 2005, p. 107); after World War Two the term Judeo-Christian came into wide use (Stamm 2006, p. 68). These religious minorities were increasingly integrated into mainstream campus life, but made independent provisions for their religious needs. Jews established and funded Hillel houses, which provided religious services, kosher food, informal meeting spaces, community service programmes, and a home for student groups (Silverman 2003, p. 49, 55). Today, Hillel is a professionally-staffed, international organisation with a presence on over 500 campuses. Catholics created Newman Societies or Aquinas Houses, which

provided similar services supported by the local Diocese.

The next large wave of immigrants came after the liberalisation of laws in the 1965 Immigration Act. Its reversal of the long-standing exclusion of non-European immigrants had a profound impact on the nation's religious diversity, bringing many non-Judeo Christian religious minorities to the United States (Eck 2001, p. 63). Although Islam had existed in the United States since colonial times, most Muslim-Americans (or their families) came to the United States after 1965. These immigrants joined a substantial African-American Muslim population and several waves of pre-1965 migrants, including a large Arab population that arrived after World War Two (Leonard 2003, p. 10). Since the United States Census does not collect information about religious affiliation, the size of the Muslim population is impossible to measure. Estimates range from 850,000 to twelve million (New York University Center for Dialogues 2007, p. 12; Pew Research Center 2007, p. 10). Presently, two thirds of Muslim-Americans are foreign-born (Pew Research Center 2007, p. 1).

Muslims of Arab and South Asian origin each comprise about one third of the total population and African-Americans comprise roughly one fifth. The rest includes Iranian, Turkish, Bosnian, and African populations, as well as white and Hispanic converts (Howell 2009, p. 9). Islamic affiliation varies widely: of those responding to a national survey, 50% of Muslim-Americans identified as Sunni, 22% as unaffiliated, 16% as Shia, and 12% as Other (Pew Research Center 2007, p. 21). Like many largely immigrant communities, Muslims are concentrated in urban centres in California, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania and Texas; as of 2010, Muslims were worshipping at over 2,000 mosques (Bagby 2012, p. 6).

As the children of post-1965 immigrants began to attend college, and foreign student numbers increased through globalisation, a new era of religious diversity on university campuses emerged. Since universities do not officially collect and report data on student religious affiliation, precise information about the demographics of Muslim students is not available. However, the geographic concentration of the Muslim community in certain areas has led to a substantial population of Muslim-American students at some public institutions. For example, an estimated 10% of students at the University of Michigan at Dearborn are Muslim (Lewin 2007). Other institutions with large Muslim populations include the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), University of California at Irvine, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, Queen's College (New York), Rutgers University at New Brunswick, University of Maryland at College Park, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and NYU. Interestingly, a number of

small Catholic colleges have attracted a surprisingly large number of Muslim students due to the alignment of social values and a willingness to acknowledge and embrace religion (Powers 2006).

There are also a large number of foreign Muslim students studying in the United States. In the 2010-2011 academic year, there were six Muslim-majority countries (Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Indonesia, Malaysia, Iran, and Pakistan) among the top 25 sending nations (Institute for International Education 2011), accounting for almost 50,000 students. This figure does not count students from countries with substantial Muslim minorities (such as India), or from countries with smaller but still substantial numbers – including Bangladesh, Kazakhstan, Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Kuwait, and the United Arab Emirates (*Ibid*).

3.1.3. SECULARISM

Although social scientists have long discussed the secularisation of American society, higher education is one of the few contexts in which this has legitimately occurred (Berger 1999, p. 1-2). College curricula and extracurricular requirements began to secularise in the mid to late nineteenth century, partly as a result of the demographic changes described above. An increased emphasis on academic specialisation, training, and the development of research capabilities also contributed to the shift. As faculty and administrators de-emphasised religion and religious morality, student groups became the primary locus for the expression of Christianity on campus (Bramadat 2000, p. 15-18).

By the outbreak of World War One, the German model of the research university began to gain prominence. It emphasised the centrality of the professor, research, academic self-governance, and the unity of teaching and research. The establishment of new private universities such as Johns Hopkins, Stanford, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), California Institute of Technology, and the University of Chicago, and the massive development of public universities through the Morrill Act, increased the pace of secularisation (Stamm 2006, p. 78). This involved the shift of faculty from generalists to highly trained specialists, and a new emphasis on research-based approaches to teaching and learning. Financial support from industry and government was critical to this transformation: as Marsden explains, 'universities became important in American life, as earlier colleges had not been, because they served the technological economy, training its experts and its supporting professionals, and conducting much of its research' (1992, p. 20).

Decades later, the socio-cultural changes of the mid-twentieth century had a profound impact on the religious culture of university campuses. The Civil Rights movement, and the concomitant increase in minority students and women gaining access to higher education, affected the demographics and tenor of college campuses (Stamm 2006, p. 79-80). Coupled with the passage of the immigration law, these changes fostered increased openness and positive attitudes to difference, which also weakened the hegemony of Christianity at many institutions. At the same time, liberal Protestant denominations began to cede their control of universities in deference to scientific standards of knowledge.

3.1.4. THE MULTI-FAITH CAMPUS

Since the social upheavals of the 1960s and 1970s many institutions have maintained an unofficial policy of avoiding conversations about religion and spirituality, in an effort to be respectful of difference (Dalton 2006, p. 168-9). Recently, however, some colleges have attempted active engagement through structured opportunities for dialogue and celebration of different traditions (Simmer-Brown 1999, p. 103). In the last decade, in particular, many private universities (and some public ones) have developed interfaith student dialogues, workshops, activities, campus centres, and chaplaincies (Brodeur & Patel 2006, p. 8-9; Diamond 2011, p. xiii). Some of these initiatives have been student-instigated and led; others have been advanced by administrators.

Chaplains – religious representatives who provide spiritual care in institutional settings – have been critical to providing support for increasingly diverse campus communities (Paget & McCormack 2006, p. 11). While the term has its origins in Christianity, it is now widely used to describe individuals representing a diversity of faiths as well as some who profess no faith (Amos 2007, p. 325). Chaplains may be ordained members of the clergy or lay persons. They typically provide a wide range of support, with a particular focus on individual pastoral care or spiritual counselling. They may also lead prayers and other congregational activities. Chaplains serve in a wide variety of contexts, including the military, healthcare, prisons, government, education, corporate sector, police/fire departments, and even domestic contexts (especially for royals or heads of state).

Prior to the twentieth century, many university presidents and other senior administrators served dual administrative and pastoral roles. As the roles separated, chaplains were appointed to minister to the spiritual needs of students and others in the campus community. Although

these chaplains were generally clergy of the denomination that founded the institution, they had responsibility for the wellbeing of students of all faiths and no faith. These early chaplains and their modern successors were generally paid employees of the college. In this thesis I refer to these individuals as University Chaplains or Deans of Religious Life. The position these individuals occupy within the administration varies by institution. In some cases, especially at more traditional and private schools, University Chaplains report directly to the university president or provost. In many other institutions, chaplains report to a Vice President for Student Affairs.[7]

As the population of college students expanded and diversified over the twentieth century, universities began to have more significant numbers of students who were not affiliated with the primary faith tradition of the institution. To meet the needs of these students, various national Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic denominations and local congregations hired part-time or full-time chaplains to serve students at particular institutions. Sometimes faculty members, graduate students, or community members volunteered to serve in these roles. In both cases, they were neither paid by, nor did they report to, the university administration. Although not legally employed by the university, they were often given office space, email accounts, parking passes, or other minor privileges as members of the university community. In this thesis, I refer to these externally appointed but university-sanctioned individuals as Affiliated Chaplains.

Despite the decline of formal mainline Protestantism since World War Two, Americans have maintained a high level of religiosity (Bramadat 2000, p. 14-15). The decline of formal, institution-sponsored Protestant prayer and perspective has provided an opportunity for students to participate in a much broader set of religious and spiritual activities. Today's college students, the majority of whom identify as Protestant, approach religion as a spiritual search or quest and 'consider their own religious narratives as evolving, open-ended and revisable' (Stamm 2006, p. 69). For many, formal denominational affiliations have been replaced with personal journeys that emphasise self-reflection. Students are increasingly tending to knit together spirituality from various world religions, while also taking inspiration from other sources – from lectures to self-help groups, books, films, and workshops.

[7] This division is often named student life or student services. In addition to religious/spiritual life, this sector of university administration is usually responsible for university residences and housing, dining, discipline, minority cultural centres or services, orientation, graduation, oversight of student groups, fraternities and sororities, and other student-led organisations. Sometimes, it is combined with admissions, financial aid, student advising, and athletics.

Figure 3.1: Religious Affiliation of First-Year College Students

RELIGION	PERCENTAGE (%)
Christian	78
Non-religious	17
Jewish	2
Muslim	1
Buddhist	1
Hindu	1
Unitarian Universalist	0.4

Figure 3.1 provides religious affiliation data from a report based on a survey of 112,000 first-year students at 236 U.S. colleges (Higher Education Research Institute 2004, p. 17). Although the total percentage of non-Christians is small, this data masks the concentration of religious minorities at certain institutions. For example, Hillel tracks data concerning the number of Jewish students on a number of campuses and it suggests that more than two dozen universities have undergraduate populations that are more than 25% Jewish.[8] Similar (though smaller) concentrations likely exist for other religious minorities. The demographics of a given campus can have a significant impact on how religious diversity is managed locally.

While there is religious diversity on many 'secular' college campuses, it operates largely within the context of Christian history and privilege (Fairchild 2009, p. 6). The prevalence of churches, chapels and University Chaplains is the most obvious sign of the Christian origins of higher education. At a deeper level, the timing of terms, holidays and weekends; the type and timing of food services; the structure and cultural rules governing interactions between men and women; policies about alcohol, smoking, sex, and dancing; and the notion that religion is a private matter itself are all based on mainstream Protestant norms, practices, and beliefs. More broadly, many facets of life in the United States, including 'currency, Pledge of Allegiance, legal holidays, presidential inauguration, and court practices', reveal the Christian foundations of the United States (Chickering 2006, p. 97).

[8] The schools are: Albany, Barnard, Binghamton, Brandeis, Brooklyn College, Brown, Columbia, Cornell, Emory, George Washington, Goucher, University of Hartford, Harvard, Long Island University, Oberlin, University of Maryland, Muhlenberg, Northwestern, University of Pennsylvania, Queens College, Sarah Lawrence, Washington University, Wesleyan, Yale and Yeshiva. See: http://reformjudaismmag.org/_kd/Items/actions.cfm?action=Show&item_id=1380&destination=ShowItem. Accessed on May 20, 2012.

The existence and advocacy of religious minorities in higher education can illuminate, de-centre, and weaken the lingering Christian hegemony. The sometimes vehement resistance towards accommodation of students who do not, or cannot, subscribe to certain aspects of university life reveals great unease around, ignorance of, and prejudice against religious minorities. Even institutions that have positively responded to student needs may simultaneously and unwittingly expose their ignorance and ambivalence.

There is a growing research community examining issues of faith on campus along with much discussion about student identity and interfaith engagement (Cherry et al. 2000; Kazanjian & Laurence 2000; Chickering et al. 2006; Kim 2006; Patel & Brodeur 2006; Speck & Hoppe 2007; Jacobsen & Jacobsen 2008; Watt et al. 2009). Many of these works are written by or for student affairs professionals. A number of them take a pragmatic approach to religious diversity by showcasing models of successful inter-religious engagement on various campuses, and providing details of how to facilitate such efforts. Nash advocates for the greater inclusion of religion in conversations about pluralism, and urges college administrators to take a leadership role in encouraging 'unbounded religious dialogue' (2001, p. 4). He acknowledges the apprehension that such conversations incite, especially on secular campuses.

Much of the religion in higher education literature focuses on student identity; few scholars have considered the relationship between religious diversity and institutions of higher education. My research brings new empirical evidence to the topic of Islam in American higher education, and makes a contribution to the growing literature about the multi-faith campus. I hope that my focus on the mechanisms and rationales of programmatic change on specific campuses will bring a new perspective to the broader conversation about diversity in higher education, as well as new insight into our conceptualisation of the modern American university.

3.2. MUSLIM STUDENTS IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

In this section, I provide a review of the limited literature about Muslim students in American higher education. I begin with studies of the experiences of Muslim college students, by far the most developed strand of this emerging field of inquiry. I then review what we know about MSAs and the tensions and controversies about Islam that have taken place on campuses in recent years. I end with an exploration of the new phenomenon of Muslim Chaplaincy.

3.2.1. EXPERIENCES OF MUSLIM COLLEGE STUDENTS

9/11 and the subsequent 'war on terror' precipitated fear and insecurity among Muslim-Americans as they grappled with their relationship to a religion that was deeply misunderstood and increasingly demonised (Peek 2011, p. 5). In some ways, this heralded the beginning of a new Muslim-American identity – and, as a stigmatised group, Muslims soon began asserting their rights to safety, non-discrimination, privacy, and belief. This mobilisation was particularly apparent among young Muslims (Peek 2005, p. 234; Sirin & Fine 2008, p. 72, 104, 180; Peek 2011, p. 85, 150).

A survey of research about Muslims in America points to a particular gap in what we know about Muslim youth, and especially college students (Leonard 2003, p. 120-5). While a few scholars are emerging in this field, there is still very little empirical research. This is symptomatic of a broader absence of scholarship about the religious lives of non-Judeo-Christian students. Much of what has been published examines Muslim student religious identity, culture, and gender from a psychological perspective. Little of the literature explores these issues through other disciplinary perspectives.

College is a time when many students struggle with questions of religious and spiritual belief and identity (Bryant & Astin 2008). This may be particularly true for young people who are living away from home for the first time, or who are members of traditional, minority, or visible religious communities. The two major published studies on the experiences of Muslim college students explored identity development in a post 9/11 environment. Peek's research, based on interviews with 127 Muslim college students, revealed shifts in their religious identity development from externally ascribed, to quietly chosen, and finally to actively declared (Peek 2005, p. 215). She found that the crisis and trauma of 9/11 impelled students to adopt their religious identity as their most salient social characteristic (Peek 2005, p. 236-7). Sirin and Fine's (2008) mixed methods study explored the construction of Muslim-American hyphenated identities among children (12-18 years old) and young adults (18-25 years old). They found that Muslim youth faced significant moral exclusion, racism, and stress. The majority of informants desired to integrate their Muslim and American identities, which they did not see as oppositional. Several others have conducted dissertation research or small scale studies about Muslim college students (Speck 1997; Cole & Ahmadi 2003; Hermansen 2003; Ajrouch 2004;

Nasir & Al-Amin 2006; Ali 2009; Ali & Bagheri 2009).[9] While these studies have provided valuable insight into the cultural and psychological experiences of Muslim students in college, they have taken individuals, not institutions, as their unit of analysis.

My thesis explores a gap in the literature by focusing on higher educational institutions and how and why they engaged with Muslim students. In particular, I explore how and why universities created Muslim Chaplaincies, and how they determined and conceptualised responsibility to this newly visible minority community.

3.2.2. MUSLIM STUDENT ASSOCIATIONS

The National MSA was launched in 1963 when 75 foreign students from ten institutions gathered at a conference in Illinois (Mubarak 2007, p. 1). In its early days, support

> from Saudi Arabia largely financed the group, and its leaders pushed the kingdom's puritan, Wahhabi strain of Islam. Prof. Hamid Algar of the University of California, Berkeley, said that in the 1960s and 1970s, chapters advocated theological and political positions derived from radical Islamist organisations and would brook no criticism of Saudi Arabia. That past has given the associations a reputation in some official quarters as a possible font of extremism, but experts in American Islam believe college campuses have become too diverse and are under too much scrutiny for the groups to foster radicals. (MacFarquhar 2008a)

Today MSA chapters exist on campuses across the country and are dominated by second-generation Muslim-Americans (Leonard 2003, p. 121). Estimates of the number of MSAs varies widely. One article cited 600, including 150-200 new chapters created between 1995-2004 (Mubarak 2007, p. 2). A subsequent *New York Times* article stated that there were 200 MSAs nationally (MacFarquhar 2008a). My research suggests that there are at least 350 chapters across the country; Wikipedia lists almost 200 MSAs.[10]

Bramadat provides a useful framework through which to understand MSAs, based on his research with an Evangelical campus organisation at a Canadian university. He describes two overarching organisational strategies employed by campus student groups: that of a 'fortress' strategy emphasising the clear boundaries between believers and others; and a 'bridge' strategy, which emphasises commonalities between various communities and constituencies

[9] A related vein of research explores Muslim youth in pre-university education. Key works include Maira (2004, 2009); Cristillo (2008); Ghaffar-Kucher (2008); and Sirin & Fine (2008).
[10] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Muslim_Students_Association. Accessed on June 4, 2012.

(2000, p. 22-23). As fortresses, MSAs facilitate religious, educational, and social activities for their constituents. They provide an opportunity for Muslim students to feel safe and comfortable, in a social context often dominated by activities unsuitable for observant Muslims, such as alcohol and drug consumption, sexual activity, or dancing. MSAs also provide young people with opportunities to meet other Muslims, and to explore and learn about Islam in an intellectual environment outside the context of family control (Peek 2005, p. 228). In their bridging capacity, MSAs act as liaisons and lobbyists to university administrators, to procure funding, prayer spaces, halal food and other provisions. MSAs 'engage questions of central importance to their faith, ranging from terrorism and human rights to women and legal reform' (Mubarak 2007, p. 3). They also played a strong role in interfaith activities, raising awareness of Islam (often by hosting Islam Awareness Weeks), Ramadan Fast-a-Thons (for the Muslim month of fasting), film festivals, and speakers.

MSAs have also been venues for discussion about the appropriate practice of Islam. For example, gender has long been an issue of debate. Some MSAs discourage women from leadership positions, pressure members to dress 'Islamically', or avoid activities where men and women intermingle, in order to follow strict Islamic codes of conduct (MacFarquhar 2008a). In contrast, MSAs on many selective campuses are dominated by women. Another example is the tension between Shia and Sunni students. In some MSAs, these issues affect which speakers, prayer leaders, and student leaders are appointed; in other chapters this is not a distinction of much importance. Each MSA operates autonomously on its own campus, subject to any university policies. Some groups are part of the National MSA infrastructure and others are not.

3.2.3. CAMPUS TENSIONS

In the last decade, universities have witnessed political conflict around Israel and Palestine, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the detention of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay, terrorist attacks in various parts of the world, and the controversy around the proposed Muslim community centre near Ground Zero. These events have rippled through college campuses, leaving some Muslim students feeling vulnerable (Greenberg 2010). As Leonard describes,

> American college campuses have been the sites of escalating conflicts between Muslim and Jewish student groups. American domestic and foreign policies since 9/11 have heightened conflicts on and off campuses among Christians, Jews, and Muslims nationwide. (2006, p. 9)

While some of these actions have been initiated by students, there is an influential cadre of right-wing activists outside the academy that have been fuelling anti-Muslim sentiment. These individuals see elite liberal colleges as important battlegrounds in a campaign to expose the threat that they perceive Islam posing to America (Steinback 2011).

These ideological differences and tensions commonly play out through the invitation of outside speakers who articulate a viewpoint held by a host student group – usually a Jewish or politically conservative one. These groups have made critics of Islam – such as Robert Spencer, Daniel Pipes, Nonie Darwish, and Ayaan Hirsi Ali – frequent speakers on college campuses. In 2007, David Horowitz and the Terrorism Awareness Project sponsored speakers and events at dozens of campuses, under the title of Islamo-Fascism Awareness Week (IFAW). Invited primarily by conservative student groups, IFAW caused significant consternation around the country (Ehrenreich 2007; Jaschik 2007b; Kaplan 2007). Most universities allowed IFAW to give speeches on their campuses. Some Muslim students condemned the events as fuelling stereotypes and misinformation, thereby fanning tensions between Muslims and other campus constituencies (Fitzpatrick 2007; Wells 2007). IFAW also raised questions about censorship and academic freedom at many colleges and universities (Jaschik 2007b). While MSAs and other Muslim student groups have never mounted a campaign as large or broad as IFAW, they have used speaker invitations and film screenings on various campuses to promulgate their positions – including sponsorship of talks by critics of Israeli policies.

One tactic used by these activists has been to target faculty members whose research or teaching has been deemed sympathetic to terrorism, supportive of conservative Islam, anti-Israeli, or anti-Zionist (Beinin 2006, p. 237-9; Cohler-Esses 2007; Borsch 2012, p. 152). They have been most effective in discrediting the scholarship of professors under review for academic appointments and promotions. Although such issues are traditionally handled by a scholar's academic department, there have been numerous cases in the past few years where advocacy by on-campus constituents working with off-campus activists – including Campus Watch, the David Project, *FrontPage* magazine, Zionist Organisation of America, StandWithUs, CAMERA (Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America) – has led to the politicisation of a process that has traditionally been an internal matter (Leonard 2006, p. 9-10). These groups have distorted or spread misinformation about the scholarship of targeted individuals and lobbied donors and the media to put pressure on senior university administrators to intervene.

The most contentious and widely covered battles occurred around the tenure cases of Nadia

Abu El Haj at Barnard College and Norman Finkelstein at DePaul University (Arenson 2007; Finder 2007; Jaschik 2007a). In addition, significant attention was brought to Rashid Khalidi and Juan Cole, who were being considered for senior positions at Princeton and Yale respectively; both were ultimately unsuccessful (Sethi 2005; Jaschik 2006). This pressure can reach beyond scholarship itself. A Brown University professor claimed that the campus Hillel and others had spread mistruths about his sources of funding, and had rallied alumni to pressure the university's administration to cancel a scholarly conference he was hosting (Colla 2007, p 52-3). In another case, an honorary degree that was to be awarded to renowned playwright Tony Kushner was blocked, because of his past assertion that the forcible removal of Palestinians from their homes during the creation of Israel was ethnic cleansing (Healy 2011). After a national controversy about academic freedom, the degree was awarded. While it is impossible to ascertain the effect such ideological attacks have on the outcomes of these cases, the targeting of academics creates a climate of fear among graduate students and junior faculty (Cohler-Esses 2007).

Beyond campus-specific controversies, a number of events external to higher education have had an impact on college and university campuses. For example, many student newspaper editorial boards debated whether they should publish the infamous Danish cartoons which depicted Prophet Muhammad. The *Harvard Salient* and the *Daily Illini* were among the ten student publications that eventually printed the images, causing disquiet on a number of these college campuses (Davey 2006; Rasmussen 2006). Yale University Press recently published a book about the cartoon controversy, but refused to include any of the images, thereby re-opening the debate about censorship, religious tolerance, and academic freedom (Cohen 2009).

Certain universities have been the site of prolonged issues. Leonard described many incidents at the University of California at Irvine over a five-year period – including provocative speakers, anti-Zionist and anti-Muslim events, a public display of the Danish cartoons, vandalism, and protests – which fostered escalating tension between Muslim and Jewish students (2006, p. 11). This resulted in a group of Jewish students filing a complaint with the U.S. Department of Education, citing anti-Semitism on campus (*Ibid*, p. 13-4). Leonard claimed that much of the turmoil was initiated by off-campus advocacy organisations and local religious groups, who directly and indirectly abetted the students (*Ibid*, p. 9-10).

3.2.4. ACCOMMODATIONS

A number of private institutions and a small minority of public ones – notably the United States military academies – provided accommodations through Christian churches or chapels, Jewish prayer rooms, and chaplaincies for their students (Siegel 2005). A smaller number of institutions offered kosher meals or dining facilities (Pensak 2010). On most campuses, external religious organisations provided the majority of religious accommodations such as chaplains and other staff, buildings, funding, and a variety of other resources for student use. This was the case with Hillel, Chabad, and a variety of Christian denominations. Universities sometimes supported these external organisations by donating land for buildings, providing free or subsidised office space, supplementing staff salaries, and providing other infrastructure such as security, internet access, electricity, and email addresses.

Institutional accommodations for Muslim students were less common. Examples included prayer rooms, *wu'du* facilities (for ritual ablutions prior to prayer), halal food (Tabb 2011), special meals during Ramadan (Walker 2006), recognition of Islamic holidays (Mubarak 2007, p. 8-9), and Muslim Chaplaincy. Although some of these provisions had existed for decades, demographic shifts, awareness, and advocacy had markedly increased the number of institutions providing accommodations (Mubarak 2007, p. 5). On some campuses, there were additional efforts to make the college experience more accessible to Muslim students. For example, a pilot programme at Harvard offered limited women-only hours at one of its three main gymnasiums (MacFarquhar 2008b; Marcus 2008). The programme was a response to a petition initiated by Muslim women concerned with modesty during their exercise regimes, and was supported by Harvard's mainstream women's group.

Although the National MSA informally tracked this data, no empirical academic research was available about the prevalence or history of these accommodations. A literature review provided some information and context, largely drawn from news sources on individual campuses. Given the religious obligation for daily prayer, prayer spaces were often the primary accommodation requested by Muslim students. These spaces were sometimes shared with other religious or student groups. Duke University was one of only a few institutions that had made major investments in renovating or furnishing a large space exclusively for the use of Muslim students (Lichter 2009).

3.2.5. MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY IN THE UNITED STATES

While many large or prominent campuses had University or Affiliated Chaplains who represented Protestantism, Catholicism, or Judaism, provisions were scarcer at smaller institutions and for non-Judeo-Christian students. Over the last decade a few universities expanded their chaplaincy staff to address the religious needs of their increasingly diverse student populations. In addition, many University Chaplains expanded their efforts to reach students from a variety of faiths, especially through interfaith activities.

Although many sects of Islam do not have a clergy *per se,* and there is no formal analogue to chaplaincy in the Muslim context, there is a tradition of informal and non-institutionalised pastoral care that dates back to the origins of Islam (Gilliat-Ray 2008, p. 145). Such care began informally in the United States in the 1940s, when members of the Nation of Islam visited prisons to educate and provide support to prisoners (Kassam-Remtulla 2010). As the result of a lawsuit filed by Muslim prisoners, in 1984 the Federal Bureau of Prisons hired its first Imam to serve as a full-time prison chaplain, the first Muslim chaplain in the military joined the Army in 1993, and colleges began hiring Chaplains in the early to mid 1990s (Special to the New York Times 1993; Kassam-Remtulla 2010). The Muslim Chaplains Association, established in 2006, boasted almost 100 members in 2011.[11]

Muslim Chaplains (sometimes known as Advisors) are most commonly found in four key realms – military, healthcare, prisons, and higher education – and less commonly in fire and police forces, high schools, or corporations. Many institutions, especially the military and prisons, have strict requirements for chaplains, including that they must either have the equivalent of a Masters degree in Divinity or be ordained. Without a formal clergy or a codified religious training programme in the United States, it was difficult for Muslims to meet these criteria until 2000, when the Hartford Seminary created the nation's first and only accredited programme in Islamic Chaplaincy (Mendez 2005). Graduates of this programme hold key Muslim Chaplaincy positions in all sectors.

Little has been written about Muslim Chaplaincy in the United States. The most widely read popular account of Muslim Chaplaincy is the autobiography of James Yee, who served at Guantanamo Bay. He was accused – and later acquitted – of espionage and of aiding the Taliban (Yee 2005). There is very little in the peer-reviewed literature. One article suggested a hybrid

[11] See: http://muslimchaplains.org. Accessed on June 6, 2012.

model for hospital-based Muslim Chaplaincy, which combined aspects of the two predominant models – a non-Muslim Chaplain trained in chaplaincy and a Muslim volunteer who has limited chaplaincy training (Hamza 2007). There have also been a few policy reports related to Muslim Chaplaincy, including one about healthcare-based Muslim Chaplains in New York City (Abu-Ras 2010). The report describes the limited Muslim-specific services available in NYC hospitals, lack of awareness about the needs of Muslim patients, and the valuable roles that Muslim and interfaith chaplains can provide in health care settings.

Even less has been written about Muslim Chaplaincy in higher education. The only significant accounts come from the United Kingdom. First among them was Gilliat-Ray's 2000 study of multi-faith chaplaincy in British higher education. Her data, collected in 1998, did not focus exclusively on Muslim Chaplaincy, although she interviewed a number of Muslim Chaplains. At the time of her research, there were nineteen volunteer, seven part-time, and no full-time Muslim Chaplains at British universities (Gilliat-Ray 2000, p. 74). Gilliat-Ray raised some interesting issues in her work: the gate-keeping role played by the University Chaplain (almost exclusively Anglicans in England and Wales); the observation that Muslim and Hindu Chaplains played a marginal role in comparison to Christian and Jewish Chaplains; the concern that volunteer advisors or Imams were sometimes ill-equipped to support students, due to generational and cultural differences and a lack of experience or training in pastoral matters. One major difference between our research is that, in this thesis, I focus largely on Muslim Chaplaincy at private institutions, whereas Gilliat-Ray was examining chaplaincy in a public context. In a more recent piece, she wrote about the growth of Muslim Chaplaincy in the United Kingdom between 1970 and 2007. She linked the expansion of the role in prisons and hospitals to changing expectations about provisions and rights for all citizens, maturation of the Muslim community and acknowledgement of its social problems, and the development of inclusive national chaplaincy structures (2008, p. 147-151). The article did not explore Muslim Chaplaincy in the context of higher education.

Another major text is a policy report commissioned by the British government on how to improve the quality of available information about Islam in English universities (Siddiqui 2007). While it included a section on Muslim Chaplaincy, it did not provide much detail about the emergence of the role in higher education. The author suggested that

> In the 1990s (after the first Gulf War and the Bosnian crisis), the demand for chaplains/advisors to cater to Muslims on university campuses began to make more impact. The nomination for Muslim chaplains came from within the

> existing chaplaincy teams, and the Muslim community was either uninterested in or unaware of the need. (*Ibid*, p. 45)

Siddiqui also identified reasons why Muslim students required particular attention: religious obligations, including daily prayer and halal food; the overlapping set of challenges related to faith, race, and culture; and an expected increase in the number of Muslim students in higher education. He reported that the 30 predominantly volunteer Muslim Chaplains or Advisors at English universities catered to students' spiritual, emotional, educational, and institutional continuity needs (*Ibid*, p. 48-50). The author also outlined three models that have emerged for funding Muslim Chaplains including those paid by universities, those paid by local communities, and those serving as volunteers (*Ibid*, p. 46-7). Siddiqui made little mention of the interests of institutions of higher education, though he noted that chaplains were often required to 'advise university authorities, and to face occasional media outbursts on issues relating to terrorism, fundamentalism, government policies and student activities and groups' (*Ibid*, p. 46).

In the United States, the modest literature about Muslim Chaplains in higher education consisted of basic profiles of Muslim Chaplains (Niebuhr 1999; Hamilton 2006; Ragovin 2007; Aron 2008; Shimron 2008; Hassan 2010), a few journalistic accounts (Goldscheider 2002; Lebowitz Rossi 2002; Mendez 2005; Jones 2007; Murphy 2008), and brief mentions in the academic literature (Hermansen 2003, p. 317; Borsch 2012, p. 157, 175, 201-11). The most focused piece on this topic was a short report produced by a graduate student for the Harvard Pluralism Project, based on interviews with nineteen higher education Muslim Chaplains (Khoja-Moolji 2011). The paper provided a summary of Muslim Chaplaincy training programs, roles and responsibilities of chaplains, and challenges and opportunities facing chaplains. It also discussed the particular leadership challenges facing female Muslim Chaplains.

3.3. CONCLUSION

Protestantism was a dominant force in the establishment of the colonial colleges, and has played a profound role in shaping American higher education. In the last sixty years, the influence of religion has shifted dramatically as a result of intellectual, cultural, and demographic changes. In this chapter, I provided a brief overview of religion in American higher education, and discussed the small but growing literature about Islam in this context. This

chapter revealed a significant gap in our knowledge about Muslim Chaplaincy, a professional role only recently developed on university campuses. In subsequent chapters, my empirical research will build on this foundation by tracing the emergence of the position in higher education, describing the roles that Muslim Chaplains play on college campuses, and exploring how and why universities hired and sanctioned Muslim Chaplains.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

4.1. RESEARCH DESIGN AND PHILOSOPHY

This chapter explains how I developed my research design, engaged with the methodological literature, gained access to individuals and institutions, generated data, analysed the results, and grappled with ethical and personal considerations.

4.1.1. RESEARCH DESIGN

As I described in the last chapter, very little has been written about Muslim Chaplaincy in American higher education, and there is almost no published empirical research on the topic. I felt that the emergence and visibility of this phenomenon, over the last decade, required a research design that balanced breadth and depth. In exploring methodologies, the case study approach emerged as an attractive option since it allowed for exploration of a topic through multiple modes of data in a specific and 'bounded' unit or context (Stake 1995, p. 2).

In his widely-cited handbook, Robert Yin describes case study methodology as well-suited to explorations of contemporary, complex social phenomena about which little is known *a priori* (2003, p. 1-2). He defines a case study as an empirical inquiry that uses multiple sources of evidence to investigate a phenomenon in its real-life context; the six types of evidence he enumerates are interviews, direct observation, documentation, archival records, participant observation, and physical artefacts (*Ibid*, p. 13, 85). Although not all evidence will be equally relevant to each case, pursuing multiple forms of evidence allows for richer data analysis.

So little was known about Muslim Chaplaincy that studying a single campus would not adequately reveal the complexity and diversity of the phenomenon as it functions across the country. Therefore, a multiple case study approach enabled me to describe different examples

as a way to begin to assemble a nuanced portrait of this emerging phenomenon. Yin cites Herriott & Firestone (1983) for the insight that a multiple case study is, 'often considered more compelling [than a single case study], and the overall study is therefore regarded as being more robust' (2003, p. 46). I had initially conceived of this research as involving four or five case studies of Canadian and American universities. However, my Transfer of Status examiners suggested – and I agreed – to limit my purview to the United States and to examine two institutions in greater detail. While multiple cases necessarily meant less depth per case, the trade-off seemed worthwhile given the newness of the phenomenon.

The goal of a case study is to 'expand and generalize theories... and not to enumerate frequencies' (Yin, p. 10). While even several cases are 'unlikely to be a strong representation of others' (Stake 1995, p. 4), my aim was not scientific generalisation but the development of theoretical inferences (Gomm et al. 2000, p. 102-3; Robson 2002, p. 183). This can be achieved based on the notion of analytical induction. As Hammersley explains:

> What analytic induction proposes is that inquiry must start from some sort of puzzle about why a particular type of event occurs, followed by the abduction of hypothetical causal principles – in other words, theoretical ideas – from [the] study of a few cases. There is then an iterative process in which, through examination of further cases and careful reflection, the theoretical hypothesis and/or the initial formulation of the type of event to be explained may be refined or transformed. (2008, p. 85)

In this fashion, I began with case studies of Rutgers and Princeton from which I generated hypotheses that I tested during visits to other academic institutions. While these visits did not provide the same depth of knowledge as the two primary cases, they afforded an opportunity to refine and broaden my initial understanding and analysis.

By selecting contrasting case studies, my goal was to reveal rich variation in the origins, practices, and rationales for Muslim Chaplaincy. At the same time, I was aware that case study methodology cannot lead to scientific generalisability. Two or more cases, no matter how different or representative, will not be able to embody the full breadth of complexity inherent in a much larger population nor predict the features or attributes of that population. Despite this, scholars have argued for the value of case studies in generating and testing hypotheses and theories. The insight gained from a single case generate 'working hypotheses' that illuminate the cultural processes within the studied group, and form the basis of inquiry to allow us to understand other cases (Cronbach 1975, p. 124-5). Eckstein echoes the notion of the

benefit of case studies in theory building and theory testing (2000, p. 119-20). While these applications are not scientific generalisations, they have value in their ability to make more broadly relevant the findings of a single case.

4.1.2. RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY AND PERSONAL BIOGRAPHY

My interpretive research philosophy was heavily informed by the concept of reflexivity, which

> ... implies that the orientations of researchers will be shaped by their socio-historical locations, including the values and interests that these locations confer upon them. What this represents is a rejection of the idea that social research is, or can be, carried out in some autonomous realm that is insulated from the wider society and from the particular biography of the researcher, in such a way that its findings can be unaffected by social processes and personal characteristics. (Hammersley & Atkinson 1995, p. 16-17)

These theorists, among others, articulate a challenge to the positivist convention that social scientists uncover or discover objective 'truths' about a community or a phenomenon. The interpretive perspective challenges the basic premise that there is a single truth that can be objectively elicited (Guba & Lincoln 1994, p. 110-111).

Hammersley and Atkinson argue that researchers are profoundly affected by their experiences, and that this in turn affects how they understand and interpret the world. In others words, researchers do not find and relate 'facts'; the data that is produced from this type of social science research is actually co-created between the researcher and the participants (1995, p. 16-22). Were someone else to pursue the same research topic, the form and structure of their project would be completely different from mine. Even if they were to study the same institutions, interview the same people, and analyse the same information, they would still produce different data (transcripts, journal entries, observations, 'facts') and they might arrive at different interpretations.

Since I believe there is no single 'truth', it is important for me as an interpretive researcher to share enough about myself and my data to allow my audience to draw its own conclusions. Alan Peshkin put it eloquently:

> As I increasingly come under conviction about the relationship between who I am, what I see, and what I conclude about what I see, I feel increasingly inclined to reveal enough about myself so that readers can make their own judgments about what I saw, what I missed, and what I misconstrued. (1986, p. 15)

Extensive research suggests that the race, gender, religion, age, and accent of researchers can affect the type of information that is generated (Hammersley & Atkinson 1995, p. 95-9; May 2001, p. 128). Individuals with particular experiences or appearances are sometimes able to solicit and generate data that would be difficult for others to produce. At the same time, one's background can present blind spots in critical analysis. Since the impact of one's subjectivity is difficult to ascertain, providing details about one's biography and approach allows the reader to make his or her own judgements. In the following two paragraphs, I provide a brief biography, which I hope will be useful to readers in interpreting my findings, analyses and conclusions.

I was born in Kenya to parents of Indian ancestry and my family immigrated to Canada when I was an infant. I grew up as a semi-observant Ismaili Muslim, a religiously syncretic and culturally liberal Shia sect; I now describe myself as a cultural Muslim. I am an openly gay man fully accepted by my immediate and extended family. In my mind, this positionality has provided both enormous benefits and potential drawbacks. I have been lucky to have received a first-rate education – starting with a magnet state school in my hometown of Calgary, Canada, followed by a scholarship to attend an international high school in New Mexico; an undergraduate degree at Stanford; a Rhodes Scholarship at Oxford; and now, finally, a return to Oxford to pursue my doctorate.

My religious and educational background afforded me some immediate credibility during my fieldwork. It also provided me with the language, insight, social capital, and sensitivity that come from familiarity. At the same time, my affiliation as a student in Europe and non-practicing Muslim, provided some distance and 'objectivity' to my research and analysis. I have previously described this position as 'halfie' – someone who is accepted as an insider but has the perspective of an outsider (Kassam-Remtulla 1998, p. 4-5). There were occasions when this status led to some discomfort. For example, I did not fast for Ramadan or participate in prayers; this must have signalled my lack of faith to my informants. In those instances, my religious status may have negatively impacted my ability to build trust with Muslim interviewees and could have influenced their willingness to be forthright with me.

Another important factor to share is that in February 2010, after I completed by Confirmation of Status oral examination, I began a full-time paid position at Princeton University. I work for both the Provost (chief academic and chief budgetary officer) and the Executive Vice President (chief administrative officer) on resource allocation, budgeting, diversity, and policy development. I do not work closely with the individuals that I interviewed for my research nor

do I work on issues related to religious support and accommodation. Therefore, I remain slightly removed from this issue which tempers my professional and personal investment in telling a particular story about administrative decision making in the Office of Religious Life (ORL). Before and after I accepted the position, I was candid with my co-workers about the topic of my doctoral research. I did not use my new position to gain access to information relevant to my research, even though it might have been useful in understanding how and why Muslim Chaplaincy emerged at Princeton.

Working at Princeton while writing up my dissertation created advantages and limitations. I joined Princeton after I had completed the vast majority of my data collection; I conducted only four interviews related to the Princeton case study after my start date. Therefore, I believe that my employment had minimal impact on my methodology since, unlike some researchers who carry out a full study in their work setting, I did not face the challenge of asking probing, uncomfortable, or critical questions of long-standing colleagues (Robson 1993, p. 300).

My status as an employee, however, did influence how I interpreted my data. While my analysis may have been influenced by the partiality that sometimes comes with being an employee, there were clear advantages to being an 'insider'. My employment-based learning about the university proved invaluable, particularly in understanding how senior administrators made decisions. Although I was not able to gain access to ORL decision making processes as a researcher, as an employee I was a participant and observer of decision making in other administrative contexts. While the notion of risk related to Muslim Chaplaincy or religion never came up in the course of my professional duties, other types of risk were widely discussed. My employment-informed understanding of the importance of risk management and mitigation – which I am doubtful I would have been able to distil from interviews, observations, and web-based research alone – was critical to developing the model of the anticipatory university that I describe in Chapter 8 ('Analysis'). In addition, the concept of institutional isomorphism was strengthened as a rationale through my observations about the importance of peer benchmarking in a broad variety of major (and some minor) decision making processes throughout the institution.

4.1.3. CASE SELECTION

The process by which cases are selected is a longstanding question in the methodological

literature, and selection required significant attention given its implications for the value and relevance of my research. There is consensus that without random sampling – which is rare in case study methodology – case studies are not statistically generalisable. While this type of generalisability was not my aim, the extent to which these findings could be applied (practically or theoretically) to other universities was a valid concern.

Gomm, Hammersley and Foster suggest that, 'most case study research must be directed towards drawing general conclusions' (2000, p. 102). In presenting ways to improve the likelihood of distilling useful theoretical inferences from case study research, they critique scholars who accept the positivistic notion that a single case study cannot have any value beyond itself. They provide two methods for improving the strength of theoretical inferences. The first is to select cases with knowledge about the population from which they are chosen. This allows the researcher to understand how typical or atypical the characteristics of the case are in relation to the population from which it is drawn. Through extensive internet research and a few key conversations, I was able to garner information about the more than 40 institutions with Muslim Chaplains before I selected my cases. The second method is to present cases in the context of the population to which they relate. To achieve this, I visited more than 20 additional campuses to understand whether, and how, the findings from my two in-depth cases were relevant to other universities with Muslim Chaplains. I present these findings in Chapter 5 ('Muslim Chaplaincy in the United States'). The transferability of a theoretical inference from one case to another depends on the 'fittingness' between the situations – that is, how similar the contexts are (Lincoln & Guba 2000, p. 40). This notion was echoed by Goetz and LeCompte, who discussed 'comparability' or 'translatability' between cases (1982, p. 34).

The importance of contextualising cases does not alleviate the question of selection. In the context of choosing a small number of cases, I have come across no more convincing or practical advice than to select cases which are important or interesting (Walford 2001, p. 17), or from which the researcher can maximise learning (Stake 1995, p. 4). Given the recent emergence of the phenomenon of Muslim Chaplaincy in American higher education, I decided to select cases that exemplified the 'leading edge' of change (Schofield 2000, p. 82) – universities that were among the first to experience this new phenomenon. I opted for heterogeneous sampling through which I identified schools that covered the spectrum on key variables such as size of Muslim student population, financial resources, and tenure of Muslim Chaplain. Schofield suggests that

> ...a finding emerging from the study of several heterogeneous sites would be more robust and thus more likely to be useful in understanding various other sites than one emerging from the study of very similar sites. (2000, p. 79-80)

For this reason, and given the exploratory nature of this work, I decided to select two contrasting cases to uncover the breadth of issues and complexities of Muslim Chaplaincy in different institutional contexts.

Among the more than 40 schools with a Muslim Chaplain, my interest in 'leading edge' cases led me to focus on those with full-time chaplains for two reasons. First, colleges and universities that had hired a full-time person in this role had made a significant commitment. New, permanent positions were usually created after much deliberation and thought. I noted that most institutions that came to this choice did so after experimenting with volunteer or part-time chaplains. Second, full-time chaplains were likely to have broader responsibilities and impact than those in part-time, contract, or volunteer positions. Full-time roles afforded opportunities for deeper and more permanent engagement with students, administrators, and community members.

At the time of case selection in spring 2008, six of the more than 40 universities with Muslim Chaplains had made commitments to full-time positions. Georgetown, NYU, and Rutgers already had full-time leaders in the position. Princeton, Yale, and Brown were all engaged in searches for full-time chaplains.[12] My approach was to select two of these six 'leading edge' cases that would provide the best insight into the more than 40 schools with Muslim Chaplains.

While there were four public institutions with Muslim Chaplains, Rutgers was the only one with a full-time person in the role.[13] Given my ambition to understand this new phenomenon in a breadth of settings, I believed it was important to study Muslim Chaplaincy in a public context since state-sponsored institutions represent the vast majority of higher education in the United States. Therefore, I selected Rutgers as one of my case studies.

To explore the breadth of full-time Muslim Chaplaincy and following Schofield's advice about selecting heterogeneous sites, I picked the other case from among the five private institutions

[12] All these full-time posts have been filled. Since 2008, Duke, Dartmouth, Northwestern, and Trinity/Wesleyan (jointly) have hired full-time Muslim Chaplains. Except for Rutgers, the first full-time chaplains hired by these institutions are all still in their positions as of May 2012.

[13] Rutgers had three campuses. My research focused exclusively on the flagship New Brunswick campus. Unless otherwise specified, when I mention Rutgers I am referring only to this campus.

with full-time Muslim Chaplains. I was looking for a school whose attributes were most similar to the other four. I eliminated Georgetown for two reasons. First, its decision to hire a Muslim Chaplain was based on a commitment to religious pluralism that came out of strong Jesuit philosophical roots which were not shared by the other four schools.[14] Second, Georgetown had hired a full-time Muslim Chaplain in 1999, almost a decade before the other four had made their full-time hires. I was concerned that this early action made Georgetown an outlier and therefore not similar enough to the other four private institutions. I also eliminated NYU, as it is an urban institution with a very large Muslim student population. Not only was this not representative of the four other schools and the majority of private schools with Muslim Chaplains, but it did not present sufficient contrast with Rutgers which had a comparable student population and urban setting. I opted for an institution with a small Muslim student population that was more representative of the majority of private colleges and universities. The three remaining institutions – Brown, Princeton, and Yale – all fit this criterion. In addition, they were all in the process of hiring their first full-time Muslim Chaplains, which I believed would provide a timely opportunity for engagement and analysis of the issue.

The final selection of Princeton over the others was motivated by academic and pragmatic considerations. On the academic side, Princeton was the smallest university in the sample (by student size), making it more comparable than Brown or Yale to the almost dozen small liberal arts colleges with Muslim Chaplains. Also, Princeton took an especially strong leadership role on religious diversity issues. In addition to the Muslim Chaplain, it had also hired a part-time Hindu Chaplain which was expanded to full-time the following year. On the pragmatic side, I hoped that by selecting an institution in close physical proximity of Rutgers and New York City (where I would be living), I would be able to spend more time on campus. I was also familiar with Princeton through my pilot research, and had already gained access and introductions to key informants there. This reassured me that it would be a viable case study.

As I began my research, I understood that the Rutgers and Princeton findings would not be scientifically generalisable to other campuses. There were ways in which each school's decisions were influenced by unique histories, financial positions, and peer groups which would make aspects of my results less relevant to other schools. At the same time, there was the possibility of developing hypotheses and theories that could have relevance beyond the in-depth cases. As I selected cases I understood that some private schools – such as Brown, Dartmouth, Tufts, and Yale – had articulated similar rationales and had made similar investments to Princeton in hiring

[14] Student, Personal interview, September 16, 2008.

Muslim Chaplains. There were also some private institutions which had very different histories and had made different institutional investments – such as Bard, Harvard, NYU, MIT, Simmons, and Wellesley. I expected that the Princeton case would have more relevance to the former institutions than the latter ones.

Over time, I came to see that Rutgers was increasingly typical of other public institutions. When I began case selection in 2008, there were four public schools with Muslim Chaplains and Rutgers was the only community-funded and full-time position. In the following four years, I was aware of only two additional public colleges – Baruch College and Queens College of the City University of New York – to create such positions. I predicted that the theoretical relevance of the Rutgers findings for these institutions would be modest. However, towards the end of my research two universities – University of Michigan and Cornell – replicated the Rutgers model of community-initiated and funded chaplaincy. My expectation was that this increased the theoretical inferences which could be drawn across these three cases.

While I will contextualise the Princeton and Rutgers case studies with data from 21 other institutions with Muslim Chaplains, it is important to acknowledge the limited generalisability of these two cases. While the findings raise theories or themes of relevance for other colleges and universities that have volunteer, part-time, and full-time chaplains, neither set of results should be considered statistically or scientifically generalisable to the broader population of schools with Muslim Chaplains.

4.1.4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

An early challenge to any budding social scientist is to define the scope of his or her research and distil it into a reasonable number of clear, answerable questions. In his classic work *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, Malinowski explained that, 'foreshadowed problems are the main endowment of a scientific thinker' (1922, p. 8-9). This approach suggests that it is possible through theoretical inquiry to establish a set of questions that can be tested or explored in the field. Hammersley and Atkinson present another, more common starting point, which is to identify an area in which there is an 'absence of detailed knowledge of a phenomenon or process' (1995, p. 26).

Like many social scientists, I come to my research with both theoretical and practical impulses. With these joint perspectives, I developed the following three research questions:

1. How did university-based Muslim Chaplaincy develop?
2. What roles did Muslim Chaplains play?
3. Why did university administrators hire and sanction Muslim Chaplains?

The first question was meant to understand the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy in American higher education. More specifically, I was interested in the individuals, events, and mechanisms that led to the emergence of these new positions on college and university campuses. The second question was more descriptive, and focused on the specific roles that Muslim Chaplains played. In addition to their support of Muslim students, I was interested in if and how they served the broader campus community, and what responsibilities (if any) they had for those beyond the campus. In addition to their actual roles, I was interested in how the positions had been conceptualised by university administrators. The personal histories, motivations, and training of Muslim Chaplains as well as their role and impact from the perspective of Muslim students was largely beyond the scope of this thesis. The third question was the most challenging to answer. I wanted to understand the motivations that led university administrators either to create these new staff positions or to sanction/support chaplains serving in this capacity.

In the next section, I describe the research methodology I used to answer these three research questions.

4.2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.2.1. PILOT RESEARCH

Although my empirical research took place in the United States, I began to test my questions and interview methods in Oxford prior to my pilot study. I conducted informal, semi-structured, interviews with staff members of three Oxford colleges – the Christian Chaplain at one of the traditional colleges, a Senior Tutor at a historically women's college, and a Muslim lecturer at one of the graduate colleges. These interviews – which focused on chaplaincy, the provision of religious and pastoral support to students, and the unique needs of Muslim students – were helpful in refining my interview schedule and surfacing early themes and questions.

In addition to this exploratory work, I conducted a pilot study at Princeton University in the

winter of 2007. I selected Princeton because it was one of just a handful of institutions that had decided to hire a full-time Muslim Chaplain which signalled to me a substantial investment and commitment. Given that Princeton was in the midst of conducting a search for a full-time chaplain, it was an opportune moment to explore the issue with administrators and students. A former graduate student in the Oxford Department of Education knew one of the ORL staff members and was able to make an introduction. On my first visit to Princeton, I interviewed two students and a staff member in the ORL. I had attempted to meet others, but the timing of my visit in mid-December was inopportune. In addition, I attempted to schedule interviews with Khalid Latif, the former Princeton Muslim Chaplain, and Ingrid Mattson, Director of Islamic Chaplaincy at the Hartford Seminary. Neither interview was possible due to scheduling conflicts and an unexpected snow storm. I returned to Princeton twice in the spring to continue my pilot work. I attended public lectures given by two of the three finalists for the Muslim Chaplaincy position which I came to know about after an informal email exchange with an ORL staff member. At that time I asked if I could observe committee interviews with the candidates, and was flatly denied. I also met with a few administrators and students, and I conducted online and library research about Princeton to better understand its history, policies, and actions related to minority students.

Despite time and logistical limitations, the pilot study was extremely valuable. It provided an opportunity to learn about Muslim Chaplaincy at an interesting inflection point for Princeton. Given the search for a new chaplain, community members were particularly aware of and interested in discussing the attributes and roles of an ideal chaplain. The ability to hear two of the Muslim Chaplaincy finalists lecture provided me both with insight about the individuals under consideration and the process the ORL had created to gain input about this decision. Two important themes were first raised in my pilot research. First, that Princeton was providing some accommodations (such as *wu'du* facilities) without requests or advocacy from Muslim students. Second, that the decisions the university was making about Muslim Chaplaincy were related to its treatment of Jewish students in the 20th century. It was through these insights that I shifted my early emphasis away from the role of Muslim Chaplains in the experience of Muslim students on U.S. university campuses and towards a focus on how and why university administrators made decisions to hire Muslim Chaplains.

After consultation with my supervisor and other professors in spring 2008, I decided to pursue Princeton as a full-scale case study. I was aware that pilot research is not traditionally incorporated into the main research project, predicated on the notion that a researcher's

methodology will improve or change as a result of this initial work. However, given the iterative and flexible nature of case study research – including the ability to visit a location multiple times and to re-interview people – I did not foresee methodological limitations with this option.

4.2.2. DATA SOURCES

In my research I relied on three key types of data: interviews, observations, and documents. Interviews were the primary technique for data generation as

> Interviewing allows people to express their views about a wide range of issues, and to wait for such information to be generated in naturally occurring situations would be very time consuming. Further, some information might not be generated in naturally occurring situations no matter how long the researcher waits. The interview gives the chance for particular questions to be asked that cannot be asked in any other situation. (Walford 2001, p. 92)

I was especially reliant on interviews, since my primary focus was on the actions and interests of administrators in developing and supporting Muslim Chaplaincy. These issues would have been particularly difficult to uncover or probe outside of the interview setting for two reasons. First, in most cases the development of Muslim Chaplaincy began several years before my research, so I could not rely on observation or other social science methods to access that information. Thus, I had to interview the individuals – some of them no longer involved in chaplaincy – to understand this recent history. Second, my research was concerned with information that was not in the public domain such as the thought processes, rationales, and justifications for Muslim Chaplaincy. Since I was not privy to internal documents which may have contained such information, the only other way to access it was through interviews.

In total I conducted 100 interviews. I interviewed 29 people (in 32 interviews) for the Princeton case study and 30 people (in 32 interviews) for the Rutgers case study. I also interviewed 35 people (in 36 interviews) at 21 other institutions.[15] Interviewees fell into six key categories: (1) current and former Muslim Chaplains; (2) current and former Deans of Religious Life (also referred to as University Chaplains); (3) undergraduates, graduate students, and alumni, including individuals from various ethnic and racial groups, Islamic traditions, and levels of religiosity or involvement with the MSA; (4) current and former faith leaders representing Catholicism, Protestantism, Judaism and Hinduism; (5) faculty members in various social science

[15] A full list of interviewees can be found in Appendix A.

and humanities disciplines; and (6) current and former university administrators including those with particular responsibility for residential life, counselling, diversity, and student services.

Epistemological considerations are central to qualitative research. Through interviews one cannot achieve or discover a 'single truth', as there are limits both to the capacity of the researcher to observe and to the participant to articulate. Some have questioned the value of interviews in providing insight into the social worlds of informants (Hammersley & Gomm 2008, p. 89). While I acknowledge the limitations of interviews, my research topic and circumstances did not provide reasonable alternatives. Therefore, I believe that:

> ... while we must not treat the validity of people's reports of their attitudes, feelings, behaviour, etc., as beyond all possible doubt, as a privileged source of information, there is no reason to dismiss them as of no value at all, or even to treat them as of value only as displays of perspectives or discourse strategies. (Hammersley & Atkinson 1995, p. 140-1)

Given the impossibility of being able to 'confirm' or 'know' what we learn in interviews, researchers must find value in what is co-constructed between interviewer and interviewee by analysing it in a particular context and with a healthy degree of scepticism.

While most of my interviews were semi-structured – meaning that I had a number of pre-selected questions or topics to address – I did not ask questions in a linear or rigid way.[16] I found that allowing the natural course of a conversation to develop often led to a richer, more honest and sometimes unexpected dialogue. The interviews generally had four distinct stages (Whyte 1984, p. 104-5; Legard, Keegan et al. 2003, p. 145-6). The first stage consisted of informal questions and small talk, which would often occur before I turned on the audio recording device. The goal was to build rapport with the interviewee and put them at ease. I reiterated my commitment to confidentiality to increase their comfort in speaking openly. I presented the consent form and answered any questions they had. Some interviewees had questions at this stage, but most did not.

In the second stage, I turned on the recorder and began the formal conversation by asking background questions about my informants. Most people enjoyed speaking about themselves; this helped to relax my interviewees. I would often ask people to tell me about their personal, educational, or career trajectory. One technique I often used was what May calls sequential interviewing: asking people to describe events in chronological order. This 'enables people to

[16] My interview schedule can be found in Appendix B.

reflect on or project their experiences in terms of the event(s) which are of interest.' (May 2001, p. 132). I used this method with students to elicit abbreviated life stories, and to understand how they had come to attend the particular college or university. I also used this approach with administrators when asking about the development or emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy. This technique was useful in building rapport, and also in obtaining a detailed description which set the foundation for follow-up questions.

In the third stage of the interview I moved from general background questions to more focused questions to explore how university administrators thought about Muslim Chaplaincy. Some of the key questions I asked of administrators included:

- How was the search for a Muslim Chaplain conducted? Who was involved?
- At any point in the process, did you speak with your peers at other institutions? What did they tell you? What influence did this have on your decision to hire a chaplain?
- What skills, experiences, and traits were you looking for in a Muslim Chaplain?
- Why did the university decide to hire a Muslim Chaplain? Who were the primary advocates for this new position? As far as you can tell, were there individuals or groups that were apprehensive about Muslim Chaplaincy?
- Some individuals I've spoken to have suggested that Muslim Chaplains have been hired to prevent extremism among Muslim students or to appease/attract donors. Do you agree?
- Some have suggested that hiring a Muslim Chaplain is about keeping up with peer institutions. What do you think about that?

These questions were asked in various ways, both directly and indirectly, depending on the interviewee and my relationship to them. I often asked the more probing questions by attributing the idea to someone else, or by portraying myself as genuinely puzzled about an issue or topic, to minimise the pointed nature of the question.

As I got further along in my research, I tested my own hypotheses regarding some of these questions with select interviewees. I did this with individuals whom I came to trust as key informants, or with faculty members who were often less personally invested in these issues than current students and administrators, which allowed them to offer a more objective and academic perspective. In this context, I sometimes asked 'leading questions' to elicit a strong response. Hammersley and Atkinson tell us that such questions:

> ...can be extremely useful in testing hypotheses and trying to penetrate fronts. What is important is to assess the likely direction of bias that the question will introduce. Indeed, a useful tactic is to make the question 'lead' in a direction opposite to that in which one expects the answer to lie, and thus avoid the danger of misleadingly confirming one's expectations... (p. 155)

I found this technique to be valuable in several situations, especially when trying to broach some of the more sensitive and complex questions described in the previous paragraph.

In the fourth and final stage of the interview, I referred to the interview schedule explicitly – both to ensure that I had not missed a key question, and to signal the end of the interview. I often asked interviewees if they had any further thoughts to share, or if there were particular people they recommended that I speak with. Unsurprisingly, people often acted differently once the official interview was complete. Sometimes they would ask me personal questions or ask more about my research. Often they would provide new information or insight, especially if I had turned off the recording device. I surmised that while most people did not make reference to or even look at the recording device during our conversation, a number were keenly aware of its presence and spoke more candidly once it was turned off. Sometimes these were short exchanges and other times they were long. If we had a substantive exchange 'off the record', I would outline the major points in my field notes.

In addition to interviews on both campuses, I observed numerous events and activities organised by the MSA, ORL, or the Muslim Chaplain. These included interfaith dialogues and conversations, social and religious activities, public events – including speakers and panel discussions – and *iftars* (evening meal to break the daily Ramadan fast). While it was difficult to take notes during these events, after they were complete, I recorded general impressions and specific quotes from the conversation. I also noted the names of people I had met so I could follow up with them as potential interviewees. Sometimes I wrote these notes in longhand; other times I emailed them to myself on my Blackberry device. While events often provided useful contextual data and opportunities to meet people, they did not figure prominently as standalone data sources. Most of the events I had access to were produced by and for students, and thus did not provide much insight on administrators or the relationships between students and administrators. A key exception was the University Muslim Chaplains' Conference, organised and hosted by Princeton's Muslim Chaplain Sohaib Sultan on April 25/26, 2009 and April 24/25, 2010. These conferences provided opportunities for Muslim Chaplains working in higher education to share their experiences with one another through structured and informal conversations. The chaplains were generous to allow me to observe their sessions.

The final data source was documents. In the course of my fieldwork I collected large amounts of information in both paper and electronic form. I relied heavily on articles from key campus publications. At Princeton I regularly monitored *The Daily Princetonian*, the student newspaper; the *Princeton Alumni Weekly*, the alumni magazine; and the *News at Princeton* website of the university, which contained articles and an online archive dating to 1999. I also reviewed publications produced by the ORL including a number of student-produced journals. At Rutgers I relied on *The Daily Targum*, the student newspaper; *Rutgers Focus*, the faculty and staff publication; *Rutgers Magazine*, an alumni publication; and the *Rutgers Universitywide News* produced by the university's media relations department. I also read other publications, including diversity policies, plans, and reports, as well as posters and announcements from MSAs and university offices. In addition, I joined multiple email and Facebook groups for the MSAs of both institutions. This was both a way to learn about events and activities, but also to follow substantive discussions among these communities.

4.2.3. ACCESS

There is a growing social science literature about researching elites and I favour Moyser and Wagstaffe's broad definition of elite as 'those at the top of any socially significant hierarchy be it politics, sports, academia, religion, or even beauty or crime' (1987, p. 8). While much of the literature focuses on political, policy and economic elites, my research with middle and senior level university administrators had some of the same characteristics. Although key administrators at my research sites did not set national higher education policy, their actions did sometimes have an impact on the activities of other institutions of higher education, both in the United States and beyond. A recent example of this was Princeton's decision to substantially increase undergraduate financial aid in 2001. Following this announcement, Harvard and then dozens of other universities followed suit (Arenson 2001).

Gaining access to informants or a research site is a topic that that has been widely discussed in the literature on qualitative research methodology (Hammersley & Atkinson 1995, p. 54-79; Walford 2001, p. 34-49). Given that my inquiry was focused on elite individuals – the issues of access I faced were different from those involving non-elite groups and settings (Fitz & Halpin 1994, p. 48-9; Conti & O'Neil 2007, p. 67-9). I did not face many of the typical challenges associated with gaining access to a new society or culture. For example, I was free from linguistic, cultural, or logistical barriers that many individuals experience if they conduct research in a foreign country, or with sub-cultural communities in their home countries. In

these cases, it is often initially difficult to gain entrée into a community; but, once embedded, researchers often have remarkable access to the private lives and perspectives of the people they are studying. This is easiest when the researcher is able to live full-time with the community and to be viewed as playing an active role that Lave and Wenger describe as a 'legitimate peripheral participant' (1991, p. 29).

The population I was most interested in – university administrators – was neither a distinct nor cohesive community, but rather a loosely bound collection of people who shared similar functions and positions within the university structure. In contrast to faculty members who taught classes, held office hours, published their work, and spoke at conferences, administrators operated largely in private spaces that were inaccessible to most outsiders. While initial identification of administrators was straightforward, gaining entrée to their private meetings or activities was virtually impossible. For example, most administrators were willing to be interviewed, but they were not willing to invite me to private meetings or to share memos, papers, or other internal documents. When I became an administrator at Princeton, I did not work closely with the ORL so was still not privy to internal conversations and decision-making. This was a scholarly limitation, as I was not able to access some of the materials that might have provided valuable insight.

Given my cultural/religious background, age, and status as a graduate student, it was much easier to build trust and credibility with student informants given the relative size, porosity and turnover of those communities. I would often test my hypotheses by asking these students about their conversations and interactions with administrators or to triangulate what administrators had shared with me directly. However, this was not a true substitute for more sustained contact with administrators.

The literature points to two key criteria that determine the ability of a researcher to gain access in elite situations: personal contacts and credibility (Fitz & Halpin 1994, p. 38; Conti & O'Neil 2007, p. 67). In the last decade, access has been vastly increased by email and the internet, which provide new, direct, and simple channels through which contact can be facilitated. These technologies also come with new expectations about availability and transparency. Many of the people I needed to interview were obvious, and could quickly be identified and contacted via email. This included Muslim Chaplains, leaders of MSAs, and staff members responsible for religious life or student affairs. If I was not able to get a referral to such people, I contacted them directly by email. I was also able to locate a number of interviewees (especially former

administrators) through rigorous internet research instead of relying exclusively on the traditional method of snowball sampling.

I found gaining access at Princeton to be relatively straightforward. In general, people responded to my email invitations promptly and with genuine interest in my research. In advance of my first pilot study trip in December 2007, I was introduced to a key staff member (Paul Raushenbush) by a friend from Oxford; I contacted the MSA directly through its website. On a subsequent pilot study visit in April 2008, I came to Princeton to meet with Joan Wallach Scott, a historian at the independent Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton. She was intrigued by my research and decided to join me for a lecture I was attending. Fortuitously, we bumped into several of her acquaintances who were on my interview list. Most of my subsequent interviewees at Princeton were identified through: (1) traditional snowball sampling, (2) people I met or had seen at events, or (3) web research.

Although the individuals most closely connected to Muslim Chaplaincy – including current and former staff in the ORL, administrators in Campus Life, MSA members, and Muslim alumni – were willing to speak with me, the President, Executive Vice President, and Vice Provost for Institutional Equity and Diversity all declined my invitations for an interview. The absence of these perspectives deprived me from understanding how some of Princeton's most senior leaders viewed Muslim Chaplaincy, the role of religion in higher education more broadly, and issues of diversity and inclusion. While I cannot ascertain how forthright such individuals would have been in a recorded interview, not having these viewpoints impacted the conclusions I was able to draw about the intentions and rationales of administrators.

There are several possible reasons why these individuals were unwilling to meet with me. First, they may have calculated that the risk of speaking with me outweighed the benefit to them or Princeton. It is possible that our conversation would have touched upon sensitive topics that they did not want to speak about on the record. Years later when I was an employee, I learned that there was a high level of oversight of public statements by senior administrators. While I had not asked for a public comment, senior officials were trained to exercise caution in responding to outside inquiries. Second, they may have felt that since their official responsibility for issues of religious life were limited, they were not the appropriate people to speak with me. Interestingly, none of them referred me to colleagues that were more closely tied to this work. Third, they may have felt that an interview on this topic was not a good use of their time. Senior officials had to prioritise the large number of unsolicited requests for meetings from individuals

inside and outside the university. I would have been low on that list of priorities given that I had no formal affiliation with the university.

Gaining access at Rutgers was generally more difficult than at Princeton. In the spring of 2008 I interviewed people at Princeton who gave me contact information for key informants at Rutgers. It took me five months of emails and telephone calls to set up my first meetings there. While I eventually spoke with the students and administrators most closely connected to Muslim Chaplaincy, setting up these meetings almost always involved multiple email exchanges. Despite numerous contacts over the course of more than a year, there were a handful of individuals with whom I was not able to arrange meetings. These individuals included the former Vice President for Student Affairs, the Director of the Paul Robeson Cultural Center, a professor of women's studies, and recent MSA leaders. The Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers was particularly difficult to contact. Although I regularly saw him at events and he promised to be available, it took many months before I was able to secure a meeting with him. He was also unwilling to provide me with the names of or contact information for board members of the Office of the Muslim Chaplaincy at Rutgers (OMCRU). Eventually I located one of them through another informant.

I am not sure why it was so much harder to connect with Rutgers informants – it may have been due to suspicion or discomfort with the topic of religion at a public institution, a lack of familiarity with social science research, scheduling constraints for a commuter student population, or concerns about confidentiality. Towards the end of my fieldwork, the Rutgers Muslim Chaplaincy became defunct. Unbeknownst to me, I was studying an office that was in the last stages of its existence. In retrospect, this may have accounted for some of the difficulty I had in gaining information about the Rutgers case.

In contrast to Princeton, however, it was relatively easy to arrange interviews with the most senior administrators including the President, Senior Vice President/General Counsel, and the Vice President for Student Affairs. I believe that the ease of accessibility at this senior level may have been the manifestation of a commitment to transparency and openness tied to Rutgers's status as a public university. These officials may have made a different calculation than their peers at Princeton. They may have decided that it was worth a little of their time to speak with me rather than risk the possibility of a Muslim community member accusing the administration of an unwillingness to engage in dialogue. This potential sensitivity may have been influenced by the open and ongoing tension between Muslims and Jews at Rutgers which had culminated

in a massive and heavily-policed rally on the New Brunswick campus in 2003 (Newman 2003).

At both institutions it was relatively easy to identify administrators and MSA members, since their contact information was readily available on the internet. It was much more challenging to locate alumni, faculty members, former administrators, and Muslim students who were not MSA leaders. I used a variety of methods to locate these individuals. Many of these names came through traditional snowball sampling, and others were identified through detailed web research in student newspaper archives, university press releases, and alumni publications. I met some of my informants through social or religious events and connected with some of them through referrals from colleagues or through social networks like Facebook. It was especially difficult to identify and contact former students or university administrators who could provide a historical perspective on Muslim Chaplaincy. However, through careful analysis and follow-up, I managed to find informants who had dispersed to Ohio, the Caribbean, and Abu Dhabi, and to interview them in person or by telephone.

In addition to the two in-depth cases, I visited sixteen other campuses. There were five sample institutions I did not visit; instead I interviewed current and former Muslim Chaplains from those schools in other locations.[17] In total, I interviewed 25 current and former university-based Muslim Chaplains. I also interviewed Muslim Chaplains and others charged with overseeing religious and spiritual life.[18] At most schools this was the University Chaplain or another Christian clergy member. In a few other cases it was an administrator working in student affairs. I travelled to most of the institutions so that I could see the physical spaces that the universities had created for Muslim and other religious students.

Ease of access to these non-case study institutions varied. In general, Muslim Chaplains were responsive to my outreach; some administrators were more difficult to schedule. Visits to these sites usually involved interviews over one or two days. These short visits did not afford an opportunity for a deep understanding of institutional history and context. In aggregate, however, these conversations were incredibly useful in positioning the Princeton and Rutgers case studies within a national context, and in an understanding that what institutions did for Muslim students was influenced by their peer institutions.

[17] I did not visit the following institutions in person: Bard, Dartmouth, Duke, Trinity, and Wesleyan.
[18] In addition to Princeton and Rutgers, I visited the following institutions in person: American, Amherst, Brandeis, Brown, Columbia, Georgetown, Harvard, MIT, NYU, Simmons, Tufts, University of Maryland, University of Pennsylvania, USC, Wellesley, and Yale.

Some scholars stress that access is not an issue to be confronted only in the early part of the research process, but an ongoing negotiation, necessary even with long-standing informants and in familiar settings (Hammersley & Atkinson 1995, p. 79). I found that in most cases once someone had agreed to the interview, the conversation was relatively free-flowing. However, it was difficult to go from an interview to something further, such as access to a meeting among administrators. Without insider knowledge, I did not even know which meetings would be useful to attend. Later in my research (but before I started to work at Princeton), I asked permission to attend meetings of the Princeton Religious Life Council, an ORL-organised student group which met regularly to discuss religious issues. The administrator who fielded my request said he would ask the student convenors, but he never replied. My follow-up messages went unanswered. I am not sure if this was active resistance or simple oversight; it was not an isolated incident, so I suspected the former rather than the latter.

4.2.4. DATA ANALYSIS AND VALIDITY

Analysis involves identifying patterns and themes by putting the data into an internal conversation with itself, and into an external conversation with outside sources. These conversations occur throughout the research process and are not limited to the final stages.

My data analysis began during and after each campus visit. I recorded thoughts about my conversations, observations, and interviews as they occurred during the day. At the end of each day of fieldwork, I transcribed these written field notes and generated additional reflections based on the cumulative experiences of the day. On days when I conducted interviews, I listened to the recordings to become more familiar with the data and to record any additional notes or impressions. Within 24 hours I made additional notes about the interviews and their relevance to the cases. As I gained more insight, I wrote a memo about each case. The first portion was purely descriptive – laying out the 'facts' of Muslim Chaplaincy and the relationships between Muslim students, the chaplain, and the university administration (Creswell 2007, p. 74); the second part was analytical and included early impressions, trends, or thoughts. I also constructed a chronology of the relationship between Muslim students and the university administration for each institution.

Initially, I had planned to transcribe interviews within days of conducting them. However, given the magnitude of the task, I transcribed about a dozen interviews myself and, with the help of a research grant from the NASPA Foundation, I hired a service to transcribe the remainder of the

interviews. These outsourced transcriptions required one or two rounds of additional edits. There were a few interviews that had poor recording quality and others that yielded little useful data or insight. In these cases I transcribed only selected portions of the recording.

I used a combination of deductive and inductive coding to organise my data (Miles & Huberman 1994, p.58). I went into the field with some preliminary codes that were based on deductive reasoning and my pilot study, and I began to code my data as I collected and transcribed it. I viewed coding as one method of organising and analysing my data, but not as a substitute for knowledge of relevant literature or innovative thinking (Coffey & Atkinson 1996, p. 45-8). Coding cannot replace deep familiarity with one's data; that is best achieved by reading and re-reading and sometimes by listening and re-listening to interview recordings.

The process began with a careful reading of each transcript, during which I highlighted key pieces of dialogue. I read all the transcripts from the Princeton case together, and subsequently adapted and elaborated the preliminary codes, through inductive reasoning, to describe key themes or topics (Miles & Huberman 1994, p. 58-61). Sample codes included 'peer institutions' (for data that described what Princeton's peers were doing vis-à-vis Muslim Chaplaincy), 'Recruitment' (for data about the impact or benefit of Muslim Chaplaincy on admissions or recruiting of Muslim and non-Muslim students), and 'Jewish' (for data about the role that Muslim Chaplains played in interfaith activities and as members of chaplaincy staff in interacting with the Jewish community).

I then created separate documents for each code or theme, and aggregated relevant dialogue from all the Princeton transcripts into these documents. I then went through each code (or theme) document and reorganised the data into sub-codes. For example, under the 'Jewish'' theme the sub-codes included: 'Spain trip' (for data related to the joint Princeton Jewish-Muslim student trip to Spain in 2007), 'Hillel' (for data references to Hillel or any of its staff members), 'Anti-Semitism' (for data related to anti-Semitism at Princeton), and 'Discrimination in admissions' (for data about Princeton's ongoing challenge in recruiting Jewish students). After sub-coding I re-read the documents and rearranged or re-coded where necessary.

In coding the Rutgers transcripts I used some of the same primary codes, but also created new ones for new themes. After coding the Rutgers data, I went back to the Princeton and Rutgers data and added in some primary codes and sub-codes that had emerged in the Rutgers and other institutions coding. I then began to compare across the cases, through techniques of

pattern-matching and explanation-building (Yin 2003, p. 116-22). I then repeated this process with the national transcripts. As I continued coding, I began to group and re-group codes. For example, the primary code 'Recruitment' later became a secondary code under the primary codes 'Reputation for intolerance' and 'Support non-Muslim students'. Another example is that the 'Spain trip' code that was developed in the Princeton analysis was later incorporated into a larger 'Jewish/Muslim trip' code which captured data about the various trips organized by several institutions. This was an extended process that occurred over several months

I organized my final coding around the three research questions. This framework represented an aggregation of inductive and deductive codes that appeared in any of the three data sets (Princeton, Rutgers, national). Some codes were only related to data from a single institution, others were raised in multiple contexts.

The process of writing was also a key part of my analysis. As I developed my case study descriptions and coded data, I wrote papers to develop themes and to draft emerging responses to my research questions. At this stage I found it useful to solicit feedback from colleagues including my supervisor. I also shared my writing with academic peers and faculty members, who raised many questions, suggestions, and challenges.

I made multiple efforts to test the validity of my findings and analysis. First, since I was relying heavily on interview data, I tested the validity or 'trustworthiness' of that data through triangulation with job descriptions, observations, newspaper reports, and other informants. By collecting and considering multiple forms of data, each illuminated the others and provided a fuller picture of the phenomenon at hand. Second, as Hammersley and Atkinson suggest:

> some of these [individuals] may need to be interviewed more than once, for example because the aim is to trace patterns of change over time, or because it is discovered that further information, or checking of previously supplied information, is required. (1995, p. 136)

I interviewed a handful of key informants a second or third time. In these conversations, I both confirmed and expanded on factual information and tested interpretations of my findings. In some cases, I presented these as my own; in others I referred to these ideas as themes that others had surfaced. These conversations allowed me to test the validity of my early conclusions. Third, in a few cases I shared early written drafts of findings chapters with key informants for their feedback on accuracy and interpretation. This method of 'member

checking' was recommended by Stake as one useful method of triangulation (1995, p. 115). I was clear with these individuals that while I welcomed their thoughts, I would not necessarily be able to incorporate all of their input in revised versions. When sharing my writing with informants, I generally sent it in advance of a meeting so that they could review it prior to our conversation. I did not record these sessions to allow for more honest and less scripted responses.

By showing my key interviewees some of my writing, I brought them into my confidence and enlisted them as allies in my project. This process enabled me to identify gaps in my understanding or knowledge that required further work. With some informants and colleagues in higher education, I also shared my theory of the anticipatory university and the important focus on risk management. These conversations were valuable in gaining perspectives on the resonance and validity of my interpretations in a broader context. In spite of these efforts, I was aware of the limitations of my data and analysis. I understood the inherent challenges of attempting to uncover personal and institutional agendas which are, by their very nature, hidden. The following section includes further reflections on these limitations.

4.3. ETHICS, PERSONAL CONSIDERATIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

My research adhered to the British Educational Research Association (BERA) revised ethical guidelines (British Educational Research Association 2004), and received approval from Oxford's Central University Research Ethics Committee (CUREC).[19] The research was not anticipated to cause risk or harm to any of the participants, and all data was stored in accordance with BERA and CUREC guidelines. Almost all of the people I interviewed were current or former students, staff, and faculty members at universities in the United States. As a result, they were highly educated and literate people who were able to offer fully informed consent to participate in the study.

Like all researchers, I faced ethical issues in the generation, analysis, and dissemination of my data (Creswell 2007, p. 141). In this section I describe two key ethical issues – anonymity of institutions/people and self-representation. The most significant ethical issue I struggled with was whether and how to anonymise institutions and individuals. The norm in social science

[19] A copy of my approved CUREC participation information sheet and consent form are available in Appendix C. Please note that the title of my thesis changed from the one used in these forms.

research is to anonymise institutions where research is conducted (Cherry, DeBerg et al. 2000, p. 6; Guenther 2009, p. 411). Walford describes it as "an almost unquestioned belief" (2005, p. 83). While I understand that anonymity is often necessary or required, I had several criticisms of this approach, building on the writings of Geoffrey Walford (2001; 2005).

First, Walford suggests that cases should be selected based on their inherent importance, 'to ensure that results have meaning beyond the particular case selected. This usually means that the site has to be named in any publication' (Walford 2001, p. 17). Withholding the identity of the institution can significantly limit its translatability or usefulness. Second, maintaining anonymity often requires the exclusion or significant modification of the truth, which may yield a less rich, less nuanced, and less detailed account of events, people, and experiences. This may result in less interesting data and analysis. Third, as there is no way to guarantee the confidentiality of everyone associated with the research, masking the institution's identity will only ever be partial. Even when a pseudonym is used, people affiliated with the institution and those close to the researcher often know its identity. It is sometimes the case that readers will also be able to identify the institution (Walford 2005, p. 87). Fourth, anonymising a case can deprive the reader of historical context. Identifying a school solely as a 'large public institution in a demographically diverse state', for example, could be used to describe schools as different as Rutgers, University of Texas at Austin, Queen's College, or UCLA. Fifth, using the name of the institution holds the researcher more accountable to his or her interviewees and participants, and to representing the data accurately (Walford 2005, p. 89). One can take more liberty or risk if one has the shield of anonymity to hide behind. Sixth, using pseudonyms can lead readers to perceive a single case as representative of a larger cohort, which overstates or magnifies its relevance and transferability. This can lead to spurious generalisations. Walford explains that

> as readers, we intellectually accept the lack of generalizability of ethnographic work, [but] we are seduced by the lack of specific details about the site and situation such that the significance of particular pieces of research expands to fill our general understanding of the issues. (2005, p. 90)

Finally, anonymising a case can deprive an institution from credit for its success or accountability for its shortcoming. A researcher exploring a new or underappreciated phenomenon can bring critical praise or censure to important issues.

My decision to name Rutgers and Princeton included two caveats to protect those who were generous enough to share their insights with me. First, I disclosed to all participants that I would

be naming their institution in my thesis. Second, as is a convention in social science research, I provided anonymity to all informants who requested it. Unless they gave permission for use of their name and title, informants were not named in this thesis. Aspects of their identities or how they were attributed in the footnotes were sometimes altered to maintain that anonymity. For example, an attribution as 'Muslim Chaplain' for a particular school would essentially reveal an identity; by attributing more broadly (such as 'Religious Life staff member') I was able to protect the informant's anonymity. Given their unique roles within institutions, some staff members had to be identified by name. I only used real names when it was relevant and important to identify the speaker, and in all such cases I sought permission from those who were identified.

I made the initial decision to provide anonymity to all informants based on two factors. First, given the potentially sensitive nature of my research, I was interested in ensuring that students, faculty members, and administrators could candidly express their views about Muslim Chaplaincy without fear of negative consequences for those who were sceptical or critical of the development of these roles. Second, as Guenther describes, 'the use of pseudonyms in place of the real names of individuals is so dominant in the social sciences' that I did not initially question this practice (2009, p. 413).

I was later persuaded to reconsider this stance. Recent scholarship has interrogated the dominant view of anonymity, including its tendency to promote recklessness or excessive candour, deny informants the right to claim their ideas and words, and patronize individuals by making comprehensive decisions without appropriate consultation (Guenther 2009, p. 413-4). To address such concerns, I contacted all of the living informants that I had quoted to share the words, context, and analysis which I planned to include in the final document. Each individual was given a choice between attribution and anonymity for each of their quotes; thus, someone could opt for some quotes to be attributed and others to remain anonymous. I also invited any other comments about the use and analysis of their words. I heard back from virtually all informants: seven asked me to use their names, four gave me permission to use their names (which I did), and the remainder asked to remain anonymous.

The second ethical issue was that I struggled with was self-representation. I was most concerned about the assumptions and expectations that Muslim informants had of me. I suspected that my South Asian ethnicity and Muslim name aided my access and rapport with Muslim Chaplains and Muslim students, based on their assumption that we shared religious

beliefs and cultural values. In reality, I consider myself to be a secular Muslim from one of Islam's most liberal sects. I did not want to deceive my informants, nor sacrifice my integrity by pretending to be as observant or traditional as they were. On the other hand, I did not want to jeopardise my credibility, relationships, or access to informants. In practical terms, these tensions came up most acutely around the issue of prayer. During several of my interviews, interviewees requested a break for prayer. I sensed some awkwardness when they realised that I was not going to join them. Sometimes, I would state this explicitly and other times it went unstated. At some events, such as Ramadan *iftars*, I sat in the background during prayers. No one made any direct reference to this, but it did feel uncomfortable at times. I wondered what impact, if any, this had on our conversations or their willingness to be candid with me.

As I became more involved in my fieldwork, I started echoing Arabic phrases that my Muslim informants used. For example, many of them started their emails with *as-salamu alaykum,* or the shortened version, *salam* (meaning 'Peace be upon you' or 'Peace'); or using the word *insha'Allah* (meaning 'God willing'). These were phrases I was familiar with from my childhood, but which I almost never used. However, slowly I began to use them in my interactions with Muslim informants. There were times when I felt that I might be misrepresenting myself by using phrases that made me appear 'more Muslim'. There were other times when it seemed natural (even methodologically appropriate) to adapt to the language and customs of my informants. If I had been interacting with Catholics, would I have felt as conflicted about wishing them *Merry Christmas* or using the phrase *Bless You*?

Although the unwritten and unspoken rules of an interview dictate a unidirectional line of questioning, I was concerned about potential questions from Muslim interviewees, which might reveal our differences of opinion and belief. I knew that a simple internet search about me could have revealed my identity as a gay man, which might have troubled some of my interviewees. After much consideration and a conversation with my supervisor, I settled on a policy to avoid or deflect personal questions. I resolved, however, that if I were pushed or confronted, I would not misrepresent my background or deceive my informants on this or any other issue. Luckily, there were no such confrontations.

In addition to concerns about authenticity among Muslim informants, I was also aware that non-Muslim administrators or faculty members may have made assumptions about my religious beliefs, or seen me as an advocate for Muslim students. This could have affected how comfortable they were in speaking truthfully. To encourage honest input, at the beginning of

these interviews I was careful to position myself as a neutral and non-judgemental researcher, and remind them that any of their comments could be made 'off the record' or without attribution. Given my academic pedigree, research orientation, and physical appearance (no obvious signs of religiosity such as a beard or *taqiyah* (cap worn by Muslim men)), I believe I provided non-Muslim respondents comfort in expressing their true views.

Beyond how my Muslim background influenced how I was perceived, I felt that both Muslim students and university administrators were apprehensive about this research. In a post 9/11 environment, Muslim students may have been nervous about discussing these issues. Administrators were probably also somewhat reticent, given the increasing scrutiny faced by universities, especially in regards to issues surrounding religion and minority students.

There were two key limitations to my methodology. First, funding and geographical considerations constrained the amount of time I was able to spend at my case study institutions. This meant that although I travelled to New Jersey regularly, I was unable to live near either of the campuses nor become deeply integrated into the campus community. While this did not impact my ability to arrange formal interviews, it limited opportunities for serendipitous interactions which might have occurred at lectures, meetings, and events on either campus. Given my interest in administrative decision making, it is unclear how likely and productive such encounters with staff members would have been. However, I am certain that greater embededness would have been useful in engaging students and possibly faculty members. My reliance on formal interviews, therefore, did not generally permit open-ended and multiple exchanges. I believe this study could have been enhanced through an ethnographic approach including 'thick' description of Muslim Chaplains and other administrators which could have provided insight into their family backgrounds, personal motivations, administrative logic, training, and religious orientations.

Second, there were challenges associated with studying university administrators which were similar to other research about elites (Moyser & Wagstaffe 1987, p. 18-19; Fitz & Halpin 1994, p. 38; Conti & O'Neil 2007, p. 67). While I did not have much difficulty in arranging interviews with key informants, such meetings did not ensure that I was able to truly determine how and why Muslim Chaplaincy developed. Some aspects of Muslim Chaplaincy were public and transparent; these included job descriptions, university and MSA websites, articles in student and other newspapers, and public events. However, the issues that I was most interested in exploring – the administrative mechanisms and institutional rationales for developing and

funding these chaplaincies – were largely covert and difficult to access. I used interviews with administrators as a primary strategy to surface and explore these issues. I also interviewed students, faculty members, and others, to gain their insight about the inner workings of the university. I believe that by triangulating my interview and other data sources, I was able to discern some of the assumptions, patterns, and rationales behind Muslim Chaplaincy. Despite this, there were inherent limitations on my ability to gain access to key decision making processes and materials, especially at the campuses where I had a single visit. Even at Princeton and Rutgers, there were limits to my access. For example, I was unable to observe private meetings and conversations or access internal written materials or budgets related to Muslim Chaplaincy or other provisions for the support of religious life.

4.4. CONCLUSION

Given the recent emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy in American higher education and the complexity of academic institutions, I approached my research through a dual case study methodology with an emphasis on interview-based data generation. While there are epistemological considerations regarding the 'truths' which can be generated though interviews, the institutions selected, the number and range of interviews conducted, and the considerations set forth in this chapter give me confidence in the value and relevance of the conclusions based on my research.

CHAPTER 5

MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY IN THE UNITED STATES

The primary goal of this first findings chapter is to frame the Princeton and Rutgers case studies. While it is not meant to be a comprehensive study of Muslim Chaplaincy in American higher education, it presents a national context through which to understand and interpret the findings from Chapters 6 and 7.[20] This is especially important given the newness of Muslim Chaplaincy and the limited academic research on this topic in the United States.

This chapter is divided into sections reflecting two of the three overarching research questions addressed in this thesis: (1) How did university-based Muslim Chaplaincies develop? and (2) What roles did Muslim Chaplains play? I set out to answer these questions based on interviews with 35 informants at 21 institutions beyond Princeton and Rutgers. An answer to the third research question – which asks *why* college and university administrators have hired or sanctioned Muslim Chaplains – would have been difficult to ascertain from this national data (based on one or two interviews on multiple campuses). This question will be fully explored in the Princeton and Rutgers case studies.

This chapter largely presents the perspectives of Muslim Chaplains and University Chaplains on these two research questions but it does not provide the breadth of analysis available in the Princeton and Rutgers case studies which include student, faculty, community member, and other perspectives. In the interest of maintaining the confidentiality of my informants, direct quotes are generally attributed by role (e.g. Muslim Chaplain) though some people are intentionally listed with more general titles to protect their anonymity. In a few cases, it was important or unavoidable to quote people by name or institution; these individuals are cited with permission.

[20] Initially, this chapter was meant to follow the Rutgers and Princeton cases. At the urging of my Confirmation of Status examiners, I present it as a prelude to the deeper institutional case studies.

5.1. DEVELOPMENT OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY

This section addresses my first research question: How did university-based Muslim Chaplaincy develop?

5.1.1. CHRONOLOGY

Muslim Chaplaincies on college and university campuses are relatively new and they are going through a period of growth and change. It is therefore challenging to keep abreast of new positions as well as those that have been terminated. The level of institutionalisation of these roles varies significantly. Many institutions are being served by volunteers and contract workers; others have developed permanent part-time and full-time positions. Figure 5.1 provides an alphabetical list of institutions that – as of spring 2012 – have, or formerly had, a Muslim Chaplain. This list includes all types of chaplains – volunteer, contract, part-time, and full-time. Where known, I provide the year in which the position was created in its first form. An asterisk denotes institutions that previously had a Muslim Chaplain but no longer have an individual serving in that role (and are not actively seeking to fill the position). While Figure 5.1 is useful in signalling some level of institutional support or awareness of Islam, it neither describes the level of commitment from the college (for example, whether the individual is paid or unpaid) nor the amount or quality of support provided by the Muslim Chaplain (for example, if the chaplain is occasional, part-time, or full-time).

Figure 5.1: Institutions with Muslim Chaplains (Current and Former)[21]

Adelphi	Northeastern
American (2006)	Northwestern (2010)
Amherst (2005)	Princeton (2006)
Babson (2010)	Queen's College CUNY (2010)
Bard (1996)	Quinnipiac (2011)
Baruch	Rochester Institute of Technology
Boston University	Roger Williams University*
Brandeis (2004)	Rutgers (2002)
Brown (2006)	Simmons (2008)

[21] This is based largely on information collected through interviews and from print publications, between 2007 and 2012. The accuracy of the information cannot be guaranteed. This list includes all forms of Muslim Chaplaincy – contract, part-time, full-time, and volunteer – some individuals may be using different definitions of the term.

Columbia (1998)	Springfield College of Massachusetts
Connecticut College* (2006)	Stony Brook
Dartmouth (2006)	Syracuse
DePaul (2008)	Trinity (2005)
Duke (1999)	Tufts (2008)
Emory	University of Maryland at College Park (2006)
Fairfield (2010)	University of Michigan at Ann Arbor (2012)
Georgetown (1999)	University of Pennsylvania (2009)
George Washington*	University of Rochester
Hampshire	University of Southern California (USC) (2008)
Harvard (circa 2000)	University of Southern Maine
Howard* (1998)	Vanderbilt
Johns Hopkins	Wake Forest (2010)
Manhattanville	Wellesley (1993)
MIT (1998)	Wesleyan (2003)
Mount Holyoke (1997)	Williams (2011)
NYU (2005)	Yale (2005)

As Figure 5.1 demonstrates, more than 50 institutions have, or had, a Muslim Chaplain. Of these, only a few were full-time positions; examining Figure 5.2 provides insight into the universities that were most invested in these new roles. Georgetown was the first university to hire a full-time Muslim Chaplain, establishing the position and hiring Imam Yahya Hendi in 1999. While it was certainly a pioneer, Georgetown was also an outlier among institutions with full-time Muslim Chaplains. First, it was the only university in the group that continued to have a denominational affiliation. The university's Jesuit leadership claimed that its Muslim Chaplaincy was one in a series of 'firsts' influenced by Pope Paul VI's call to engage non-Christians.[22,23] As a direct result of this call, in 1968 the university was the first Catholic higher education institution to hire a full-time Rabbi.[24] Second, Georgetown had the nation's largest university chaplaincy programme, with seven Catholic Chaplains, three Protestant Chaplains, three Jewish Chaplains, an Imam and Muslim programme coordinator, and an Orthodox Christian Chaplain. In addition,

[22] University Chaplain, Personal interview, October 15, 2009.

[23] Much of this continued the work of his predecessor Pope John XXIII, and is described in *Nostra Aetate* (Declaration on the Relation of the Church to non-Christian Religions), which was proclaimed by Pope Paul VI in October 1965. Read more at http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651028_nostra-aetate_en.html

[24] University Chaplain, Personal interview, October 15, 2009.

the university had 21 people who served in a Chaplaincy-in-Residence programme. In the context of this substantial programme, the creation of a Muslim Chaplaincy was not quite as remarkable as it may have been elsewhere.

Third, the Muslim community at Georgetown was larger than at most other private institutions which is due to the large size of the study body, location in cosmopolitan Washington, D.C., unique academic programmes (including the School of Foreign Service), and longstanding association with the Middle East.

Figure 5.2: Year When First Full-Time Muslim Chaplain Began[25]

1999: Georgetown
2005: Rutgers
2006: Trinity/Wesleyan (joint full-time position)
2007: NYU
2008: Duke, Princeton, Yale
2009: Brown, Dartmouth
2010: Northwestern

The Muslim Chaplain at Georgetown played a more expansive role than his peers at other institutions, and some Muslim Chaplains were critical of this. One of them suggested that:

> [Georgetown's] primary concern was not Muslim students. They needed an intelligent voice of Islam on campus where they can basically respond to many many needs, [only] one of which is the Muslim students... [Hendi] is hardly on campus. He's constantly on demand from [the] State Department, Pentagon, various departments in the government ... especially after [the] Obama administration [came into power]. Now, even more so, [he is] repairing relations [between] the United States and the Muslim society. That's a very different role. He is somewhat an ambassador in some sense, and he is working with clergy beyond borders. He has [a] more national and international role which makes him somewhat, almost absent on campus.[26]

A former Muslim Chaplain at another institution added that he was disappointed with Georgetown because of 'the role they've carved out for themselves... D.C. is political and

[25] Dartmouth's full-time position was actually half-time Muslim Chaplain and half-time student advisor on international service and education. Although Rutgers had a full-time Muslim Chaplain, the role was created for, and supported by, alumni and local community members. All the other chaplaincy positions were paid for by the institution. All the institutions in this study, except Georgetown and Northwestern, began with a contract or part-time chaplain and later expanded to a full-time position. This explains discrepancies with Figure 1.

[26] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 24, 2010.

everything is a political position. The chaplain has rendered the community disempowered'.[27] Given its unusualness, Georgetown should be considered somewhat separately from the other institutions with full-time chaplains.

I noticed an emphasis on the chronology of the creation of Muslim Chaplaincy positions; several universities were eager to claim to having been the first to create and fill such posts. Georgetown's leadership as the first institution with a full-time Muslim Chaplain was featured prominently on its website and in numerous press materials and profiles. In public and private ways, individuals at several other institutions made claims about their leadership on Muslim Chaplaincy, and the topic was also commented on by outside observers (Daneman 2011). For example, a 2011 job posting for an Associate Dean of Religious Life at Princeton described the university as 'proud to have created the first full-time position of Hindu Chaplain in American higher education and the second national position of Muslim Chaplain.'

Although each campus had its own story about the development of Muslim Chaplaincy, it was clear through my interviews that individuals were watching their peers. In 2007, NYU was the next university to hire a full-time chaplain – who had, in the previous year, split his time between NYU and Princeton. Princeton had also made him a full-time offer, which he declined. By the time Princeton had hired in the summer of 2008, Duke and Yale had also found full-time Muslim Chaplains. The following year, Brown and Dartmouth made appointments; Brown had unsuccessfully attempted to hire the year before. Because of the small pool of suitable applicants, there was fierce competition among colleges for the most qualified candidates. Most of the full-time chaplains hired between 2007-2009 were heavily recruited by other institutions.[28]

In the course of my research I interviewed current and former staff members from 23 institutions, or about half of the schools that have or had Muslim Chaplains. The institutions in my sample are listed in Figure 5.3.

[27] Muslim Chaplain (former), Personal interview, July 29, 2010.
[28] Muslim Chaplains, Personal interviews, April 10, 2009 and April 24, 2010.

Figure 5.3: Research Sample Institutions with Muslim Chaplains by Year of Post Creation

1993: Wellesley
1996: Bard
1998: Columbia, MIT
1999: Duke, Georgetown
2000: Harvard
2002: Rutgers
2003: Wesleyan
2004: Brandeis
2005: Amherst, NYU, Trinity, Yale
2006: American, Brown, Dartmouth, Princeton, University of Maryland
2008: Simmons, Tufts, USC
2009: University of Pennsylvania

5.1.2. CATALYST/ORIGINS

It is important to acknowledge that, in most cases, there was a confluence of factors and constituencies leading to the creation or sanctioning of a Muslim Chaplaincy. As one Muslim Chaplain explained:

> I think it would be absolutely wrong to claim that these ideas are exclusively owned by one person... Someone mentioned it in a classroom. Someone else mentions it in a faculty gathering and a student gathering. Then the momentum starts growing around it. Then usually someone says, 'you know, let's make it happen.' So in this case I know students mentioned it. I know Campus Ministry mentioned it. The [university] president mentioned it... 'oh well, it's a good idea, let's make it happen.'[29]

While there were several stakeholders that participated in the decision to hire a Muslim Chaplain, I was often able to identify a primary advocate that catalysed the conversation and brought the idea to fruition. Understanding the development of these positions is critical, because the source of original momentum often shaped the structure of the chaplaincy that eventually emerged. I have categorised the Muslim Chaplaincies in my sample institutions into three groups, based on the primary role played by university administrators in their development (see Figure 5.4).

[29] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, October 15, 2009.

Figure 5.4: Primary Role Played by Administrators in the Development of Muslim Chaplaincy

Administration-Initiated	Administration-Expanded	Administration-Sanctioned
Amherst	University of Pennsylvania	American
Bard	Wesleyan	Columbia
Brandeis		Harvard
Brown		MIT
Dartmouth		Rutgers
Duke		University of Maryland
Georgetown		USC
NYU		
Princeton		
Simmons		
Trinity		
Tufts		
Wellesley		
Yale		

5.1.2.1. ADMINISTRATION-INITIATED

The majority of institutions in Figure 5.4 are categorised as administration-initiated. At these schools, administrators took the lead in conceptualising, exploring, developing, and financing Muslim Chaplaincy posts. Although administrators developed these positions with input and enthusiasm from Muslim students, they were the primary force in creating these posts. Not surprisingly, all of the institutions in this group are private colleges and universities where religion played an important role in the historical and contemporary life of the institution. The fourteen institutions in this category can be divided into two groups based on how the roles developed on different campuses. On some campuses, Muslim Chaplaincy was created to respond to the special needs of Muslim students and on others it occurred as part of a broader examination of religious and spiritual life.

In the first group of colleges, Muslim Chaplaincy developed in response to particular expressed or perceived needs of Muslim students. Administrators, usually University Chaplains, realised that Muslim students faced particular challenges. For example, many of the Muslim students attending college were the children of immigrants; as such they were negotiating between the expectations of their parents and the norms of American society. The differences between the two – in terms of dress, behaviour, piety, dating, marriage, hobbies, career, and food –

were sometimes vast, especially for young women. In general, foreign-born Imams and other Muslim religious leaders did not have the training or experience to help students navigate this transition. These students also faced heightened scrutiny, discrimination, and harassment in the wake of the events of 9/11, which had the potential to intimidate and further alienate them.

Let me describe the development of Muslim Chaplaincy at Dartmouth College, an Ivy League school in a small town in New Hampshire (several hours north of Boston). The institution created a part-time position in the 2006-2007 academic year. The first part-time chaplain commuted from Boston. The following year the position was unfilled, but in 2008-2009 David Coolidge filled the role, similarly commuting from Boston. These 20-hour-a-week positions involved two weekly visits, though time on campus was limited by the five-hour round-trip travel from Boston.[30] Effectively, this meant that students had access to the chaplain for ten hours per week.

In 2009, a group of Muslim students lobbied the administration to expand the part-time position to a full-time role. Coolidge, explained that the students said:

> 'You know we want to advocate for more. And our number one concern is a full-time person, because the university is more willing to give us money or larger space or something like that and they're more reluctant to bring on more staff. But that's what we want because we feel very isolated up here and we need a person who is always here, and is part of the community on a daily basis that can provide the sort of nexus point for the community to move forward.' So in terms of advocating for this position, you know it was very clear to me, by all quarters that the student demand was the key component in terms of how the administration would respond to this request.[31]

In this case, the part-time, administration-initiated Muslim Chaplaincy provided a foundation and resource for students to advocate for greater provisions. They knew that there were people within the administration who understood and valued the role, and they worked closely with staff in the ORL to build their case. Coolidge continued:

> ...we just made clear [to students] that, if this is going to happen it has to be student-initiated, so form a student committee and then go from there... And then without much prompting about how to go about it they created this really quite remarkable and professional, 40-page document about why we need a full time advisor, and it had sections on increased enrolments in classes relating to Islam and Muslims, the history... of all the [Muslim]

[30] David Coolidge, Muslim Chaplain, Dartmouth College, Personal interview, March 7, 2009.
[31] *Ibid.*

> chaplaincies in the Ivy League... a whole section on what other things you could do [to] support us and why that's not as good as a full-time person ... [They had] student testimonials and a bunch of other things...we went through a series of drafts...it's coming up to the end of the year and what we need to do is submit this to the Provost as soon as possible because the main student who had been involved also had [a] previous relationship – good relationship with the Provost and is known on campus...[32]

This proposal was made during difficult economic times, and Dartmouth did not have the funds to support an outright expansion of the Muslim Chaplaincy. However, the administration suggested that those interested in a full-time position attempt to find a related, part-time position that could be paired with this role. This was eventually accomplished with a half-time position for international service and education advising. Thus, the Muslim Chaplain had dual duties, but was in residence on campus full-time and available in the evenings and on weekends. Coolidge did not take up this post in the fall of 2009; instead he returned to his alma mater Brown University to become the first full-time Muslim Chaplain.

While in most cases Muslim Chaplaincy was a response to thinking about the particular needs of Muslim students, in the second group of institutions it was created as part of a broad re-examination of religious life on campus. I will use the rest of this section to explore how such a process unfolded at Wellesley, a women's college in suburban Boston. Based on my research, Wellesley was the first educational institution with a paid Muslim Chaplain.[33] It has had six individuals in this role since it was created in 1993.[34]

The Muslim Chaplaincy at Wellesley evolved through a broad transformation of religious life at the college and a conscious decision to diverge from the school's Protestant origins. In 1991:

> ...in her final act as college chaplain, Connie Chandler Ward put forth the analysis that religious life at the College would no longer be well served by a model which was centered around a Protestant Christian college chaplain (Kazanjian 2000, p. 216)

Under the leadership of its then college president, Wellesley attempted to grapple with this issue by trying to

> ...develop a pluralistic multi-faith community [which] challenged the common practice of many colleges and universities, which assumes that the religious and spiritual life of a diverse educational community can adequately be

[32] *Ibid.*
[33] Daneman 2011 contradicts this by claiming that Bard College was the first institution with a Muslim Chaplain.
[34] University Chaplain, Personal interview, September 10, 2009.

> served by a programme in which there is still one dominant religious tradition (usually Protestant Christian), around whom everyone else must orient themselves. Wellesley was interested in dismantling its old Protestant Christian-dominated structures... To do this, Wellesley created the position of dean of religious and spiritual life... the dean would not function as a chaplain in a particular tradition, but as an administrator and spiritual leader for the whole college. (*Ibid*, p. 215-6)

After Chandler Ward's departure, the college conducted two failed searches to find someone to fill this new role. Unfortunately, top candidates resisted this innovation and insisted on serving as denominational Chaplains while also taking broader responsibility for students of all faiths. In a surprising turns of events, Victor Kazanjian, an ordained Episcopal priest, who had been acting as a consultant on this issue, was asked to become the Dean.[35]

For the 20 years prior to Kazanjian's arrival, Wellesley had maintained a college-supported full-time Protestant Chaplain; it also had a stable part-time Hillel Rabbi and a variable part-time Catholic Priest, both largely supported by their sending communities. In decentring Christianity and imagining a true multi-faith model, Kazanjian hired part-time Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim, Protestant, Catholic, and Unitarian Universalist advisors. The college provided immediate funds for this while it launched a fundraising appeal to support these new positions. Hillel abandoned its independent fundraising efforts and joined the college's campaign in solidarity.

Because of the early genesis of Muslim Chaplaincy at Wellesley, the college has had more people in this role than any other institution in the study. It began with Katie Krauss, a white convert and alumna who helped to develop the role in its early years. She was followed by Idrisa Pandit, a Kashmiri, who also served as a residential advisor. Next came Fatimah Iliasu, a Nigerian woman who went on to receive a legal doctorate from Harvard. After Iliasu, Pakistani alumna Afshan Bokhari was the chaplain while serving as a visiting lecturer in art history. There was a shift with the next chaplain: Egyptian-American Nancy Khalil transformed the role from an 'older sister' model to something more professional. Khalil was pursuing a master's degree in higher education and student development, and went on to a doctoral programme at Harvard. The current chaplain, Najiba Akbar, an Indian-American alumna, has a degree in social work and is continuing the professionalisation of the role.

This progression of chaplains highlights a couple of trends. Early holders of the post were largely foreign-born, while the last two were children of immigrants. Three of the four early

[35] *Ibid.*

chaplains served during or after receiving their doctorates, though they had little training in providing support to students. The last two Muslim Chaplains brought a perspective and capacity through their training in student development and social work. Both the diversity of academic and cultural backgrounds and the increasing professionalisation of this role have been made possible by the infrastructure, financial support, and sponsorship of the college's central administration. At Wellesley, Muslim Chaplaincy was developed as part of a fundamental transformation of religious life. The creation of the position had less to do with the particular needs of Muslim students and more to do with the general needs of non-Protestant students and an interest in educating all students about world religions. The other institutions that went through similar transformations were Bard, Brown, Georgetown, NYU, Simmons, and USC.

5.1.2.2. ADMINISTRATION-EXPANDED

Over the course of over four years of research, I saw student advocacy play an increasing role in the hiring of Muslim Chaplains. Through my research I identified two institutions – the University of Pennsylvania and Wesleyan – where students were a significant driver in the development of Muslim Chaplaincies (see Figure 5.4). I refer to these as 'administration-expanded' because this generally took the form of lobbying university administrators to hire a Muslim Chaplain. In neither case did students attempt to create a free-standing chaplaincy funded by students, parents, alumni, or the local community. There were a number of reasons why so few of the chaplaincies were student-initiated. First, since the role of chaplain did not exist in Islam, very few students were familiar with the concept of Muslim Chaplaincy and the benefits it could provide. Second, until recently Muslim students had only a modest presence on college campuses. It was not until the 2000s that MSAs became more widespread and visible, largely as a result of the increased awareness of Islam post-9/11, and a demographic surge in Muslim students (many of them children of first-generation immigrants). Third, Muslim students, like some other minority groups, had not historically felt entitled to ask for religious accommodations. A generation ago, they may have kept their religious practices and needs unarticulated. At the time of my research, however, they were more willing to explain and demand that they have support similar to that afforded to Jewish or Christian students.

Wesleyan had an early example of student activism. As described by someone familiar with the case:

> So a handful of Muslim students, stormed the president's office. They basically held him 'hostage' there for a while, and said you are not going to leave the room until you sign this piece of paper saying you will try to hire a Muslim Chaplain... So university students were saying, 'we pay the same

> tuition, we don't get the same services. So you should be hiring a Muslim Chaplain'... And then the university agreed in the shock and aftermath of 9/11. They said, 'maybe it's a good idea' ... So they tried for almost two years...[36]

In this case, student action that occurred soon after 9/11 resulted in a hire in 2003. The search was protracted because of the lack of agreement between students and administrators about what a Muslim Chaplain should do and where he or she could be found.

A more recent example dates from 2009, when the University of Pennsylvania MSA convinced the newly appointed University Chaplain to sponsor its petition to the administration for a part-time Muslim Chaplain. In April 2010, the MSA introduced a resolution passed by the university's Undergraduate Assembly to call 'upon the University to establish the Interfaith Fellow and Campus Minister to the Muslim Community as a permanent, full time position.'[37] According to an administrator there:

> The subject was broached last spring... about bringing a formal Muslim Chaplain... I think that simultaneously just the explosion of the numbers of Muslim Chaplains on campus over the last four years has caught a lot of people's eyes, and made a lot of MSAs [ask] 'why don't we have that?' Especially [as] it's getting closer to us: you know Princeton... certainly at Brown... And so the conversation was 'how can we make this happen?' So for the first time we sent a proposal to the administration... that was pre-written by the MSA president...[38]

The cause for a full-time chaplain was taken up by the Penn Muslim Alumni Network (founded in 2005), which had created an MSA Endowment that complied with *Shari'ah* (Islamic religious law). Through this it hoped to raise funds to permanently support a Muslim Chaplain.[39]

The emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy on a number of campuses, including some of the nation's most selective private institutions, had increased the visibility and collective understanding about the role chaplains can play in serving Muslim students – and the greater university community. As I will discuss later in this chapter, university administrators seemed to be aware of, and influenced by, the actions of their peers and those institutions that they aspired to be like. In the Dartmouth case, Muslim students were able to point to the actions of peer institutions (especially their Ivy League counterparts) to justify the desire for a full-time Muslim Chaplain. Benchmarking, long undertaken by institutions themselves, was now an increasingly

[36] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, April 24, 2010.
[37] http://pennua.org/2010/04/muslim-chaplain-textbook-exchange-nytimes-budget-allocation/
[38] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, April 3, 2009.
[39] Details at: http://www.upennmsa.org/endowment. Accessed on May 20, 2012.

common tactic employed by students to advance their agendas. As Muslim Chaplaincy becomes more widespread in the future, I believe students are likely to play a greater role in advocating for the creation and expansion of such positions on their campuses.

5.1.2.3. ADMINISTRATION-SANCTIONED

There were seven institutions (five private and two public) for which Muslim Chaplaincy was administration-sanctioned (see Figure 5.4). While they represent a minority of institutions in my sample, their policies neither to hire nor to fund any chaplains (in the case of public schools), or only to hire Christian University Chaplains with responsibility for all religious groups (in the case of private institutions), was the most widespread model in American higher education. Like hundreds of others, these six schools were willing to sanction a range of Affiliated Chaplains who served particular religious traditions, but not to provide financial support to these individuals. As Muslim Chaplains emerged on these campuses in the late 1990s and early 2000s, these universities treated them as they did all of their other Affiliated Chaplains. Interestingly, many of the administration-initiated and administration-expanded schools in my sample had similar policies *until* they hired a Muslim Chaplain.

All seven of these schools had relatively large Muslim student populations due to some combination of a large student body, high percentage of international students, and geographic proximity to substantial Muslim-American communities. As a result, these institutions have long had a critical mass of Muslim students. The religious and pastoral needs of these students were met in the 1990s and early 2000s by volunteers – current or former students (as was the case at Harvard, MIT and Rutgers), or local Muslim leaders (as was the case at American and Columbia) — at a time when few institutions had Muslim Chaplains, and only a handful were paying them.

In recent years, administrators at these institutions became more aware of the particular needs of Muslim student populations. Some of them began reaching out to these volunteer Muslim Chaplains, and invited them to join existing organisations for officially-sanctioned Affiliated Chaplains. While the evolution of Muslim Chaplaincy at each of these schools was institution-specific, several factors explained why these schools maintained policies not to hire Muslim Chaplains or other denomination-specific chaplains. First, most of these institutions already had volunteer Muslim Chaplains by the time the phenomenon had gained national momentum in the mid 2000s, so there was little impetus to hire and pay new chaplains. Second, given that most of these schools were located in urban centres, their Muslim students had relatively good access to Islamic religious services and support at local mosques. In contrast, one of the reasons

Dartmouth hired a *full-time* chaplain was that there was no other Muslim authority for students to access within 100 miles of campus. An unintended consequence was that the chaplain also provided religious support to the local Muslim community.[40] Third, with the exception of Harvard and Columbia, religion did not figure prominently at these schools. For example, Rutgers had terminated the position of University Chaplain in 1981, the University of Maryland never had such a position, and MIT hired its first University Chaplain in 2007.

While administrators at these institutions had not hired Muslim Chaplains, they were supportive of Muslim students in other ways. All but the University of Maryland provided one or more forms of assistance through the provision of prayer rooms, halal food, or *wu'du* facilities. As a University Chaplain explained:

> I don't know why [universities] would [hire Muslim Chaplains]. We wouldn't. I would recommend strongly against it because we wouldn't have enough money to support all the people that have a legitimate claim in that particular regard. I certainly think since 9/11, as it were, there has been a great sense of trying to accommodate Muslim ministry...[41]

This administrator suggested another reason not to hire a Muslim Chaplain – that such a decision would also require the university to provide chaplains for any other religious community that made a request. Such requests were made by Hindu students at Princeton and Yale, both of which subsequently hired Hindu Chaplains.[42] Rather than risk that possibility, and in the interest of equity, the chaplain quoted above believed that no institutional support should be given to any religious minority group.

At the same time, this administrator acknowledged that Muslim students were under-served by his institution's volunteer Muslim Chaplain when compared to the leadership that other religious communities had:

> Now, the Muslim constituency has never really had a full-time professional chaplain here and there's been some frustration about that because as [their] constituency has grown, I think Muslim students have said, 'well, why not us? The Jews have one, the Methodists have one, so then why don't we?' Well there are a number of reasons. Most of these groups are founded and are sustained by denominational bodies and all have strong alumni bodies, neither of which appear to play much of a role in Muslim life as I've seen it at [University X]. So we have had graduate student members of the [Chaplains organisation] who have taken on Muslim work as such. But [that] can't be compared in terms of

[40] David Coolidge, Muslim Chaplain, Dartmouth College, Personal interview, March 7, 2009.
[41] University Chaplain, Personal interview, September 11, 2009.
[42] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, December 12, 2007.

> either commitment or scale of work with something like the Director of Hillel or the Episcopal Chaplain...[43]

Despite this chaplain's admission that there were structural inequities facing the Muslim community, he did not see a university-sponsored chaplaincy as a viable solution. He placed responsibility for action squarely with students and alumni, indicating that the university might support an initiative that was spearheaded by other constituencies:

> [University X] should respond to whatever cogent and significant proposals come from its Muslim constituents. In the absence of that, there's not much we can do, it seems to me. We would either be guilty of creating a Muslim establishment that suited us or we would be prey to funding internecine warfare and I don't think we want to do that. So my view is if a Muslim constituency of <u>any</u> kind came forward and said 'this is what we want and this is what we're prepared to do,' we would be morally [obligated] to take that very seriously... Nothing will happen unless somebody says, 'I will give the money. I will build the building. I will provide the infrastructure.' There isn't any of that, that I know of. I think there's an effort to try to build that up among recent graduates, but I don't see it happening very soon... So the [University X] situation for Muslims I think is... vague. [There are] more Muslims here than ever before, but no organised way religiously of meeting their needs... And where we are at the moment I think is waiting either for the Muslim Student Association or some alumni group to come up with a reasonable plan that commands the loyalty of sufficient Muslims to establish a formal chaplaincy. But we don't have that at the moment.[44]

In response to a question about an institutional obligation to support students, the University Chaplain responded:

> But I don't think we're morally [obligated] to create something that meets the peculiar circumstances, without those peculiar circumstances actually <u>asking</u> us to do some certain things... I've spent time over the years often meeting Muslim groups and saying, 'what do you want?' Some want this. Some want that. And then I say, 'what are you prepared to do?' And that usually becomes a very problematic conversation...[45]

When I mentioned that other universities were investing in Muslim Chaplaincy, he suggested with feigned modesty that his institution must not be as 'enlightened' as its peers. Even though these seven universities did not pay their Muslim Chaplains, they wanted to maintain some control over the sanctioning of their Affiliated Chaplains. One University Chaplain insisted that:

---

[43] University Chaplain, Personal interview, September 11, 2009.
[44] *Ibid.*
[45] *Ibid.*

> ... if we are going to have chaplains... I want everyone here who serves in this position to have training and be recognised and be appointed by [University X]. I want [us] to take responsibility. The idea was I wanted religious life to move closer, more symbolically and otherwise to [University X], to the center of the [university]...[46]

When I asked how the institution sanctioned its Affiliated Chaplains, he explained that:

> The Board of Chaplains – they vet one another... If you said 'I would like to be the Imam for the Muslim student community at [University X]' a letter would [have to] come from – I don't know who the appointing organisation would be, but they would say... 'we would like for him to be our teacher and here are his credentials'. The Board of Chaplains would look at the credentials and say 'he wasn't trained in a back room... he went to a particular programme and graduated, has a degree, has the training, and therefore we are recommending [him] for appointment as the chaplain'... And if the credentialing was unusual for some reason the person might be appointed an Associate Chaplain, not a full Chaplain. And after a period of time, once it was seen that the person was not [a] hack or a liar of some sort, then [they would become a full Chaplain].[47]

This vetting process was similar to the one used by Rutgers University which is described in detail in Chapter 7.

5.1.2.4. THE EFFECTS OF 9/11

A number of informants suggested that Muslim Chaplaincy on university campuses developed in response to the terrorist attacks of September 11th 2001. As one Muslim Chaplain described, there was 'only one [Muslim Chaplain] before 9/11 [that was] full-time, employed by [a] university. Pretty much everybody else, including myself, popped up as a post-9/11 reality.'[48] I was sceptical about the suggested simple causality between the terrorist attacks and Muslim Chaplaincy. I found only two institutions (Rutgers and Wesleyan) that directly traced the origins of their chaplaincy to the terrorist attacks. As described in Figure 5.3, one-third of the positions at my sample institutions pre-dated 2001. In addition, a number of colleges had created the roles as part of a broader examination of religious and spiritual support for students, which was not solely concerned with Muslim students.

At the same time, I believe that the form and trajectory of Muslim Chaplaincy in American higher education was shaped by the terrorist attacks. Without 9/11, I suspect there would have been fewer Muslim Chaplaincies, and they might have increased at a slower rate. Similar to the

[46] University Chaplain, Personal interview, March 5, 2009.
[47] *Ibid.*
[48] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 24, 2010.

pre-2001 positions, these roles might have emerged at the few schools with particularly enlightened leaders aware of the unmet needs of Muslim students. In a world without 9/11, Muslim students might not have felt as vulnerable, nor as empowered, to advocate for support; university administrators may also have been less aware and responsive to the needs. It is also possible that absent 9/11, Muslim Chaplaincy may not have taken the form of so many full-time positions. Only Georgetown had such a role prior to 2001, and it is possible that new positions would have developed primarily as volunteer, contract, or part-time.

One must view 9/11 as a critical and visible event in a much longer relationship between the West and the Middle East. This long-running political, economic and cultural drama had implications for Muslims and Arab immigrants long before 2001. While tensions were heightened after the terrorist attacks, Islamophobia was not a new phenomenon. I believe that it was not 9/11 alone, but the profound and sustained legacy of which it was a part, that left Muslim-Americans feeling targeted and vulnerable. While 9/11 dramatically changed American attitudes and perceptions about Islam and the experiences of Muslims in the United States, I came to see that the rationales for this phenomenon were much more complex. I describe this more fully in Chapter 8 ('Analysis').

5.2. STRUCTURES, ATTRIBUTES, AND ROLES OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINS

In this section, I explore my second research question: what roles did Muslim Chaplains play on college campuses? My sample of 23 institutions revealed varied models of, and roles for, these individuals. I suspect that some of this variation is due to the relatively recent emergence of campus Muslim Chaplaincy, and to the idiosyncratic histories and cultures of the institutions that have hired or sanctioned people in such positions. There is also significant fluidity within institutions, as they pilot, expand, institutionalise, and professionalise Muslim Chaplaincy and its position in their administrations.

In the first two parts of this section, I examine the structures and attributes of Muslim Chaplaincy, specifically describing the three models of higher-education chaplaincy among my sample institutions. I also explore how arrangements across institutions differ in terms of financial investment, job titles, and demographics. In the second part of this section, I look at the roles Muslim Chaplains play, differentiating between service to Muslim students and service

to the university and the broader community.

5.2.1. STRUCTURES OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY

5.2.1.1. MODELS

In this section, I provide a typology of three different models of Muslim Chaplaincy I developed based on my fieldwork. Before I describe that typology, I will provide some context about the ORLs into which Muslim Chaplains were generally hired.

All the Muslim Chaplains at private institutions in my sample were affiliated with an ORL. In general, such offices reported to the Provost, though some reported directly to the President and some to the Vice President for Student Life (or its equivalent). The few Muslim Chaplains serving in public schools liaised directly with the division of student affairs. Generally, ORLs were modern manifestations of traditional chaplaincies; many of them dated back to the founding of their institutions. The vast majority of offices in my sample were led by male Protestant ministers who carried the title of Dean or University Chaplain, or both, and often were affiliated with the denomination that had founded the institution. In the last few years, there had been some interesting leadership developments as institutions hired more women and lay people to lead these offices.

University Chaplains were paid staff members of the institution, and were responsible for advancing the goals of the administration. As university employees, these chaplains bore responsibility for all students regardless of religious background. In contrast, Affiliated Chaplains were responsible to the sending bodies that funded them, and were primarily focused on serving the needs of those specific denominations. On most campuses, there was an explicit and long-standing policy not to pay the salaries of Affiliated Chaplains as they were representatives of outside organisations, rather than employees of the institution. While universities sometimes provided privileges to these affiliates (such as email addresses, use of meeting space, university ID cards, and office space), these individuals did not generally play a lead role in organising campus-sponsored programmes – nor did they have university budgets for such activities. Catholic and Jewish affiliates were found near many U.S. campuses, often in independent Aquinas/Newman and Hillel/Chabad, houses respectively. In addition, national Episcopal, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, and Lutheran denominations were active in sending

chaplains to key institutions across the country. My research showed that no denominational organisations outside the Judeo-Christian tradition sponsored full-time Affiliated Chaplains. Traditionally, Deans and other ORL staff members were Christians. In the last two decades, a few Protestant-founded colleges hired non-Christians to serve as staff members. This began with a few institutions hiring Rabbis. For example, since 1996 Stanford has had a Rabbi on its ORL staff (the first non-Christian in that role). At the same time, the campus is served by two Rabbis from Hillel and one Rabbi from Chabad. ORL Rabbis, like all ORL staff, have a remit to provide support and care to all community members, regardless of religious background. In the mid-2000s, Yale was among the first institutions to hire a Muslim ORL staffer (who was not a Muslim Chaplain). USC was the first major university to hire a Rabbi as its University Chaplain; in 2008 they made another bold move by hiring a lay Hindu to lead the office. My research suggests that he is the nation's first non Judeo-Christian University Chaplain. Other schools have also made unconventional choices: Brandeis, a Jewish-founded secular institution, has a Catholic priest as coordinator of its Interfaith Chaplaincy; Tufts, which was founded by Universalists, also has a Catholic priest as its Dean of the Chapel; and Yale – founded by Puritans – has a Catholic laywoman as its University Chaplain. Interestingly, an informant told me that a selective private institution had recently offered its University Chaplain position to an Imam, who turned it down to be a Muslim Chaplain elsewhere.[49]

It is in this dominantly Protestant, but increasingly multi-faith, context that the notion of Muslim Chaplaincy has emerged in the last decade. I found that Muslim Chaplains at all but one institution were hired or sanctioned by universities, since neither a national sending body nor a local congregation had supported such roles. It is useful to analyse the position Muslim Chaplaincy occupied within broader chaplaincy structures. Based primarily on interviews, document analysis, and internet research, I divided my sample institutions into three dominant models: exceptional, inclusive or exclusive (see Figure 5.5).

[49] University Chaplain, Personal interview, April 3, 2009.

Figure 5.5: Typology of Muslim Chaplaincy Models

Exceptional	Inclusive	Exclusive
Dartmouth	Amherst	American
Duke	Bard	Columbia
Princeton	Brandeis	Harvard
Trinity	Brown	MIT
University of Pennsylvania	Georgetown	Rutgers
Yale	NYU	University of Maryland
	Simmons	USC
	Tufts	
	Wellesley	
	Wesleyan	

EXCEPTIONAL MODEL

A number of universities made implicit or explicit claims that Muslim students were in an 'exceptional' position, which encouraged the institution to hire a Muslim Chaplain as an exception to a standard policy not to financially support denominationally-specific Affiliated Chaplains.[50] The schools that adopted this model made major commitments to Muslim Chaplaincy – commitments that included five of the seven full-time Muslim Chaplaincy positions in my sample (namely Dartmouth, Duke, Princeton, Trinity/Wesleyan and Yale).[51] The only other institution in this group was the University of Pennsylvania, which hired a part-time Muslim Chaplain in the fall of 2009 as its only paid religious leader besides the University Chaplain.

Administrators at institutions in the 'exceptional' category explained that they were directly supporting Muslim Chaplains for three key reasons. First, it was widely agreed that Muslim students were particularly vulnerable in the post-9/11, Islamophobic geopolitical climate. As such, they would benefit from access to religiously and culturally appropriate pastoral care. Second, Muslim students were under-served because their communities did not have the resources or infrastructure to send their own chaplains. As Samuel Wells, Duke's former

[50] Several of these institutions have already made significant commitments to their campus Jewish communities, which could also be viewed as an exception to their longstanding policies. Thus, the term 'exceptional' refers to exceptions beyond the prior elevated status already accorded to the Protestant and (in some cases) Jewish faiths.

[51] Although Trinity and Wesleyan shared a full-time chaplain, I considered their effort comparable since together they had far fewer students than any of the other institutions with full-time chaplains. In addition, Dartmouth's Muslim Chaplain served half-time as chaplain and half-time as an International Service and Education Advisor. The Dean of the Chapel actively sought a second half-time role so that they could hire a full-time staff member. The position was advertised as joint. Duke's chaplain served both as chaplain and as an adjunct faculty member at the Duke Divinity School.

University Chaplain wrote, the Muslim community, 'lacks faculty advocates and enthusiastic alumni/ae: thus funding is problematic' (Wells & Kocher 2007, p. 16). Several informants explained that Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish communities had long had this infrastructure, and that the inequality between these groups and Muslims compelled university administrators to fund a Muslim Chaplaincy. One ORL staffer explained that his institution would be happy for an outside organisation to send and pay for a Muslim Chaplain, but that no such group existed.

> A lot of mainline Protestants and Hindus and Buddhists are basically attacking [University X saying]: 'Why are you favouring Muslims?' [They say that the] Presbyterian minister is paid by the Presbyterian church, Methodists - same, Hindus - they don't have a chaplain at all, Buddhists - they have no representation. 'But you pick one community and pay for it.' And I think universities wouldn't care [except that] there is no Muslim community nominating or paying for Muslim chaplaincy positions... I mean if the Muslim community from [the local city] said, 'we want our Muslim Chaplain to be totally independent, here is the money'... [the university would stop paying] in a heartbeat, in a heartbeat. And that's the projection for the most part.[52]

This chaplain, and some others I spoke to, suggested that university-supported denominational chaplains were a stop-gap measure, and the hope was that the Muslim community would soon have the capability to nominate and send its own chaplains.[53] Other informants provided a third explanation. They suggested that, although some selective schools could have found donors to support or endow a Muslim Chaplaincy, institutions chose to pay chaplains from their own funds because they wanted to retain control of the selection and work of these individuals. One University Chaplain said she was looking for a Muslim Chaplain who would be able to support and guide Muslim students of all types including those who were engaged in behaviours – such as pre-marital sex or homosexuality – that were condemned by many Muslims. She explained, 'What I may not be saying... the elephant in this room... I'm looking for somebody with a particular... I'll just call it a liberal set... of religious ethics.'[54] Some university administrators wanted to hire Muslim Chaplains that practiced and promoted an inclusive and non-judgemental form of Islam that was compatible with the diversity of perspectives that existed on many college campuses.[55] A volunteer Affiliated Chaplain paid by a local mosque or community group might face pressure to advance more conservative or traditional views.

[52] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 24, 2010.
[53] Muslim Chaplain (former), Personal interview, July 29, 2010.
[54] University Chaplain, Personal interview, March 27, 2012.
[55] Faculty member, Personal interview, April 23, 2009.

INCLUSIVE MODEL

Some universities supported a model of chaplaincy that can be described as 'inclusive', in that the institution provided financial support for multiple denominational chaplaincies including, but not limited to, the Muslim Chaplaincy. The institutions in this category are of two types. The first group included five universities that conceptualised all chaplains as serving the entire university community. This group included Brown, NYU, and Georgetown, which each had full-time Muslim Chaplains; and Wellesley and Wesleyan, which had part-time chaplains. Staff at these institutions described the dual mandate of denominational chaplains to serve religious minority students, and provide all students with knowledge of and exposure to other faiths. The second group included five colleges – Amherst, Bard, Brandeis, Simmons, and Tufts – which had part-time or contract Muslim Chaplains. Administrators at these institutions described the primary purpose of these chaplains as being support for religious minorities. These schools provided similar levels of financial support for multiple non-Christian faith groups.

Many institutions in the 'inclusive' category created Muslim Chaplaincies in the context of a broader re-examination of provisions for religious life. Administrators at the five universities in the first category provided historical and religious rationales for their institutions' support of religion-specific chaplains. As described earlier in this chapter, Wellesley College played a pioneering national role in changing the paradigm of campus chaplaincy. In the mid-1990s it moved away from the hierarchical model of non-Christian chaplains participating as 'guests' of the host religion, to a democratic chaplaincy model where each religion was given equal representation and financial support, regardless of the number of students.[56] Thus, at Wellesley, equal support for the Muslim and Catholic Chaplains had a dramatic effect on the dynamics of religious life on campus.

As a Jesuit (Catholic) institution, and the only denominational school in my sample, Georgetown approached this issue through its particular commitment to the role of religion in academic life, and an interest in supporting the spiritual life of its students, staff, and faculty members. Another 'inclusive' institution was Brown University, which had long been among the nation's most liberal colleges. It began considering Muslim Chaplaincy in the mid 1990s. At the time of my research, Brown funded Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and Muslim Chaplains, as well as a Rabbi who worked at the intersection of faith and community service. Brown University Chaplain Janet Cooper Nelson described Muslim Chaplaincy as a structural intervention to

[56] University Chaplain, Personal interview, September 10, 2009.

improve the literacy of the entire Brown community, similar to the university's sweeping open curriculum, introduced in 1969.[57]

It is worth noting that, although administrators at all of the first group of 'inclusive' schools made commitments to expand or transform their chaplaincy structures, they also had the financial and human resources necessary to support multi-faith chaplaincy. Though administrators at the second group of 'inclusive' institutions supported the notion that the university *should* fund multi-faith chaplaincy, their smaller student populations and more limited financial resources did not allow them to justify full-time or, in many cases, even half-time positions for the majority of chaplaincies. As a result, Muslim Chaplains at these institutions were focused largely on Muslim student concerns and functioned less broadly within the institution.

EXCLUSIVE MODEL

The 'exclusive' model is one in which universities do not financially support any denomination-specific chaplains. The seven schools in this group were the same as the administration-sanctioned institutions mentioned earlier in the chapter. All the private schools in this category fund a University Chaplain (generally a Christian) to serve the entire community; the public schools have no University Chaplain. In all cases, however, these campuses sanction externally-funded Affiliated Chaplains, who serve students on their campus. Administrators at these colleges provided several reasons for taking the 'exclusive' stance. First, they felt that given a commitment to equality, supporting a chaplain that ministers to a particular religious group would be unfair to other communities. One person described it as a 'slippery slope', invoking the notion that it would be difficult to justify exceptionalism for only some communities. They raised the challenge of deciding which chaplain(s) to support, and how to make such decisions. Perhaps out of a sense of fairness, administrators at these institutions decided it was simpler not to support any chaplains than to get into subjective questions about whom and how much to fund. The second reason was financial. The costs of hiring and supporting an inclusive multi-faith chaplaincy could be very high. At the same time, several of these institutions had made other investments to support Muslim student life. For example, MIT built a multi-faith religious centre in 1995, Columbia installed *wu'du* facilities for Muslim students, and Harvard renovated a Muslim prayer room with *wu'du* facilities. These infrastructure investments were less expensive than paying staff salaries, benefits, and programmatic budgets. In addition, as described in 5.1.2.3, religion played a comparatively minor role at these schools and their

[57] Janet Cooper Nelson, University Chaplain, Brown University, Personal interview, September 9, 2009.

proximity to urban centres with Muslim communities relieved pressure on administrators to provide support already available locally.

5.2.1.2. FINANCIAL INVESTMENT

The financial investment in Muslim Chaplaincy varied significantly between institutions, and was most easily understood by comparing employment arrangements between chaplains and the universities they served.[58] The chart below categorises 23 institutions based on those arrangements. Some chaplains also had discretionary programmatic annual budgets as high as $25,000. Even some of the schools that did not pay Muslim Chaplains provided non-financial resources such as office space, use of meeting rooms, email addresses, parking permits, and university ID cards.

Figure 5.6: University Employment of Muslim Chaplains

Full-Time **35+ hours/week**	**Part-Time** **15-25 hours/week**	**Contract** **under 15 hours/week**	**Not paid by University**[59]
Private Research Universities: Brown Dartmouth Duke Georgetown NYU Princeton Yale	Private Liberal Arts Colleges: Trinity Wellesley Wesleyan Private Masters Institution: Simmons Private Research Universities: Tufts	Private Liberal Arts Colleges: Amherst Bard Private Research Universities: Brandeis University of Pennsylvania	Private Research Universities: American Columbia Harvard MIT USC Public Universities: Rutgers University of Maryland

The typology in Figure 5.6 is useful in understanding the choices administrators made about Muslim Chaplaincy at my sample institutions. There were seven universities supporting full-time

[58] I limited my research to the employment arrangement. I did not inquire about salaries, benefits, or other associated costs. This information is self-reported and may have changed during the course of my fieldwork.

[59] Most of the Muslim Chaplains not paid by their universities worked part-time (Columbia's worked less than 10 hours a week, and the remainder worked between 10-20 hours a week). The exception was the Rutgers Chaplain, who worked full-time until the programme was terminated in 2009. His salary was paid by a local community-based organisation.

Muslim Chaplains – all of them private, national research institutions.[60] All were selective universities, including four out of the eight Ivy League schools. These universities had large student populations (from 6,000 at Dartmouth to 51,000 at NYU), and significant financial resources as measured by endowments and operating budgets. With the exception of Georgetown, these institutions began with volunteer, contract, or part-time chaplains in the 1990s or 2000s and developed full-time chaplaincies in 2007 or 2008.

Institutions with part-time and contract Muslim Chaplains were a combination of small, undergraduate-focused liberal arts colleges and large, national research universities. The exception was Simmons, which had 5,000 students: half undergraduates and half Masters degree students. Liberal arts colleges had small student populations: 2,000 to 3,000 for the schools in this category; national research university populations ranged from 5,000 at Brandeis to 20,000 at the University of Pennsylvania. Given their student populations, it would have been difficult for the small colleges in these categories to justify a full-time person in this role. Although the colleges in these two groups were private, they were generally less selective and less wealthy than the peer institutions with full-time chaplains.

The final group – those with chaplains not paid by the university – included a mixture of selective and wealthy national research universities, and public institutions. The schools in this group had large student populations: from 10,000 at MIT to 52,000 at Rutgers. The private institutions in this category were similar in size and stature to their peers with full-time chaplains. As such, they had comparable financial resources and student populations, but chose not to make similar financial commitments. Rutgers and the University of Maryland, the only public institutions among the 23 in my sample, did not have paid chaplains of any sort, due to legal concerns and financial limitations (Clark 2001, p. 39; Graves 2008, p. 295-6).

5.2.2. ATTRIBUTES

5.2.2.1. JOB TITLES

Job titles were a topic of significant conversation for Muslim Chaplains since they signalled authority and affinity within the institution. They also provided insight into how the positions were viewed by university administrators. Figure 5.7 provides official job titles for these roles at 23 institutions. While most of the individuals serving as Muslim Chaplains referred to

[60] National research universities all have doctoral programmes as well as professional programmes (such as medicine, law, business, public policy, divinity, architecture and so on).

themselves as such, several institutions did not officially use this term. In interviewing for the Muslim Chaplaincy position at Princeton, Sohaib Sultan asked why the title did not contain the word 'chaplain':

> [She said] it was for internal reasons that she had to entitle it that way... They don't pay other [Affiliated] Chaplains and so how do you market this position and how do you title it and how do you describe it in a way that doesn't sound like you're changing your policy to the point that they would have to start dishing out full-time contracts to all the chaplains?... I was nervous because I was like, 'okay I sort of understand that.' I don't like the title. It sound[s] less authoritative. It sounds like... it seemed almost administrative or secretarial so I didn't like it.[61]

None of my informants mentioned concern with the Christian origin of the term 'chaplain'. A few of the Muslim Chaplains also used the religious title 'Imam', which was compatible with – and in addition to – the job title of 'Muslim Chaplain'.

Figure 5.7: Official Titles for Muslim Chaplains

Institution	Title
American	Muslim Chaplain
Amherst	Advisor to Muslim Students (previously Muslim Adjunct Advisor or Adjunct Muslim Advisor or Adjunct Religious Advisor)
Bard	Muslim Chaplain
Brandeis	Muslim Chaplain
Brown	Associate University Chaplain for the Muslim Community
Columbia	Religious Life Advisor for Muslim Students Association
Dartmouth	Advisor for Campus Muslim Life (previously Muslim Advisor)
Duke	Muslim Chaplain
Georgetown	Muslim Chaplain
Harvard	Chaplain for the Harvard Islamic Society
MIT	Muslim Chaplain
NYU	Executive Director and University Chaplain, Islamic Center at NYU
Princeton	Coordinator for Muslim Life
Rutgers	Muslim Chaplain
Simmons	Muslim Chaplain
Trinity	Muslim Chaplain

[61] Sohaib Sultan, Muslim Chaplain, Princeton University, Personal interview, August 27, 2008.

Tufts	Muslim Chaplain
U Maryland	Muslim Chaplain
U Pennsylvania	Interfaith Fellow and Campus Minister to the Muslim Community
USC	Director of Muslim Student Life
Wellesley	Muslim Chaplain
Wesleyan	Muslim Chaplain
Yale	Coordinator for Muslim Life (previously Muslim Fellow)

The diversity of titles for this role represented both the particular histories and structures of various campus chaplaincies and the multiple ways in which Muslim Chaplains have been conceptualised at different institutions. Both Brown and NYU used the term University Chaplain (not Muslim Chaplain), with the qualifier that the person had particular responsibility for the Muslim community. This designation was consistent with the titles of their colleagues of other faiths. At Harvard the title was 'Chaplain for the Harvard Islamic Society', delineating a relationship to the MSA rather than to the university. Administrators at Yale borrowed the title 'Coordinator for Muslim Life' from their peers at Princeton.[62] At Dartmouth the titles 'Muslim Advisor' or 'Muslim Life Coordinator' (the 'coordinator' title presumably borrowed from Princeton and Yale) were different from the title 'Chaplain' which was used by Christian and Jewish faith leaders. The USC title was also interesting in that it linked the chaplain to student life/affairs. Selection of more generic titles, such as the one at the University of Pennsylvania, may have been a strategy to allay concerns about special treatment for Muslim students, or to manage the expectations of a large and underserved Muslim student population.

5.2.2.2. DEMOGRAPHICS

In this section, I provide demographic information about the chaplains in my sample, including age, gender, ethnicity, and immigration background. There was great diversity among Muslim Chaplains across a variety of demographic characteristics. At the same time there were some clear trends, which I will discuss below. This data is based on the Muslim Chaplains serving in positions in mid-2010. As of May 2012, a few institutions have had personnel changes including American University, Amherst, Simmons, and University of Pennsylvania. The Rutgers chaplaincy is now defunct.

[62] University Chaplain, Personal interview, April 11, 2009.

Figure 5.8 provides information about the estimated age and gender of the Muslim Chaplains in my sample. Estimated ages are indicated by decade (as of 2010); female chaplains appear in bold.

Figure 5.8: Estimated Age and Gender of Muslim Chaplains

20s	30s	40s	50s	60s
American	Amherst	Georgetown	Brandeis	Bard
NYU	Brown			Columbia
Trinity/Wesleyan	Dartmouth			**Simmons**
Tufts	Duke			
USC	Harvard			
Wellesley	MIT			
	Princeton			
	Rutgers			
	U. Maryland			
	U. Pennsylvania			
	Yale			

The vast majority of Muslim Chaplains were in their 20s and 30s – three quarters were under 40 years old. This was unsurprising considering the newness of the positions. I suspect that younger chaplains were more likely to hold views that would be compatible with those of Muslim students and university administrators. One student told me that she had a strong preference for a chaplain who had gone to college in the United States, so that he or she would be able to relate to the unique experiences of American higher education.[63] There were only four female Muslim Chaplains: two at women's colleges and two at co-educational institutions. Based on my research, these individuals faced particular challenges in gaining credibility within the Muslim community.[64] A primary role for most Muslim Chaplains was managing the *jum'ah* (Friday prayer service). Given the prohibition in most Muslim sects against women leading mixed gender groups in prayer, the two female chaplains at co-educational schools were unable to lead Friday prayers themselves. Instead they would invite outside speakers, or prepare male students to take on the role. See Khoja-Moolji (2011, p. 5-6, 16-7) for more about female Muslim Chaplains in higher education.

[63] Student, Personal interview, September 16, 2008.
[64] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, March 7, 2009.

Figure 5.9 shows the racial and ethnic backgrounds of the Muslim Chaplains in my sample. Those in bold are first-generation Americans – they grew up primarily outside the United States. Almost half were of South Asian origin, one third were of Arab origin, and the remainder were either African-American or white. These numbers roughly reflected the broader Muslim-American population. Just over one-third were first-generation immigrants who spent their formative pre-university years outside the United States.

Figure 5.9: Racial/Ethnic Backgrounds and Immigration Status of Muslim Chaplains

South Asian	Arab/Turkish	African-American	White
American	**Amherst**	Bard	Brown
Columbia	**Brandeis**	Dartmouth	Rutgers
MIT	**Duke**	Harvard	
NYU	**Georgetown**		
Princeton	Simmons		
Tufts	Trinity/Wesleyan		
U. Pennsylvania	**U. Maryland**		
USC			
Wellesley			
Yale			

5.2.2.2. TRAINING AND CREDENTIALS

There were a diversity of paths that had led individuals to Muslim Chaplaincy positions in higher education. In this section I will describe the religious, educational, and experiential backgrounds among the chaplains in my sample.

Islam does not have a single or formal clergy, which makes it difficult to define or agree on the appropriate training or certification required for a religious leadership position including Muslim Chaplaincy. In 1998 the Hartford Seminary created an Islamic Chaplaincy program to fill this void. The program provides a 48-credit academic Masters degree in Islamic Studies/Christian-Muslim Relations as well as a 24-credit practical Graduate Certificate with one of three foci: Islamic Chaplaincy, Imam and Muslim Community Leadership, or Islamic Studies/Christian-Muslim Relations. The certificate is meant to train individuals for pastoral care. It includes six credits of practical training and is accredited through the Association of Theological Schools as equivalent to a Master of Divinity degree which is standard training for

Christian chaplains.[65] As the first program of its kind, many of the Muslim Chaplains I spoke with were familiar with the program.

The program at Hartford was led by Ingrid Mattson, who held a PhD in Islamic Studies from the University of Chicago. It was an appealing credential for university administrators because

> it has taken the form for training... Christians and Jews and appl[ied] it to Islam. It's that kind of certification. Perhaps in a self-centred way I say 'I know the kind of credential he now has' and that makes sense to me. There's no translation required... So that particular degree program just answers a question for religious practitioners in American higher ed[ucation].[66]

This certification gave comfort to administrators that the individual they were hiring had been trained to serve as a Muslim Chaplain in an American context. Given Hartford's unique position in training Muslim Chaplains, Mattson was frequently consulted by university administrators during their hiring processes. This gave her a distinctive role in advising universities how to configure these positions and recommend individuals to serve in them. As one University Chaplain described, the Hartford program is

> giving critical skills [and] practical training to a coterie of wonderful folks. So in the end, almost all the people that we interview[ed] had passed through that program somehow, even folks who were just doing a summer course.[67]

This individual was so impressed with Hartford that she 'longed for a Hartford equivalent' in a search for another type of non-Judeo Christian chaplain. In that case she hired someone who had 'gotten some kind of chaplaincy experience somewhere [else].'[68] Besides Hartford, there were several other American institutions developing programmes to train Muslim Chaplains (Khoja-Moolji 2011, p. 9-10).

In Figure 5.10, I provide information on the highest academic degrees obtained by the Muslim Chaplains in my sample. Approximately half of them held, or were pursuing, Masters degrees; one third had, or were pursuing, doctorates. Most of these advanced degrees were in Islamic Studies, Divinity, Religion, Near Eastern Studies, or Middle Eastern Studies; one degree was in Engineering and one was in Counselling. Six chaplains had, or were pursuing, the Hartford Seminary Masters degree or certificate (denoted in italics) which means that the vast majority

[65] The United States armed forces requires Muslim military chaplains trained at Hartford to obtain both the Masters degree and the Graduate Certificate. Other institutions set their own criteria.
[66] University Chaplain, Personal interview, March 27, 2012.
[67] *Ibid.*
[68] *Ibid.*

of chaplains did not have formal training in counselling, pastoral care, or ministry. Almost half of the chaplains were former students or alumni of the institutions where they worked (denoted with an asterisk). Since so many of them were the first people in the role, having a connection to the institution may have given administrators more confidence in their ability to be successful, and may also have made the transition easier for the chaplains.

Figure 5.10: Educational Training and Affiliation of Muslim Chaplains

Doctorate	Masters	Bachelors	High School
Bard	Amherst	**American**	Rutgers (did not
Brandeis	Brown*	***Dartmouth (pursuing MA)***	complete BA)*
Columbia	***Duke (pursuing DMinistry)***	***NYU (pursuing MA)****	
Georgetown	Harvard (pursuing PhD)*	U. Maryland*	
	MIT (pursuing PhD)*	USC*	
	Princeton		
	Simmons		
	Trinity/Wesleyan		
	Tufts		
	U. Pennsylvania (pursuing PhD)*		
	Wellesley*		
	Yale		

There was also significant variation in the religious knowledge and authority of these individuals. University Chaplains were looking for individuals that had sufficient familiarity with Islam to lead prayers and act as a religious guide, but they did not expect Muslim Chaplains to be scholarly experts. As a University Chaplain explained,

> what I need most is someone who can be really relevant as a religious guide and leader here. And that may not be the person with the highest intellectual academic pedigree in terms of religious scholarship. I mean there's religious leadership and that is... different from the person that the Religion Department may be looking to hire... I'm looking for somebody with a skill set for being a resource for students, staff, and faculty... And that's not about intellectual pedigree. In the end it's just going to come down to your chops... I need someone who can also talk to a pregnant student... I need someone who's going to be able to talk to a gay student.[69]

[69] University Chaplain, Personal interview, March 27, 2012.

A Muslim Chaplain elaborated

> ... We're clearly seen as religious figures ... and even religious leaders but we're not expected (for the most part) to be religious scholars... From the university standpoint... 'we're not hiring a scholar, we're hiring a pastoral care giver. We're hiring somebody who knows how to work with religion in the public sphere.' And I think the university... has wisely come to understand that to be a prominent role for the chaplain.[70]

Possessing formal Islamic religious credentials was not a key criterion used by University Chaplains. When such expertise was needed, Muslim Chaplains often identified and brought in experts for particular programs or events such as Qur'anic recitation, Islamic calligraphy, or Shia prayers.[71]

At the same time, some students and local community members had questions about the religious expertise and authority of Muslim Chaplains. One Muslim Chaplain explained that:

> At the university, they look at me as a very authoritative figure, even more than they should [laughs] but then within the Muslim community... they're not quite sure who I am. And I'm not sure how to introduce myself. And so 'am I an Imam?' Yes and no. [Students wonder] 'If I have a *fatwa* [Islamic legal opinion] question do I go to you or do I not go to you? If I'm having a breakdown should I come to you?' So it's not entirely clear... and I think that at least for some of them, there was maybe an expectation for me to be some sort of *'alim* [scholar]...[72]

According to this chaplain, becoming an *'alim* required five to ten years of intensive religious training in various Islamic disciplines. As there is no such training program in the United States, attaining these credentials required education overseas.[73] To his knowledge, there were no university Muslim Chaplains that had attained this level of expertise. However, there were several *'ulama'* (plural of *'alim*) he consulted with when he received *fiqh* (Islamic jurisprudence) or other questions he was unable to answer himself. He explained that there were a number of *'ulama'* that served as advisors to campus-based Muslim Chaplains.[74]

A central challenge was that Muslim Chaplaincy was modelled on a Christian role and there was no widely recognised equivalent in the Muslim world. Thus while university administrators

[70] Sohaib Sultan, Muslim Chaplain, Princeton University, Personal interview, April 16, 2012.
[71] University Chaplain, Personal interview, March 27, 2012.
[72] Sohaib Sultan, Muslim Chaplain, Princeton University, Personal interview, April 16, 2012.
[73] *Ibid.*
[74] *Ibid.*

understood the position, Muslim students and community members often did not. As one informant explained,

> The Muslim Chaplain is a type of religious leader which is so different from any other type of religious leader they've experienced. They've experienced the religious leadership of their Imam at their local mosque or they've seen the *'alim* on television. But they haven't quite seen the Muslim Chaplain who's working on the ground with people... I don't think we've quite carved out our space in religious leadership and in religious authority in America. We're still carving it out... I can quite understand why [someone] would want to take on the persona of an *'alim* type of figure... [I] sometimes feel pressure to take on that persona, and people sometimes come to us expecting that sort of interaction...[75]

In an effort to make their role intelligible to Muslims and non-Muslims, the majority of male Muslim Chaplains adopted the title Imam (denoted in bold in Figure 5.10), a term often associated with the prayer leader at a mosque.[76] The limitation of this term was that it did not convey the pastoral, advisory, or advocacy responsibilities of campus Muslim Chaplains; it was also a term that could not be used by female Muslim Chaplains. Although the title was not associated with particular religious training, in the university context it was often seen as equivalent to Minister, Priest, or Rabbi (all of which required several years of theological study).

5.2.3. ROLES OF CHAPLAINS

This section explores my second research question: namely, what roles did Muslim Chaplains play? I found that the work of Muslim Chaplains varied widely according to their personal strengths and experiences, as well as the mandate and autonomy provided by administrators at their institutions. One of my informants suggested that the role was 'multifaceted and it's almost constantly under construction.'[77] In this section, I attempt to paint a picture of the breadth and depth of those roles, paying particular attention to the ways in which Muslim Chaplains served the broader university and the local community. My research reveals some interesting trends as well as noteworthy outliers.

5.2.3.1. SERVING MUSLIM STUDENTS

Based on my fieldwork, I enumerated six key forms of support Muslim Chaplains provided to Muslim students: (1) religious, (2) pastoral, (3) advisory to the MSA, (4) educational, (5)

[75] *Ibid.*
[76] At least two of the Muslim Chaplains in my sample had previously led non-campus congregations in the United States.
[77] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 24, 2010.

programmatic, and (6) liaisonal. Since many of these are detailed in my case studies of Princeton and Rutgers (in Chapters 6 and 7), I provide a summary of these roles in the following two paragraphs.

First, at most institutions the Muslim Chaplain was considered to be the religious leader of the campus Muslim community. This role usually involved leading prayers and delivering *khutbahs* at *jum'ah* (Friday afternoon) services and on other occasions. In many cases, particularly with female chaplains at co-educational institutions, Muslim Chaplains trained male students to perform these religious duties. Second, most chaplains spent a significant amount of time providing pastoral care (counselling) to Muslim and non-Muslim students on a range of topics covering academic, ethical, religious, familial, and career concerns. Chaplains were often called upon to assist students in times of personal crisis. One chaplain described pastoral care as 'what distinguishes a chaplain from a regular parish minister or clergy.'[78] Similar to other college students outside the orbit of their families for the first time, some Muslim students began to question who they were and what they believed. Some found themselves adrift without support from their families; others embraced the newfound freedoms and temptations of the college environment. This is where Muslim Chaplains were often a stabilising influence:

> ... it's beautiful to see people changing, absolutely. There's nothing more empowering than that. And I guess that's a word that I love to use... I love to use the word empowerment... And I think, believe it or not, we spoke about a lot of aspects of chaplaincy, I see this as an empowering position. Empowering students because they're here on a mission and you need to just widen their horizons a little bit and you can make them see what they can do. Help them adjust, help them overcome their issues... Believe it or not, I sometimes get requests like, 'can you please just talk to me about self-confidence... I feel bad and depressed and I need your help. I don't know. I don't have the answers. I am terrible. Help me out...' And some of them also need help to find direction in life.[79]

Muslim Chaplains often played the role of mentor to these students; they were aware that some students faced unique social, cultural, and political challenges. Some of the chaplains had, themselves, been in similar situations. Some Muslim students were able to talk to Muslim Chaplains about sensitive issues – such as interracial and inter-religious dating and marriage, drugs and alcohol, sexuality and pregnancy, religious doubts – that they could not discuss with their parents or an Imam.

[78] *Ibid.*
[79] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, October 15, 2009.

Third, most of the Muslim Chaplains in my sample served as advisors to the MSA at their school. At some institutions they were central to MSA activities and decision-making; at others they played a more distant and independent role to give students autonomy. In moments of tension or crisis, however, Muslim Chaplains were often critical in helping MSAs navigate relationships with other student groups, the university administration, and the outside community. Fourth, on many campuses, the chaplain provided religious education, including *halaqas* (study circles) or non-credit courses about Islamic theology, law, or history. In some cases, this involved teaching students how to recite the Qur'an (Muslim holy book) or to read Arabic. Muslim Chaplains also served as a resource for students with questions about *fiqh*. Fifth, Muslim Chaplains were often responsible for programming speakers, panels, conferences and other events. Many of them took a leadership role in planning and managing the month of Ramadan, including assigning religious duties, preparing and distributing *suhoor* (dawn meals), and organising *iftars*. Often, chaplains had separate budgets to support events that they or students organised. Sixth, chaplains often acted as a liaison between the MSA and the university administration. At times they took on the role of student advocate or ally in negotiating with staff members regarding facilities, housing or dining services, student affairs, and other units. In other cases, they communicated and represented the perspective of the administration to students.

These six roles most closely reflect the type of support a full-time Muslim Chaplain was able to provide. However, such positions represented a minority of my sample institutions. For chaplains with more limited hours of engagement, religious, pastoral, and MSA advisory roles (the first three points above) were most important. In some cases, especially for Muslim Chaplains on contract, they were primarily responsible for leading Friday prayers and were available by email and telephone for pastoral care.

In addition to these functional roles played by Muslim Chaplains, there were overarching efforts or philosophies that some of them advanced through a combination of their religious, pastoral, programmatic, and educational roles. I will describe two of them below: (1) promoting inclusivity within the Muslim community and (2) helping students to navigate their Muslim identity in the American context.

First, a number of Muslim Chaplains explained that one of their roles '... becomes creating an inclusive space, where anybody who identifies with Islam and Muslims in any way feels like they

can participate and that there will be something there for them.'[80] On some campuses, MSAs had been inhospitable places for those who did not identify with mainstream Sunni Islam such as Shias, Ahmadiyyas, Sufis, and adherents of the Nation of Islam. In addition to sectarian differences, women, homosexuals, liberals, converts, and the less observant had sometimes felt uncomfortable in MSA environments (MacFarquhar 2008a). Muslim Chaplains advanced inclusivity by advocating for tolerance, highlighting commonalities, urging against judgement of others, demystifying religious and cultural differences, and actively engaging marginalised individuals. Many of the Muslim Chaplains I spoke with were successful in creating safe and inclusive spaces. However, this work posed fundamental challenges. As one informant described:

> How to be honest [about] who I am, so that I am not going to be a watered-down, wishy-washy, fits-everywhere kind of person? How can [I] authentically [honour] my own identity, [and] at the same time serve people and make religion meaningful in daily life? It's an ongoing challenge... [Therefore], the symbol for campus Muslim chaplaincy is not a mosque. It has to be the *Kaaba* [Islam's most sacred site], it has to be *Hajj* [holy pilgrimage to the *Kaaba*]... [A place where] everybody, anybody who considers themselves as Muslim [is accepted]... We cannot be in the business of defining anybody's or measuring anybody's faith.[81]

Inclusivity was not universally or easily achievable. For example, sectarian tensions within the Rutgers MSA led to one faction breaking off to form an independent organisation. Although the two groups were later united, tensions lingered.[82]

Second, Muslim Chaplains sometimes helped young people to figure out how to be Muslim in the American context and to see that – despite what their parents or the media might tell them – these two identities were not mutually exclusive or contradictory. As one Muslim Chaplain described it, 'they need to bridge their reality as Muslims with the American reality... That requires some fluency in terms of just understanding how to address those issues... It is actually something I take very seriously with the students.'[83] The contours of this support extended from the religious to the cultural. One Muslim Chaplain hosted a halal Super Bowl party and marvelled at how refreshing such an event would have been during his college days.[84] Another Muslim Chaplain described his role as

[80] David Coolidge, Muslim Chaplain, Dartmouth College, Personal interview, March 7, 2009.
[81] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 24, 2010.
[82] Details can be found in Chapter 7 'Muslim Chaplaincy at Rutgers'.
[83] *Ibid.*
[84] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 10, 2009.

> ...literally helping people develop a different paradigm and understanding of their identity as Muslims in this context. Not in a foreign context, not with your own little household, [but] as part of a bigger, diverse community of people with different points of views and living in America... because whatever philosophies or backgrounds people have inherited, essentially colour[s] how they behave, how they interact.[85]

In some cases, students simply needed permission to make the choices they already thought to be correct. A University Chaplain described her Muslim Chaplain as someone who was, 'letting people know that the ideas that they have about how to put together all these pieces of their identity are fine.'[86]

The responsibility for supporting students in this balancing act often fell to chaplains because Muslim students often

> ... don't have, unfortunately, accessible places to go to and even when they go to Imams, local Imams, they just have no way of communicating with them. Because I'm sure you're familiar with this... gap that exists... Lots of the Imams cannot connect with youth because they're not looking just for technical answers. They're looking for, 'do you understand my problem?' So I try to fill that void as much as possible by just having a conversation with them. Sometimes even just listening.[87]

My research suggested that some Muslim Chaplains were filling a cultural and generational gap for students whose parents and religious leaders did not fully understand their experiences in the American context. Most of the chaplains were American-born and just a few years older than college students. Part of their value and success in this role was attributable to having relatively recently gone through some of the same experiences as the students they were supporting. A University Chaplain explained that 'the younger generation of American Muslims faces unique opportunities, experiences and challenges' and that it is a benefit to have someone young 'who really understands their own needs and their own hopes and aspirations from the inside' (Stern 2006).

5.2.3.2. SERVING THE UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY

Over the course of my research, I noticed a shift in the role that Muslim Chaplains played on university campuses. An administrator at one institution said, 'we hired [Name] as a Muslim Chaplain, not only for the Muslim community, but for the entire [campus]... The need is for the

[85] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, October 15, 2009.
[86] University Chaplain, Personal interview, March 27, 2012.
[87] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, October 15, 2009.

entire community.'[88] On this and other campuses, hiring a chaplain was characterised as broader than an investment in the Muslim community. Beyond providing religiously and culturally appropriate support for Muslim students, a number of chaplains were engaged with the larger campus community. In some cases, their work extended to local and national communities.

My research revealed seven substantive ways in which Muslim Chaplains served the larger campus community: (1) advising the administration, (2) educating non-Muslims about Islam, (3) leading interfaith activities, (4) serving as a member of the broader chaplaincy staff, (5) engaging with alumni, (6) interacting with parents, and (7) serving the local Muslim community which was not affiliated with the university. In the rest of this section, I will explore these roles in further detail.

First, university administrators were looking for advice from Muslim Chaplains to help them better understand, anticipate, and respond to students. Given the widespread ignorance about Islam, the need for someone to interpret and explain the Muslim faith was critical. Two informants explained:

> [University administrators said], 'we have many questions and we don't know what to do. We don't know whom to go to. Muslim students need to take off, something called Eid, Ramadan. We don't know what Ramadan is all about.' Whom do we ask? [When] we call the local mosque, the local Imam does not respond. Or you call two Imams and you have two answers. The institution is confused. So when you institutionalise it, when you have someone who is on board that can pick up the phone and answer the questions or organise the programmes, it helps the administration. It's peace of mind for the institution...[89]

> I believe that institutions are really benefiting from being able to discreetly ask questions of a Muslim Chaplain. They also benefit from having someone on staff who serves as a living model of Islam. This balances the widespread paranoia and misinformation about Muslims.[90]

Having a trustworthy authority on Islam was critical for university administrators in setting basic policies about religious holidays, dining service accommodations, and provisions for Ramadan. In addition, Muslim Chaplains were indispensable during times of tension or crisis. In such instances, their input was helpful in determining institutional action and policy.

[88] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 24, 2010.
[89] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, October 15, 2009.
[90] Ingrid Mattson, Director of Islamic Chaplaincy, Hartford Seminary, Personal interview, January 12, 2010.

Second, Muslim Chaplains were expected to play a role in educating non-Muslims about Islam. This was sometimes mentioned in Muslim Chaplain job descriptions. The first Princeton job description (2006) included: 'As the principal representative of Islam on campus, the Muslim chaplain will also be expected to... be a resource for the entire University community on matters of Islam, religious diversity, and interfaith dialogue.' Yale's 2008 job description included the responsibility 'to educate others about Islam... Take part in the larger educational mission of the faculty.' Duke University stated this idea most clearly and thoroughly in its 2008 Muslim Chaplain job description:

> To offer non-Muslims opportunities to learn about the broad Islamic tradition in its theological, pastoral, and cultural dimensions; to articulate a thoughtful and engaged Muslim perspective on global religious and political developments in public settings, particularly in times of crisis... To teach two courses a year, at least one of these to be concerned principally with introducing Islam to non-Muslims and exploring modes of engagement. To pursue personally and cultivate within the Duke community intellectual inquiry into Islamic faith and life.

Sometimes engagement with non-Muslims was formal – through academic courses, lectures, and panels – and other times it was through informal conversations or simple visibility.

Janet Cooper Nelson described her struggle to get people to understand the role of the Muslim Chaplain beyond supporting the Muslim community:

> One of the primary arguments I had to struggle to get the committee to hear [is that] whoever is hired [as a Muslim Chaplain] has an obligation to see that the literacy of this entire university family with respect to that [which is] Muslim is enhanced... [such] that we are much more fluent in these issues across religious lines. So that obligation is as much to me (as a non-Muslim) as it is to the Muslim community... For the person on the campus who is not religious at all and who just show[s] up in any leadership position in the world, that person must have the benefit of the learning and leadership of this person... [Our Muslim Chaplain] will be invited into classes to teach. He is already working on Arabic language with some graduate students, one of whom is a Muslim, one of whom is not.[91]

A Muslim Chaplain described it as 'being the voice and face of Islam on the campus.'[92] He continued:

> This society in general doesn't know Islam. I mean, they've been hearing about Islam and Muslims from various channels, but they don't understand. They

[91] Janet Cooper Nelson, University Chaplain, Brown University, Personal interview, September 9, 2009.
[92] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 24, 2010.

> don't have any resources where they can turn to and make sense of what they have been hearing from Fox TV or CNN. So the need became much larger... The need for [an] intelligent, educated, understandable, and respectable Muslim voice has become the need of the entire campus, both intellectually as well as in a civic way... Almost everybody is talking about Islam, different aspects of Islam. This whole post 9/11 level created [a] culture which is somewhat negative, in general. Islam is [seen as a] scary monster. People get scared [when they hear] anything about Islam...[93]

Another Muslim Chaplain suggested that he had knowledge beyond the strictly religious that he could share with non-Muslim audiences:

> I'm happy to talk about American intervention in the Middle East with an average educated audience... I'm not a foreign policy expert, but I think I have enough [knowledge] to be able to have an intelligent, credible discussion or [give a] presentation that gives people something that they can think about... And that's my approach because... I read other stuff that's not strictly religious, pastoral... [I can go] into these engagements with the large non-Muslim community.[94]

Many Muslim Chaplains saw their interaction with non-Muslims, on their campuses and in the communities beyond, as an opportunity to educate people about a faith that was profoundly mischaracterised, misunderstood, and politicised.

Although the position descriptions articulated a role that Muslim Chaplains should play beyond serving the needs of the Muslim community, my interviews suggested that few chaplains had the time or infrastructure for significant engagement with non-Muslims given their primary focus on Muslim students.[95] It was unclear whether there was a genuine aspiration for interfaith education and engagement at these institutions, or if this rhetoric was a tool to garner financial or political support within the institution. Interestingly, this aspiration paralleled the widespread desire for increased cross-racial or multicultural engagement, which was a leading justification for racial affirmative action.

Third, an important role for most Muslim Chaplains was to build relationships with other religious groups. This was included as a responsibility in a number of job descriptions. As one Muslim Chaplain explained, such work involved

[93] *Ibid.*
[94] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 10, 2009.
[95] Sohaib Sultan, Personal interview, April 16, 2012.

> ...partnering with other faith communities, being [an] active member of existing interfaith initiatives, and even shouldering and initiating new ones. Basically, shouldering with fellow clergy to make faith relevant [i]n a secular establishment. It is now a huge industry – interfaith work.[96]

Interfaith activities in which Muslim Chaplains participated as representatives of Islam included dialogues, panels, lectures, conferences, ceremonies, and other activities. For many, regular meetings of religious life staff members provided opportunities for chaplains to share their denominational activities and to collaborate on projects. Muslim Chaplains were also involved in supporting Muslim students in interfaith activities, which included interfaith councils, community service projects, formal dialogues, and social activities. On several campuses, Muslim Chaplains established especially close relationships with the Jewish community. Given their status as non-Christian, monotheistic religious groups and in spite of the ongoing tensions between the communities, Muslim Chaplains and Hillel Rabbis developed strong personal and professional relationships.

Fourth, at private institutions Muslim Chaplains often contributed to the broader ORL. This involved working on programmes, events, or issues beyond those of particular interest and concern to Muslim students. A University Chaplain described the role of the Muslim Chaplain at her institution:

> But he's also here as part of our team. My style in terms of staffing is very collaborative. So we're kind of all in it together. So if there's something that doesn't involve the Muslim community but involves the community at large, [he's] part of what we do... He is part of my managerial and professional staff... As I said before, when we have a crisis, we divide and conquer. I have every confidence that I can send him on a pastoral mission and he would be fine.[97]

As small chaplaincy staffs expanded, it was only natural that new staff members took on broader responsibilities. As such, Muslim Chaplains were expected to balance the needs of the Muslim community with the wider aims of the institution. One Muslim Chaplain described the aftermath of a protest against the Gaza Conflict:

> [The university administration shared] some of the concern from alumni and donors. And of course on their part, there is an expectation that I will not fuel the fire, and I will basically be constructive, the bridge builder, and peacemaker. Not a partisan heading in one pole. Depending on [your] perspective... I see my

[96] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 24, 2010.
[97] University Chaplain, Personal interview, April 11, 2009.

> role not necessarily [as] exclusively representing the Muslim community, but being a good team member and working with everybody.[98]

Not all Muslim Chaplains saw their role as broadly as this individual, especially when Muslim student concerns were in tension with those of other communities on campus. It seemed to me that paid chaplains, especially those with full-time positions, had the institutional allegiance, perspective, accountability, and time to be responsible for the larger community. Volunteers and those with part-time roles were more likely to see themselves primarily as advocates for Muslim students.

Fifth, I noticed a growing recognition that Muslim Chaplains could serve as a key link to Muslim alumni, who were seen as critical to a flourishing and sustainable Muslim student community. Two universities referenced alumni outreach as a responsibility. Princeton made an oblique reference in its 2007 job description: 'a person able to contribute imaginatively to the crafting of a long-term vision for Princeton's Muslim community, with extensive skills in institution-building and development.' Duke was more explicit (2008): 'to develop a strong alumni/ae base of potential advocates and donors for the role of Islam at Duke.'

Several institutions had made efforts to engage Muslim alumni. One University Chaplain explained that he administered an endowment from an overseas alumnus, which produced income to support Muslim student life. Staff members at Brown, Georgetown, Rutgers, and other institutions described substantive administrative engagement with Muslim alumni and other Muslim donors of significant means. On a more modest scale, a number of schools encouraged and supported MSAs in soliciting Muslim alumni for support. Coolidge explained that at Dartmouth

> ... every couple of years it seems like the students manage to get a fundraising letter out, a fundraising package, and it's sort of organised by the university... We did that this year and we sent out the fundraising request in a letter ... and the alumni responded. And that's how the bulk of our gift account grows... having talked to some of the alumni, they do feel really connected to the institution and they wish in a way that there can be more of an engagement. But there is just nobody to organise them. You know all the alumni are busy with their own careers and everything and then – it's really my hope that... the next person that comes in [as Muslim Chaplain]... over the next couple of years, they focus on reaching out to the alumni more directly and creating some sort of mechanism for them to be more involved... I think it offers so much to the student body in general.[99]

[98] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 24, 2010.
[99] David Coolidge, Muslim Chaplain, Dartmouth College, Personal interview, March 7, 2009.

Several schools, including Cornell, Harvard, Princeton, Rutgers, the University of Pennsylvania, and Yale, had Muslim alumni organisations.[100] Interestingly, in 2011 the Muslim alumni organisations of Cornell and the University of Pennsylvania launched campaigns to raise money to create and expand Muslim Chaplaincy positions (Daneman 2011).

The sixth way in which Muslim Chaplains served the broader community was in their engagement with the parents of Muslim students often designed to improve the chaplain's ability to support students. While this did not occupy a significant amount of their time, it was a powerful and symbolic role – one that is likely to grow stronger as Muslim Chaplaincy develops. Several Muslim Chaplains mentioned their interactions with parents. This contact often occurred when parents were visiting campus during recruitment, orientation, or graduation. They were sometimes surprised and reassured that there was a Muslim Chaplain on campus. Marwa Aly, the Muslim Chaplain at Trinity College and Wesleyan University, explained:

> ... a lot [of] the parents come up to me and they say, '...we are so happy to hear that you have a Muslim Chaplain. Can you tell us what you provide? Is there a halal [option] on campus?' We are working towards getting that. So it definitely helps for prospective students and it helps the college look good...[101]

One chaplain described more sustained contact with parents:

> **Muslim Chaplain**: I do a lot of counselling for students in relation to [romantic] relationships or relationships with their parents. I do a lot of counselling for parents in relation to their children or for children.
> **AKR**: So parents will come and see you?
> **Muslim Chaplain**: Yes, for parents and staff. So a student might come to me and say, 'Imam, my father and mother have been fighting and I really want you to talk to them, please.' I see that as a help to the student. So I do that a lot...[102]

While this level of involvement with parents was rare, it revealed an unusual sensitivity to the dynamics of some Muslim families. Another Muslim Chaplain actively reached out to parents by asking his students to provide their parents' addresses, so he could send them an Eid (festival) card. This allowed him to open up a line of communication with parents similar to some of the university's residential life staff. These examples showed that Muslim Chaplains could provide a unique type of support by relating to and translating between generations.

[100] Alumnus, Personal interview, December 5, 2008 and Affiliated Chaplain (former), Personal interview, March 1, 2010.
[101] Marwa Aly, Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, January 12, 2010.
[102] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, October 15, 2009.

The seventh and final role was that a number of Muslim Chaplains played a part in the religious life of the local Muslim population. This was especially important in rural communities where there was no nearby Imam or mosque. Here are perspectives from two Muslim Chaplains serving rural institutions. The first is from Coolidge who worked at Dartmouth College, located in Hanover, New Hampshire, a town with 11,000 inhabitants located 175 km North of Boston:

> ... because of my position, I am the only Muslim religious authority for a 100 miles... I [have] become someone that the local community here – other ministers around town, people who are teaching at the community college, random people who just find [out] about me [and]... want to talk about Islam and Muslims... [People say] 'go talk to the Muslim Advisor at Dartmouth.'[103] I really think it's unique and I am sure there's a few other campuses like this in the country, but I think that particularly in our situation... there is very little local Muslim community. Meaning that there is no *masjid*. There has never been a *masjid* and I don't foresee one in the near future. There [are] very few people that live and work that are Muslim... So what happens is that most of the people, I would say the vast majority of the Muslims there are either students, undergraduate students, graduate students or staff or faculty at the university, so they are not connected, which means that for decades and decades... all the *jum'ahs*, 52 weeks a year were on campus. All the Eid prayers were on campus. Monthly potlucks for the community to get together were on campus. *Iftars* during Ramadan were on campus... and if you get married, you got married on campus... But the problem then became as well when you don't have a local community base, it comes [out of] the bottom line [of the university] in terms of financial support... Long story short, the point is the community I think in many ways needs one, but there's no Imam. We haven't had an Imam.[104]

Community involvement was not limited to places without a local mosque. A couple of Muslim Chaplains mentioned that they presented an appealing alternative to local mosques in urban areas with significant Muslim populations:

> ... there are lot of people coming in locally from the community they come for *jum'ah*... Believe it or not (I'm not trying to brag here) but actually a lot of them come because they enjoy the *jum'ah khutbahs* that [we have], so they don't necessarily get what they are looking for in all of the *masjids*.[105]

Another Muslim Chaplain in a large city concurred, explaining that he would regularly get cab drivers and other local Muslims attending Friday prayers at the university.[106]

---

[103] David Coolidge, Muslim Chaplain, Dartmouth College, Personal interview, March 7, 2009.
[104] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 10, 2009.
[105] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, October 15, 2009.
[106] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, March 5, 2009.

5.3. CONCLUSION

This chapter began with an analysis about the development of Muslim Chaplaincy in American higher education. In 1993 Wellesley, a women's liberal arts college, hired the first part-time Muslim Chaplain; six years later Georgetown hired the first person to serve full-time in the role. Today more than 40 institutions of higher education have or had a Muslim Chaplain.

The origins of Muslim Chaplaincies on different campuses can be divided into three groups based on the primary role played by the university administration in their development: administration-initiated schools where administrators took the lead in conceptualising, exploring, developing, and financing Muslim Chaplain posts; administration-expanded schools where student advocacy was a significant driver; and administration-sanctioned schools which officially recognised (but did not pay) chaplains retained by the MSA or the local community.

Muslim Chaplaincies developed in the context of three models of campus chaplaincy. In the exceptional model, university administrators argued that Muslim students were in a unique position – one which required the institution to hire a Muslim Chaplain as an exception to a standard policy not to financially support denominationally-specific chaplaincy. In the inclusive model, institutions provided financial support for multiple denominational chaplaincies including, but not limited to, the Muslim Chaplaincy. In the exclusive model, universities did not financially support any denomination-specific chaplains. Regardless of the chaplaincy model, all campuses sanctioned *externally-funded* denomination-specific chaplains. Funding for Muslim Chaplains also varied and included full-time, part-time, and contract employees as well as volunteers.

The background and attributes of the Muslim Chaplains at the 23 institutions in my sample varied greatly. In terms of education, half of the Muslim Chaplains held, or were pursuing, Masters degrees; one third had, or were pursuing, doctorates. In addition, five of them had, or were pursuing, the Muslim Chaplaincy Masters degree programme at Hartford Seminary which provided increased credibility and legitimacy. Interestingly, almost half of the chaplains were former students or alumni of the institutions where they worked. There was significant variation in the religious knowledge and credentials of Muslim Chaplains. This was not a key criterion used by University Chaplains to select individuals for these positions. Yet Muslim students and community members were sometimes surprised to find that Muslim Chaplains did not have *'alim* level religious training.

The vast majority of Muslim Chaplains were young – three quarters were under 40 years old. Most Muslim Chaplains were also male; there were only four female Muslim Chaplains: two at women's colleges and two at co-educational institutions. In terms of ethnicity, almost half were of South Asian origin, one-third were of Arab origin, and the remainder were either African-American or white. Just over one-third were first-generation immigrants who spent their formative pre-university years outside the United States.

Based on my fieldwork, I saw that Muslim Chaplains operated in two primary spheres. There were six roles that they played in providing support to Muslim students: religious, pastoral, advisory to the MSA, educational, programmatic, and liaisonal. In addition to the most common, and officially proscribed, ways in which chaplains served Muslim students, they also promoted inclusivity within the Muslim community and helped students to navigate Muslim identity in the American context. In addition, there were seven roles that Muslim Chaplains played in serving the larger campus community. They actively advised the administration, educated non-Muslims about Islam, lead interfaith activities, served as a member of the broader chaplaincy staff, engaged with alumni, interacted with parents, and served the local Muslim community who were not affiliated with the university.

CHAPTER 6

MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY AT PRINCETON

6.1. PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Princeton occupies a unique place in the pantheon of American higher education. Founded in 1746, Princeton is a member of the Ivy League and the fifth oldest institution of higher education in the United States. With 5,200 undergraduates and 2,600 graduate students (predominantly doctoral students), it has the highest endowment per student among American research universities and is able to offer one of the most generous financial aid programmes in the country. Princeton was long considered the most conservative of the Ivy League institutions. Historically, several factors have given Princeton special allure: a strong focus on undergraduate education, a social milieu focused around the exclusive Eating Clubs, and exceedingly loyal and generous alumni.[107] Through co-education, affirmative action, and generous financial aid policies, in recent years a Princeton education has become available to a broader group of students – including increasing numbers of women, international students, racial minorities, and first-generation college students.

Princeton had long been an institution of Protestant exclusivity; for many decades it was closely linked to the Presbyterian Church. Until 1932, all but one of the university's presidents were Presbyterian theologians; however, in 1928 the trustees released the president from oversight of student religious welfare, and the role of Dean of the Chapel was created.[108] In 1964 Princeton released freshmen from mandatory chapel attendance (Princeton University Archives 2002).[109] In 1979, separate faculty and trustee reports recommended a movement away from

[107] First founded in 1879, Eating Clubs are non-residential social houses for third and fourth-year undergraduate students. They provide meals for members and form a key aspect of social life on campus.
[108] Details at: http://etcweb.princeton.edu/CampusWWW/Companion/university_chapel.html.
[109] Juniors and seniors were released from this obligation in 1935; sophomores in the 1950s.

Protestant exclusivity and towards interfaith engagement in the mandate and activities of the Dean of the Chapel (Borsch 2012, p. 72, 77).

Today religion comes under the purview of the ORL, which is responsible for the care and support of all faith communities. It is headed by the Dean of Religious Life (a secular role), who may also serve as Dean of the Chapel (a Protestant religious role); the Dean reports to the Vice President for Campus Life. At the time of my research the ORL professional staff included two Associate Deans who, until 2011, had both been ordained Protestant clergy. In 2011 the Dean hired an Associate Dean who was a practicing Buddhist born into the Jewish faith. As I will describe in greater detail in this chapter, in the late 2000s the ORL hired a Coordinator for Muslim Life and a Coordinator for Hindu Life. It also supported an administrator at the Center for Jewish Life (CJL), who jointly reported to the Hillel Rabbi and ORL. In addition, there were a dozen Affiliated Chaplains, representing various faiths, who provided support to Princeton students. They were not employees of the university, and in addition to the aforementioned Hillel Rabbi they included Catholic, Baptist, Chabad (Hasidic Jewish), Episcopal, Lutheran, Manna (Evangelical Christian), Orthodox Christian, Evangelical Christian, Presbyterian, Unitarian Universalist, and Methodist representatives.

At the turn of the 20th century, in the context of its wealthy and elite Protestant culture, Princeton harboured strong anti-Semitic tendencies. In the 1920s the university administration took an active role in limiting the admission of Jewish students, and regularly rejected highly qualified Jewish applicants even when it could not attract sufficient numbers of Christian men (Axtell 2006, p. 129). The few Jewish students who were admitted and matriculated between the 1910s and 1960s were, to various extents, ostracised and socially excluded (Karabel 2005a, p. 124, 127). Like many of its selective peers, Princeton has gone through a massive transformation in its relationship with Jewish students and faculty members. It hired its first Jewish president, Harold Shapiro, in 1988. Five years later the university partnered with Hillel to open a $4.85 million CJL at the center of campus (Axtell 2006, p. 141). In addition to Hillel, Princeton had an active Chabad chaplaincy, which it initially refused to sanction in 2008; it was subsequently afforded full recognition (Cai 2007; Kay 2008).

Princeton had been slow to acknowledge and combat anti-Semitism; it was similarly slow to embrace racial diversity. The university had not enrolled a single black student until 1945. In 1960 there was only one in the freshman class; however, a decade later there were 103 black students in the entering cohort (Karabel 2005a, p. 379). The dramatic increase in racial diversity

was profoundly influenced by the civil rights movement and

> the threat of black radicalism, both on and off campus, that was the moving force behind the intensification of Princeton's effort to recruit more black students ... Princeton's public statements left little doubt that the increasingly violent racial disturbances that shook the nation's cities in the summer of 1967 were the main cause of the change in its admissions policy. (*Ibid*, p.397)

This 'threat', as Karabel terms it, led the university to actively recruit black students; hire the Ivy League's first black administrator; provide black applicants with the special consideration that was already afforded to legacy applicants, prep-school boys, athletes, and Navy ROTC candidates;[110] and re-frame an admissions policy away from its focus on 'well-rounded men' which had been used to limit Jewish student numbers, towards achieving a 'well-rounded class' (*Ibid,* p. 394-6). The rationale here was not simply to avoid violence, but to dispel Princeton's image as a conservative and exclusive institution. In 1968-69 it expanded its efforts through outreach to other minority populations including Hispanic, Native American, and 'disadvantaged' white students (*Ibid*, p. 398).

A former senior administrator I spoke with framed the racial diversification strategy as a moral issue rather than an effort to prevent violence. He explained that:

> there surely was a slow enlightenment process... There was a genuine feeling [that] a moral imperative was involved... I think *Brown v. Board of Education* made a huge impact... There was a real sense of the values involved... I would distinguish [access for African-Americans] from the women's issue, which I think is a very different issue. The arguments for equality, equal justice, equal access, equal treatment for African-Americans were so stark, [so] clear... Even the people against it could recognise we were fighting for certain kinds of moral imperatives. The movement... began out of a sense of real conscience. The amount of responding to pressure [from students] or that you had to race to catch up [with peers] was a small piece of that.[111]

This administrator countered the notion that Princeton's actions were driven by competition with peers. He also made a clear distinction between race and gender, arguing that prior to co-education one would not have suggested that women were being denied educational access since, at the time, there were many academically strong women's colleges. In contrast, historically black colleges were unable to offer a comparable education.

[110] A legacy is a close relative of an alumnus of an academic institution. Many selective private colleges and universities provide special consideration for legacies. In general this applies to the children and grandchildren of the alumnus but may also include other relations such as siblings.
[111] Administrator (former), Personal interview, March 30, 2011.

Karabel asserts that what moved Princeton towards co-education was that in the 1960s it began losing admitted students to Harvard, where male and female students took classes together. As Yale, Williams, Wesleyan, and other all-male institutions began considering co-education, Princeton administrators realised that the shifting landscape might seriously impact the college's ability to attract top male students (*Ibid*, p. 428-9). The *Patterson Report* – based on the work of a committee charged with studying the issue – came out strongly in favour of co-education not only for its utility in attracting the strongest male applicants, but also because the number of full-paying admitted students would increase (*Ibid*, p. 431-3). Though there was substantial opposition from alumni, the final decision was influenced by Yale's announcement in the fall of 1968 that it would begin admitting women.[112]

Beginning in the 1990s there was a push for internationalisation. 'Princeton has a responsibility to produce globally competent citizens... defined as a combination of substantive knowledge about international matters, an empathy with and appreciation of other cultures, foreign language proficiency, and a practical ability to function in other cultures' (Nancy Weiss Malkiel quoted in Tilghman & Eisgruber 2007). The authors added that '... in order to be a great American university, Princeton must integrate the national and international domains into a cohesive educational enterprise' (*Ibid*). The linkage between globalisation and prestige mirrored earlier rhetoric about the necessity of admitting women to maintain competitiveness. While interest in internationalisation built on earlier efforts, it took on a different urgency in the aftermath of 9/11 and the nation's renewed focus on the Middle East and the Muslim World.

Over the last four decades, Princeton has continued efforts to broaden the pool of students who apply and are admitted to the university. A century ago, like many of its peers, it drew students from a small pool of elite private schools in the Northeast (Axtell 2006, p. 119). The class that will graduate in 2015 has representatives from almost every state.[113] This class also represents broad racial diversity: 19% of students identify as Asian American, 7% as Hispanic, 7% as African-American, 5% as multiracial and 11% as international students.[114] The enrolment

[112] Although gender integration occurred in the 1960s, it was several decades before the last private Eating Club allowed female members – in 1991, when its male-only status was deemed unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court (Stanley 1990). The Trustees hired the university's first female president, Shirley Tilghman, in 2001.

[113] Despite this geographical diversity, students from New Jersey, California, New York, Pennsylvania, and Florida account for 47% of the class; 15% alone come from the university's home state. See Statistics for Enrolled Class of 2015 at: http://www.princeton.edu/admission/applyingforadmission/admission_statistics. Accessed on May 20, 2012.

[114] *Ibid.*

of low-income and first-generation students increased dramatically after 2001 when all student loans were eliminated. The first gender-balanced class was admitted in 2007. In addition to admitting more diverse students, Princeton has created campus resources to support these students including cultural centres for racial minorities, women, the LGBT community, and international staff and students.[115] It also provides academic programmes of particular interest to these students, including African-American Studies, Gender and Sexuality Studies, and Judaic Studies.

6.2. EMERGENCE OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY

In this section I will attempt to answer my first research question, namely 'How did university-based Muslim Chaplaincy develop?' My research revealed that although they consulted with Muslim students at each stage of the process, ORL administrators were the primary force in developing Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton. One staff person explained, 'it was administratively initiated because 9/11 happened just as we were hiring [a new Dean].'[116] An Affiliated Chaplain concurred, saying that the Muslim Chaplaincy position seemed to be based on 'strong, strong leadership from the top.'[117] This was echoed by an MSA board leader who explained that, 'I think in many cases it's really the university's effort to help us out... You know sometimes it's even unprovoked...'[118] To illustrate his point, he gave me the example of the administration approaching the MSA about building a *wu'du* facility:

> There certainly wasn't a demand for that here. Apparently they came and [said] 'what if we did this'? I mean, personally I don't think it was that necessary but if they're willing to do it then... it's certainly a nice gesture on their part.[119]

[115] The Carl Fields Center, founded in 1971 as the Third World Center and later named for the Ivy League's first African-American administrator, provides training, social programmes and education opportunities focused on African-American and other racial minority students. Similar and more recently created cultural centres exist for women and the LGBT community. Each centre has a physical space, two staff members, and a programme budget. There is also the Davis International Center, which has ten staff; in addition to undergraduates it provides significant services to graduate students, non-student scholars, and spouses of international visitors. The university also offers several academic enrichment programmes, generally offered in the summer, targeted to racial minorities, women, low-income or first generation college students.

[116] Senior administrator, Personal interview, September 16, 2008.

[117] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, August 27, 2008.

[118] Student, Personal interview, December 12, 2007.

[119] *Ibid.*

I did not surface evidence that Muslim student advocacy had been a primary catalyst for the development of Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton. However, students were quickly engaged on the topic, widely consulted about the benefit of the role, and actively included as search committee members for both the pilot and permanent positions.

Since the MSA's inception in 1995, the ORL had been supporting it in a financial and advisory capacity.[120] Although no official numbers were kept, when I began my research in 2007 there were approximately 200-300 Muslim students on campus; one third were estimated to be graduate students, many of them from foreign countries. The majority of students were American born children of South Asian and Middle Eastern immigrants. According to my informants, about 30-50 students participated in MSA activities on a weekly basis; their numbers doubled during Ramadan and other holidays.[121]

Some of my interviewees linked the origin of Muslim Chaplaincy to the events of September 11, 2001. One administrator explained that, on the day of the terrorist attacks:

> the Muslim students had responded to the invitation that went out immediately from the Episcopal Chaplain that they could use his house (which was where the Chaplaincy was based) as a safe place. Many Muslim students went there that day and then also began to congregate at the Office of Religious Life where there has been (for some time) a small Muslim prayer room.[122]

This experience seemed to have revealed to university administrators that Muslim students lacked, and might benefit from, formal pastoral support. At this time, the university was in the midst of a search for a new Dean of Religious Life. In the February 2002 press release announcing the appointment of Thomas Breidenthal, President Tilghman said that, 'The tragedies of September 11 have ... reminded us of the central role that is played on this campus by the dean of religious life.'[123] The document also noted the new Dean 'has worked throughout his career to promote an essential dialogue among Christians, Jews and Muslims'.[124]

Breidenthal served as Dean of Religious Life between 2002 and 2007. He and others explained that his responsibilities and mandate from the senior administration had included serious

[120] Technically, there was a separate Graduate MSA, but the groups generally functioned as a single organisation, with two representatives from the GMSA serving on the MSA board.
[121] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, August 27, 2008 and Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, October 22, 2008.
[122] Senior administrator, Personal interview, September 16, 2008.
[123] See Princeton press release: http://www.princeton.edu/pr/news/01/q4/1001-religiouslife.htm. Accessed on May 20, 2012.
[124] *Ibid.*

attention to Muslim student issues.[125] To make progress on this front, he used a search for a new Assistant Dean to recruit someone who would take responsibility for strengthening support for Muslim, Hindu, and other non-Judeo Christian religious communities. In 2003 he hired Paul Raushenbush, a former Baptist Chaplain at Columbia University, to lead this work. Raushenbush came with a strong personal commitment to interfaith issues.[126] A professor described Raushenbush as 'a crucial part of the story' because of his inclination and self-professed desire to be a 'representative of the unrepresented.'[127]

When I asked about the origin of Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton, Breidenthal mentioned a 2002 *New York Times* article that introduced the concept and its emergence at a number of universities including Mount Holyoke and Georgetown.[128] He shared this idea with the MSA and the university administration during the first year of his leadership. There was general interest in the idea, but Breidenthal and his staff did not know how such a model would be received at Princeton, nor did the ORL have the financial resources to support an additional staff member.

In May 2005 the ORL hosted a session to explore the possibility of Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton. Breidenthal invited a number of key figures in the nascent field – including Dawud Fricke, then Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers University; Ingrid Mattson, Director of Islamic Chaplaincy at the Hartford Seminary; Sohaib Sultan, then Muslim Chaplain at Trinity College (later Princeton's first full-time chaplain); Ahmed Kobeisy, Muslim Chaplain at Syracuse; representatives from the Muslim Chaplaincy at Georgetown; and members of the National MSA—to provide input and advice about how Princeton should approach this issue. These experts engaged in an all-day conversation with ORL staff, Muslim students, and Princeton administrators. In recalling the event, Sultan described a

> breakthrough when [someone]... proposed the argument that... the university... does end up putting quite a bit of money into various religious communities... through the fact that the religious spaces for these communities are on campus... [including] the huge enormous chapel... If you add all these costs together, it's actually a good amount of money that the university puts towards these other religious communities... [Why not] make some of that money

[125] Thomas Breidenthal, Former Dean of Religious Life, Personal interview, November 25, 2008 and Senior administrator, Personal interview, September 16, 2008.
[126] Raushenbush is a great grandson of Louis Brandeis, America's first Jewish Supreme Court Justice, and also of Walter Rauschenbusch, a Baptist minister who was a key figure in the Social Gospel movement (Raushenbush 2009). Raushenbush left Princeton in 2011.
[127] Stanley Katz, Faculty member, Princeton University, Personal interview, November 3, 2008.
[128] Thomas Breidenthal, Former Dean of Religious Life, Personal interview, November 25, 2008. The article was Goldscheider (2002).

> accessible for hiring a Muslim Chaplain?... I remember being in the room and suddenly light bulbs went off.[129]

Breidenthal explained that, 'I don't think that we could have proceeded without that kind of insight, that kind of help, and essentially the support and the affirmation of what we [we]re trying to do.'[130] Eventually, ORL funded a half-time, pilot Muslim Chaplain for the 2006-2007 academic year.

The search committee for this role included Breidenthal, Raushenbush, and Stanley Katz, a Professor at the Woodrow Wilson School and former Chair of the CJL. It also included several Muslim students. The job description emphasised the relationship of the chaplain to the campus Muslim community and listed common duties expected of the individual in this position:

> [the] Muslim Chaplain will be responsible for and to the Muslim community of students, faculty and staff at Princeton University. The chaplain's duties will include ministering (including leading of worship), counselling, advocacy, (informal) teaching, and programmes aimed at enriching and enhancing the Muslim experience at Princeton.

The university hired Khalid Latif – a charismatic then-24-year-old son of Pakistani immigrants – to fill this role. Latif had grown up in New Jersey, not far from Princeton, and received a bachelor's degree in Middle Eastern Studies from NYU. He had completed some coursework at the Hartford Seminary. During his time at Princeton, he continued to serve as a part-time volunteer Muslim Chaplain at his alma mater (Bernstein 2006, p. 21-2).

Latif made a powerful impression on the Princeton community. His wisdom, knowledge, and charm won him support with ORL, other administrators, and Muslim students, who were energised by the young and diminutive man who styled himself as an Imam. Breidenthal felt that:

> ... it made all the difference in the world [to] actually have a chaplain there. I think it just catapulted the Muslim students into a new place. They were very happy and attendance at *jum'ah* rose right away, although Khalid was very careful not to take the place of other people who had exercised leadership of worship. But his presence as a teacher, as an expert, as a visible symbol of [the] university's welcome to this community I think was very, very powerful. And as

[129] Sohaib Sultan, Muslim Chaplain, Princeton University, Personal interview, April 16, 2012.
[130] Thomas Breidenthal, Former Dean of Religious Life, Personal interview, November 25, 2008.

> soon as he was there, I knew we had done the right thing in creating this position.[131]

When I asked university administrators about Latif's accomplishments, several of them cited the trip he organised with Rabbi Julie Roth of the CJL. They took eleven Jewish and nine Muslim students to Southern Spain during spring break 2007, to expose them to the rich history of Muslim and Jewish co-existence in Arab Iberia. A semester-long class co-taught by both religious leaders preceded the trip.

The only criticism I heard of Latif was that, like some observant Muslims, he refrained from physical contact with members of the opposite sex. This was most clearly manifest in his unwillingness to shake hands with women. Breidenthal explained:

> That sounds like a small thing but actually [it] was a big deal for some women administrators who greeted him with a hand outstretched and he did not respond... So I think that one big thing that I learned was that there needs to be a lot of training and teaching that goes with any kind of new cultural encounter, and people have to change and they have to learn new ways to express their respect for one another...[132]

At the same time, Breidenthal expressed that Latif could have been more flexible in his approach, '[Latif] was perhaps displaying his youth somewhat in a certain lack of flexibility around this matter, a kind of assumption that this is the way he expressed... himself and that his gift was to teach people about that.[133] A Muslim faculty member took a different view of the response to Latif's refusal to shake hands with women. This individual felt that:

> ...although Princeton was committed to having a Muslim Chaplain, they certainly didn't want a Muslim Chaplain that wasn't committed to the kind of levels of tolerance or diversity that Princeton also stood for... What was very clear is that there are certain expectations of Muslims. We will tolerate [you]. We will respect you. We will incorporate you. But you're not going to sit here and implement a Taliban system of governance. Or at least make women feel uncomfortable. This is not going to be tolerated.[134]

To my surprise, the issue of shaking hands with members of the opposite sex came up at several institutions. At a peer school, a willingness to shake hands with women became a litmus test for

[131] *Ibid.*
[132] *Ibid.*
[133] *Ibid.*
[134] Faculty member, Personal interview, April 23, 2009.

administrators and female Muslim students about the type of male Muslim Chaplain that would be acceptable at their university.[135]

Despite this issue, the experience with Latif was so positive that ORL recommended and funded a full-time, permanent Muslim Chaplaincy, which was approved by the central university administration and paid for by ORL from its own budget.[136] The decision to extend from half-time to full-time was partially influenced by students who recounted having trouble connecting with Latif since he commuted from New York. In particular, he had limited availability in the evenings and on weekends when students were most likely to hold events, *iftars* during Ramadan, and be available for counselling and pastoral care. It would also have been difficult to attract and relocate top candidates for a part-time role.

Latif's academic year at Princeton (fall 2006- spring 2007) was one of transition for the ORL. Breidenthal was appointed Episcopal Bishop of Southern Ohio and left in January 2007. Former Dean of the Chapel Frederick Borsch (who had served from 1981-1988) returned to Princeton as Interim Dean while a successor was selected. In the spring of 2007 Latif was asked to stay on in a full-time capacity, but he declined in favour of a full-time, paid chaplaincy position at NYU. He also accepted an additional role as Muslim Chaplain to the New York City Police Department (Bruinius 2009).

In fall 2007 Alison Boden – former Dean of Rockefeller Memorial Chapel at the University of Chicago – began her tenure as the new Dean of Religious Life and Dean of the Chapel. She maintained Breidenthal's commitment to a full-time Muslim Chaplain, and launched a search to replace Latif. The position description for this full-time job was more expansive than the earlier version; it emphasised the plurality of Islam at Princeton, in seeking a 'person dedicated to nurturing Muslims from every manner of religious commitment and expression... who will support and encourage the growth of all Muslims, regardless of her or his own religious perspective or lifestyle.' The document also indicated a desire for a leader with a 'long-term vision for Princeton's Muslim community, with extensive skills in institution-building and development,' a 'commitment to interfaith dialogue and partnerships...and a profound respect for the faiths of others'.

[135] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 10, 2009; Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, April 10, 2009; University Chaplain, Personal interview, April 11, 2009.
[136] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, March 27, 2012.

The search committee included Boden, Raushenbush, Katz, and six students.[137] Katz described it as a 'student-dominated' process with unusually significant and diverse student representation. He described Boden as deferential to student opinion, more so than Breidenthal in the previous search. In selecting finalists, there was strong convergence. Katz noted that students

> didn't primarily want a scholar [be]cause they kept saying 'we know who the scholars are, and we can invite them to give lectures on Friday'... They really wanted someone who was going to be a pastor. They didn't use that word, but that's how I understood [it]... We did talk a lot about that.[138]

The committee members I spoke with concurred that the primary goal of the search was to identify a chaplain that would best serve student-defined needs.

The committee selected three candidates for campus visits in the spring of 2008; the leading candidate took a similar role at another institution. The ORL reopened the search and the committee recommended that Boden hire Sohaib Sultan, then joint Muslim Chaplain at Wesleyan and Trinity, who had not been a candidate in the first round of the search. Like Latif, Sultan was a 20-something second-generation Pakistani-American and part-time student at the Hartford Seminary. He had previously served as a part-time Muslim Chaplain Fellow at Yale University. He began at Princeton in August 2008.

In his first year, Sultan spent much of his time building relationships with administrators, and engaging Muslim students in their context and on their terms. He organised several internal conversations to begin long-term goal setting for the Muslim community. I was particularly struck by his diplomatic skills when there was an outcry from some community members over the MSA's co-sponsorship of a silent vigil in connection with the 2008/2009 Gaza Conflict. Sultan adeptly defused the tension and hosted student dialogues to discuss these issues. His physical proximity to campus made it easy for him to quickly respond to this situation, which developed during the winter holiday break.

In the context of a long-standing policy not to pay denomination-specific chaplains, the ORL made an exception in hiring both Latif and Sultan as employees of the university. In contrast, the Affiliated Christian Chaplains and the Rabbis were paid employees of their local or national

[137] I asked several individuals why a Muslim faculty member or Islamic scholar was not asked to serve on the search committee. Some suggested there were no appropriate Muslim faculty members/Islamic scholars and others suggested the particular value of Katz serving on the committee as continuity from the previous search.

[138] Stanley Katz, Faculty member, Princeton University, Personal interview, November 3, 2008.

religious denominations.[139] Several explanations – mirroring those I discussed in Chapter 5 ('Muslim Chaplaincy in American Higher Education') – were offered by administrators for this discrepancy. First, American Islam had no official clergy, codified clerical training, or central 'sending agency' that deployed and supervised Muslim Chaplains. As such, there was no one to send and support a Muslim Chaplain. Second, the local Muslim community was not organised or unified enough to fund the chaplaincy themselves. In fact, most community members did not understand the role or benefit of a Muslim Chaplain, nor did they have enough of a connection to Princeton to feel responsible for its students. Third, as one administrator explained, 'through the research [Princeton] did, they didn't think they could raise the money from their [own Muslim] alumni base [since] Muslims are hesitant to give money to Muslim-specific charities because the [donor] might be mislabelled as radical'.[140, 141] Finally an administrator suggested that while these Affiliated Chaplains 'would love it if [ORL] would help underwrite their ministries... they also know that they [would] lose their autonomy' which would be 'a very big change' since 'their theological positions are not [necessarily] in keeping with [the] university's non-discrimination policies.'[142] This individual thought it unlikely that these organisations would have been willing to compromise their theological positions in exchange for financial support.[143] To make clear the distinction between the Muslim Chaplain and the Affiliated Chaplains, the new full-time role was titled Coordinator for Muslim Life.[144]

As I mentioned earlier, the creation of a paid Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton led indirectly to the development of a Hindu Chaplaincy. After the successful Muslim Chaplaincy pilot programme, Hindu students approached the administration about a Hindu Chaplain (Pease-Kerr 2008). Advocates pointed out that the number of Hindu students was roughly comparable to the number of Muslim students. As a result, in the 2007-2008 academic year, the ORL hired Vineet Chander as a part-time Hindu Chaplain. After one year, he accepted a permanent and full-time position as Coordinator for Hindu Life.[145] To my knowledge, Chander remains the only full-time Hindu Chaplain at an American college or university.

[139] In truth, Muslim Chaplains were granted the second exemption to the rule of not financially supporting denominational religious life staff. The first exception to that policy came with the university's significant financial support of the CJL and its ongoing commitment to pay the salary of one of the centre's administrators (though not the Rabbi).
[140] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, August 27, 2008.
[141] Research by the American Civil Liberties Union and other organisations had documented a post-9/11 chilling effect on Muslim charitable giving (2009).
[142] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, November 3, 2008.
[143] *Ibid.*
[144] Sohaib Sultan, Muslim Chaplain, Princeton University, Personal interview, August 27, 2008.
[145] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, August 27, 2008.

In Chapter 9 ('Discussion and Conclusions') I explore the future evolution and potential impact of Muslim Chaplaincy, drawing heavily from the Princeton case study. Of particular relevance to this case are trends towards the augmentation of bureaucratic and administrative responsibilities for Muslim Chaplains, pressure to provide support tailored to Muslim sects or sub-communities, and community advocacy to create stand-alone Muslim student centres.

6.3. ROLES OF THE MUSLIM CHAPLAIN

In the previous section, I described the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton. In this section, I answer my second research question, which concerns the roles that the Muslim Chaplain played at the university. While this section is based largely on conversations I had with Sohaib Sultan, the current Muslim Chaplain, it also draws on conversations with other current and former Religious Life staff members, students, and faculty members.

According to a Religious Life staff member,

> this is a position that's first and foremost to enable and energise and lift up our Muslim community....[students want] somebody to come in and say, 'What do you students value? What do you want? Where do you want to go? Let me think about how I can enable that... We absolutely wanted somebody who would be accessible to every Muslim student. Our students wanted that too... [We] just really wanted somebody who... would earn the trust of everyone in the community right away as an authority, but a non-judgemental one. Who you could really talk to [about] your issues... and who would hear them without giving you a lecture, wagging a finger, anything like that... I think the motivation here has really been about student welfare. Before [considering] staff, faculty, [or] any greater agenda that [we] might have about having religion taken seriously... it was genuinely starting with student voices.[146]

As this informant described, there was a particular emphasis on a chaplain that was inclusive, approachable, and non judgemental.

Sultan estimated that he spent roughly 60% of his time serving Muslim students. Of the six key types of such support I outlined in Chapter 5 ('Muslim Chaplaincy in American Higher Education'), his three biggest responsibilities were to: (1) provide pastoral care, (2) lead and facilitate religious services, and (3) organise programmes for the Muslim student community.

[146] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, November 3, 2008.

First, pastoral care involved one-on-one student counselling. Sultan explained that these discussions often centred on doubts about faith, romantic relationships, and interfaith relations. Beyond that, students turned to the chaplain to discuss a broad range of issues including family, health, academics, career choices, and social life. Sultan also played a special role in translating American norms for international students on a similarly wide set of topics. He explained that the type of pastoral care he provided at Princeton was different from the formal, clinical approach he had learned in seminary. Instead of making an appointment, students often cornered him at prayers or community events to ask him for advice. He described this as 'counselling on the fly', and it took place for the limited time the student had available, and without notice or warning. Second, Sultan cited research, which concludes that for Muslim-Americans, the Friday *khutbah* was the primary source of knowledge about Islam. For this reason, he spent a substantial portion of his student-focused time preparing for and coaching others to give *khutbahs*. Of the four *khutbahs* performed each month, Sultan prepared one himself and invited a graduate student, an undergraduate student, and a speaker from outside the community to deliver the remaining three. He spent time coaching and preparing undergraduate students both on the content and presentation of their *khutbahs*. Third, one of Sultan's roles was to organise speakers, panels, dinners, and other events. While the preparation work was not taxing, he remarked about the significant time commitment involved in administrative matters. He had two student helpers that each worked ten hours a week on these types of administrative projects.

In addition to the areas above, where Sultan spent most of his student-focused energies, he devoted time to the other three roles I discussed in Chapter 5 ('Muslim Chaplaincy in American Higher Education'), namely (1) advisor to the MSA, (2) educator, and (3) liaison to the administration. First, Sultan worked closely with the MSA. Unlike some of his peers at other institutions, he directly controlled the MSA budget and played an active role in approving and supporting its major activities. The considerable academic commitments of Princeton students impacted the MSA's level of activity, follow-through, and responsiveness. Sultan discussed the important balance of both advising and supporting the MSA, but resisting the urge to work on its behalf. He also intimated that, although his financial oversight of the MSA allowed for greater coordination and communication, it may have limited students' opportunities for autonomous decision making. Second, Sultan explained that his education—like his pastoral care—was often provided in an informal context. When he arrived at Princeton he had anticipated hosting *halaqas* and sponsoring non-credit courses. He soon realised that only a small number of Princeton students had the time and interest to commit to such extended

activities. More recently, he commissioned experts on and off campus to provide mini-courses on specific topics. Third, Sultan spent time working with fellow administrators at Princeton to ensure that the needs of Muslim students were being met. For example, he developed relationships with colleagues in Dining Services to educate them about the dietary restrictions of Muslim students, advocate for increased halal food options, and request accommodations during the month of Ramadan. When necessary, he also met with colleagues in Counseling and Psychological Services, Athletics, and Housing.

While the majority of students I spoke with felt well-served by the Muslim Chaplain, not all of them saw the creation of this role as wholly positive. One student acknowledged that having a chaplain had benefits and drawbacks.

> Now that Sohaib has come, it's been more institutionalised. It's not as random and... we have an institution now that he is here. But it has taken away a little bit of the student creativity... It's a mixed bag. [Now] we have the funding and we have more resources, but... he has taken up some of the roles that we had to play before. I guess it freed us up to do different things. So I feel like now we are really focusing on the social... more than educational role since he has come... Recruiting speakers and things like that. Before we would have to do that [on our own]; now... he has more resources, so he can get bigger names and more substantial Muslim scholars and just different thinkers that we didn't have access to before. So I think that's definitely a positive.[147]

This student pointed to a new division of labour where the chaplain handled educational and religious programming while students focused on social events. The financial resources available to the chaplain provided him with the power to set or influence the programmatic agenda. The natural tension between the work of the chaplain and the work of the MSA is something Sultan acknowledged.

One Princeton student described an experience with a Muslim Chaplain at another institution, who had a

> very negative effect on the ways students would practice Islam. I told you about how vibrant the community of students was before he came, and then his presence, while a relief in some ways for the work that students had to do, was also a negative in some ways. He took away a sense of diversity [t]o what students end[ed] up coordinating... There shouldn't be one dominant position or interpretation... it creates a homogeneity that I think is damaging to students' exposure and intellectual growth.[148]

[147] Student, Personal interview, February 26, 2009.
[148] Student, Personal interview, September 16, 2008.

That experience shaped the student's perspective on the proper role of a Muslim Chaplain. In the Princeton context the student felt it was:

> important to set in place limits on the chaplain's power and scope of authority... for coordinating social activities and religious activities. Because I think the chaplain has [the] potential to have a huge impact on the way students think about Islam. He leads *halaqas*, gives the *khutbahs* or coordinates them, so that's a huge measure of authority and [role in] determining what students are hearing about the religion. [Once he arrived] the student group itself became a little bit apathetic because they kn[e]w that they could rely on the chaplain to do everything. So they no longer had to use their creative energy...[149]

The power of the chaplain in determining the activities of the MSA and influencing the beliefs of its members was clear.

Beyond supporting Muslim students, Sultan estimated that he spent the remaining 40% of his time serving the university and broader community. He identified his two most significant commitments as interfaith activities and engaging non-Muslims about Islam. Sultan's interfaith work at Princeton was different from his prior activities at Trinity and Wesleyan, where he had been partially responsible for the college's general interfaith programming. Given that Princeton had an Associate Dean with primary oversight of interfaith work, Sultan was able to concentrate on interfaith work with Muslim students. For example, he continued his predecessor's strong relationship with the CJL, and he co-led a non-credit, six-week course about Jewish and Muslim perspectives on war, reconciliation, and peace. In partnership with the Episcopal Chaplain, he co-facilitated a multi-week dialogue between five Muslim and five Episcopal students. Beyond interfaith activities, Sultan pursued education and engagement with non-Muslims, primarily through public dialogues. Last academic year he hosted a conversation about oppression, between Princeton Aquinas scholar Eric Gregory and Oxford's Tariq Ramadan. The previous year he had organised one about black suffering, between Princeton philosopher Cornel West and then University of Michigan Islamic scholar Sherman Jackson. In addition to large-scale public events, Sultan pursued more intimate opportunities to advance understanding about Islam. He regularly participated in or moderated conversations about Islam or Muslims; guest lectured in academic courses; and developed relationships with a number of non-Muslim students who were interested in religion and spirituality. With interfaith activities and non-Muslim engagement taking up the majority of his university and community work, Sultan spent limited time working with Muslim alumni and engaging with the parents of Muslim students.

[149] *Ibid.*

While Sultan had not originally expected it to be a notable part of his portfolio, over the years his involvement with the Muslim community in central New Jersey grew substantially. He estimated that about one third of the regular attendees at *jum'ah* prayers were local community members. These individuals also attended many of the public events and classes that he organised, since local mosques did not have the resources to put on similar events. Sultan found this to be an unexpected and enjoyable new frontier for campus Muslim Chaplaincy. He contrasted his experience at Princeton with those of his colleagues in more remote locations where they were often the only Muslim religious authority in the area. In his case, local community members were attending his prayers and events despite having other options.

6.4. RATIONALES TO HIRE A MUSLIM CHAPLAIN

The previous section described the roles played by the Muslim Chaplain at Princeton. In this section I answer my third research question: why did Princeton hire a Muslim Chaplain?

I asked this question of many informants and commonly heard two answers. Some considered the creation of Muslim Chaplaincy to be a response to 9/11, though no one could explain why it had emerged several years after the terrorist attacks. Others considered it to be a reaction to the growing Muslim student population on campus, but there was neither a reliable census of that population (and its growth) nor an understanding of when it might have reached a tipping point that would justify a chaplain. These simple explanations could not describe what made this initiative—among many competing demands—a priority for university administrators. Historically, 'minority' students have advocated for innovation through protest, alumni pressure, public exposure, or the threat of such things (Yamane 2001, p. 20-21; Rojas 2007, p. 177). Muslim Chaplaincy did not conform to that model, but rather to one that had become increasing common in recent years. As institutions have become more responsive to student needs and desires, public student advocacy tactics have been replaced with earlier and greater engagement between students and administrators to agree on joint solutions to expressed needs.

Although I was interested in exploring the intent behind administrative decisions, this was not a universal concern. In response to this question, one student provided a pragmatic answer.

> Why are they being accommodating?... I don't think it matters whether it's symbolic or it's earnest or not. I think what matters is what they are doing and how it affects the students.[150]

In spite of this perspective, I believe that intent has real consequences for outcomes, and based on my research I uncovered four rationales that motivated the creation of Princeton's Muslim Chaplaincy. First, university administrators displayed a genuine (if somewhat paternalistic) desire to support Muslim students and provide them with a level of support comparable to Christian and Jewish students. This included an acknowledgment of the particular challenges faced by Muslim students in the university's distinct social culture and the broader society. Second, there was a desire to overcome Princeton's historical intolerance, which included pronounced anti-Semitism, resistance to co-education, and slow adoption of racial integration. Third, exposure to Islam provided by the Muslim Chaplain increased the awareness and cultural competency of non-Muslim students, and potentially aided those with aspirations for careers in government, private sector, and academia. Finally, hiring a Muslim Chaplain was a strategy to make Princeton attractive to top students from all backgrounds, which was critical to maintaining the university's academic reputation and financial standing. I describe each of these four rationales in greater detail below.

6.4.1. SUPPORT MUSLIM STUDENTS

A number of administrators and students I spoke with believed that the primary impetus for the creation of a Muslim Chaplaincy was genuine and deep moral concern for the well-being and inclusion of Muslim students on campus. According to one administrator, Breidenthal had hired Raushenbush with an explicit mandate to provide 'special attention to the Muslim students and the Hindu students, and any religious minority... [that] didn't have an adult supervisor on campus'.[151] Another administrator framed that commitment within the larger obligation of the university to '...recognise diversity in all its constellation of characteristics', and an acknowledgement that 'it's one thing to recruit students here, but quite another to provide the supportive structures and programmes and mentors who will enable students to feel like they [have] some place to go'.[152] That commitment was tied to the distinct culture of the university:

> Princeton was a place defined very much by the affinity groups with which people were affiliated. So their Eating Club or their sports team or their social organisation was, in a way, a definition of who people [were]. And students who

[150] Student, Personal interview, February 26, 2009.
[151] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, December 12, 2007.
[152] Senior administrator, Personal interview, September 16, 2008.

> *weren't* a member of those key groups... were often defined by what they were not.[153]

Formal support for Muslim Chaplaincy was based on an understanding that observant Muslim students might feel excluded from, or marginalised within, Princeton's traditional social scene which revolved around alcohol, sports, and sex. It was also a recognition of the benefit of a university-employed adult advisor.

That some administrators articulated a desire to advance social justice on behalf of Muslim students revealed some level of paternalism. For Sue Anne Steffey Morrow, Former Associate Dean of Religious Life at Princeton, the way to support students was providing them with an adult guide:

> We wanted to support and strengthen these Muslim students... We were more advocating for them than they were for themselves... We worked very hard to cultivate their sense of belonging... So you had to sort of support and strengthen them to give them their identity... So I think it's the university model of student groups [which] grow and grow and then they need an adult... The thing [that's] so important is [for] the adult to come in and support and strengthen them. Not to tell them what to do, but to support and strengthen the work. I think that's what the chaplaincy really is.[154]

ORL staff members, and later Muslim Chaplains, were critical in helping Muslim students to integrate into the larger campus community and prepare—like all of their fellow students—for leadership roles in society. For Morrow, the social justice framework was undergirded by her personal religious ideology:

> It's theological for me. I believe out of my own Christian faith that God wants everybody at the party... It's the Christian thing to do. And then we are much better [for it]. My faith is stronger if everybody is there... that pluralism is what is beautiful. It's really—it's aesthetic—it's not just theological.[155]

She argued that providing chaplaincy and other support to Muslim students was actually a way for her to heed a religious impulse for compassion and equality. In some ways this echoed the Catholic religious motivation for Muslim Chaplaincy at Georgetown expressed in the previous chapter.

---

[153] *Ibid.*

[154] Sue Anne Steffey Morrow, Former Associate Dean of Religious Life, Princeton University, Personal interview, April 24, 2009.

[155] *Ibid.*

While many administrators described supporting Muslim students as the primary goal of Princeton's efforts to hire a Muslim Chaplain, there were some who questioned these rationales. A student with experience of Muslim Chaplaincy at several institutions provided her perspective:

> So *why* are they hiring [Muslim Chaplains]? I think there are a number of reasons that universities want a [chaplain]... They want someone with whom *they* could interface, so interfaith relations and [an] administrative or institutional go-to person rather than going to this confused group of students with no leader. I think that that would be the primary reason, and secondary and tertiary reasons would be student concerns like counselling or pastoral services... and religious services and that sort of thing... even student demand. I don't think universities are responsive in that way to students just [be]cause the [students] want [something]. I think [having a Muslim Chaplain] was in the university's best interest for its own outreach and conversation efforts.[156]

This student rejected the notion that Muslim Chaplaincy was primarily about student welfare. She challenged the notion that student demands were in themselves sufficient to warrant administrative action.

As evidence for her belief that Muslim Chaplaincy was not created to meet student concerns, she critiqued the process by which student representatives were chosen to serve on the search committee.

> ...I don't even know how the committee selection took place. I just woke up one day and I had an email in my box that said, 'here's the committee and we're accepting commentary on the chaplains' job talks after the process had already started and after the short listing had already been done... Princeton has a daily [student news]paper. Just put an ad, run an ad in there for one week, saying 'if anyone's interested, here's what we're doing', including non-Muslims since there are non-Muslims on the committee too from the university because, again, this whole interfaith thing is going to be one aspect of it... I hope that they actually did take people's concerns into account, but ... [the] whole thing to me seems like a bad process and a non-transparent process.[157]

This student explained that those chosen to serve on the search committee were MSA insiders, which she did not feel 'was representative of the gamut of Muslims on campus, let alone the MSA.'[158] Her comments suggested that the selection of students was either driven by convenience and expediency or structured to maintain administrative control of the process.

---

[156] Student, Personal interview, September 16, 2008.
[157] *Ibid.*
[158] *Ibid.*

6.4.2. OVERCOME HISTORICAL REPUTATION

The concern for, and commitment to, Muslim students was linked by some interviewees to Princeton's well-known historical exclusion of religious minorities, especially Jewish students. One informant explained:

> Most of the Ivies were Protestant bastions where a Roman Catholic or Jewish student would be a religious minority... in some ways it goes back to... how did Jewish life come to be on campus?... Because oftentimes Muslims look to Jews and say, 'okay, they figured out some way to have a really strong [community]'... In response to its anti-Semitic past [Princeton] decided, 'okay we are going to create a Center for Jewish Life and in part pay for it. ...We're going to atone for our sins'...[159]

This perspective provided a broader historical context for support of Muslim students linked to a desire not to repeat past moral failures.

Decades after the anti-Semitism of the early to middle 20th century, Princeton continued to suffer in its ability to recruit as many Jewish students as its East Coast peers. This had become a source of concern for the Admissions Office and senior administrators.[160] While resources for, and tolerance of Jewish students at Princeton had dramatically improved, one administrator told me that the Jewish community still viewed the university negatively. As evidence, this individual explained that Princeton's undergraduate population was 11% Jewish, in comparison with 26% of Harvard undergraduates and 30% of Yale undergraduates.[161]

I believe the historical legacy of anti-Semitism informed the university's response to Muslim students in the early 21st century. Princeton did not want to repeat its discriminatory legacy, both for its moral repugnance and for its potential impact on the ability of the institution to recruit Muslim students in the future. An ORL staff member described the university's desire to

> [be] pro-active...in serving an important constituency. In some ways, that meant [looking at] some of the considerations that went into creating the opportunity for the Center for Jewish Life. Let us work proactively, *not* wait a decade or two decades for... whatever body to ... figure out how to train [Muslim] Chaplains [and] send them...[162]

[159] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, December 12, 2007.
[160] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, August 27, 2008.
[161] *Ibid* and see: http://reformjudaismmag.org/_kd/Items/actions.cfm?action=Show&item_id=1380&destination=ShowItem. Accessed on May 20, 2012.
[162] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, December 12, 2007.

Evidence of this aspiration to be proactive could be seen in the act of creating a university-supported Muslim Chaplaincy.

This desire was not limited to religious minorities, but included a broader acknowledgment about Princeton's long history of exclusion of women and racial minorities and a desire to actively present the institution as a welcoming place for all types of students. One student referred to this

> larger framework of diversity that the university administration is pursuing... President Tilghman has emphasised... hiring... from minority groups and that kind of thing... I have seen it in my department... it's a much more diverse department compared to when I came here... That kind of policy of diversity has been actively pursued on campus...[163]

For this student, inclusion had less to do with Princeton's historical reputation and more to do with creating environments where all students felt supported.

Although the rhetoric of tolerance was widespread, there were also limits about the kind of Islam that was acceptable. For example, Latif's refusal to shake hands with female colleagues was perceived of as sexist, not as a legitimate religiously-motivated practice.[164] As a faculty member explained:

> And so I think [that] although Princeton was committed to having a Muslim Chaplain, they certainly didn't want a Muslim Chaplain that wasn't committed to the kind of levels of tolerance or diversity that Princeton stood for... I think all-in-all that's part of the vision for the university... I mean even the diversity project or the internationalisation project, it's a project of understanding, but an understanding more-or-less on our terms... Yes we'll support democracy, but we'll only support liberal democracy. And we'll support diversity, but we'll only support liberal diversity... So how tolerant are we in terms of our diversity agenda for people who don't think the way we want them to think? The idea is we're committed to diversification so long as it promotes our ideals. And if it doesn't promote our ideals, we're better off without it. But is that, in and of itself, diversity?[165]

This quote highlighted the tension of articulating a vision of tolerance and then making judgements about what types of difference were acceptable. This professor explained that

[163] Student, Personal interview, February 26, 2009.
[164] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, March 27, 2012.
[165] Faculty member, Personal interview, April 23, 2009.

although she personally supported a liberal vision of Islam, she was troubled by the 'homogenising discourse' that rendered impotent the true notion of liberalism.[166]

6.4.3. BENEFIT NON-MUSLIM STUDENTS

The first job posting for Princeton's Muslim Chaplain described the position as 'a resource for the entire University community on matters of Islam, religious diversity, and interfaith dialogue'. This explicit role beyond the Muslim community was a recognition of the value of education about Islam. Engagement with difference was part of a larger project at Princeton, to create an atmosphere of comfort with cultural heterogeneity. An informant from a peer school said that, 'understanding Islam is now central to what it means to have a well-rounded education.'[167] A Princeton faculty member concurred, suggesting that

> all of these models, from the chaplaincy to the [overseas] exchange programs to the internationalisation agendas—especially in [the Islamic] part of [the] world—are correcting for... this realisation that this is a part of the world that we haven't culturally interacted with, exchanged with, and understood. And so it's about time that we correct for that. And I think that a lot of that is going on.[168]

After 9/11 it became clearer for Princeton students—many of whom will function at a national or international level in the worlds of finance, business, and government—that there were important benefits to having a basic awareness and appreciation of Islam.

Several interviewees framed the benefits of Muslim Chaplaincy for the broader Princeton community in terms of educating and preparing students for a globalised world. A senior administrator explained that this 'is the right time to have people of Hindu and Muslim background present on campus and provide support not only for the primary populations they're working with, but also for all of us.'[169] This need was recognised after 9/11, when

> Parents who discovered that their [child] was going to be rooming with a student from Turkey ... were demanding to move [their child]... People were lashing out at those students who were visibly members of religious communities... People didn't necessarily know who's Muslim or Hindu or whatever. But... anybody of colour was subject to questions.[170]

---

[166] *Ibid.*
[167] Janet Cooper Nelson, University Chaplain, Brown University, Personal interview, September 9, 2009.
[168] Faculty member, Personal interview, April 23, 2009.
[169] Senior administrator, Personal interview, September 16, 2008.
[170] *Ibid.*

At the same time, there was a new intellectual curiosity about Islam and Muslims in the United States and abroad. According to Sultan, 'the number of people [who] come out to hear Islam 101 or Islamic Spirituality tripled, quadrupled, ten times more. And there's no denying that that's... because it's in the news. It's always in the headlines. It's part of our conscious.'[171] This desire to learn about Islam was also reflected in the classroom, as evidenced by the explosion of Arabic language courses and increased enrolment in Near Eastern Studies at Princeton (Herschtal 2003; Zureick 2004; Benner 2007).

While many people articulated the benefits of Muslim Chaplaincy to non-Muslim students as a key goal of the initiative, my research suggested that Sultan's activities beyond Muslim student circles were modest. A structural explanation was that since Raushenbush (and later Weiner) had primary responsibility for campus-wide interfaith activities, Sultan's role was more narrowly focused on serving and representing the Muslim community. Given the limitations on his time, it was difficult for Sultan to find ways to substantively engage non-Muslim students, despite an interest in such engagement expressed in job descriptions and by ORL administrators.[172]

6.4.4. MAINTAIN PRESTIGE AND RESOURCES

One of Princeton's most valuable assets was its reputation. Failing to keep pace with peer institutions could have affected its ability to attract the brightest students, which would have serious implications for its relative prestige. Like other selective universities, Princeton spent significant resources to attract and retain the best possible students, in what was described by some as the 'admissions arms race'. This involved increasing the number of applicants, decreasing the number of admittees, and increasing the rate at which admittees accepted offers of admission (Steinberg 2011).

In this context, overlooking the needs of a particular student population could have significant consequences—as evidenced by Princeton's comparative inability to attract top Jewish students. One observer explained the potential impact of a Muslim Chaplain on the ability of Princeton to recruit students:

> ...if the [Muslim student] population is small, having a chaplain, an Imam on campus could impact, over time, the number of Muslim students who see

[171] Sohaib Sultan, Muslim Chaplain, Princeton University, Personal interview, August 27, 2008.
[172] Sohaib Sultan, Muslim Chaplain, Princeton University, Personal interview, April 16, 2012.

> Princeton as an attractive option, because it will seem... with halal food in the dining halls and a Muslim Chaplain... that the university is... providing for Muslim students.[173]

Sultan suggested that the Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton was 'to serve current students.' At the same time, he continued, 'you can attract the most intelligent Muslim students to this campus if they know that they're well accommodated and that their religion is supported here... I don't think that's a priority, but it's an element.'[174]

Regardless of the origin of Muslim Chaplaincy, it was easy to imagine admissions considerations becoming more important in the future, especially given increased provisions for Muslim students at peer institutions and the growing number of Muslim students on US campuses. Princeton's anticipatory perspective—taking action now to mitigate risk or prevent potential negative outcomes—was a theme that pervaded several aspects of Muslim Chaplaincy but was sharpest in terms of the competition with peer schools.

Taking action to manage or compensate for possible negative outcomes was informed by Princeton's history. As Morrow described, in an earlier era this had been the motivation behind the introduction of co-education and the construction of the CJL:

> ...in relation to co-education and in relation to the Center for Jewish Life, it was practical. When [former President] Robert Goheen finally pushed the two trustees over to co-education, it was because the university would 'go down' without women here. [Without] the best students, Princeton's place in the universe was not assured unless we went co-ed. So it was practical. And that was true with the Center for Jewish Life. We wanted Jewish students to want to come to Princeton.[175]

Morrow believed that the seemingly enlightened positions taken by the university were more pragmatic than idealistic.

Prestige was a comparative measure and throughout my research at Princeton professors, administrators, students, and alumni invoked what was happening at other institutions, especially other members of the Ivy League. One student explained administrative initiatives as, 'not necessarily unprovoked', but that '[administrators] see what's happening at other

[173] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, August 27, 2008.
[174] Sohaib Sultan, Muslim Chaplain, Princeton University, Personal interview, April 16, 2012.
[175] Sue Anne Steffey Morrow, Former Associate Dean of Religious Life, Princeton University, Personal interview, April 24, 2009.

universities.'[176] As a staff member myself, I knew that many major policy decisions involved benchmarking against peers. In the case of Muslim Chaplaincy, there was a genuine exchange of experience and advice between schools, which created norms and expectations about Muslim Chaplaincy and other provisions for Muslim students.

Informal sharing occurred in multiple ways, especially through regular meetings among the eight Ivy League University Chaplains. In addition, some ORL staff were members of associations such as the Association of College and University Religious Affairs and the National Association of College and University Chaplains. I believe that direct and indirect communication between administrators at different schools contributed to the synchronous creation and hiring of full-time Muslim Chaplaincies at Princeton, Yale, and Duke in the fall of 2008. My informants explained that there had been significant overlap in the applicant pools for these chaplaincies and fierce competition for the top candidates.[177]

Benchmarking and information exchange occurred among administrators and also through students, who were connected through various networks including the National MSA. For example, a request by female Muslim students for limited, women-only hours in one of Harvard's three student athletic facilities (MacFarquhar 2008) influenced a Muslim student at Princeton to ask for women-only hours at the swimming pool.[178] Some students used the support provided to Muslim students at peer institutions to reassure administrators about the value or validity of their requests, and also to suggest that inaction could result in a competitive disadvantage. It is important to acknowledge that this pressure was highest at schools which were most clearly in competition with each other, and also that the pressure could best be applied at schools that had the resources to respond.

Beyond attracting and supporting students, the vibrancy of Muslim student life could also have an impact on alumni engagement and fundraising. An administrator described the relationship in the Jewish context:

> ... the vibrancy of Jewish life on the Princeton campus... often energises the alumni to be reconnected to Princeton. It excites them. It does have fundraising potential for the university... the university recognises the ways in which it's mutually beneficial ... for Jewish life to be strong here both in the ways that it

[176] Student, Personal interview, December 12, 2007.
[177] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, November 3, 2008 and Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 10, 2009.
[178] Student, Personal interview, February 26, 2009.

> serves Jewish students directly and the way that it serves the larger university...[179]

An engaging Muslim student experience could affect future fundraising from Muslim alumni. Given the centrality of alumni giving to Princeton's institutional stature, an investment in Muslim Chaplaincy could pay significant dividends. Put another way, even though the existence of the Muslim Chaplaincy did not currently seem to be a significant factor in the decision making of prospective Princeton Muslim students, with alumni support it could one day become an important factor.

6.5. CONCLUSION

Princeton was a 'leading' case study of the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy in American higher education. While evidence supporting this case was specific to the institution, based on research at almost two dozen other universities, it seemed that many private institutions were experiencing comparable developments, pressures, and influences. This congruence was unsurprising given the similarity between Princeton and many of the selective, East Coast, private schools with Muslim Chaplains.

The emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton, as at many of its peer institutions, could be attributed to leadership in the ORL and support from the senior administration. The university began with a part-time pilot position that eventually expanded into a full-time role. The work of the Muslim Chaplain at Princeton mirrored what I observed at private institutions across the country. He spent the majority of his time supporting students through individualised pastoral care; facilitating weekly and special religious services; and organising speakers, panels, and other programmes of interest to Muslim students. He also spent a significant amount of time engaging with non-Muslims through interfaith activities with Jewish and Christian communities on campus and by hosting large-scale public events for the campus community.

The rationales of administrators at Princeton to develop Muslim Chaplaincy were also comparable to their national peers. These included a desire to support Muslim students who were perceived to be in need of leadership support; an interest in preparing non-Muslim students for success in a diverse and heterogeneous global world where Islamic nations were

[179] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, August 27, 2008.

economically and politically important; and part of a larger effort to maintain academic prestige by making investments necessary to compete with other institutions to attract the most gifted students. At the same time, there was a distinctive element of the Princeton story. The university's history of exclusion—in particular its legacy of discrimination against Jewish students—was a critical contributor to its contemporary leadership position on religious diversity.

In this context, Princeton was among the first institutions to make an offer of a full-time Muslim Chaplaincy and the first and only school to hire a full-time Hindu Chaplain. The ongoing impact of its anti-Semitic past made Princeton especially sensitive to the needs of Muslims and other religious minorities, and the potential unintended and unanticipated consequences its actions could have. These hires were part of a large and diffuse effort to overcome Princeton's reputation as a conservative, homogenous, and exclusive institution.

CHAPTER 7

MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY AT RUTGERS

7.1. RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

The benefit of a dual case study is that it makes visible structures and processes that may otherwise appear invisible. In the previous chapter, I explored why Princeton, a private university with a small and placid Muslim student community, created a full-time Muslim Chaplaincy. In this chapter I attempt to explain why Rutgers, an institution with a large, active, and sometimes volatile Muslim student population, provided comparatively little support to the externally paid Muslim chaplain affiliated with the university.

Rutgers was founded in 1766 as Queen's College: a private, male-only institution affiliated with the Dutch Reformed Church. Renamed in 1825 for donor and revolutionary war hero Henry Rutgers, the university became a land-grant institution in 1864 through the Morrill Act (McCormick 1990, p. 7), and a public university in 1945.[180] During the twentieth century, the university expanded by adding semi-autonomous degree-granting colleges to the original Rutgers College and acquiring two satellite campuses.[181] My research focused exclusively on the New Brunswick campus of Rutgers which in 2011 had almost 35,000 full-time and more than 5,000 part-time students. In the autumn term of 2011, 93% of undergraduates and 70% of graduate students were state residents.[182]

[180] Senior administrator, Personal contact, September 12, 2011.
[181] In 1918, the New Jersey College for Women was created (later renamed Douglass College). Other colleges included: University, founded in 1934 to serve mature and part-time students; Livingston, founded in 1969 to serve racial minority students; and Cook, founded in 1971, which developed from the university's agricultural unit. These five colleges constitute the flagship New Brunswick campus. The university absorbed autonomous institutions in Newark in 1946, and Camden in 1950, and turned them into satellite campuses. Unless specified, all references are to the New Brunswick campus of Rutgers.
[182] Data from Rutgers Fact Book: http://oirap.rutgers.edu/instchar/factpdf/enroll11.pdf, p. 9, 26, and 27. Accessed on May 19, 2012.

Historically, Rutgers's five constituent colleges operated independently. Each had authority over its own admissions, faculty, administration, and physical site, which led to duplication of resources and disparities in quality. In 1982, Rutgers merged the liberal arts faculty members of the five colleges into a single Faculty of Arts and Sciences to harmonise hiring, tenure decisions, and teaching functions.[183] In the context of severe budgetary pressure in 2007, Rutgers merged most functions of the colleges into the School of Arts and Sciences. This move centralised many functions including student affairs, which had grown significantly in the previous 25 years.

Like many American higher education institutions, the student body at Rutgers changed dramatically in the 1960s and 1970s in the context of great social upheaval across the United States.[184] In 1963, Rutgers appointed a committee to examine how it might expand support for disadvantaged students. Early initiatives were 'stimulated by recent federal civil rights legislation, and carried forward chiefly by liberal whites who were in sympathy with the movement' (*Ibid*, p. 15). On February 24, 1969, black students – frustrated by the slow pace of change – initiated a dramatic student occupation of the Conklin Hall academic building on the Rutgers Newark campus, which led to other, sometimes violent, demonstrations and acts of civil disobedience across all campuses. The 1970s brought substantial change as administrators and the Board of Governors responded to student demands for increased access. By 1979 almost 12% of Rutgers undergraduates were black, ranking Rutgers in the top five among public institutions nationally. There were also noticeable increases in the number of minority faculty members, black student groups, new courses in African-American Studies, and minority students on historically white athletic teams.

As Rutgers was grappling with racial integration, it also confronted the issue of gender. There was active debate about the integration of the traditionally all-male Rutgers College. Opponents argued that the presence of a women's college eliminated the need for integration. In 1970, Rutgers College became co-educational, though Douglass College remains female-only to this day (Green 2000).

Changes to the U.S. immigration law in 1965 impacted New Jersey demographics as immigrants from Latin America, the Caribbean, and Asia arrived in the state. In 1980, 1.4% of the state's population was of Asian ancestry and 6.7% was of Hispanic ancestry (Bischoff 2004, p. 260-262); thirty years later, the state population had increased to 8.3% of Asian ancestry and 17.7% of

[183] Student Services staff member, Personal interview, October 7, 2008.
[184] This paragraph and the next draw heavily on a book by Richard P. McCormick (1990), a noted historian, former Rutgers professor, and father of Rutgers president Richard L. McCormick (2002-2012).

Hispanic ancestry.[185] As the children of these newcomers entered higher education in the 1980s and 1990s, the demographics of the student population shifted once again. Data from 2011 showed that among undergraduate students at the New Brunswick campus, 49% were female, 25% were Asian American, 11% were Hispanic, 8% were African-American, 2% were foreign, less than 1% were Native American, and 5% were multi-racial or unknown.[186] As a result of these demographics, Rutgers created academic, administrative, and social entities that serviced and supported a breadth of populations and interests.[187]

Like Princeton, Rutgers began as a deeply religious institution. Twice-daily chapel attendance and a full day of religious education on Sundays were mandated by the university board in 1825.[188] These requirements softened over the years, and were made voluntary in 1946. Historically, faculty members – and especially the President – took responsibility for the character-building and pastoral support of students. In 1921 this responsibility transferred to the part-time Dean of Students and later a Dean of Men. In 1926 it shifted to the newly created post of University Chaplain, which became a Coordinator of Religious Affairs in 1974 before its elimination in 1981 due to budget cuts (Kling 1981; Calvanelli & Frusciano 1992). Religious affairs then came under the purview of the Provost of each campus, until the mid-1990s when these posts were eliminated due to financial cuts. Religious life currently falls under the remit of the central Office of Student Affairs (Radick 2006). It is the responsibility of a single staff member with a much broader student services portfolio.[189]

Affiliated Chaplains have long been part of the religious landscape at Rutgers. Until recently, these individuals had limited contact with each other. However, in 2006, a few of them formed

[185] Data from U.S. Census: http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/34000.html. Accessed on May 20, 2012.
[186] Data from Rutgers Fact Book: http://oirap.rutgers.edu/instchar/factpdf/enroll11.pdf, p. 14. Accessed May 19, 2012. The Newark campus – sometimes described as the most diverse university in the country – had 24% Asian-American, 21% Hispanic, and 18% African-American students (Alaya 2008).
[187] Rutgers had academic departments in African Studies, Jewish Studies, Latino and Hispanic Caribbean Studies, and Women and Gender Studies. It also had academic centres and institutes, including the Center for Race and Ethnicity; Center for Middle Eastern Studies; Center for the Study of Jewish Life; Center for Women's Global Leadership; Diversity Research Center; the Institute on Ethnicity, Culture, and the Modern Experience; and the Institute for Research on Women. On the non-academic side, there were administrative offices including the Office of Faculty Diversity Initiatives, Office of Multicultural Student Involvement, and Office of Social Justice Education and LGBT Communities. There were also student-focused cultural centres for African-American, Hispanic, and Asian American communities.
[188] Unless otherwise stated, details in this and the next paragraph are taken from these websites where a full history of Chaplaincy at Rutgers can be found:
http://www2.scc.rutgers.edu/ead/uarchives/rc_dean_of_menf.html and
http://www2.scc.rutgers.edu/ead/uarchives/abernethyf.html. Accessed on May 20, 2012.
[189] Student Services staff member, Personal interview, October 30, 2008.

an informal invitation-only group called the Religious Life Association (RLA). The group was open to chaplaincies that had at least one full-time staffer devoted to the Rutgers community.

Despite their consistent and prolonged involvement with Rutgers students over the years, these chaplaincies had minimal formal contact with, or support from, university administrators. That began to change when Rutgers hired Gregory Blimling to serve as the new Vice President for Student Affairs. He brought a new focus to student religious and spiritual development, enacting a series of structural changes to centralise student affairs functions within the university. This included a review of religious life. Renewed interest in issues of faith provided the RLA with an opportunity to approach the university with a proposed model for engagement which had been successfully implemented at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. It offered two designations for affiliated chaplaincies: one for active Rutgers-focused chaplaincies with dedicated staff members regularly ministering to students and the second for local congregations that welcomed students, but were not actively focused on campus ministry. The distinction was meant to create greater collaboration, and recognition for the religious programming and support that chaplaincies were providing for Rutgers students.[190]

The RLA's proposal was vetted, adapted, and adopted by the university. It resulted in the 2008 creation of the Religious Life Council (RLC) as a new, university-sponsored entity. The purpose of the RLC was

> to promote and enhance Rutgers University's mission of educating the whole person. The RLC seeks to create an atmosphere in which groups and individuals affiliated with the University are engaged in the active pursuit of intellectual and spiritual truths. The RLC exists to assist and advise the Department of Student Life/Office of Student Involvement in matters relating to religious groups on the New Brunswick/Piscataway campus and to advise the Department of Student Life/Office of Student Involvement, as appropriate, on groups requesting formal designation as a Chaplaincy; to ensure Chaplaincies recognized on campus are all inclusive and to help differentiate between a chaplaincy and an affiliated congregation.[191]

A key benefit of this new structure was that it broadened the formal interaction and engagement of chaplaincies with the university and with each other. In addition to the chaplains, the RLC included a number of administrators from student affairs, residential life,

[190] Affiliated Chaplain, Personal interview, January 14, 2009.
[191] Full details about the RLC available at: http://getinvolved.rutgers.edu/documents/organizations/religious-life-council.pdf. Accessed on May 20, 2012.

counselling services, campus information, and admissions. It also included a few faculty members.

7.2. EMERGENCE OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY

Three structural factors distinguished Muslim Chaplaincy at Rutgers from most of the other institutions in my sample. First, because it was a public institution, there was no ORL to lead, support, coordinate, or host the work of denominational chaplains. Second, legal concerns that the institution might overstep its appropriate role on the issue of religion led leaders to minimise its support for student spiritual and religious life. Third, Rutgers was a commuter campus. Many Muslim students lived at home with their parents or spent their weekends at home. This regular access to family, friends, and the Muslim congregations they grew up with may have decreased the support these students needed in comparison to students who returned home only occasionally.

I found it difficult to piece together the history of Muslim Chaplaincy at Rutgers. Since it was not university-initiated or financed, there were few sources documenting the work, mandate, or leadership of the office. By the time my research at Rutgers began in 2008, many of the original actors had left New Jersey; some were as far away as the Middle East. As a result, much of what I describe in this section is based on interviews with a few key informants including some of those that had left the university.

Unlike the other Muslim Chaplains in my sample, who were either volunteers or employees of the institution, the Rutgers chaplain was hired under the aegis of OMCRU, an independent non-profit organisation set up by members of the local Muslim community. Between 2002 and 2009 Rutgers was one of only a handful of public universities with a Muslim Chaplain, and the only state higher educational institution ever to have had a full-time person in the role.

Rutgers's Muslim Chaplaincy emerged to support a large Muslim student population – estimated at between 3,000 and 4,000 students. These students 'were affected by the [post 9/11] backlash and intolerance and suspicion;' as demonstrated by several incidents on campus in which Muslim students were harassed or attacked.[192,193] At the same time, there was an

[192] Affiliated Chaplain, Personal interview, October 7, 2008.

outpouring of support for Muslim students, including a declaration by the Episcopal Chaplain that his church would be a sanctuary for students experiencing harassment (Nunley 2001). In 2002, a handful of local leaders established OMCRU, which they described as

> a resource for the Rutgers community that provides first, guidance to the Muslim student regarding spiritual and intellectual development (in both an academic environment and an ever changing contemporary society), second, a liaison with the University community and administration that serves as a resource to enable understanding the vibrant contribution of an Islamic world view, and third, an advocacy function for the special needs of Muslim students in campus life (OMCRU 2007, p. 1).

The organisation began with a small Board of Directors, who were members of the New Brunswick Islamic Center. Nadeem Baig, a local medical doctor and OMCRU board member, explained that the mosque served as a fiscal sponsor; it was the legal employer of the chaplain and collected funds to support his salary.[194]

Former Rutgers student David 'Dawud' Fricke was a driving force behind OMCRU, and served as its first volunteer administrator. Fricke grew up in a middle class white family and converted to Islam while attending the elite Milton Academy prep school, after which he came to Rutgers on a lacrosse scholarship in 1991. At the time, he was active with the Islamic Society of Rutgers University (ISRU), the university's MSA. Fricke left college without graduating and began working for the Sufi intellectual Imam Zaid Shakir. He returned to New Jersey after several years away and in the aftermath of 9/11 began to attend campus events as a concerned former student and someone with strong contacts with university administrators.

Fricke supported Rutgers's first two Muslim Chaplains who were hired by the OMCRU board. The first was Sheikh Jihad Hashim Brown, a white convert who had been President of ISRU in the early 1990s. After graduation, he went to Syria for a decade to study for his *ijazah* (scholarly licenses).[195] He was working for the Tabah Foundation in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates when Fricke reached out to him to serve as an off-site Muslim Chaplain. Hashim Brown was in that role for eight months in 2002-03, but since he lived abroad, his primary service was to provide guidance to Fricke by email and telephone. He did, however, come to speak on campus for the first anniversary of the 9/11 attacks.[196] Hashim Brown was replaced by Waleed

[193] Affiliated Chaplain (former), Personal interview, October 31, 2008.
[194] Nadeem Baig, Board Member, Office of the Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers University, Personal interview, March 23, 2010.
[195] Affiliated Chaplain (former), Personal interview, October 31, 2008
[196] *Ibid.*

Abushahba, an African-American scholar who stayed for two years and then also moved to the Tabah Foundation.

When Abushahba left, OMCRU's Board of Directors looked for another chaplain without success. In 2005 the board suggested that Fricke take over the role, since he had served as an assistant to the two previous chaplains and was already carrying out the vast majority of OMCRU's administrative responsibilities. An informant credited Fricke for his vision, strategy, and perseverance in developing a Muslim Chaplaincy in an environment with limited resources. He explained that

> [Fricke] was actually the one who [was] instrumental in creating a position for the [Muslim] Chaplain. It was his vision. He saw that... He made all of [the] connections with the chaplains with the university and the administration. Academically, he was well connected with professors... The real support was coming from non-Muslim professors and administrative faculty. Deans were involved and they wanted to see this happen and [Fricke] was very instrumental in bringing all of these [people] together.[197]

With humility and a native understanding of American culture, Fricke was able to establish a chaplaincy at Rutgers without significant financial resources, a dedicated staff, or the structural assistance of an ORL.

The relationship between OMCRU and Rutgers was intimately linked to Fricke's personal relationships with key university administrators. A student services staff member described the status of the chaplaincies in the early 2000s:

> It was always just this piecemeal sort of thing. I think that because we had no role for the chaplaincies, 'How do we find somebody to talk to? Or who do we go to about this issue?' It was just this ad hoc, 'oh we have concern around our Muslim students, who do we [go to]'... It was trying to make something fit without there really being an infrastructure or mechanism to do that. It was all built on relationships... Again, very challenging [because we had] separate colleges, separate philosophies. So David [Dawud Fricke] and I began talking a lot.[198]

As OMCRU became more visible to the administration, Fricke was encouraged by university officials to formalise its relationship with Rutgers by registering it as what was then called a Campus Ministry. This affiliation was offered to any non-university religious organisation that wanted to serve Rutgers students.

---

[197] Affiliated Chaplain (former), Personal interview, October 31, 2008.
[198] Student Services staff member, Personal interview, October 7, 2008.

Fricke was an obvious choice given that OMCRU had few options in light of the very limited salary it could provide. Baig said

> ... who would want to take a job where there's no good salary, no set salary?... The salary provided to Brother Dawud – I agree – was not appropriate. He deserved more [but] we just couldn't give him more.[199]

In our conversation, Fricke acknowledged his lack of credentials for the role – he had not completed an undergraduate degree nor did he have formal training in pastoral care. As Baig explained, even when Fricke accepted the role, 'he said that this was too much for [him] to do [and] he needed help.'[200] On the other hand, he understood the role and knew the key parties better than anyone else. Fricke's title was officially OMCRU's Director of Religious Life and Administrative Affairs and he was generally referred to as the Muslim Chaplain although he was not doing the traditional work of a Muslim Chaplain. This discrepancy may simply have been that Fricke's position was mis-titled and that Rutgers did not actually have someone performing the traditional student-focused role of chaplain.[201]

OMCRU board members noticed this gap between title and role, and in 2007 they hired Faraz Khan as the part-time Chaplain for Student Development, to complement Fricke's administrative role. Khan was a Rutgers alumnus who had previously taught at a local Islamic School. He committed to provide ten hours per week of service in the 2007-2008 academic year, although he actually volunteered three times that.[202] The position began as unpaid; later OMCRU provided a modest stipend. Khan was initially asked to teach a class, but there was limited student turnout so it was cancelled.[203] Fricke and Khan had inter-personal conflict, which resulted in Khan's departure after one academic year of service. Baig explained that 'the marriage between the two of them – it just didn't work, to put it simply.'[204] There had been attempts to replace Khan but none materialised.

Baig described several factors that had led to the organisation's dissolution in late 2008.[205] First, with Khan's departure the OMCRU board felt that it was still not meeting its primary obligation

---

[199] Nadeem Baig, Board Member, Office of the Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers University, Personal interview, March 23, 2010.
[200] *Ibid.*
[201] I have Professor Geoffrey Walford, Department of Education at Oxford, to thank for this insight.
[202] Affiliated Chaplain (former), Personal interview, March 1, 2010.
[203] Affiliated Chaplain, Personal interview, October 7, 2008.
[204] Nadeem Baig, Board Member, Office of the Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers University, Personal interview, March 23, 2010.
[205] Nadeem Baig, Board Member, Office of the Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers University, Personal interview, March 23, 2010.

to serve Muslim students.

> The thing we were interested in having better and greater interaction with was the student population. As much as it's important to have a connection with the administration, it's equally important that the main mission of the chaplaincy is to serve the student population, not the administration. And that was, I think, at times lacking.[206]

Second, two of the most active board members had moved to other parts of the country; they had not been replaced with strong local leaders. Board continuity and governance were major, unresolved concerns. Third, after almost a decade of existence, the funding sources for OMCRU were extremely weak. The organisation only had one major donor and he 'did not see the project moving forward as [he] had desired... [and] the resources that [he] was putting into it – both personal and financial' were not providing the expected return on investment.[207] After his termination, Fricke continued to serve as an unpaid advisor to the Rutgers administration and planned to volunteer one day a week at the Rutgers campus.[208] By late 2010, Rutgers administrators had not yet heard about OMCRU's change of status; Fricke was still listed on the university's website as an Affiliated Chaplain.[209]

The following year the Center for Islamic Life at Rutgers University (CILRU) – founded in 2009 by two undergraduates – hired Khan and Imam Moutaz Charaf as volunteer Muslim Chaplains to teach classes about Islam and provide pastoral care (Enerio 2011).[210] CILRU was governed by a five-member board that included the co-founders, a graduate student, and two alumni. The organisation planned to hire a full-time, paid Muslim Chaplain by 2013, and had a long-term vision to acquire a physical space near campus where the Muslim community could gather.

---

[206] Nadeem Baig, Board Member, Office of the Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers University, Personal interview, March 23, 2010.
[207] Nadeem Baig, Board Member, Office of the Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers University, Personal interview, March 23, 2010.
[208] Affiliated Chaplain (former), Private conversation, April 25, 2009.
[209] Student Services staff member, Private conversation, September 15, 2010.
[210] I came to know of this organisation after I had completed the vast majority of my fieldwork. Thus, the information included here comes from the article by Enerio (2011) and from CILRU's website: www.cilru.org. Accessed on May 20, 2012.

7.3. ROLES OF THE MUSLIM CHAPLAIN

Of the six student-focused roles I described in Chapter 5, Fricke spent most of his time engaging administrators and some time providing pastoral care to Muslim students. This was reflected in his official job description which divided his duties as follows: 45% meetings with university administrators, 20% meetings with students (in-person pastoral care and MSA meetings), 20% programming (attendance and planning), and 15% remote contact with students (OMCRU 2007, p. 3).

My research confirmed that Fricke's primary engagement was serving as an educational resource to university administrators. Due to his strong relationships with Rutgers, Fricke was able to navigate the byzantine bureaucracy to voice a perspective on behalf of Muslim students. Between 2006 and 2008, he participated in many university-focused activities, including: drafting a Muslim holiday calendar and an absence policy, holding a workshop for Dining Services on Muslim dietary law, engaging with the Director of Public Safety on sensitivity training, garnering university endorsement for a Muslim Campus Center, meeting with academic department heads about faculty hiring and course offerings, meeting with Multicultural Engagement staff about leadership training, co-authoring studies about the need for dedicated prayer space on each campus, and presenting to the annual meetings of the offices of Counselling, Alcohol and Other Drug Assistance Program, and Psychiatric Services (CAPS) (OMCRU 2007, p. 4). Fricke's association with the administration was so strong that Natasha Piracha, an ISRU board member mistakenly believed that 'he is a part of the administration... [and]... he is hired by the university.'[211]

Some students developed their own positive and productive relationships with administrators; others were doubtful about the knowledge and neutrality of those working in student affairs. As one student leader explained

> one of the issues with the administration is that we don't know [them], we don't have a connection with them. And on top of that, [I] really doubt they would understand the complexity of the situation. This is an assumption, but I think it's a valid one if you go to someone who doesn't really understand the work of the Muslim community, who doesn't even understand the basics of Islam or what it represents... [There] is so much negative media and stereotype[s] about Islam...[212]

[211] Natasha Piracha, Undergraduate Student, Rutgers University, Personal interview, November 17, 2008.
[212] Student, Personal interview, January 14, 2009.

Fricke played an important role in bridging the gap between Muslim student leaders and administrators in the context of student suspicion or doubt. This link was especially important in a large, decentralised, non-residential institution where students had limited opportunities for direct contact with administrators.

Fricke's second key role was to provide pastoral care, as CAPS was not able to meet the needs of many Muslim students who

> ... were coming to the counselling center but the counsellors there had difficulty connecting with them. From my understanding, they had some problems in truly understanding the scope of the issues that these Muslim students were dealing with. A lot, of course, [were] basic issues related to campus life. But they were also bringing issues related to their home life, cultural issues, and religious issues that [the counsellors] were not understanding.[213]

While Fricke provided some pastoral care, some Muslim students did not feel adequately supported and many did not even know who the Muslim Chaplain was.[214] Two student leaders explained:

> To be honest, at Rutgers I am feeling like we're really on our own. I know he is the Chaplain and he is a very good guy. But I've never seen [him]... and I am sure no one else really sees him, [except] maybe the [MSA] president and the board members...[215]

> We need someone with us, always on call, always [available] to ask advice... He is very, very busy. When we call him or email him, he gets back to us... after a couple of days and it's not really like you can just walk into his office.[216]

It seemed that Fricke's interactions were limited to a small number of students, including MSA leaders and those who were in acute personal or academic crisis situations. For the period of time when Khan was affiliated with OMCRU, he spent a significant amount of his time counselling students.[217] At other times, MSA leaders provided some of the pastoral care that would ordinarily be provided by a chaplain.[218]

---

[213] Nadeem Baig, Board Member, Office of the Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers University, Personal interview, March 23, 2010.
[214] Student, Personal interview, November 17, 2008 and Nadeem Baig, Board Member, Office of the Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers University, Personal interview, March 23, 2010.
[215] Student, Personal interview, November 17, 2008.
[216] Student, Personal interview, January 14, 2009.
[217] Nadeem Baig, Board Member, Office of the Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers University, Personal interview, March 23, 2010.
[218] *Ibid.*

The Muslim Chaplaincy at Rutgers had a different focus from many others I studied. Beyond the two roles described above – supporting administrators and providing pastoral care – Fricke devoted little time to the other four roles I discussed in Chapter 5 ('Muslim Chaplaincy in American Higher Education'), namely (1) advisor to the MSA, (2) student educator, (3) leader and facilitator of religious services, and (4) organiser of programs for the Muslim student community. As a result, unlike most chaplains, Fricke was not seen as a community leader. As Piracha explained, Fricke 'doesn't lead... he doesn't really do religious activity... he hasn't yet.'[219]

I believe part of Fricke's inability to be seen as a leader of the Muslim student community was due to his lack of involvement in leading and organising weekly religious services. A colleague hypothesised that Fricke may not have been able to wield authority over Muslim students due to his status as a convert or his lack of both a college degree and formal Islamic training credentials.[220] A Rutgers administrator noted that, while female students engaged with Fricke, the male Wahhabi (orthodox) students who dominated ISRU dismissed him for his moderate beliefs.[221] These factors may have led him to focus on areas where he had more credibility. One student described his role as more similar to an administrative Dean than a religious Chaplain.[222]

The discrepancy between Fricke's actual work and the expectations others had of him was apparent in his refusal to mediate a divisive split within ISRU despite pleas from student leaders. Beginning in the late 1990s, ISRU experienced an increased Wahhabi influence as conservative members began taking on leadership roles (Schwartz 2005). In 2005 some claimed that ISRU 'has grown intolerant of Muslim women and minority factions and incapable of reaching its aim to include all Islamic students' (Marya 2005). Later that year a group of students began planning for a new, independent MSA called SALAM.[223] At this time, some students turned to Fricke for his advice and support, and they were surprised by his unwillingness to get involved. Sana Sheikh, a key student leader in the new SALAM group, explained:

> Straight from the beginning they completely stayed out of it. They didn't want to be part of it at all. In fact Brother Dawud protested it for a while. He didn't come to any of the meetings for both ISRU and SALAM... At first, I kind of felt abandoned. You know, 'we need your help, we need your advice; this is when

[219] Natasha Piracha, Undergraduate Student, Rutgers University, Personal interview, November 17, 2008.
[220] Affiliated Chaplain (former), Private conversation, April 25, 2009.
[221] Student Services staff member, August 27, 2009.
[222] Student, Personal interview, November 17, 2008.
[223] The word *salam* means peace in Arabic.

> you're supposed to be helping out.' Later on he explained, 'I can't take sides... you guys are all acting immature, get over it.' And [I thought], it might be easy for some people to say, but not for someone who has first-hand experience.[224]

Fricke described this as a political drama and refused to engage with either student group. This stance led a number of students, OMCRU board members, and some university administrators to feel that Fricke had abdicated his duty as a Muslim Chaplain.[225]

University administrators were eager to facilitate reunification. I asked Sheikh why she thought the administration supported a single MSA:

> There was an article in the *New York Times* two years ago about there being two MSAs at Rutgers, and about how there was a Shia/Sunni split and about how they can't get along.[226] Stuff like that. And I think when the administration saw that, they were really upset about it. 'Oh, it's giving Rutgers a bad name.' Rutgers is the only university with two MSAs... They hated it. 'It's making us look bad'... I think it's reputational...and also monetary because they give funding to every single organisation, so it's like giving double the funding for two organisations to do the exact same thing.[227]

In 2008, Khalid Latif, the Muslim Chaplain at NYU, came to speak at Rutgers and urged ISRU and SALAM to settle their differences.[228] Sheikh and several others referred to this intervention as a turning point in the rift between the two groups. Latif's talk catalysed a series of conversations that eventually resulted in the creation of a new Rutgers MSA in 2009.

During the short time that Khan worked for OMCRU, he made attempts to support Muslim students in ways that Fricke had not. His role was to 'offer spiritual advice and Islamic education to interested students at Rutgers' and his duties were divided as follows: 40% for instruction and preparation, 20% for meetings with students (in-person pastoral care and MSA meetings), 20% programming (attendance and planning) and 15% remote contact with students (by phone, email, Facebook), and 5% for programme attendance (OMCRU 2007, p. 5). Khan understood the importance of building trust and strong relationships with students. For the first three or four months he attended MSA meetings on Tuesday and Thursday nights. He also went to other

[224] Sana Sheikh, Undergraduate Student, Rutgers University, Personal interview, October 7, 2008.
[225] Sana Sheikh, Undergraduate Student, Rutgers University, Personal interview, October 7, 2008; Student Services staff member, Personal interview, January 14, 2009; Student, Personal interview, January 14, 2009; Nadeem Baig, Board Member, Office of the Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers University, Personal interview, March 23, 2010; and Student Services staff member, Personal interview, May 20, 2010.
[226] The article referred to by this student is MacFarquhar (2007).
[227] Sana Sheikh, Undergraduate Student, Rutgers University, Personal interview, October 7, 2008.
[228] *Ibid.*

organisations that had large Muslim populations such as the Pakistani, Bengali, and Indian student groups. He introduced himself at these meetings and held office hours on Friday morning before *jum'ah* prayer. Some students came to these sessions but most preferred to be in touch by email or cell phone. After several months of outreach and trust-building, he started teaching a 90-minute weekly non-credit course about the Qur'an and the life of the Prophet. Khan was described by Baig as 'very well-suited for being a chaplain, even though he had no prior formal training in it. He was just by his character and personality very well-suited for helping out.'[229]

Of the seven common ways in which most Muslim Chaplains served the university and the broader community as described in Chapter 5 ('Muslim Chaplaincy in American Higher Education'), Fricke was most focused on advising the administration. There were three other roles in which he participated minimally: educating non-Muslims about Islam, leading interfaith activities in conjunction with Hillel and Christian chaplaincies, and engaging with alumni. Sheikh expressed dissatisfaction with Fricke's ability to raise funds from alumni:

> Our main contact with the alumni is the Chaplain and... he says that he does a lot. He tries to reach out to alumni, but I don't really think he does [it] at all – [though he does] the best that he can probably do. Because if that was the case, we would have a Muslim Center right now. It's been in the talks for years and years and years because Muslims have no place to pray. We pray in corners wherever we can find space... and people hate it. Everybody always ask us, 'oh, when are we going to get a Muslim Student Center?' And Brother Dawud always pushes back. He [says], I've been talking to people. It's in the process of it happening.' But, I have yet to see [it]. I said to him several times... 'if you want, I can talk to alumni myself... the students can come together. We can figure something out. Some way of reaching out'... He's like, 'no no no, I'll take care of it. I'll take care of it.'[230]

Alumni support would have been particularly helpful at Rutgers, as a resource-constrained state institution. Sheikh later contrasted Fricke's inability to raise funds with the success of Jewish alumni in establishing Chabad House.[231] Fricke did not participate in any of the final three activities: serving as a member of the broader chaplaincy staff since he was not a university employee, serving the local Muslim community which was unnecessary given the number of mosques in the area, and interacting with parents.

---

[229] Nadeem Baig, Board Member, Office of the Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers University, Personal interview, March 23, 2010.
[230] *Ibid.*
[231] *Ibid.*

7.4. SANCTIONING MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY

The previous section described the roles of the Muslim Chaplaincy at Rutgers. In this section I explore my third research question: why did Rutgers sanction and support the Muslim Chaplaincy? Even though many administrators acknowledged the need, I spend the first half of this section describing the legal, financial, cultural, and structural limitations that prevented the institution from more broadly supporting Muslim student religious life. In the second half of this section, I provide an analysis of the rationales that compelled administrators to provide the support that they did.

7.4.1. LIMITATIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

As described in Chapter 5 ('Muslim Chaplaincy in American Higher Education'), Rutgers displayed an exclusive model of Muslim Chaplaincy in which institutions do not financially support any denomination-specific chaplains. Baig explained that, despite this 'the university was very supportive of [the chaplaincy] because there is a very large Muslim student population ... which [Rutgers] could not appropriately support.'[232] A number of administrators concurred that there was a need for support but that for various reasons which I will explore below, the university was unable to provide that support. One senior administrator explained that these limitations had led Rutgers to move 'away from accommodating *anyone* rather than accommodating *everyone*.'[233]

7.4.1.1. LEGAL LIMITATIONS

Several people I spoke with described the significant challenges of supporting religion at a state institution, given the restrictions imposed by the U.S. Constitution.[234] As a senior administrator explained

> The one thing that makes religion tricky for public institutions is that you do have these separate constitutional clauses. So you can't deal with religion in precisely the same way that you can deal with race or even gender, because you do have the establishment clause that says [a] public institution can't do something that looks like it's establishing or favouring one religion over any other. At the same time, you have the free exercise clause that says you've got to respect the free exercise rights of everybody. So those clauses have made it

[232] *Ibid.*
[233] Student Services staff member, Personal interview, January 14, 2009.
[234] The establishment clause states: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

> more difficult... Private institutions might have some latitude, but the publics do have the constitutional criteria.[235]

There was widespread misunderstanding about if and how a public university could legally accommodate religious students, especially in light of the constitutional 'separation of church and state.' Some people believed this to mean that no religious activity could take place on a public college campus, such as the use of university facilities by a student religious group for prayer or Bible study. In reality, such uses are legal so long as the institution is not sanctioning or supporting one religious group over others.

The common interpretation of the law requires that any accommodation provided for one religious group must be provided for all other religious groups. According to a senior administrator at Rutgers, this restriction did not prevent funding of student religious groups (or any student group, regardless of its purpose) nor provision of halal food options, both of which the administration had already done. However, it precluded creating a dedicated Muslim prayer room, installing *wu'du* facilities, or hiring a Muslim Chaplain, since such accommodations offered to one group would also have to be offered to any other religious group expressing an interest.[236] The differentiating factor was the exclusivity of the accommodation. For example, halal food could be purchased and consumed by any one; it was not restricted to a particular subset of the population. On the other hand, prayer rooms or *wu'du* facilities limited to use by a certain group counted as exclusive accommodations and would have to be matched for our groups requesting parallel support.

Both of the above informants made reference to the 2007 controversy at the University of Michigan at Dearborn, whose administrators proposed erecting footbaths in two campus locations in response to Muslim students using sinks to wash their feet before prayers (Lewin 2007). The use of sinks for this purpose had resulted in spilled water, and some sinks becoming detached from walls. This presented a health and safety hazard. Unfortunately, there was significant opposition at Dearborn from students, alumni, and lay citizens objecting to 'special' resources benefiting Muslim students. Some people referred to the idea of installing footbaths as part of the 'Islamification' of the United States. One blogger referred to the institution as the 'University of Michigan-Dearbornistan' to signal her belief that the campus had gone too far in accommodating Muslim students.[237] The controversy was fuelled by a misbelief that states

[235] Senior administrator, Personal interview, May 19, 2009.
[236] Senior administrator, Personal interview, May 19, 2009.
[237] See http://www.debbieschlussel.com/1347/exclusive-so-long-churchstate-separation-university-of-michigan-to-fund-muslim-footbaths. Accessed on May 20, 2012.

cannot provide any religious accommodations – rather than the reality that accommodations provided to one religious group must be provided to any others making such a request.[238] Despite the outcry at Dearborn, a number of public colleges across the country had already installed footbaths (*Ibid*).

For evidence that such programs are legally permissible and defensible, one only need consider the extensive, Congressionally-funded military chaplaincy programme and at chaplaincy programmes in government prisons and hospitals (Cadge et al. 2008). Interestingly, government-run U.S. military academies have Christian chapels or churches, and several also have synagogues or Jewish gathering spaces (Siegel 2005). In 2006, the military academy at West Point consecrated a prayer room for Muslim use (Associated Press 2006).

At Rutgers there was active consideration and engagement with questions about the legality of religious provisions – in some cases, a willingness to test conventional boundaries, but also a clear sense of the distinction between 'church and state'. Some public schools, such as Pennsylvania State University, had prayer spaces or interfaith centres which senior administrators at Rutgers supported, but explained they could not fund.[239] Beyond the active legal issues, public sentiment was critical: New Jersey state residents were stakeholders in Rutgers and they could easily commandeer these issues for their own political gain. Given the particular scrutiny and financial concerns facing state institutions, the political risk of such a move was difficult to justify. These very real considerations were nearly irrelevant at private institutions, where different legal rules, a more narrow set of stakeholders, and longstanding Christian faith traditions made it much easier to support all religions.

7.4.1.2. FINANCIAL LIMITATIONS

In addition to legal concerns about support for student religious life at Rutgers, there were also significant financial considerations. In an environment where core academic and research funding was in peril, student life and especially religious life were low priorities for Rutgers administrators and alumni donors. Financial support had long been a challenge for this work. Budget cutbacks were the stated reason for the elimination of the University Chaplaincy in 1981, and for the later removal of the campus Provosts who inherited responsibility for religious and spiritual life (Kling 1981). In recent years, Rutgers had again faced significant reductions in state appropriations, which accounted for approximately 20% of its annual

[238] Student Services staff member, Personal interview, October 30, 2008.
[239] Senior administrator, Personal interview, August 27, 2009.

budget.[240] The 2011 appropriation for the three-campus Rutgers system was the lowest since 1994.[241] While most public and private institutions were struggling financially, Rutgers was in a particularly challenging financial situation due to the confluence of drastic cuts to government appropriations, a negligible endowment, and weak donor support. In this context, administrative financial support for a Muslim Chaplain would have been unimaginable.

Beyond restricted institutional support, several informants mentioned the limited opportunity for external fundraising for Muslim student life. One Affiliated Chaplain bemoaned the lack of support from Muslim alumni: '...here it's like pulling teeth... we can't seem to get any consistent help from alumni.'[242] A number of people mentioned a goal of building a Muslim House similar to those run by some Jewish and Christian Chaplaincies. Whereas the Judeo-Christian chaplaincies were supported by large, national organisations (such as Hillel), or regional denominations (such as the local Catholic Diocese), OMCRU and later CILRU were small, poorly funded, local organisations.

7.4.1.3. CULTURAL LIMITATIONS

At Rutgers responsibility for religious life came under the purview of the division of Student Life or Student Affairs. The staff member who had this portfolio was not educated in nor dedicated to religious issues. She was a generalist who lacked student life experience with religion in general and especially with Islam. She acknowledged this by explaining that her role

> was my first introduction into the [Islamic] religion, the culture, anything... the students were... at issue with one another and running a student organisation as if they were a mosque, as opposed to a student organisation... And I wasn't familiar with the culture and with the religion, so that was challenging for me...[243]

Others in her office were also poorly equipped. An illustration of the lack of cultural sensitivity came from a male Muslim student services staff member who described his interaction with another administrator. Despite having told her many times that he did not engage in physical contact with women outside his immediate family, the female administrator continued to embrace him when they met. He explained that his 'wife almost fell over [the] last time' she witnessed it, but he did not want to 'push [this administrator] away.'[244] This situation had two

[240] Rutgers Revenue Sources 2011: http://budgetfacts.rutgers.edu/pdf/revenue_sources_pie.pdf. Accessed on May 20, 2012.
[241] Trends in New Jersey Appropriations for Rutgers: http://budgetfacts.rutgers.edu/pdf/trends_2011.pdf
[242] Affiliated Chaplain, Personal interview, October 7, 2008.
[243] Student Services staff member, Personal interview, October 30, 2008.
[244] Student Services staff member, Personal interview, October 7, 2008.

consequences. First, it made it difficult for administrators to understand the controversies and issues facing Muslim students, which limited their ability to intervene productively. Second, Muslim students did not see these administrators as credible, which reduced the likelihood that their advice or counsel would be impactful.

7.4.1.4. STRUCTURAL LIMITATIONS

There were structural issues which made it difficult for Rutgers to support Muslim student life. As described earlier in this chapter, until very recently Rutgers New Brunswick was a collection of somewhat autonomous colleges. As one administrator described it:

> ...there was no model for us to go look at any other institution. [In our minds], we weren't a large state institution; we were separate colleges. Now [that it is centralised] I can say, 'What does Michigan do? What does Maryland do?' I have now charged folks to look at what's being done elsewhere because now we have other places to go look [at] and see how it's done. But, again, we're in our infancy in all of these things.[245]

The consolidation of student affairs units among the five colleges allowed Rutgers New Brunswick to conceive of itself as a single institution, and to consider its joint responsibility to support religious minorities. Administrators finally felt able to meaningfully compare themselves to peer institutions.

Despite this new administrative centralisation, however, the structure continued to pose particular challenges for Muslim students in terms of access to halal food and prayer space. Although there was a halal restaurant on the main College Avenue campus, there were no similar amenities on the other four campuses. This challenge also applied to prayer space, which had been a concern for many years. As one administrator described it:

> The students, because they're on five campuses, they're just logistical challenges in terms of where to find the spaces on every campus all the time... So it's something that I think we will revisit again. But it's gotten caught up in the [negative financial] realities of the past year and all of that. I think that the issue... is that the spaces were getting too small.[246]

The university was severely constrained for space, and did not have the resources to expand its physical infrastructure. There was a need for prayer space on several of the campuses, but administrators never designated spaces for prayer. To meet their needs, students informally used common spaces for prayer. However, according to a senior administrator, non-Muslim

[245] *Ibid.*
[246] *Ibid.*

students found this disruptive or disturbing.[247] The large number of Muslim students, frequency of prayers (five times a day), negative responses to students praying, and the huge premium on space made it difficult for some Muslim students to find a workable solution. Campus geography had been a similar challenge for observant Jewish students, who wanted to live within walking distance of the only Jewish prayer spaces and kosher dining facilities near Rutgers which were located on the College Avenue Campus.[248]

7.4.2. RATIONALES TO SUPPORT A MUSLIM CHAPLAIN

In the previous section, I explored the limitations faced by Rutgers in providing more support to Muslim students. In this section, I describe the rationales behind the support that administrators *were* able to provide to the Muslim Chaplain. My research revealed two primary rationales that explained support for Muslim Chaplaincy: a genuine desire to support Muslim students and a need for administrative support especially in crisis situations. I will explore these in further detail below.

Some administrators acknowledged the challenges facing Muslim students and wanted to provide support to those students. There was evidence to suggest that these students faced discrimination on a regular basis (Josephs 2007, p. 84-5). One administrator explained, 'I think that [students are] *afraid*, and I'm going to use that word mostly because it's true. A lot of students are afraid. September11th has put the fear of God into [the] community...'[249] She went on to explain that these students were especially vulnerable without adults on campus to guide and advise them and in the absence of a physical safe space like some other religious and racial communities. Others discussed the need to support student religious identity in general. A student affairs official explained that the new interest in student religious life was part of a desire to

> create greater clarity about the value of the out-of-classroom experience ...it's about students' development, students' growth... And to me, spiritual identity is as much an element as personal leadership or... involvement in clubs and

[247] Senior administrator, Personal interview, August 27, 2009.
[248] Observant Jews are prohibited from 'working' from sundown on Friday night until dusk on Saturday; working includes turning lights on and off, driving, cooking, and writing (among many other things). They must also attend Friday evening religious services which occur after sundown. To attend Sabbath services and to eat kosher food, students living or working on other campuses were required to walk several miles each way in variable weather conditions. Requests by Jewish students for housing on the College Avenue campus (also the most socially desirable of the five campuses) were significant but could not always be granted.
[249] Administrator, Personal interview, October 6, 2009.

> organisations. To have it sort of be this tangential 'other' that's disconnected seemed to me to be missing an element of a message that we were now trying to create... Talking about students' spirituality as part of their identity and their development, and opportunities to connect with chaplaincies, to me is something that we have an obligation and responsibility to do as an institution.[250]

This administrator signalled Rutgers's responsibility for considering student religious identity as a central value of student services.

In addition to the desire to support Muslim students, some administrators viewed chaplains as a resource to the university. This had not always been the case, as historically there had been minimal contact between denominational chaplains and the institution. A senior administrator described the old paradigm:

> You're not a part of any organisational unit. You're out there on your own. We don't talk to you. We don't hear from you. We don't *want* to hear from you. We just don't want you to cause problems.[251]

Conversations I had with student affairs staffers during my research suggested that things had shifted. Rutgers was benefiting from the services provided by chaplains. In a resource-constrained environment, they provided students with support that might otherwise have fallen to university staff members. One administrator described the chaplains as:

> an [informational] resource for us, so God forbid [if] something were to happen, this is a group that we could reach out to... Last year we had a death on campus and we needed to get in touch with someone from Hillel. Nobody had any contact information for them besides their work [number]. Well it was a Saturday. They're not there... What I would like is for this group to be a resource for residential life. You know, say something were to happen... an incident of bias or something along those lines... In the residence halls they can go through Social Justice Education and we have a Bias Prevention Committee at the university but here's another resource for you. A programming tool... [Resident Assistants] have to do programming in the residence halls. Here's a wealth of people. We have 35 people sitting here in the room right now with all different perspectives. Here's a group you could reach out to.[252]

This administrator focused on how the chaplains could be an asset to Rutgers; she clarified that the example related to residential life was only one way in which they could be part of the campus community.[253] Given its limited financial resources, the university could not meet the

[250] Student Services staff member, Personal interview, October 7, 2008.
[251] *Ibid.*
[252] Student Services staff member, Personal interview, October 30, 2008.
[253] Student Services staff member, Email correspondence, March 16, 2012.

varied needs of all of its students. Acknowledging and engaging chaplains who were already providing this support was a decision that expanded resources for students. This was especially valuable in a crisis situation where a rapid response would be necessary. In some ways, chaplains had shifted from a potential problem to a potential resource.

Three of the other rationales described in Chapter 6 ('Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton') did not apply to the Rutgers case. First, the university did not place as high a value on the benefits of Muslim Chaplaincy for non-Muslims. This may have been due to the large Muslim student population which could not be adequately served by a single chaplain, the more pragmatic and applied education it offered, the lower emphasis on internationalisation, and the limited financial resources it had available. As a large commuter campus the role of chaplains in the academic and residential context was entirely different from a private institution. Second, Rutgers was less concerned with competing with peers to maintain prestige and resources. With a more narrow applicant pool, and strong incentives for in-state students, it did not face the same pressure to expend resources to satisfy the real or perceived needs of all segments of the population. Finally, Rutgers did not have the same historical legacy of anti-Semitism, racism, and male exclusivity as Princeton. As a state university, it had often been at the forefront of inclusion.

7.6. CONCLUSION

While I selected Rutgers as a case study since it was the only public university with a full-time Muslim Chaplain and the first school with a chaplain funded by a local community, it turned out not to be representative of other institutions in my sample. The Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers played a different role than any of the others I studied. His efforts were focused on liaising between university administrators and Muslim students and educating administrators about Islam. He provided some pastoral care to Muslim students with acute concerns but he had only modest involvement in the traditional roles of religious and educational leader, MSA advisor, event planner, and interfaith convenor. This atypical portfolio was partially influenced by Fricke's lack of educational and pastoral credentials and challenges to his legitimacy from influential conservative elements in the Rutgers MSA. It may also have been impacted by his skills, personality, and interests. Structurally, he did not have the capacity to serve the enormous Muslim student population at Rutgers which was much larger than the other schools

in my sample. For these reasons, the role of the Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers was very different from the other institutions in my sample, which impacted its transferability to other cases.

Rutgers sanctioned the Muslim Chaplain, as it did other chaplaincies, but there were limits to the institution's ability to support this enterprise. These included legal limitations given ongoing concerns about the separation of 'church and state' in public higher education; financial limitations of the steadily declining resources available to the university; cultural limitations due to the lack of religious literacy among student services staff members; and structural limitations related to the physical decentralisation of the New Brunswick campus. These limitations were common to most public and some private institutions. Despite these limitations, student life professionals at Rutgers were supportive of and invested in the success of Muslim Chaplaincy for two reasons: a desire to mitigate the unique challenges facing Muslim students, and a recognition of the value provided to the institution by Muslim Chaplains.

CHAPTER 8

ANALYSIS

8.1. CONCEPTUAL MODELS REVISITED

In Chapter 2 ('Minority Student Policies in Higher Education'), I described three types of conceptual models – political, cultural and adaptive – which have been used to explain the behaviour and policymaking of colleges and universities. The names and descriptions of these models come directly from the literature. As I described in that chapter, each of them has great strengths alongside substantial limitations.

In the first part of this chapter, I will apply these models to the findings data from Chapters 5, 6, and 7. I will discuss how these conceptual models can be used as tools for understanding how decisions are made in the university context and as lenses that bring clarity and insight to the workings of higher education. Since no model can fully or exclusively explain the complex phenomenon of Muslim Chaplaincy, I will apply each model to the national and dual case study data.

In the second half of this chapter, I will introduce a new conceptual framework which I have developed. The 'anticipatory' model complements the others by providing another framework through which to understand my data. I believe this model has relevance to American higher education beyond the case of Muslim Chaplaincy.

8.1.1. POLITICAL MODEL

The political model of university decision-making was introduced by Baldridge, who viewed universities as political systems (1971). His conceptualisation focused on processes of policy development, and was premised on the idea that various interest groups inside the university

have goals that naturally place them in conflict. These groups articulate their interests by influencing university administrators which act as a legislative body that translates multiple pressures and positions into formal policies. The implementation of these formal policies can lead to another cycle of conflict. Pusser provided a valuable expansion of the political model in two ways. First, he suggested that university administrators could themselves constitute an interest group, rather than simply mediating the interests of other groups (2004, p. 212). Second, he expanded interest groups to include external actors. This notion arose through his case study of public higher education institutions in which the state and other external interest groups had significant power and impact in the university context (2003, p. 135-6).

8.1.1.1. NATIONAL FINDINGS

In this section, I describe ways in which a political analysis of policy-making can explain the data from the national interviews. A key concept in the political model is the notion of an interest group, which articulates its desires with the goal of impacting policy. Based on research about the central role played by minority students acting as interest groups in advocating for ethnic studies and affirmative action in admissions, my initial hypothesis was that Muslim students – possibly through MSAs – were the primary advocates for the creation of chaplaincies on their campuses. To my surprise, fourteen out of twenty-one institutions in my sample (this number does not include Princeton and Rutgers) had what I described as administration-initiated chaplaincies. It was University Chaplains – most of them from mainline Protestant traditions – who were the primary interest group in conceptualising, articulating, advocating, implementing, and supervising these positions.

Although in most cases students were not the primary interest group, there were two schools at which administrators expanded chaplaincies that students had initiated. The role of Muslim students was modest because when this phenomenon began to emerge in the mid-2000s, few of them knew what a Muslim Chaplain was. As knowledge of the role spread, some students began asking university administrators to hire Muslim Chaplains. I predict there is likely be more Muslim student advocacy to create, expand, and fund these positions. This is what seems to have occurred at Northwestern University: a full-time Muslim Chaplain role was created there in the fall of 2010. At least one commentator suggested a relationship between a controversy in which a student group chalked images of Prophet Muhammad around the campus (Turner 2010a, 2010b, 2010c) and the hiring of a chaplain several months later (Carson 2010).

I found that other potential interest groups – such as faculty members, alumni, donors, and

community members – were only minimally active in the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy on private campuses. At public schools – such as Rutgers and the University of Maryland – alumni and community members took a more active leadership role. The participation of other interest groups is changing as the role becomes more well-known. This is apparent in the alumni-led development of community-supported Muslim Chaplaincies at the University of Michigan and Cornell.

All this leads to the question: in the absence of advocacy or pressure from Muslim students, alumni, or faculty members, why *did* University Chaplains so strongly advocate for these roles? Some of these administrators made significant commitments from their own budgets, or expended political capital to lobby their colleagues to fund or authorise them to hire Muslim Chaplains. What interest of theirs was being served by creating Muslim Chaplaincies? Why would they make these commitments, especially when their budgets were reduced or frozen during the recent economic crisis?

In the political model, the notion that various interest groups are in conflict is seen as natural and expected. However, my national data did not reveal obvious conflict in the genesis of Muslim Chaplaincy. This was likely due to the fact that the primary interest group were members of the university administration. As insiders, ORL staff understood how best to advocate for the creation of these positions by making the right case to appropriate university leaders. Even if there had been internal conflict – for example, senior administrators rejecting the idea put forth by a University Chaplain – it would be unlikely to be publicly known or something my informants would have revealed to me in an interview.

Another hypothesis is that there were conflicts for which hiring Muslim Chaplains was a solution. There were longstanding tensions between Muslim and Jewish students on many campuses, which centred largely, but not exclusively, around political issues in Israel and Palestine. These conflicts were ubiquitous on college campuses, and were often waged through vigils, protests, and provocative speakers. American universities provided a public platform to individuals on various sides of the Israel/Palestine conflict – including Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad; Israel's Ambassador to the U.S., Michael Oren; former Muslim Nonie Darwish; and Zionist Harvard professor Alan Dershowitz. University Chaplains – themselves mostly Protestants – were sometimes drawn into these ideological controversies. In those instances, they were sometimes interacting with Jewish students led by Rabbis on the one hand and with Muslim students without adult leaders on the other. For University Chaplains, this may

have highlighted the need for sophisticated and reliable adult leadership for Muslim students. I will discuss this in more detail towards the end of this chapter.

Another hypothesis is that Muslim Chaplains were hired in anticipation of conflicts which might have an impact on Muslim students. Such circumstances might arise from external events including a Muslim-led terrorist attack or political/religious conflict somewhere in the world. Conflict could also emerge from campus events such as speakers, classes, publications, film screenings, art shows, or political action. Job descriptions for Muslim Chaplains often alluded to such possibilities. For example, the 2010 posting for the Northwestern University Muslim Chaplain required 'skills in counselling, crisis management, conflict resolution.' In hiring a Muslim Chaplain, a University Chaplain may have been aiming to protect both Muslim students and others. As such, one could view this action as anticipatory – and specifically, as aiming to pre-empt or prepare for possible conflict.

Administrators understood that hiring a Muslim Chaplain could itself lead to a new cycle of conflict, as predicted by the political model. Although my interviewees did not generally reveal such negative responses, this does not mean that such concerns were not aired in private forums. The one relevant public statement I found was a 2008 news article which reported some significant negative responses to the hiring of the Muslim Chaplain at Duke University:

> In October, a donor to the Duke Chapel wrote to say she could no longer support a university with a Muslim chaplain. 'I feel it necessary to stand up for my Christian religion against what I view as an evil religion at its very heart,' wrote the woman, a resident of Littleton, a town in a Virginia border county north of the Triangle. Other letters, [Muslim Chaplain] Antepli said, had an even harder edge. Christians aren't the only ones wondering about this new position. Muslims in the community are watching Antepli to see if he will represent orthodox Islam or succumb to liberal practices, such as allowing women to lead Jumu'ah, or the Friday noon prayer. (Shimron 2008)

As the article noted, one could imagine dissatisfaction from a variety of interest groups beyond those described in the article: Jews, Hindus, or other religious groups that have experienced conflict with Muslims in various parts of the world; Affiliated Chaplains unhappy about an institutional exception to a long-standing policy not to pay chaplains; atheists or agnostics displeased with additional funding for religious support; administrators concerned about setting a precedent for other religious minorities; liberals concerned about the institutional sanctioning of some of Islam's conservative views; and Muslims not supportive of the role or of the individual in the role.

The political model had significant value in explaining the national findings. Protestant University Chaplains were the primary interest group advocating for the creation of Muslim Chaplaincies; as the role has become more widely known, Muslim students and alumni have become active in this regard. The development of the Muslim Chaplaincies profiled in this study rarely involved public conflict. This may have been a consequence of having an interest group composed of administrators who were able to advocate without conflict. It is also possible that this aspect of the political model is less relevant today than in the 1960s and 1970s; now many negotiations occur in private meeting rooms rather than in the public square. Thus there may have been conflict associated with Muslim Chaplaincy which was not revealed to me in interviews and observations. This is a methodological limitation I discuss in Chapter 4.

8.1.1.2. CASE STUDY FINDINGS

The data from Princeton was very similar to the national findings. At Princeton, as among most of the institutions in my sample, the primary interest group consisted of current and former staff in the ORL. They initiated, developed, advocated for, funded, hired, and supervised the Muslim Chaplain. Muslim students did not play a major role in interest articulation, though they were consulted and especially well-represented on the search committees for both the part-time pilot and full-time permanent chaplains.

Rutgers was very different from the majority of national institutions. In this case, the interest group was local community members who created OMCRU, based on their recognition that Muslim students did not have adequate religious, organisational, or emotional support and their acknowledgement that the university could not provide chaplaincy services. OMCRU asked for recognition as a chaplaincy, and Rutgers granted this as they did for all legitimate groups. This provided Rutgers students with a free and valuable resource that came at no financial cost to the institution. It also provided Rutgers administrators with a free resource for assistance and advice. In particular, administrators turned to the chaplain when they identified Muslim students who needed religiously or culturally appropriate counselling and during the tensions that resulted in the splitting (and later reunification) of the MSA. In the context of ongoing tension between the Jewish and Muslim communities at Rutgers, a Muslim Chaplain had the potential to provide significant support and leadership both to the Muslim community and to Rutgers administrators.

8.1.2. CULTURAL MODEL

Of the three conceptual models I explore in this thesis, the cultural model is the most expansive. It is premised on the notion that an organisation is a social system, and that culture is an 'amalgam of beliefs, ideology, language, ritual, and myth' (Pettigrew 1979, p. 572). As Masland described it, 'organisational culture induces purpose, commitment, and order; provides meaning and social cohesion; and clarifies and explains behavioural expectations' (1985, p. 157-8). Although the concept is diffuse, Tierney describes six elements through which institutional culture may be revealed: environment, mission, socialisation, information, strategy, and leadership (1988, p. 8). Other windows to institutional culture are sagas or histories, heroes, language use, norms, symbols, rituals, the physical campus, assumptions, metaphors, and values (Clark 1970, p. 234-7).

8.1.2.1. NATIONAL FINDINGS

In this section I will describe ways in which a cultural analysis of policymaking can explain the national data. The 21 institutions in my sample shared many structural similarities. Almost all of them can be described as selective, wealthy, four-year institutions that drew students and faculty members from national and international pools. Six were liberal arts colleges, and the rest were research universities; only one was a public institution. All were founded in the nineteenth century or earlier; almost all were residential institutions founded by Protestant clergy. The private schools shared similar origins and structures, which contributed to some common cultural attributes: respect for, and celebration of, institutional history; commitment to a liberal arts education; emphasis on teaching and research; school pride and active engagement of alumni; a long history of donor support especially from alumni, which led to large endowments; an articulated commitment to diversity and inclusion among students, and to affirmative action for racial minorities, legacies, and athletes; a commitment to the spiritual and religious life of students; responsiveness to students and their parents; and attention to physical and campus aesthetics.

Several of these cultural attributes were critical to the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy, and influenced the form it took on each campus. First, the Protestant origin of most of these institutions and their long-standing commitment to spiritual and religious life, meant that they already had University Chaplains grounded in ecumenical perspectives. These religiously literate individuals were the primary advocates for strengthening spiritual and religious support for the entire campus community, and their presence was critical to the emergence of institutionally

sponsored Muslim Chaplaincy. A campus without a commitment to spiritual and religious life, or one with a more sectarian chaplain, might have been less conducive to the development of Muslim Chaplaincy. Second, these campuses had articulated the benefits of various forms of diversity for minority *and* majority students. In this context, it was relatively easy to justify the creation of Muslim Chaplaincy to support a particular student sub-community, given existing support for racial minorities, LGBT students, women, and international students. Third, a willingness and sensitivity to meet the many needs of students and parents had contributed to a culture of accommodation that already included providing prayer space and halal food to Muslim students. The Muslim Chaplain was an extension of those commitments and to bringing some level of parity to the various religious communities.

8.1.2.2. CASE STUDY FINDINGS

Princeton had a strong culture, born of and sustained by its status as an historic, small, centralised, and wealthy institution. There were five aspects of this culture which influenced the structure and function of religious life on campus and consequently the development of Muslim Chaplaincy. First, Princeton was a small community and it provided individual attention to every student. Creating a Muslim Chaplaincy, even if it directly served relatively few individuals, was a manifestation of this ideal of personalised education. Second, there was a culture of exceptionalism in staffing for religious life. Although the official university policy was not to financially support Affiliated Chaplaincies, in 1994 the university raised money to build the CJL. This was the first exception to the policy. Subsequent exceptions were made to hire the Muslim and Hindu Chaplains. Third, Princeton had a long-standing history of exclusion and elitism most visible in the treatment of Jews, African-Americans, and women in undergraduate admissions and at the independent Eating Clubs. A desire to overcome that legacy may have contributed to Princeton's early creation of Muslim Chaplaincy. Fourth, Princeton was uniquely attentive to its alumni and they exerted a particularly strong influence on the institution through their financial support. The potential influence of current and future Muslim alumni may have contributed to the development of the chaplaincy. Fifth, as a residential college, the vast majority of students lived on campus. This meant that they not only shared academic experiences, but also social, athletic, and extracurricular life. This level of contact led to an intense, uniform, and somewhat insular community and culture.

In contrast to Princeton and many of the other institutions I studied, Rutgers had a relatively weak culture. There were three aspects of this culture which played a particular role in the structure and function of religious life on campus. First, the university's weak finances could not

sustain a generous financial aid program or extensive campus housing, which resulted in many students working part-time or full-time and living off-campus. This led to a commuter culture in which students did not look to the university to provide support for activities outside the classroom and laboratory, including religious or pastoral provisions. In any case, tight budgets could not finance those extracurricular activities. Second, Rutgers's mission placed a significant emphasis on accessibility and affordability to a wide range of students from within the state, which resulted in a large student body. Consequently, it focused on the needs of the majority of students and did not cater to subpopulations such as Muslim students. Third, Rutgers was a consolidation of several campuses which were geographically distinct; this decentralisation gave rise to separate academic and residential programs which limited the ability of some religious groups to develop a cohesive community.

8.1.3. ADAPTIVE MODEL

In this thesis, I explore three strands of the adaptive model, which differs from both the political and cultural models in its emphasis on how higher education institutions influence and are influenced by their environments. This model views colleges and universities as porous organisations profoundly embedded in a societal context. Resource dependency theory rests on the notion that organisations are dependent on their environment for resources. The theory of institutional isomorphism details mechanisms by which institutions come to resemble each other as a response to environmental uncertainty. Strategic choice theory emphasises organisations as a dominant coalition of interest groups, and strategic choice as the active responsibility of managers.

8.1.3.1. NATIONAL FINDINGS

In this section, I will test the usefulness of the three theories of the adaptive model to explain the findings generated at the 21 colleges and universities in my sample.

RESOURCE DEPENDENCY THEORY

Except in a few instances, the development of Muslim Chaplaincy had little to do with dependence on outside resources and much more to do with internal advocacy and actions. All higher education institutions are dependent on their environments for financial and other resources, and they are influenced by the individuals and organisations upon which they depend. The stakeholders most likely to exert external influence on the institution – parents,

alumni, donors – were not particularly active in this regard. While a few parents and alumni were pleased to hear that Muslim Chaplains existed, and a few students made decisions to attend a specific college based on this information, the development of Muslim Chaplaincy was not significantly influenced by the preferences of students or their parents.

However, there were a few institutions where the creation of a Muslim Chaplaincy may have been used to maintain or attract financial resources to the university. The schools most likely to fall into this category were those that created positions in the 1990s to provide support to a significant, full-tuition-paying, overseas Muslim population. Women's colleges Wellesley and Mount Holyoke had relatively large numbers of foreign Muslim students in the 1990s, and they were among the first institutions to have created these roles. A slightly different example is Georgetown, the first institution to have a full-time Muslim Chaplain; an informant there posited that administrators used the appointment to demonstrate to donors the institution's commitment to Islam and Muslim student life.[254] In 2005 Georgetown's Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding received a $20 million donation from Saudi Arabia's Prince Alwaleed Bin Talal (Murphy 2005). Just before my visit in 2009, alumnus and former Lebanese Prime Minister Saad Hariri made a $20 million donation to Georgetown's Business School (Echols 2009). These large gifts suggest that Georgetown had a strategy to engage Arab donors which may have been supported by the distinctive role played by its Muslim Chaplain in university life and as a representative of the institution more broadly.

INSTITUTIONAL ISOMORPHISM THEORY

As I described in Chapter 2 ('Minority Student Policies in Higher Education'), there are three mechanisms of isomorphism, that seem to be at play in the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy: (1) coercive, which operates through formal and informal pressure exerted by bodies that control resources, political power, or legitimacy; (2) mimetic, in which organisations model themselves on others that possess greater legitimacy or success; and (3) normative, which operates through the imposition of professional standards and values through the influence of peers or gate-keeping agencies (DiMaggio & Powell 1983, p. 150). I contend that the year when an institution began paying a Muslim Chaplain can be roughly correlated to the type of isomorphic pressure at play.

[254] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, October 15, 2009.

Figure 8.1: Year When Institutions Began Paying Part/Full-Time Muslim Chaplains[255]

1993: Wellesley	2002: none
1994: none	2003: Wesleyan
1995: none	2004: Brandeis
1996: Bard	2005: Amherst, NYU, Trinity, Yale
1997: Mount Holyoke*	2006: American, Brown, Dartmouth, Princeton
1998: none	2007: none
1999: Georgetown	2008: DePaul*, Duke, Simmons, Tufts
2000: none	2009: University of Pennsylvania
2001: none	2010: Babson*, Fairfield*, Queen's College (CUNY)*, Northwestern*, Wake Forest*
	2011: Williams*, Quinnipiac*

* Denotes institutions not in my sample

Figure 8.1 shows colleges and universities by the year in which the institution began paying a Muslim Chaplain. The first wave of hires, from 1993 to 2004, operated prior to significant isomorphic pressure. The schools that hired Muslim Chaplains in this period seemed to have institution-specific reasons for doing so. As women's colleges, Wellesley and Mount Holyoke had long attracted large numbers of female Muslim students. The single-sex and non-urban setting of both schools appealed to Muslim families in the United States and abroad (Lewin 2008).[256] In these cases, student demographics and the desire to support and grow the international student population may have been part of what led administrators to hire

[255] This is not necessarily the same year in which the university sanctioned its first Muslim Chaplain. For example, although Duke sanctioned an unpaid Muslim Chaplain in 1999, it first paid a chaplain in 2008, so it is listed by the latter date. Institutions which have unpaid chaplains are not included in this chart.
[256] Also see this transcript of a radio interview: http://www.theworld.org/2009/12/us-women-colleges-appeal-to-muslims. Accessed on May 20, 2012.

chaplains. Administrators at other institutions had different motivations. Georgetown was stimulated by a Jesuit mission to engage in interfaith work; Brandeis may have been similarly motivated as a secular, Jewish university. Wesleyan's first Muslim Chaplain was hired in response to student advocacy.

The second wave in 2005 and 2006 was influenced by normative isomorphism, which operated through the imposition of professional standards and values through peers or gate-keeping agencies. Four out of five Ivy League institutions with a Muslim Chaplain hired the first person in that role during this period. In addition, Trinity College hired the half-time Muslim Chaplain at Wesleyan University, to create a joint full-time position. The timing of these hires was not coincidental; as Muslim Chaplaincy was being actively discussed among administrators at these selective schools. This contact was facilitated by professional organisations for chaplains – the Association for College and University Religious Affairs, the International Association of Chaplains in Higher Education, and the National Association of College and University Chaplains – at which Muslim Chaplaincy was a topic of formal and informal conversation.[257]

In addition to membership in professional organisations, geographic proximity may also have played a role in disseminating the concept of Muslim Chaplaincy. We can see this most clearly in the case of Trinity College and Wesleyan University. They were close neighbours, academic peers, and athletic rivals; Wesleyan had a part-time chaplain for a couple of years before Trinity approached the same person to serve its community. This arrangement occurred through contact between the two University Chaplains and Muslim students on both campuses.[258] It may also have been influenced by the location of the Hartford Seminary in the same city. Beyond this case, there was a concentration of paid Muslim Chaplains in the metropolitan Boston area, beginning with Wellesley in 1993 and including Brandeis, Simmons, Tufts, and Babson. There were also unpaid chaplains in the area at MIT, Harvard, Northeastern, and Boston University. There was a similar trend in Western Massachusetts, at schools including Smith, Mount Holyoke, Amherst, and Williams (and there had previously been chaplains at Hampshire and Springfield College). In this rural area, some of the chaplains served multiple institutions. The creation of some of these positions may have had less to do with meeting clearly articulated needs and demands, and more to do with adopting responses similar to local peers during an uncertain and volatile time for Muslim-Americans in the early 21st century.

[257] University Chaplain, Personal interview, September 26, 2011.
[258] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, January 12, 2010.

The third wave, from 2008 to 2012, represented mimetic isomorphism – through which organisations modelled themselves on others that possessed greater legitimacy or success. The Catholic universities of DePaul and Fairfield hired Muslim Chaplains in this period. Though neither was in my sample, I suspect they were following Georgetown, which is the nation's leading Catholic institution. Tufts, Duke, University of Pennsylvania, and Northwestern also made appointments in this period, following the lead of the most selective research universities, including four Ivy League schools (Yale, Brown, Dartmouth and Princeton). As the Muslim Chaplain at one of these institutions explained

> [University X] can't remain what it was. Otherwise it will become anachronistic to its peer institutions. You know what I mean? And it won't be able to compete for the same students and the same faculty that you know Harvard does, Columbia does.[259]

In addition, several liberal arts colleges – Simmons, Babson, and Wake Forest – made appointments in this period, following their top-tier peers at Wellesley, Mount Holyoke, Wesleyan, Amherst, and Trinity. Simmons may also have been influenced by other women's colleges. The colleges and universities that hired Muslim Chaplains at this time did so partially because they aspired to follow their more selective peers. In addition, the institutions in this group were able to take the steps they did because their selective peers had already done so, reducing the administrative uncertainty and likelihood of criticism for these decisions.

I predict a future wave that might involve coercive isomorphism. This mechanism generally operates through formal and informal pressures exerted by bodies that control resources, political power, or legitimacy. Colleges and universities are unlikely to exert such pressures directly on their peers, but I imagine such isomorphism could be imposed by students, alumni, or agents external to the university. Elements of this were already visible in 2010. The decisions to hire and expand the roles of Muslim Chaplains at Northwestern, University of Pennsylvania, and Dartmouth were significantly influenced by student advocacy. One informant explained that students at one of these institutions developed a comprehensive white paper, which relied heavily on benchmarking data from peers.[260] Students were able to point to the existence and value of Muslim Chaplaincies at other schools to persuade administrators of the necessity of these roles. In the future, having a Muslim Chaplain could become an expectation for students

[259] David Coolidge, Muslim Chaplain, Dartmouth College, Personal interview, March 7, 2009.
[260] *Ibid.*

at selective colleges and universities – similar to having an African-American Studies programme or an LGBT resource centre.

Institutional isomorphism was noticeably weaker at public schools because they did not have University Chaplains to act as advocates for the creation of Muslim Chaplaincy. Without these leaders, there were no natural stakeholders to participate in professional chaplaincy groups where these conversations were taking place. Legal, financial, and public relations considerations were also likely to inhibit isomorphic pressures. Furthermore, in contrast to the close physical proximity of private schools which may have facilitated the diffusion of Muslim Chaplaincy within a city or small region, public institutions were, by design, spread much further apart. These structural limitations may have hindered the development of normative isomorphism.

Beyond the structural issues, the missions and tuition structures of most public schools meant that the vast majority of their students came from within the state. Traditionally, these schools had little to do to recruit or attract students, given low in-state tuition and modest entry requirements. Without the same pressures to compete, public institutions were less likely to participate in mimetic isomorphism. In this context, even coercive isomorphism was unlikely to take hold since it would be difficult for students, alumni, or others to advocate for funding Muslim Chaplaincy in a context where the institution provided no support for religious and spiritual life.

STRATEGIC CHOICE THEORY

Strategic choice theory emphasises the role of institutional decision-makers – in this case, administrators – in setting the direction for the organisation through creating, managing, and implementing strategies and plans that control the environment. Instead of responding to environmental pressures as predicted in resource dependency theory, or reacting to peer pressure as predicted in institutional isomorphism, strategic choice theory focuses on the agency of administrators in taking a proactive role in shaping the context in which they operate. In some ways this theory is similar to the political model, especially in light of Pusser's modifications in which administrators can be considered an interest group with an agenda (2004, p. 212).

Strategic choice theory can provide value in understanding the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy. It underscores the singular and powerful role of the University Chaplain in

developing and advocating for the resources and authorisation to create paid Muslim Chaplaincy positions. As the hiring authority, University Chaplains profoundly shaped the form and function of these roles in three key ways – they dictated the scope of the position, they selected the individual serving in the role, and they managed that individual. These provided significant influence over the work of the Muslim Chaplain and ensured that these individuals had a primary duty to serving the college.

In making the decision to hire Muslim Chaplains, University Chaplains defined the mandate of these roles. In reviewing eleven job descriptions, I identified a few themes that illustrate how Muslim Chaplains were expected to advance the values and perspectives of the institution. For example, several job descriptions emphasised the diversity of the Muslim community itself, and the responsibility the Chaplain had to create an environment inclusive of all those who identify as Muslim. Yale's 2008 position description described an individual that will 'work engagingly with Yale's diverse Muslim community consisting of members from different regional backgrounds, branches of Muslim thought and practice, legal traditions and levels of religious observance.' Another key theme was the importance of a commitment to interfaith interaction and comfort with the multicultural campus environment. DePaul's 2008 description stated:

> In compliance with our interfaith hospitality spirit, the chaplain supports the interfaith and ecumenical vision and practice of our Religious Diversity ministry at the University... The candidate must... be comfortable working in a multi-faith and multi-cultural college environment.

Another theme that cut across institutions was the importance of the Muslim Chaplain's engagement with local Muslim congregations. This was mentioned in several job descriptions: Yale (2008), Dartmouth (2009), Duke (2008) and Northwestern (2010).

The role of Muslim Chaplain was profoundly conceptualised as advancing the goals of the university first, and the goals of a religious denomination second. The themes above reflected the interests and priorities of educational institutions, though they were not central to what some Muslims might consider key responsibilities for a chaplain. One could imagine that a job description written by a Muslim alumni group or a national organisation might not mention or prioritise the themes from the previous paragraph, but instead emphasise religious credentials such as experience serving as an Imam or congregational leader, fluency in Arabic, knowledge of the Qur'an and other religious texts, or formal training in Islamic theology.

8.1.3.2. CASE STUDY FINDINGS

In this section, I explore the utility of resource dependency theory, institutional isomorphism, and strategic choice theory in explaining the development of Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton and Rutgers.

RESOURCE DEPENDENCY THEORY

Resource dependency theory was not particularly useful in explaining the development of Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton. I did not find evidence that the chaplaincy had been created to attract financial resources through students or donors. Sultan explained that he had only met with colleagues in the Admission Office on a couple of occasions and that although they had been cordial, they had not actively sought his involvement in recruiting Muslim students.[261] He also had minimal contact with colleagues in fundraising who had not tapped him as a resource during the university's $1.75 billion capital campaign. In contrast, the CJL had been deemed a priority in the capital campaign.[262] Rabbi Roth regularly met with the Admission Office and worked extensively with university fundraisers.[263] The difference was both structural and historic. Roth and her predecessors had long advised the university on its persistent inability to attract Jewish undergraduates in numbers comparable to its peers. In addition, many donors to CJL had also given funds to the university. As such, fundraising from Jewish alumni often required coordination and negotiation between the CJL and the university. Although resource dependency did not seem to be a current factor in Muslim Chaplaincy, it is possible that may change in the future.

The university is substantially dependent on revenue from the state of New Jersey; as such, it behoves Rutgers not to jeopardise access to those resources by spending them in a way that is perceived to be inappropriate. Even if administrators at the institution had felt that hiring a Muslim Chaplain was a valuable accommodation for its large Muslim student population, they would have been highly unlikely to make such an accommodation if it were likely to jeopardise state funding and support. While this specific concern had not arisen at Rutgers, there was ample evidence from other public institutions that such efforts by administrators could result in legal challenges, consequences for its fundraising, alumni and community relations, and student recruitment. Any potential benefit of a university-sponsored Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers would thus have been dramatically outweighed by reputational and financial risk.

---

[261] Sohaib Sultan, Muslim Chaplain, Princeton University, Personal interview, April 16, 2012.
[262] See: http://giving.princeton.edu/priorities/princeton_experience/campus_life/. Accessed on April 28, 2012.
[263] Religious Life staff member, Personal interview, August 27, 2008.

INSTITUTIONAL ISOMORPHISM THEORY

Institutional isomorphism was useful in explaining the Princeton case study. As I described earlier in this section, the university's decision to create a Muslim Chaplaincy was part of a second wave of hirings which I identified with normative isomorphism (that is, the imposition of standards or values through gatekeepers or peers). Evidence of this can be seen in Figure 8.2 which depicts the structural changes (paid/unpaid, part-time/full-time) that occurred at the five Ivy League schools that now have paid Muslim Chaplains.[264]

Figure 8.2: Development of Muslim Chaplaincy in the Ivy League

Academic Year	Brown	Dartmouth	U Penn	Princeton	Yale
2003-2004	none	Unpaid, part-time	none	none	Unpaid, part-time
2004-2005	none	Unpaid, part-time	none	none	Unpaid, part-time
2005-2006	Paid, part-time	Unpaid, part-time	none	none	Paid, part-time
2006-2007	Paid, part-time	Paid, part-time	none	Paid, part-time	Paid, part-time
2007-2008	Paid, part-time	vacant	none	vacant	Paid, part-time
2008-2009	vacant	Paid, part-time	none	Paid, full-time	Paid, full-time
2009-2010	Paid, full-time	Paid, full-time*	Paid, part time	Paid, full-time	Paid, full-time
2010-2011	Paid, full-time	Paid, full-time*	Paid, part-time	Paid, full-time	Paid, full-time
2011-2012	Paid, full-time	Paid, full-time*	Paid, part-time	Paid, full-time	Paid, full-time

* Note – Although this individual is paid full-time, officially his Chaplaincy duties are half-time. The other half of his duties relate to secular service and education initiatives.

In a matter of a few academic years, five Ivy League institutions went from having no paid Muslim Chaplains to having part-time and full-time individuals in these roles. The rapid transition and similar structure of these roles suggest that these institutions were following or consulting with each other during these developments. My informants explained that, in

[264] Columbia, Cornell, and Harvard are not included since none of them have had a university-paid person in the role.

addition to conversations at national chaplaincy conferences and meetings, the eight Ivy League University Chaplains participated in a peer group that met once or twice a year.[265] Conversations at these meetings spread information about the value of Muslim Chaplaincy and kept institutions apprised of the actions of their peer schools.

Institutional isomorphism had less explanatory value for Rutgers since the isomorphic pressures were generally so much lower at public schools. When I began my research, Rutgers was the only institution with a Muslim Chaplain funded by local community members and alumni. By 2011, similar efforts were underway at both Cornell and the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. Still, these were outliers in the landscape of volunteer and university-paid Muslim Chaplaincies. Developmentally, I would describe public institutions at a pre-isomorphic stage, similar to the first wave of positions at private institutions between 1993-2004. As such, decisions were still being made at public schools based on campus-specific needs or alumni advocacy, not on communication or coordination with peers.

STRATEGIC CHOICE THEORY

Strategic choice theory – which highlights the agency of institutional decision makers in resisting environmental pressures and shaping institutional agendas – is incredibly valuable in explaining the events at Princeton which began with a mandate from the senior administration to Breidenthal to provide better religious support for Muslim students. This resulted in his hiring of Raushenbush, who oversaw interfaith and multi-faith activities, and led to the eventual hiring of Latif as the university's first Muslim Chaplain. When Boden replaced Breidenthal, she continued the charge, and Raushenbush led the search to hire Sultan. It was truly the decisions made Breidenthal and Boden that shaped the Muslim Chaplaincy in place today.

Rutgers was a different case. The university did not fund nor hire a Muslim Chaplain and administrators were constrained by environmental variables including precedent, finances, and legal considerations. For Rutgers, strategic choice theory was not a useful explanatory framework, since administrators played a very minimal role in shaping the context in which they were operating.

[265] University Chaplain, Personal interview, September 26, 2011.

8.2. RISK MANAGEMENT AND THE ANTICIPATORY UNIVERSITY

8.2.1. THE ANTICIPATORY UNIVERSITY

While the political, cultural, and adaptive models provided significant value in understanding the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy in the higher education context, I began to discern a theme, which – though not explicitly suggested by my informants – seemed to explain several of my findings and undergird some of the rationales that were identified in my case studies. That theme was a desire to minimise and mitigate risk. In the remaining half of this chapter, I draw upon my research, my experience as a university administrator, and a broader analysis of American higher education to propose a new model of the 'anticipatory university' which is finely attuned to, and actively engaged in managing, risk. I argue that the anticipatory university provides a useful framework through which to understand the development of Muslim Chaplaincy.

Risk is any issue that negatively affects an institution's ability to meet its objectives (Mattie 2007, p. 3). The wide variety of risks that colleges and universities were concerned with can be divided into four primary categories: (1) operational risk related to internal processes, people, and systems, or the ability to respond to external events; (2) financial risk related to the protection of assets; (3) compliance risk related to compliance with applicable laws, rules and standards; and (4) reputational risk related to an organisation's reputation or standing. Some issues can cross multiple risk categories. The first three types of risk are generally the easiest to manage, since they are largely under the control of the university administration. In general, these risks can be more easily predicted, assessed, and managed. The final type of risk is more dispersed and difficult to control; it can be influenced and even enacted by constituents beyond the university, and can continue to damage the institution even after the underlying issue has been resolved.

I have identified three characteristics of the anticipatory university: (1) a preoccupation and active approach to risk management, (2) a high level of concern for reputational risk, and (3) a keen awareness of peer status and activity. I will describe each of these in the sections below.

8.2.1.1. CONCERN FOR RISK AND PROACTIVE RISK MANAGEMENT

While references to 'risk' in my interviews and fieldwork were indirect and subtle, I came to see the rhetoric and power of risk most clearly through my administrative responsibilities at

Princeton. The concept was ubiquitous in conversations I had with colleagues. A common formulation was the portrayal of a worst-case scenario in which a particular issue might 'make it to the cover of the *New York Times*' or some other newspaper. A colleague working in communications explained how she helped to shape policy by asking individuals to 'think about how the press will interpret' a particular decision or issue. I also heard risk framed by the common phrase, 'X keeps me up at night,' where X is an issue of unexplored or unresolved risk. A colleague in student affairs put it another way. She said that her work involved the possibility for 'career-ending incidents' every day, implying that some students posed a great risk to themselves and others, and that a horrific student action or its aftermath could seriously affect her career or that of other administrators. I imagined she was referring to incidents where Princeton could be held morally or legally liable for not preventing, or not responding appropriately to, a student action or potential action.

Though they did not use the term until quite recently, universities have long been aware of and responsive to risk. In the last few years, that has sharpened due to increased scrutiny of higher education by various constituencies, new ways in how information is collected and shared, and changed expectations about who should be served by higher education. These contemporary circumstances lead to a contemporary response, and I use the term 'anticipatory university' to describe the strategic, sometimes aggressive, approach to risk management which has become a central feature of higher education institutional decision-making. While there is not a robust academic literature about risk management in higher education, there are a few professional organisations that have focused on this topic.[266]

The anticipatory university has shifted the approach to risk management from reactive to proactive. Traditionally, institutions responded to risks as they arose. For example, Princeton made a commitment to co-education only after Yale publicly announced that it was moving forward with its co-educational plan in 1969 (Synnott 2004, p. 118). In the same way, in the 1960s Rutgers made big commitments to black students after they stormed the university (McCormick 1990, p. 67-70). Another example is the longstanding policy of providing counteroffers to faculty members with employment offers from rival institutions. Today, universities increasingly take a proactive approach to issues before they become acute especially those that have the resources to do so. From my administrative experience, I know that Princeton and many other institutions conduct an annual risk audit to identify, assess, and

[266] These organisations include the National Association of College and University Business Officers, Association of College and University Auditors, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, and University Risk Management and Insurance Association.

mitigate potential risks. This exercise is a methodical and deliberate way to approach risk management. I would argue that the decisions by ORL staff at Princeton to build a *wu'du* facility and hire a Muslim Chaplain – without requests or advocacy from Muslim students – were both examples of taking a proactive approach to needs before they were articulated.

8.2.1.2. REPUTATIONAL RISK

Reputational risk is a key concern in the current environment, where it can have a direct impact on the types of students who apply to colleges and subsequently attend them, the types of faculty members who can be recruited, and the amount of money that can be raised from alumni and other donors. The level of competition among institutions is particularly high, which means that no universities can afford to alienate or appear to slight any individual or group. The reputational threat here is that if a campus becomes known as unfriendly or hostile to a certain group, it could have a negative effect on the institution's ability to recruit students, staff, faculty members, and allies of that community, and could also have implications for other aspects of institutional life.

The focus of the anticipatory university has shifted from operational, financial, and compliance risk to reputational risk. As institutions have become more sophisticated in their understanding of risk, they have been able to implement systems to better mitigate concrete risks that are primarily under administrative control. For example, by dedicating increased staff and resources to risk management, colleges and universities are better prepared to deal with physical safety and security, budgetary volatility, and legal and regulatory actions. Managing reputational risk, however, is much more difficult since students, faculty, staff, alumni, and trustees all have a stake in impacting something as intangible as an institution's reputation. In addition, reputation is heavily shaped by the modern media which is increasingly diffuse, rapid, and unmediated. This places a lot of power beyond the control of administrators who respond by spending significant resources on shaping and promoting key internal and external messages. In recent years, the higher education communications enterprise has increased dramatically. Simple press releases have been replaced with an arsenal of websites, social media strategies, videos, newsfeeds, and sophisticated email communications aimed at controlling and articulating the messages the university wants to convey.

Institutional reputation was based largely on highly subjective metrics, such as perceived academic excellence (Samarasekara 2011). Attracting top faculty was central to an institution's reputation, which in turn was critical to attracting top students (especially graduate students),

large levels of donor support and research funding, and high rankings and accolades. Universities traded on their reputations, and this was most intense among selective, national, schools which were competing with each other for the same students, faculty members, government grants, corporate partners, and major donors. Selective public and private institutions were highly vulnerable: they received the most visibility and scrutiny, and they had high expectations to meet. On the other hand, non-selective schools were also vulnerable; their exceedingly limited resources and decreasing government support (in the case of public schools) meant they had to focus on creating and maintaining a reputation with less. The stakes for them were particularly high – failing to attract sufficient resources or enrolment could result in foreclosure. Although institutions were constantly striving to improve their reputations, significant changes in the rankings took decades to achieve and were highly correlated with the age and wealth of an institution. Less favourable rankings actually led to lower student quality (Monks & Ehrenberg 1999, p. 42-3). On the other hand, reputations could be tarnished in a relatively short time, for relatively minor reasons.

Reputations were especially vulnerable in the new media environment, where unverified consumer-generated content can spread rapidly – through social media, viral news, and other mechanisms. Reputations were also notoriously long-lasting and difficult to change. As I explained in Chapter 6 ('Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton'), the university's anti-Semitic actions in the early-to-mid-twentieth century led to a persistent reputation that it was unwelcoming to Jewish students despite having had a Jewish president and other senior administrators, a centrally located and university-funded CJL with a kosher dining hall, and proximity to New York City which had one of the largest and most vibrant Jewish communities in the world. As a result, Princeton's undergraduate Jewish population was still one-third to one-half as large as Harvard's or Yale's. This was troubling because it meant that Princeton could not attract a substantial number of top students in the undergraduate applicant pool. Reputations were also self-fulfilling. Princeton's low number of Jewish students made it more difficult to attract others.

The focus on reputational risk was linked to the rise and increased intensity of a variety of processes in which institutions were compared to each other or to a fixed set of standards. These included university ranking systems, which were skewed towards subjective or output-focused metrics of excellence; academic accreditation processes, which held institutions to a proscribed set of standards; the ubiquitous practice of benchmarking, through which universities compared themselves to their peers; development of formal and informal peer

associations which shared 'best practices'; and increased compliance through a variety of government regulatory agencies. Beyond that, most colleges and universities were under intense scrutiny by government, media, donors, parents, alumni, and community members. These organisations were attractive targets for special interest groups trying to advance a particular agenda. This recent and growing scrutiny was facilitated by information-gathering and sharing through modern technology. Ever-increasing ease of contact through phone, email, and travel, and the proliferation of non-traditional media forms, reduced the cost of entry for commentators and 'watchdogs'.

Since they already enjoyed a high status, selective schools had little to gain and much to lose. These institutions responded most aggressively when their stated values of meritocracy, inclusivity, and integrity were challenged. For example, after Harvard's then-President Larry Summers questioned the merit and scholarship of African-American public intellectual Cornel West with what some described as racist overtones, West publicly defected to Princeton (Belluck 2002). This was widely considered one of the great missteps of Summers's tenure as president. The other was a 2005 speech in which he suggested that the under-representation of women in the sciences might be due to the dearth of women with the highest levels of scientific aptitude (O'Rourke 2005). These incidents led to a no-confidence vote from the faculty, which ended Summers's tenure in 2006. The following year he was replaced by Drew Gilpin Faust, Harvard's first female president. One explanation for this dramatic turn of events is that to maintain its selective status, Harvard could not afford a reputation as unwelcoming or hostile to African-Americans and women. This was both because upholding these values was essential to attracting the best students and teachers (which was critical to institutional reputation), and because such accusations referenced a past that administrators did not want to confront.

Selective colleges and universities promoted active support of various minority groups through policies and programming. This took several tangible forms. Sometimes it involved responding to active public conflicts or tensions; other times it involved responding to privately voiced concerns from students or other interest groups; and still other times it involved pre-emptive action for groups that had not yet asked for support. In this final case, the goal was both genuinely to promote inclusivity but also to avoid escalating into conflict. Conflict of any sort was seen as a liability; it could tarnish reputations in ways that could not be predicted, mitigated, or reversed. In an age of intense public scrutiny, avoiding conflict was of paramount importance to educational institutions, and it undergirded much pro-active action.

8.2.1.3. RISK AND PEER COMPETITION

The anticipatory university is constantly comparing itself to its peers. In many arenas, success is not an absolute value, but is defined relative to peer institutions. Risk management, therefore, involves not only mitigating potential negative outcomes but also taking measured risks to achieve positive outcomes. In some cases, the policies or actions of one institution convince leaders of peer schools to take similar actions; in other cases, peer data is used to justify or defend actions that institutional leaders want to pursue. This benchmarking has been occurring informally for decades as evidenced by numerous similar policy changes over the years in admissions at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton (Karabel 2005a, p. 397, 431-2). The comparative mindset has increased dramatically, as evidenced by the delineation of peer groups against which many administrative decisions are measured.

Every year selective schools are compared against each other on the number of applications they receive, the rates of acceptance and yield, the percentage of under-represented minorities accepted, and the percentage of students receiving financial aid. Some of these comparisons take place publicly in newspapers and on blogs, and others take place privately in board meetings and administrative offices. An example from my fieldwork was the consistent refrain in my interviews and in the press – from various institutions including Bard, Brown, Georgetown, Duke, and Princeton – that they had been the first or among the first to hire a Muslim Chaplain (Niebuhr 1999; Li 2008; Lichter 2009; Daneman 2011). There was cachet attached to being a 'first mover' in Muslim Chaplaincy – in having committed to it before peer schools; it was a sign of leadership that institutions wanted to promote, so that they would be considered more enlightened or progressive than their peers.

I have seen first-hand how many policy considerations involve benchmarking against other schools. Knowledge about the activities of institutional peers has been facilitated through informal exchanges and formal data-sharing programmes such as the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE) and the American Association of Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE).[267] Princeton has defined its peers as the 'Ivy+' group.[268] Among these schools, it was most concerned with the activities of Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and MIT. Rutgers has defined its

[267] COFHE is a select group of 31 private liberal arts colleges and national universities: http://web.mit.edu/cofhe; and AAUDE is an invitation-only group of 34 public, 25 private, and 2 Canadian research universities that includes both Princeton and Rutgers: http://aaude.org.

[268] There is no single definition of Ivy+. It includes all eight Ivy League institutions as well as some of the following (depending on the context): Stanford, MIT, Duke, University of Chicago, and Johns Hopkins. The term is widely used by this group of institutions as it relates to defining peers and benchmarking on a variety of academic and non-academic metrics.

peers as the 34 public American Association of Universities institutions; it identified nine of them as those to which it has particular aspirations.[269]

There were risks associated with action and risks associated with inaction. Within an institutional peer group, the risk associated with a specific action changed over time. In general, selective institutions did not want to take the risk, either of being 'first movers', or of being 'late adopters', in pursuing new policies. The first institutions to hire Muslim Chaplains were concerned with the risk of creating a new position. For example, would they be seen as promoting a religion thought by some to be violent, extreme, or antithetical to liberal values? Would they be accused of bowing to the dictates of political correctness, or of chasing Middle East mega-donors? Would there be pressure from other religious groups demanding similar support? Would Muslim students reject a university-selected chaplain as inauthentic? Would having a Muslim Chaplain upset Jewish, LGBT, or non-practicing Muslim students, faculty, or alumni? As Muslim Chaplaincy spread and gained credibility among selective institutions, the risk became one of being left behind peer institutions that had already hired Muslim Chaplains. Would the lack of a Muslim Chaplain increase the likelihood of Muslim students turning down an offer of admission? Would there be pressure from students and alumni to match the accommodations offered at peer schools? Would universities without Muslim Chaplains be seen as intolerant, parochial, homogeneous?

In the case of Muslim Chaplaincy, Princeton was among the first large institutions to provide financial support for the role. By hiring a part-time chaplain at about the same time as several of its peers (including Brown, Duke, and Yale), it was able to claim 'first mover' status – as it did, publicly, in a recent ORL job description: 'Princeton is proud to have created the first full-time position of Hindu Chaplain in American higher education and the second national position of Muslim Chaplain.' As institutional isomorphism theory predicts, it also allowed the university to have the protection and validity that comes from taking action at the same time as its peers. In a sense, Rutgers acted in a similar fashion. None of its peer institutions had paid chaplains of any kind and Rutgers followed that example.

[269] The nine aspirational peers are three University of California campuses (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and San Diego) and the Universities of Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin.

8.2.2. MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY AS RISK MANAGEMENT

I want to argue that the emergence of institutionally-funded Muslim Chaplaincy is a development of the anticipatory university. The three key rationales expressed in the Princeton case study can be understood as proxies for risk management. First, one of the explanations for hiring a Muslim Chaplain was a desire to overcome the university's reputation for being among the least diverse and least tolerant selective colleges in the country. As I described earlier in this thesis, Princeton administrators were cognisant that this reputation still had a serious impact on the university's ability to attract top Jewish students. Second, a related rationale was a desire to remain competitive with peers. Since the quality of the student body was a key driver of reputation, having a Muslim Chaplain could be viewed as an anticipatory effort to buttress a competitive position. Third, another rationale was a desire to maintain prestige and resources. In this case, top students and faculty buoyed prestige which motivated and compelled donors; these donors provided the resources for top salaries, generous financial aid packages, and other benefits to retain top faculty and attract top students.

Risk mitigation was also an underlying rationale for the Rutgers administration's support for and sanction of Muslim and other chaplaincies. Given the university's modest funding and large student body, administrators viewed chaplains as an additional resource for its leanly-staffed student life division. Chaplains were able to supplement university-sponsored services by providing religiously and culturally appropriate pastoral care. This was especially important for students in personal crisis or in the wake of trauma on campus or beyond. Given the legal sensitivity to religion at Rutgers (and other public institutions), it was useful to have chaplaincy resources without the institution being directly responsible for funding them. This was a risk-mitigation strategy to serve students without overstepping legal boundaries. The presence of chaplaincies also reduced the likelihood of intra-student tensions, which could result in negative publicity for the school. Many of these rationales were also relevant to the Princeton case.

As a risk management strategy, Muslim Chaplaincy did two things: (1) it vested internal leadership and control of the Muslim community with a single adult, and (2) externally, it provided someone with the authority to represent and speak on behalf of the community. I will explore these in further detail below. To do this I will draw on the Princeton case study which provided rich examples of Muslim Chaplaincy leadership. The Rutgers case is far less useful here, due to the weak leadership of the Muslim Chaplain and his lack of authority with Muslim students. These findings should not be generalised to other institutions.

8.2.2.1. MUSLIM CHAPLAIN AS LEADER

The creation of a Muslim Chaplaincy vested primary leadership, responsibility, and control for the campus Muslim community with a single adult, hired by the administration or a local community/alumni group but credible to students. Appointing a community leader incentivised certain kinds of behaviour and dis-incentivised others. It streamlined daily contact between students and senior administrators, and created official bureaucratic processes and protocols for conversations and requests. It transferred primary responsibility for events and activities from students to the chaplain, thereby increasing efficiency and sustainability. This meant that students were sometimes less involved in organising events when there was a chaplain to take ownership of those responsibilities.[270]

Chaplains were usually on the front line of crisis management – to encourage Muslim students to act in ways that would best represent them and the institution. They were able to identify students with concerns or grievances and engage them well before they resorted to destructive or public solutions. They were also able to manage and control student responses to complex and volatile situations. Let me describe an example from the Princeton case study in which Sultan, the Muslim Chaplain, provided this sort of leadership to the Muslim student community.

In early January 2009 in the wake of the Gaza Conflict,[271] an interfaith student group began to organise a silent vigil 'to mourn the loss of life in Israel and Palestine and to express a hope for lasting peace.' These students secured sponsorship from the CJL, MSA, ORL, and the International Center. When the flyer describing the vigil was sent to the MSA email list the night before the event, it unleashed a flurry of messages, including the following:[272]

> I understand the tough political balancing act that we as a community have to do, but there are times when we've got to be willing to be politically incorrect and speak what we take to be the truth... To effectively in a single sentence mourn the loss of both Palestinian and Israeli lives is to imply moral equivalence between the two sides.
>
> I was, and still am, shocked that anyone could put our name in an event that clearly makes equal the oppressor and the oppressed... I WILL leave if the MSA does not withdraw from this event. God knows how difficult this would be for me and for my family... I love all of you, but my love for God, Islam, and justice is much much more.

[270] Student, Personal interview, September 16, 2008.
[271] Also known as Operation Cast Lead or the Gaza Massacre.
[272] These emails were sent by three Muslim graduate students to an MSA email list on January 7 and 8, 2009. I have removed all identifying information.

> My heart is really broken from many things which [are] happening these days in Gaza. I tried to be silent but I can't any more. In [the] days when you expect relief from your brothers and sisters... what you see is a betrayal... I don't see any thing in common between [the] two sides of this battle, and the differences are much [too] deep to be ignored. But in the case you wish to persist... you won't see me [or] my wife [at] MSA events anymore.

While these were among the most passionate messages against co-sponsoring the vigil, they left the MSA in a difficult situation. If it proceeded with the vigil, it might alienate key members and cause a rift in the Muslim student community; if it withdrew the day before the event, it might negatively impact relationships with colleagues in CJL and ORL who had carefully negotiated a gathering that was acceptable to all sides.

Sultan took an immediate leadership role in this online debate by writing several emails to the community in which he acknowledged their pain, explained that he and the MSA had been acting in good faith, and suggested that it was too late to withdraw co-sponsorship. Over the next few days he was able to convince those who had threatened to leave the MSA to retract their statements. As he described, he did this through

> identifying the major players... who had discontentment and then meeting with each one of them individually. Hearing them out, listening to their stories... I think that for [one particular student] it was very healing that somebody was going to hear his story. I think the thing [that] made him so upset was the way the Gaza vigil was framed. For him, [a silent vigil] meant that [his] story had been taken away from him.[273]

He also organised an in-person forum for students to discuss the issue and worked with the MSA to sponsor a number of post-vigil events including a fundraising dinner to support a Palestinian charity. Without Sultan's leadership, it is possible that the MSA might have conceded to the few strong opinions expressed above. Withdrawing from or protesting the vigil could have had negative consequences, especially for Muslim-Jewish relations on campus. It may also have reflected negatively on Muslim students who might have been viewed as disruptive or inconstant.

Sultan's involvement with the Gaza vigil provided an example of how a Muslim Chaplain could exercise leadership within the Muslim community. By defusing tension through individual and group communication, appeasing those who felt marginalised by hosting other events, and

[273] Sohaib Sultan, Muslim Chaplain, Princeton University, Personal interview, April 16, 2012.

encouraging Muslim students to honour their commitments, Sultan managed to mitigate the risks of a fissure in the community as well as possible tension with other communities.

As he described above, one of his strategies for engagement was listening to people's stories. This was one aspect of a broader commitment to anticipatorily build strong relationships with potential constituents before there were acute issues to address. As an ORL colleague described, 'what Sohaib does all the time is make relationships, that's the currency of what our office does period, and that's the risk management.'[274] So when a situation develops

> he's [already] got the relationships there to talk to [the Dean's Office or] to talk to [Rabbi] Julie [Roth] ... he's already got the foundation there for a conversation... He does the risk management stuff through relationships which is spot on. He does risk management really well in another way... which is turning lemons into lemonade. The Danish cartoonist came [and] Sohaib [was] really masterful at looking at that not as an opportunity to retrench... but saying 'we need to attend and we need to plan in advance the kind of questions we want to ask and we need to look at this as an opportunity to show anybody present what Islam is like, what Muslims are like, how 21st century we are, how committed we are to free speech.' In that particular instance they came off smelling like a rose... they came across as the [most] thoughtful people in the room so that's a part of risk management.[275]

In addition to reacting to a crisis situation (such as the Gaza controversy on the eve of the vigil), Sultan was able to proactively approach potentially controversial situations and use them as opportunities to model effective behaviour. Instead of protest or avoidance, he chose engagement.

In contrast to Sultan, Fricke did not often display leadership skills for the Muslim student community at Rutgers. Although he was widely respected and consulted by university administrators, he did not hold the same status with students. During the tensions within ISRU, Fricke withdrew rather than becoming more engaged. He did not actively participate in the creation of SALAM or the subsequent reconciliation of the MSA even though non-Rutgers colleagues became invested in a unified MSA after the split was detailed in a *New York Times* article.[276] It is impossible to know what effect engagement from Fricke or another chaplain might have had.

[274] University Chaplain, Personal interview, March 27, 2012.
[275] *Ibid.*
[276] Sana Sheikh, Undergraduate Student, Rutgers University, Personal interview, October 7, 2008.

8.2.2.2. MUSLIM CHAPLAIN AS AMBASSADOR

The Muslim Chaplain was also an ambassador and interlocutor, who represented the Muslim community and sometimes the university in conversations with other groups. For example, on a number of campuses, chaplains played a critical role in reducing tension and building goodwill with Rabbis, who were generally leaders of campus Jewish communities. Differences in authority, knowledge, experience, and continuity made establishing those types of relationships much more difficult for Muslim student leaders who, in the absence of a chaplain, were the de facto representatives of the community. Not only did Muslim Chaplains engage with the Jewish community externally, they also guided, supported, and influenced Muslim students to make decisions that were good for them and for their Jewish colleagues.

An example of an 'ambassadorial' intervention came up in the Princeton case study. In November 2009, there was a planned public lecture by Nonie Darwish, a Muslim convert to Christianity who founded Arabs for Israel. She had been cited for calling Islam 'the greatest lie in human history' and stating that *Shari'ah* law supports 'vigilante street justice to bring about Islamic submission' (Martins 2009). Darwish was invited to campus by Tigers for Israel (TFI) and the Whig-Clio debating society. The MSA had planned to protest at the talk by asking questions, holding signs, and standing with their backs to the speaker.[277]

According to the *Daily Princetonian*, two days before Darwish's talk Muslim Chaplain Sultan reached out to CJL director Rabbi Roth to explain the Muslim community's

> strong objections concerning Darwish. 'I have a very good relationship with the CJL', he said, adding that he aimed to share with Roth and the TFI 'what types of feelings and divisions' Darwish's visit could foster on campus (*Ibid*).

Based on guidance from Roth, TFI withdrew sponsorship of the event and issued an apology for offending the Muslim community. Roth suggested that, 'this should be seen as an affirmation that a wide range of conflicting political views can be aired on campus, but that there are boundaries on both sides where political views become anti-Islamic or anti-Semitic' (*Ibid*).

Sultan's outreach as a representative of the Muslim community was based on an assumption that TFI was not 'fully aware of the [Muslim community's] strong objections concerning Darwish' (*Ibid*). Although at least one TFI board member publicly disagreed with withdrawing the invitation, this outcome avoided a potentially heated lecture and public protest; it also

[277] According to an email sent to the MSA list on November 17, 2009.

allowed TFI to plead ignorance rather than acknowledging pressure from Roth, Sultan, or the MSA. Without Sultan's intervention, the talk would probably have occurred and inflamed latent tension between Muslim and Jewish students on campus. Had the MSA engaged in its planned protests, Muslim students may have been viewed as reactionary, extreme, and unsupportive of the free speech.

Despite Sultan and Roth's efforts, this episode did not end quietly. The retracted invitation was widely covered in the blogosphere based on information sent out by CAMERA which sponsored Darwish's talk. This led to blog headlines suggesting that a critic of Islam had been censored; one posting was titled, 'Jews caved to Muslim pressure to cancel Nonie Darwish at Princeton.'[278] Many alumni, donors, and others contacted the Princeton president's office, the CJL, Roth, Sultan, TFI, Whig-Clio, and a variety of other Princeton officials and students.[279] The incident was memorialised in a book by conservative blogger Pamela Geller (2010, p. 261-3).

On another campus, a Muslim Chaplain described how the relationship he had developed with the Jewish community was tested by Muslim student protests. He explained:

> During the Gaza War we organized the biggest protest on campus... Well, we have a wonderful relationship with the Jewish community despite our political disagreements... If you have a pre-existing relationship, an ongoing conversation... like marriage, like friendship it's not always smooth... [The protest] [wa]s considered and absorbed in the context of that relationship. They were very upset and disappointed and it was very painful [for them] to hear what the Muslim community had to say about certain policies of the state of Israel. And we were very careful. We weren't emotional. We weren't making generalisations to all Israelis, all Jews. We made it very clear that we were protesting and condemning certain acts and policies of the Israeli government...[280]

The diplomatic tactics this chaplain prescribed were aimed at genuinely communicating the concerns of Muslim students in a way that was honest, fair, and unemotional. This chaplain acted as a mitigating force at a time of extreme volatility. As a university employee his allegiance was both to Muslim students and to his fellow administrators.

[278] The original posting and certain responses are available on the blog Atlas Shrugged: http://atlasshrugs2000.typepad.com/atlas_shrugs/2009/11/the-jews-caved-to-muslim-pressure-to-cancel-nonie-darwish-at-princeton.html. Accessed on April 20, 2012.
[279] *Ibid.*
[280] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 24, 2010.

The ambassadorial role of Muslim Chaplains was important for three reasons. First, Muslim Chaplains were widely called upon to represent Muslim students and the university more broadly.[281] As a faculty member explained, 'all of us who identify as Muslim become these pseudo-ambassadors of Islam.'[282] On many campuses, they were seen as the voice and face of Islam. Some chaplains engaged in educational activities on and off campus speaking to student organisations, community groups, academic classes, and local congregations. They were sometimes able to adeptly represent the Muslim community, the faith, and the university in ways that students and faculty members could not. The reputational risk of poor representation was significant, as exemplified by national controversies that erupted around statements made by volunteer Muslim Chaplains at Harvard and Vanderbilt.[283]

Second, tensions between Muslim and Jewish students were a key concern for ORL staff members and other administrators. A University Chaplain described one of her two biggest fears as 'the Middle East issue,' by which she meant the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians, and how it manifested at her university.[284] This was a concern on many campuses, given the sometimes explosive debates the Israel-Palestine issue engendered (Beinin 2006, p. 238). Administrators sometimes became enmeshed in these conflicts when they had to respond to complaints or act as mediators. In this context, a key risk faced by institutions was taking actions or positions which could be labelled anti-Semitic or Islamophobic. These had the possibility of catalysing an outcry from students, faculty members, donors, trustees, or other stakeholders (Cooperman 2004; Jaschik 2005; Jaschik 2007a; Scherr 2008; Reich 2011). Hiring a Muslim Chaplain that could engage with the Jewish community was a significant positive investment that an institution could make towards mitigating those potential conflicts.

Third, Muslim-Jewish engagement was an important aspect of the broader interfaith movement on college campuses (Amusin et al. 2006, p, 126-7; Boden 2006, p. 132-4). Providing Muslim students with a representative allowed them to more fruitfully engage with other communities

[281] Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, March 7, 2009 and Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, April 10, 2009.
[282] Faculty member, Personal interview, April 23, 2009.
[283] Taha Abdul-Basser, Harvard's Muslim Chaplain for many years, attracted national attention when a private email he sent to a student was forwarded to the media. The email suggested that the there was some 'wisdom' in considering capital punishment as the Islamic penalty for apostasy (Hu 2009). Another controversy erupted after Awadh Binhazim, Vanderbilt's Muslim Chaplain, confirmed in a video-recorded lecture that he 'accepted' that individuals engaging in homosexual acts should be punished by death (George 2011). At the time, Abdul-Basser was a Harvard graduate student and Binhazim was a Vanderbilt adjunct faculty member; both were volunteer Muslim Chaplains and neither had formal training in the field of chaplaincy.
[284] University Chaplain, Personal interview, April 11, 2009.

on an equal footing. One faculty member offered a critique of interfaith dialogue suggesting that although dialogue implied equal terms of engagement, it was often Muslims explaining their beliefs to non-Muslims in the context of a significant power dynamic.[285] In these situations, Muslims were sometimes asked to justify and defend their practices and beliefs, contest misinformation and misinterpretations, display their allegiance to the United States, and prove that they were not terrorists. This informant felt that what was called 'interfaith dialogue' was sometimes a cross examination rather than a true and equal exchange of perspectives. In this context, having a Muslim Chaplain speaking for the community mitigated some of the power imbalance, built connectivity between Muslims and other communities, and reduced the likelihood of future conflict.

8.3. CONCLUSION

In the first part of the chapter, I applied the political, cultural and adaptive models to the data from Chapters 5, 6, and 7.

The political model held some value in explaining both my national and Princeton findings. Protestant University Chaplains were the primary interest group advocating for the creation of Muslim Chaplaincies, and they were able to do this efficiently. As the role became more widely known, in some cases Muslim students and alumni became active interest groups. Rutgers was very different from the majority of national findings because the chaplaincy was initiated by a community group which, given the university's secular position, did not exert much any political pressure.

The cultural model was also a useful lens through which to understand the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton and most of my sample institutions. These schools had strong cultures which could be described as Christian-founded, selective, wealthy, residential colleges and they shared features that were critical to the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy including ecumenical University Chaplains, commitments to spiritual development, and histories of religious exclusion. In contrast, Rutgers had a weak culture as a large, decentralised, and modestly funded public university.

[285] Faculty member, Personal interview, April 23, 2009.

The value of the adaptive model's three sub-theories – resource dependency, institutional isomorphism, and strategic choice – varied. For the vast majority of institutions, the development of Muslim Chaplaincy had little to do with resource dependency theory – except among the few institutions that first created these roles. Later chaplaincies were not generally created to attract financial or other resources to the institution. The theory of institutional isomorphism had significant value in explaining Muslim Chaplaincy at Princeton and other private universities. The first wave of hires operated prior to isomorphic pressure. The second wave of hires were influenced by normative isomorphism which operated through professional standards and values imposed by peers or gate-keeping agencies. The third wave represented mimetic isomorphism through which organisations modelled themselves on others that had greater legitimacy. I predicted a future wave that might involve coercive isomorphism through formal and informal pressure exerted by students or alumni who control resources, political power, or legitimacy. Institutional isomorphism was weaker at Rutgers because it did not have a University Chaplain or other natural stakeholder through which pressure could be exerted. Strategic choice theory was also valuable in understanding the powerful role of administrators including University Chaplains in advocating for the resources and authorisation to create paid Muslim Chaplaincy positions. This was relevant to Princeton and national sample schools and irrelevant at Rutgers.

In the second half of this chapter, I proposed the 'anticipatory university' as a new framework to understand the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy. The anticipatory university takes a proactive approach to risk management. Having made significant inroads with operational, financial, and legal risk, universities are now especially focused on mitigating reputational risk. Some of this attention is focused on managing negative messages but a fair bit is positively positioning institutions in relation to peers. Many of the rationales expressed by my informants suggested that managing risk was a key impetus for the development of Muslim Chaplaincy. As a risk management strategy, Muslim Chaplaincy made a single university employee the leader of the Muslim community which allowed him or her to address internal tensions and establish a cohesive group to direct student energy in ways that were constructive. It also allowed the chaplain to take on an ambassadorial role in representing the Muslim community and the university. This was especially important in defusing tensions between Muslim and Jewish students and engaging the Muslim community in broader interfaith dialogue.

CHAPTER 9

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has three sections. In the first section, I summarise and synthesise my findings. In the second, I describe the possible evolution and potential impact of Muslim Chaplaincy. In the final section, I propose areas for further inquiry and provide policy recommendations.

9.1. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In this section I summarise and synthesise the key findings of my research by answering the three research questions that framed my study. In responding to the first two questions, 'How did university-based Muslim Chaplaincy develop?' and 'What roles did Muslim Chaplains play?', there were significant similarities between Princeton and a number of the private colleges in my sample. The Muslim Chaplaincy at Rutgers had a unique origin and its longest serving chaplain played a role different from his peers at most other institutions. As such, the Rutgers case bore little resemblance to other sample institutions, though certain themes surfaced in this case that may have relevance for the future of Muslim Chaplaincy (as I describe in section 9.2.). Despite the value of both of the detailed cases studies and the theoretical inferences they generated, they did not present opportunities for scientific generalisability.

My findings for the third question 'Why did university administrators hire and sanction Muslim Chaplains?' raised interesting themes and concepts. Given the variability in context and leadership, and the challenges of uncovering the true rationales and motivations for creating these positions, I am cautious about promoting the relevance of these findings in other contexts. At the same time, the structural similarities, competitive relationships, and isomorphic tendencies between Princeton and a number of schools in the sample, suggest that my Princeton findings generated hypotheses worth exploring in other contexts.

9.1.1. HOW DID UNIVERSITY-BASED MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY DEVELOP?

Most of the 23 colleges in my sample were private institutions founded in the nineteenth century as explicitly Christian institutions. They included about half of the almost 50 schools that had Muslim Chaplains when I began case selection in 2008. As such, they had University Chaplains – often ordained in the Protestant tradition – who bore responsibility for the spiritual wellbeing of all members of the campus community. As student bodies diversified, local congregations or denominational bodies (such as the Catholic Diocese or Hillel) assigned their own denominationally-specific representatives to support non-Protestant students at particular institutions. In general, the university sanctioned these individuals as Affiliated Chaplains. While they often received minor privileges, they were rarely compensated by higher education institutions. Muslim Chaplaincy did not fit this paradigm of Affiliated Chaplaincy since there was no centralised organisation to vet and support Islamic leaders. At the same time, few Muslim congregations had an awareness of the value of such an investment or the financial resources to support a local college.

My research suggested that in general Muslim Chaplaincy was initiated by university administrators and represented a proactive approach of responding to perceived student needs. The development of Muslim Chaplaincy varied by institution, and can be divided into three types. For the first group, which represents the majority of universities (including Princeton), the position of Muslim Chaplain was what I term *administration-initiated,* meaning that it was conceived of by the school's University Chaplain and others in the ORL. These predominantly Protestant clergy were the initiators and primary advocates for the creation of this new role. Unlike the vast majority of Affiliated Chaplains, Muslim Chaplains were hired as part-time or full-time employees of the university. In some cases, these chaplaincies developed in response to the particular perceived needs of Muslim students; in other cases, they emerged as part of a broader re-examination of spiritual and religious provision on campus. While initiated by administrators, these chaplaincies were developed in close collaboration with Muslim students. In the second, much smaller group of schools – which I deemed as *administration-expanded* – students pressured administrators to create Muslim Chaplaincies, sometimes based on developments at peer institutions. A third group of schools (including Rutgers) had Muslim Chaplains in the traditional model of Affiliated Chaplains; I called these *administration-sanctioned.* In this context, volunteers (often graduate students or faculty members) acting in this capacity received recognition as Affiliated Chaplains even though they were not linked to a central 'sending' agency.

9.1.2. WHAT ROLES DID MUSLIM CHAPLAINS PLAY?

The roles of Muslim Chaplains were remarkably similar across institutions; what varied was their relative priority. These roles could be broadly divided into two categories: serving Muslim students and serving the university/community.

The primary responsibility of Muslim Chaplains was to support Muslim students, and they performed religious, pastoral, educational, advisory, programmatic, liaisonal, integrative, mediative, and representative roles in this capacity. As religious leaders, chaplains led or organised weekly Friday afternoon prayer services, as well as services during Ramadan and other special observances. They played a pastoral role, providing one-on-one counselling for students with questions or concerns about Islam, academic choices, intimate relationships, social life, parents, and health issues. Muslim Chaplains sometimes played an educational role by leading study circles to read the Qur'an, *Hadiths* (sayings ascribed to the Prophet) or other religious texts. Some also taught formal academic courses. In most cases, chaplains played a critical advisory role in the MSA. Many of them attended MSA meetings and provided advice about events, speakers, interfaith relations, and politics. Chaplains often ran their own programmes supported by a budget independent of the student group. They were sometimes viewed as a liaison or broker between the MSA and the university administration; they sometimes aided students in procuring funding, gaining accommodations (such as halal food or Ramadan meals), and framing conversations with senior administrators. At other times they acted as advocates for Muslim students. Chaplains also played a role in engaging and integrating students within the Muslim community (across sectarian and gender lines) and between Muslim and other faith or minority communities. In cases of actual or potential conflict, chaplains acted as mediators, ambassadors, and negotiators. Finally, Muslim Chaplains were seen by many as the face of Islam; they represented the Muslim community at major events such as orientation, parents' weekend, and graduation. The Muslim Chaplain at Princeton, like most others, played almost all of these roles. The chaplain at Rutgers focused on developing relationships with the administration and advocating on behalf of Muslim students. He played only a minimal role in religious leadership and MSA support. He was unique in my sample for the way he had prioritised his responsibilities.

In addition to their services in direct support of Muslim students, some Muslim Chaplains also provided significant service to their institutions and broader off-campus communities. These responsibilities were most significant for individuals who served as full-time paid employees of

universities. In many cases, such chaplains were asked to advise the administration about how it could best meet the needs of Muslim students. Chaplains often played a role in educating non-Muslims about Islam by serving on panels, giving lectures, and participating in academic courses. Those who served as staff members of ORLs had other administrative responsibilities, including participating in office programmes and activities, providing care and support to non-Muslim students, and representing the office on committees across campus. At a few institutions, Muslim Chaplains developed programmes to engage alumni or support Muslim alumni organisations. In a few cases, chaplains actively engaged parents – answering questions from the families of prospective students, participating in orientation and graduation activities, and offering themselves as a resource to parents. Beyond the university, Muslim Chaplains often spoke to local Christian and Jewish congregations about Islam. A few also served Muslim community members not associated with the college; this was true especially in rural areas where there were no other Islamic religious leaders.

9.1.3. WHY DID UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS HIRE AND SANCTION MUSLIM CHAPLAINS?

This was the most complex question to answer. I began by asking this question both directly and indirectly at Princeton. I spoke first to administrators; later I asked students, faculty members, and others to gain additional insight and triangulate what I had heard from administrators. Subsequently, I asked chaplains and administrators at other institutions. Since Rutgers had sanctioned a Muslim Chaplain, as it did for numerous Christian and Jewish chaplains, there was less insight on this question to be gained from the particular case of Muslim Chaplaincy. As a result, the answers in this section are strongly reliant on my research at Princeton. This was due both to the depth of research I had conducted there and the distinctive insight afforded by my status as an administrator. Although I was not able to ascertain administrative rationales at the campuses where I had conducted only one or two interviews, I was able to test some of my Princeton insights in these contexts. While I believe that some of these explanations may be relevant to other schools (especially those which invested in full-time chaplaincies), there were limits to the generalisability of these findings. In this section, I share five answers to this question that emerged from my research: advancing social justice, educating non-Muslim students, maintaining prestige and resources, overcoming a negative reputation, and supporting the administration.

First, many of my informants articulated the notion that Muslim Chaplaincy was an act of social justice that emerged in response to the perceived vulnerability of Muslim students. This was most acute in the wake of the events of 9/11, but it continued throughout the decade as hostility toward and fear of Muslims persisted in the context of subsequent terrorist activity, military operations in the Middle East and North Africa, and other geopolitical developments. Administrators believed that Muslim students would benefit from religious and pastoral guidance, and a leader who could advocate for them within the institutional context. With no national religious authority and no community-based funding or infrastructure to send chaplains, some university administrators felt it was their responsibility to provide a resource for Muslim students that was already available to Christian and Jewish students. This sense of obligation was steeped in a common tradition, at most of my sample institutions, of support for spiritual and religious development, recognition and celebration of diversity in all its forms, and a mindset of responsiveness to students and their parents. The social justice frame was most common at institutions that had made a significant financial investment in hiring a part-time or full-time chaplain, it was less commonly articulated at schools with volunteer or contract chaplains.

Second, Muslim Chaplaincy provided an opportunity to educate non-Muslim students about Islam. After 9/11, many institutions saw a sharp increase in interest in classes about Islam and the Arabic language. The desire to educate non-Muslims about Islam was part of a larger trend towards multiculturalism and internationalisation in American higher education. The benefits of this education went beyond the intellectual and social; increasing students' cultural capital could have economic and political benefits for these students, the university, and American society. This explanation was most common at schools with a full-time Muslim Chaplain; chaplains with more limited hours had far less time to support non-Muslim students.

Third, hiring Muslim Chaplains did not occur in isolation; it was seen by some as an effort to compete with peers for prestige and resources. As I charted the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy at various institutions across the country, it became clear that most of them emerged between 2007 and 2011; in the 2007-2008 academic year alone, four Ivy League schools had open searches for full-time Muslim Chaplains. That timing was not accidental. As in many other respects, colleges were influenced by the choices of their peers and aspirational peers. There were twin impulses: to be 'first movers', thereby providing better provisions than their peers; and, equally, not to be 'late adopters' and fall behind their peers. This explanation for Muslim Chaplaincy was articulated at a number of private institutions, especially Ivy League

schools and other national universities that saw themselves competing for top students. It was less common among liberal arts colleges and was not mentioned at the two public universities in my sample.

The fourth theme I identified was the creation of Muslim Chaplaincies to overcome a reputation for being exclusive and intolerant. Some selective schools, especially those that had histories of discrimination against women and various minority groups were especially sensitive to the long legacy of their past exclusionary policies. In light of that history, they were constantly making efforts to be seen as open, welcoming, and tolerant. At the same time, there were also contemporary reputational issues to grapple with. For example, on many campuses there was tension between Jewish and Muslim students which had the potential to lead to anti-Semitism or Islamophobia which colleges wanted to avoid. Investing in a Muslim Chaplain sometimes reduced these tensions. Of the five explanations in this section, this rationale seemed more relevant to Princeton than other schools in my sample given its particularly egregious record of prejudice against Jews and African-Americans.

Finally, Muslim Chaplains were an asset to their institutions in their service to students who might otherwise be underserved. This was among the most common themes across all types of institutions. It was particularly relevant at Rutgers and other public institutions, where limited human and financial resources made it impossible to support all students, especially those with acute or unusual needs. In these contexts, Muslim Chaplains reduced the burden on student services staff members or other ORL staff who lacked the cultural and religious resources to best serve Muslim students. These chaplains were also available to play a role in defusing and managing crisis situations and over time, for preventing such situations from developing. In most contexts, Muslim Chaplains provided additional support to institutions as advisors to colleagues in the ORL, student services, and occasionally to faculty members and alumni.

9.2. EVOLUTION AND POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY

9.2.1. EVOLUTION OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY

This thesis examines Muslim Chaplaincy during a period of expansion and early institutionalisation. What began as isolated volunteer and part-time positions on a handful of campuses two decades ago has evolved into a critical mass of Muslim ministries – eight of them

with full-time institutionally-funded Muslim Chaplains – that have garnered national visibility and credibility. In this section I discuss five issues for Muslim Chaplaincy that I expect to emerge in the next five to ten years: (1) pressure for expansion and standardisation, (2) emergence of community-sponsored chaplaincies, (3) augmentation of bureaucratic and administrative responsibilities, (4) demand to serve multiple Muslim sects or ideologies, and (5) advocacy to create dedicated Muslim community centres. Unless otherwise noted, these ideas draw most heavily from my case studies at Rutgers and Princeton. Although I predict these trends will emerge nationally, I do not want to overstate their broad relevance since my analysis is based on evidence from just one or two campuses.

First, as I described in Chapter 8 ('Analysis'), pressure to create and standardise Muslim Chaplaincies will likely exert continued influence on colleges and universities. New positions or the conversion of volunteer roles to paid ones will probably result from both administration and student-initiated efforts. As the position of Muslim Chaplain becomes more widely known, alumni and other stakeholders may also request these provisions on behalf of students. Such isomorphic pressure is most likely to be successful at schools that are (or aspire to be) peers of institutions with established positions. Thus I predict we will see the greatest expansion of Muslim Chaplaincy among private research institutions and private liberal arts colleges. I can also imagine an increase among women's colleges and small Catholic schools – both of which are well-represented in the group of institutions that currently have Muslim Chaplains – given the constant demands they face to attract students from smaller pools, especially those that do not require financial aid. Geographically, paid Muslim Chaplaincy has been nearly exclusive to the Northeast region of the country. There has already been some expansion to the Midwest (at Northwestern and DePaul) and I can imagine further growth there and in the West where there are large Muslim populations. I predict that catastrophic world events similar to 9/11 or serious Islamophobic incidents on campus could also spur the creation of new Muslim Chaplaincies.

Second, although the community-sponsored Muslim Chaplaincy at Rutgers failed, recent developments suggest that this model may be a viable alternative to administration-initiated and supported positions, particularly at public institutions. There have been two recent developments in this area. In January 2012, the Michigan Muslim Alumni Association hired a Muslim Chaplain to serve students at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor (Ahmed 2012). He is currently the only paid chaplain at a public university. Cornell alumni have established the Diwan Foundation to fund a Muslim Chaplaincy at their alma mater. In a feature article published in the nation's most widely circulated daily newspaper, several individuals mentioned

that this was an attempt to put Cornell on par with peer institutions that had created such roles (Daneman 2011). Diwan's Advisory Board includes the Muslim Chaplain at Duke and is chaired by the father of the Muslim Chaplain at Yale. Muslim alumni of other institutions are taking notice of these changes. Sultan was recently invited to speak to alumni groups at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and his alma mater Indiana University at Bloomington, both of which were considering similar efforts.[286]

While this model will be of particular interest to alumni of public universities since their institutions offer no religious provision or support to any community, it could also be appealing to alumni at private institutions like Columbia, Emory, Harvard, MIT, and Vanderbilt that currently have volunteers serving in these roles. Unlike the Rutgers effort which was led by non-alumni community members, Muslim alumni who have a particular and personal connection to their alma mater have spearheaded many of these recent efforts. While this work is currently occurring on an ad hoc basis, there is a nascent group looking to create a national Muslim Chaplain certification program not linked to a particular training programme; that group could potentially give rise to a national campus Muslim organisation to coordinate and support broader Muslim Chaplaincy provision (Khoja-Moolji 2011, p. 11, 15).

Third, the institutionalisation of Muslim Chaplaincy may increase the volume of bureaucratic responsibilities which could take chaplains away from their religious and pastoral duties. I base this prediction on a conversation with a single Muslim Chaplain, so will need more evidence to judge its merit in other contexts. This chaplain explained that when his programme was new, there were many opportunities for experimentation: 'back in the day [we had]... random *halaqas* and [a] random study groups, and people would get together and the topic would be different every week and [nobody knew] who [wa]s teaching it...'[287] Now his educational programmes have become formalised. He recently offered a year-long non-credit course which he described as

> very meaningful and very rich. It's being taught by someone who actually knows his stuff. There's been a syllabus... that's an example of the formalisation and institutionalisation. So much effort goes into that. It doesn't just happen on its own... I raised money so that [the instructor] would get paid for it... and so [it required] going out into the community and making the relationships so that we can pay the salary.[288]

[286] Sohaib Sultan, Muslim Chaplain, Princeton University, Personal interview, April 16, 2012.
[287] *Ibid.*
[288] *Ibid.*

Education and speaker programmes like this required significant planning, fundraising, advertising, and oversight which took time away from other duties.

Prior to hiring paid chaplains, there were fewer programs and the coordinating work was done voluntarily by students. With augmented staff and financial resources come increased professionalism and expectations. As chaplaincies become further institutionalised, there may be additional responsibilities for fundraising, communications and publicity, alumni development, parent engagement, and personnel or operations management (where chaplaincies have additional staff or physical space). Chaplains may also be asked to serve on university-wide committees or engage in formal teaching. These are positive developments, but they have the potential to distance Muslim Chaplains from their current primary roles of providing religious and pastoral guidance to Muslim students.

Fourth, Shia or other Muslim sub-populations may begin to assert the need for support specific to their religious traditions or ideologies. As I discussed in Chapter 7 ('Muslim Chaplaincy at Rutgers'), sectarian and ideological differences were a key factor in the splitting of ISRU, the original MSA at Rutgers. That experience may serve as a harbinger for other campus Muslim communities. Most of the Muslim Chaplains that I interviewed came from the Sunni tradition, which is unsurprising given their preponderance among American Muslims. However, as Muslim Chaplaincy becomes further institutionalised and Muslim student communities grow in size, it is possible that sub-populations may ask for particular accommodations. As one University Chaplain acknowledged:

> I imagine that the time will come in the not-too-distant-future when our Shia community is going to say, 'we love [the Muslim Chaplain], but you know, we want somebody [else] leading Friday prayers... cause we do things a little differently'. The Muslim community is growing in its own identity. They are in a great and flourishing place. They will rise to a level of comfort where they say, 'now I think it's time to get specific'.[289]

Many campuses have experienced such shifts within Protestant and Jewish communities. Some institutions have gone from a single chaplain for all sects and denominations to multiple chaplains. This has often occurred under the auspices of outside organisations sponsoring Affiliated Chaplains. However, such expansion has not always been smooth. A petition by the Chabad Jewish chaplaincy for university recognition at Princeton caused much consternation about dividing an already small faith community (Cai 2007; Kay 2008).

[289] University Chaplain, Personal interview, March 27, 2012.

When I asked a University Chaplain what she would do if Shia students came to her for additional support, she explained:

> I don't think I would hire a second chaplain. I think I might ask the local Shia community to work with [the Muslim Chaplain] to provide someone to do specific things – [be] it Friday prayer... certain areas of pastoral counselling... observance of particular holidays...[290]

This response might work as long as Shia students were seeking university support. However, if an outside organisation or community group were to sponsor a Shia Chaplain and seek university recognition at an institution with an existing Muslim Chaplain, the university response might be less positive. This would be even more complicated if the outside group were not seen as meeting an unmet denominational need. There is nothing, for example, to prevent a community or alumni group from sponsoring a Muslim Chaplaincy that advocated more conservative or orthodox views. As with Chabad at Princeton, such a group might be seen as posing a serious threat to a university-sponsored and funded chaplaincy.

Fifth, there was an aspiration among some individuals – on several campuses including both Princeton and Rutgers – for a dedicated building for the Muslim community similar to the Hillel houses at many schools.[291] Only one such facility existed – the Center for Muslim Life at Duke which opened in 2008. Most of my sample campuses had a Muslim prayer room and some had *wu'du* facilities, but few had other dedicated spaces for Muslim students such as kitchens, conference rooms, libraries, computer clusters, or social spaces. As one University Chaplain explained, on her campus there were a number of voices who say, 'we need a Center for Muslim Life'... 'Look at what the Jews have... Are we second rate?' On that campus, most chaplaincies are housed in a single ORL building except the Jewish community which has a separate centre. This chaplain imagined her Muslim Chaplain saying

> 'We [should] not segregate ourselves. It's not time to be separate, it's time to show people we're Muslim and we are American. And we do that by participating. We don't want our own building right now or people won't integrate with us. Why should they come?'[292]

---

[290] *Ibid.*

[291] Student, Personal interview, December 17, 2007; Affiliated Chaplain (former), Personal interview, August 27, 2008; Sana Sheikh, Undergraduate Student, Rutgers University, Personal interview, October 7, 2008; Alumnus, Personal interview, December 5, 2008; and Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, March 7, 2009.

[292] University Chaplain, Personal interview, March 27, 2012.

She acknowledged, however, that for some people a dedicated building was a powerful symbol. She mused empathically, 'maybe that's what it means to arrive...' Pointing to the chapel, she conceded, 'I have nothing to prove; [the Muslim community's] got everything to prove.'[293]

9.2.2. POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY

The college experience in the United States represented a formative period of spiritual development for many students (Cady 2007, p. 102-5). It provided an opportunity to gain distance from the influence of parents and home communities and to become immersed in a new culture. This was most true for students who went away to college. It was less common for those who remained living at home, though even commuter students had opportunities to be exposed to new people and ideas and to be involved in college student activities. As several informants explained, it was during college that many Muslim students truly began to explore Islamic views on gender roles, religious practices and observances, Islamic dress, marriage and sexuality, conversion, and relationships between Muslim sects and with other faiths. Although most students refined their belief systems in college, some experienced a crisis of belief.[294]

As time passes, more students will experience Muslim Chaplaincy during their college years. While it is too early to ascertain the long-term impact of this experience on young people, some informants suggested the possibility of significant influence. A former Muslim Chaplain predicted that

> [college] graduates who have enjoyed the privilege of strong chaplaincy, they're going to realize that post-college life is [tough]. They're going to demand [that] their local communities meet their needs in a similar way [as universities]...[295]

While my research was not sufficiently focused on Muslim students to support or deny this informant's statement, this notion raises three sets of questions worth posing to students who have been engaged with Muslim Chaplains. First, are these students likely to seek or create similarly inclusive and diverse communities when they leave college? Even if they go back to the congregations where they grew up, will they share or experiment with some of the ideas they were exposed to in college? Second, will their experiences of accommodation in college translate into their graduate schools and workplaces? Will they feel entitled and empowered to ask for chaplains, prayer rooms, halal food, and permission to observe key holidays? At the

[293] *Ibid.*

[294] Student, Personal interview, December 17, 2007; Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, March 7, 2009; Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, October 15, 2009; and Muslim Chaplain, Personal interview, October 19, 2009.

[295] Muslim Chaplain (former), Personal interview, July 29, 2010.

same time will their non-Muslim colleagues, who have also been exposed to these issues in college, be supportive of their Muslim co-workers? Third, what will be the broader impact of the students who have been exposed to Muslim Chaplaincy? Given the selective nature of their higher education institutions, will these individuals exert disproportionate influence within and beyond the Muslim-American community? If so, what aspects of their experience with Muslim Chaplaincy will translate?

Beyond the impact on Muslim students, as the site of the first prolonged exposure of many non-Muslims to Islam, university environments present opportunities to impact the ignorance and negative attitudes that many Americans have about this faith. The result of the Muslim Chaplaincy experiment and the patterns of expression, tolerance, and collaboration that develop in campus contexts could provide a foundation for Muslim life and civic engagement – as they have for racial minorities – in the workplace, community, and public sphere (Bryant 2006, p. 2-3, 24; Kim 2006, p. 149-150).

In addition to the impact on students, a former Muslim Chaplain suggested that his colleagues were

> ... trailblazers for creating a new form of authority for Sunni Muslims in America and one with staying power. It's a model that will work and will last... [Universities are] doing hard work, due diligence, [asking] 'who would be best able to meet their needs and move the community forward?'... They seek a meritocratic system and transparency... What we'll realize ten years from now is the inroads they've made have really redefined or defined for the American Muslim community [what is] Sunni Muslim authority... For all the work that Zaytuna[296] and Hartford [Seminary] do, when the rubber meets the road, for our generation [college chaplains] are going to define Sunni Muslim religious authority.[297]

While I am not as convinced as this informant, it is possible that Muslim Chaplains could take on a leadership role in the absence of an existing unified religious authority for Islam in the United States. These individuals may be uniquely positioned to define Sunni Islam in America as a result of the legitimacy and visibility of their institutional affiliations and resources, experience in creating inclusive Muslim communities, familiarity with interfaith dialogue and relationships, credibility with the non-Muslim community, and ability to explain and interpret Islam in an American context.

---

[296] Zaytuna College is the first Islamic higher education institution in the United States and it aims to provide a seminary-like training for Muslim leaders. It offers bachelor's degrees only. More information available at: http://www.zaytunacollege.org.

[297] *Ibid.*

9.3. FURTHER RESEARCH AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

9.3.1. FURTHER RESEARCH

This thesis explores the emergence of a relatively new phenomenon that has not previously been written about in the higher education literature. I originally conceived of the project as two in-depth case studies and later found that their value was enhanced by examining the cases in the context of other institutions with Muslim Chaplaincies. There is still much fertile ground for academic exploration of this topic. In this section, I describe a number of research projects that would expand our knowledge of Muslim Chaplaincy.

First, I researched Muslim Chaplaincy during a period of substantial growth; it would be interesting to follow its evolution over the next five to ten years. During my five years of research (2007-2012) the number of institutions with paid Muslim Chaplains almost doubled, and the number of full-time chaplains also doubled. Which new chaplaincies will be created and which current chaplaincies will end? Will public universities, many of them with significant Muslim student populations, find a way to hire or support Muslim Chaplains? Will the roles of Muslim Chaplains change? Will Muslim Chaplaincy staffs grow and acquire physical spaces, like other campus ministries? Will there come a time when campuses have multiple Muslim Chaplains for different sects or with different mandates?

Second, although I had initially expected my research to focus on the experience of Muslim students in American higher education, early on I shifted to an exploration of the administrative intent and rationale for Muslim Chaplaincy. There remains an opportunity to explore the relationship between Muslim Chaplaincy and Muslim students. In particular, how do Muslim Chaplains shape the way Muslim students engage with Islam during their college years? What implications does this have for students once they graduate? How do chaplains and students share and negotiate responsibility for religious and other provisions for the Muslim community? What religious authority do students ascribe to the chaplain and where else do they look for religious advice?

Third, while this thesis makes a basic attempt to understand who Muslim Chaplains are and what roles they play, there is still much more to learn about *why* people chose this profession and how they practice it. Gilliat-Ray identifies a strand of research about the motivations of the individuals who pursue Muslim Chaplaincy as well as an interest in understanding how the

identities of Muslim Chaplains are socially constructed (2008, p. 154-5). There is an opportunity to more fully explore the daily work of Muslim Chaplains, and to understand how they blend religious, academic, and cultural resources to support students and others in the university context. While this was not an area of focus in this thesis, it is worth exploring in future research.

Fourth, as I described earlier in this thesis, a number of Muslim Chaplains were trained at the Hartford Seminary, the gateway and gold standard for Muslim Chaplaincy education. Its Islamic Chaplaincy programme, the only one in the United States, is accredited as equivalent to a Masters of Divinity degree. Since this programme determines who will gain valid credentials in the field, it has the potential to powerfully shape the profession of Muslim Chaplaincy and hence influence the future of Islam in the United States. As such it would be enlightening to study the history and development of the program, the educational and religious philosophy, the religious authority and credentials it confers, the process by which it gained accreditation, the curriculum and training program, issues of gender and interfaith/intrafaith relations, and how it has been shaped by its founder.

Fifth, while I made efforts to visit more than 20 campuses, I pursued in-depth studies of only two institutions. There is value in better understanding the genesis and practice of Muslim Chaplaincy in different environments. In particular, it would be interesting to conduct a case study of Georgetown (the first institution to hire a full-time Muslim Chaplain) or other Catholic institutions (including DePaul and Fairfield) which are the only sectarian schools that have created such positions. Another option would be a case study of Wellesley which was the first school to hire a part-time Muslim Chaplain. It would also be useful to have more detailed accounts of Muslim Chaplaincy at other institutions that have committed to full-time individuals in these positions. It may also be interesting to expand on the work of Khoja-Moolji (2011) and examine Muslim Chaplaincy at women's colleges or explore the experiences of female Muslim Chaplains working in co-educational environments.

Sixth, I had initially planned to pursue case studies of Muslim Chaplaincy in both the United States and Canada. It might be interesting to compare the mechanisms and rationales for the development of Muslim Chaplaincy in these different national contexts. Beyond higher education, there has been an increase in Muslim Chaplaincy in the armed forces, correctional facilities and prisons, police and fire departments, and hospitals. Therefore, a cross-sector comparison might prove valuable. The benefit of comparative studies of any sort is that they

bring into sharp relief the differences and similarities between cases and contexts. This can provide unexpected clarity about the salient commonalities and differences.

Beyond learning more about Muslim Chaplaincy, several other avenues for exploration were raised by my research.

First, while the number of studies about Muslim youth has increased in the last decade, there are still significant gaps in our knowledge of this diverse group of individuals (Leonard 2003, p. 120). Much of the research has taken a psychological approach, but other disciplinary approaches should be encouraged – especially anthropology, education, ethnic studies, history, politics, and sociology. Beyond studies of individuals, very little empirical research has been conducted on MSAs, though they are the largest and most widespread Muslim youth groups in the United States. My research only marginally explores MSAs and there has not been a comprehensive review of these organisations, an in-depth study of MSA National, or case studies of MSAs on particular campuses. With several hundred such groups across the United States, it is time for a scholarly approach to this topic. There are many questions to explore. How did MSAs develop? What are their missions and functions? Which Muslims join MSAs and why? How are leaders selected, and what roles do they play? Why are some MSAs highly gendered and others not? How do MSAs participate in interfaith activities, and how do they relate to other religious and minority groups on campus? How do MSAs manage intra-Muslim religious diversity? What is the relationship between MSAs and Muslim Chaplains? What role do MSAs play in political discourse on campus? What happens to MSA members after college? Attention should also be paid to the Muslim students who do not join MSAs. What can we say about such individuals and their relationship to the MSA? Are there other groups through which non-MSA Muslim students organise or engage?

Second, the emergence of Muslim Chaplaincy is only one of the many changes in religious and spiritual life taking place at colleges and universities across the country. A number of institutions are moving away from a Christian-centric approach and increasing their emphasis on inter-faith and intra-faith dialogue and activities. Schools now sanction a plethora of Affiliated Chaplains representing a wide variety of religions. The staffing for these offices has also changed. University Chaplains were traditionally men. Many colleges have recently hired women to serve in these leadership roles; some historically Protestant institutions have hired Catholics, Jews, and Hindus into these positions. In addition to Muslim Chaplains, a few colleges have hired chaplains from the Hindu, Buddhist, Evangelical Christian, Eastern Orthodox

Christian, and Unitarian Universalist traditions. These dramatic changes in campus religious and spiritual life deserve much more academic attention.

Third, I developed the idea of the 'anticipatory university' as a framework to understand the decision-making processes that led to the development of Muslim Chaplaincy. I wonder if this framework might be usefully applied to other issues in higher education. For example, how does risk figure into the decisions institutions make about faculty hiring and tenure, physical safety and policing, international expansion, budget and endowment management, admissions, and cyber-security? How has the focus on institutional prestige and reputation protected and limited the university? How does the anticipatory university approach these issues, and what are the benefits and drawbacks of the risk management approach?

9.3.2. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

While this research endeavour was not intended to produce policy recommendations, I have been asked by some informants and others to share my thoughts about how colleges and universities can best support Muslim and other religious minority students. In this section, I provide suggestions both about Muslim Chaplaincy and religious life more broadly.

9.3.2.1. FOR MUSLIM CHAPLAINCY

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Before considering Muslim Chaplaincy, universities should conduct an anonymous survey and small focus group sessions with current Muslim students. The MSA is the obvious place to begin, but special efforts should be made to reach out to Muslim students who are not members of the group. On large campuses, in particular, MSA members may represent a small minority of Muslim students. Institutions should also consult with alumni (especially recent graduates), faculty members, staff, parents, and other chaplains affiliated with the institution. It is especially important to reach out to Hillel, Chabad, and other Jewish chaplaincies to learn about the relationships between Jewish and Muslim communities.

FUNDING

Institutions should consider how best to fund a Muslim Chaplaincy. Administrators should think about equity with other religious communities. Can an institution justify supporting a Muslim Chaplain and not a Hindu, Christian, or Jewish Chaplain? If so, it is important to articulate the

rationale clearly, whether it is about the size of the population, the lack of community-sponsored chaplaincy, or some other reason. If it is meant to be a pilot or temporary position, be clear about how long the institution is willing to fund the position and work with students, alumni, and parents to develop a sustainability plan. Although institutional leaders may be reticent to approach alumni at this early stage, it may be prudent as a long-term strategy to cultivate outside sources of funding for a Muslim Chaplain.

KNOWLEDGE OF UNIVERSITIES

Most Muslim Chaplains are selected for their pastoral skills, basic religious knowledge, and experience working with young people. Universities should look for applicants who also understand how colleges and universities work, and have the political skill to navigate them successfully. Some aspects of American higher education are unique so it is important to select a chaplain that understands American college culture (alcohol culture, Greek life, athletics, residential life) and how it might pose special challenges to observant Muslims. [298] Chaplains who do not come with such knowledge should make active efforts to learn and understand.

BIG-TENT ISLAM

The Muslim Chaplain must try to serve all Muslim students. She or he must provide and develop a community that is welcoming and safe for Muslims of all sects, levels of religiosity and knowledge, and backgrounds. This means being open to minority communities – especially mainstream Shias, Ismailis, Ahmadiyyas, Druze, and Sufis, as well as non-practicing cultural Muslims. The chaplain should seek contact with Muslim students in organisations such as those for Arab, Pakistani, Indian, Turkish, and Malaysian students. This outreach must be handled sensitively, by offering a resource without assuming that all members are Muslim or interested in contact with a Chaplain. The Chaplain should particularly welcome women (regardless of their sartorial choices, including whether or not they wear the *hijab* (headscarf)), converts, children from multi-faith homes, LGBT Muslims, and any others who identify with Islam. At the same time, those with traditional and orthodox views should be welcomed and engaged. This can be a difficult balance to strike – but principles of respect, open-mindedness, goodwill, curiosity and tolerance must be emphasised.

[298] 'Greek life' refers to fraternities and sororities, which are generally single-sex, initiatory, social organisations for undergraduate students.

INTERFAITH ACTIVITIES

The Muslim Chaplain should play a critical role in developing and participating in interfaith activities. This should involve both hosting other communities (for *iftars*, for example) and attending events put on by other communities. These should not be limited to special holidays like Passover, Divali, or Christmas; the chaplain should regularly attend the religious services of other communities for self-education, visibility, and to show solidarity. An important way to engage in interfaith activities is over meals; others include credit or non-credit courses, community service, study trips, and discussion groups.

BEYOND THE MUSLIM COMMUNITY

Beyond the Muslim community, the Muslim Chaplain should aim to be a good university citizen. He or she should connect with non-Muslims interested in Islam, including those thinking about converting and those travelling to Muslim-majority countries for extended periods of time. He or she should connect with faculty members who teach courses on Islam or religion, and with staff members who deal with student services and human resources. He or she should make particular efforts to connect with residential life, dining, and athletics – and with leaders of racial minority, women's, LGBT communities, and counselling and psychological services. The chaplain should actively cultivate relationships with senior administrators and find other ways to be involved, whether it is through participating in community service activities, coaching an athletic team, teaching a course, or serving on university committees. Where appropriate, the chaplain should make special efforts to be a resource for students from faiths that do not have support (such as Hindus, Sikhs, Zoroastrians, Baha'is, and Buddhists).

CONNECT WITH PARENTS AND ALUMNI

Parents and alumni are critical constituencies that are often overlooked in this conversation. Without overstepping boundaries, the chaplain should be a resource for parents. Muslim Chaplains should be visible at activities where parents participate – including orientation, parent visiting weekends, and graduation. Chaplains should consider hosting an Islamic graduation ceremony or blessing during graduation weekend, and prayer services or other activities during reunions and other alumni activities. These events can either be exclusively Muslim or interfaith activities. Another reason to connect to parents and alumni is sustainability: these constituencies may have financial resources to support the work of the Muslim Chaplain. Chaplains should never solicit funds without coordinating with their institution's development staff.

OTHER MUSLIM CONSTITUENCIES ON OR NEAR CAMPUS

The campus environment includes many groups besides students. The Muslim Chaplain should actively engage Muslim staff and faculty members, while being respectful of those who prefer not to affiliate at work. Some of these individuals may need the support of a chaplain, especially in rural areas where the Muslim Chaplain may be a scarce resource in the local community. Many colleges and universities have strained relationships with neighbouring municipalities, and the chaplain may be able to play a small part in strengthening town-gown relations. While a Chaplain should be generous with her or his time, he or she should prioritise support of students over other constituencies.

9.3.2.2. FOR RELIGIOUS AND SPIRITUAL LIFE ON CAMPUS

In this section, I outline a few recommendations that I believe would improve religious and spiritual life on campus for all students, and especially for those from non Judeo-Christian backgrounds. I understand that there may be financial implications to these suggestions, and I offer them as aspirations towards which colleges can work.

DE-COUPLE DENOMINATIONAL CHAPLAINCY AND DEANSHIP

Many of the institutions in my sample had a single individual who played both the role of administrative director for the ORL and an ordained denominational chaplaincy for a particular faith community. I advocate for de-coupling these administrative and religious roles. The administrative leader should have broad responsibility for religious and spiritual life on campus as the University Chaplain. He or she would benefit from an education in religion and a personal sense of faith, but need not be an ordained clergyperson. If ordained, she or he should not be a chaplain to a particular faith group. In cases where this is impossible, the distinction between the two roles should be made more explicit to students and others.

This model has been successfully implemented at Wellesley College, which undertook an explicit process in the early 1990s to de-centre Protestantism in its ORL.[299] Though the current Dean is an Episcopal minister, there is a separate individual who serves as the Protestant Chaplain. Both Yale and USC recently hired lay people as their Deans of Religious Life. Neither serves as chaplain to their faith communities. There is no reason why such a role could not be created at a public institution. In that case it might be impossible for the university to support Chaplains for specific faiths, but the Dean could oversee a group of volunteer Affiliated

[299] University Chaplain, Personal interview, September 10, 2009.

Chaplains. Hiring a lay person in this role might help dispel concerns about institutional support for one religion over another.

DEVELOP A MULTI-FAITH CENTRE

Most of the institutions in my sample had institutionally constructed and maintained churches or chapels, many of which dated from the nineteenth century. Many campuses also had dedicated spaces for Jewish students, either provided by the college or by Hillel or Chabad. A number of institutions also provided prayer rooms for Muslim students and other communities. Instead of this ad hoc approach to providing space for religious groups, I recommend that each college create a multi-faith space that can be used by all religious communities.

Given the high premium on space on most campuses, the most logical option for many schools is to re-purpose the chapel. There are sometimes large basements and other spaces within these buildings, which can be renovated for this purpose. This is what Wellesley did in 2008 and the building now has a number of rooms dedicated to specific faiths, as well as several rooms that can be used by any faith group. Alternately, institutions should consider constructing or re-purposing another building for use as a multi-faith centre. Such centres could include offices for the chaplains, kosher/halal dining facilities, Jewish *mikvehs* (ritual baths), Muslim *wu'du* facilities, and other specific amenities. Both Tufts and MIT have built such centres. The benefit of these facilities is that they represent a fresh start and avoid the issue of minority religious communities worshipping in historically Christian spaces. In addition, there is a great benefit to chaplains and religious students sharing a single building rather than being relegated to different parts of campus. It creates opportunities for informal learning, exposure, and contact. Such a facility could also be built at a public institution, as long as it was open to students of all faiths and to those of no faith.

ACHIEVE EQUITY AND TRANSPARENCY IN PAY FOR NON-CHRISTIAN CHAPLAINS

How should an institution equitably allocate its limited resources to a variety of religious communities? There are many religious groups, and no institution has the resources to support them all at the same level. One model is what is currently employed by most public institutions. They provide no financial support to any affiliated chaplain but will sanction most individuals who apply for recognition. The other option is to hire several chaplains to meet the needs of various communities, but to be open-minded about which communities will be eligible for financial support. This is the model Wellesley and USC have pioneered.

One challenge is to determine the needs of each religious community fairly and transparently.

Metrics could include the percentage of students who report affiliation with a specific faith, the size of the congregation that engages in regular worship or activities, presence or absence of local congregations, and particular need or vulnerability. Another option is to agree on clear criteria and a process through which a chaplain can be requested. Another is for the institution to offer to pay half of any salary, as long as the community can support the other half. For example, one community might be able to support a half-time chaplain and the college could pay the other half. Another community might only be able to support five hours a week, and the institution could double that to ten. Having a financial stake for the faith community ensures accountability and provides a foundation for the chaplains to feel like they are part of a team. A particular challenge with this model is how to incorporate Hillel and Chabad, which often have independently funded Rabbis and one or more other staff members.

APPENDIX A: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

In the chart below I provide a list of 100 formal interviews, almost all of which were audio-recorded. This list does not include substantive but less structured conversations or email contact.

Eleven informants gave permission for their names to be associated with their quotes; the others voiced a desire to remain unattributed. Please note that the titles listed below may vary according to the context. For example, I list some Muslim Chaplains with that title and list some under the broader title of 'Religious Life staff member'. This allows me greater latitude in protecting the confidentiality of individuals who might otherwise be identifiable.

The roles listed are those occupied by individuals at the time of the interview; a number of them have subsequently transferred institutions or left their positions entirely. Asterisks delineate second or third interviews with individuals who appear earlier in the list.

Role	Date
Student	December 12, 2007
Religious Life staff member	December 12, 2007
Student	December 12, 2007
Sohaib Sultan, Muslim Chaplain, Princeton University	August 27, 2008
Religious Life staff member	August 27, 2008
Religious Life staff member	August 27, 2008
Affiliated Chaplain (former)	August 27, 2008
Student	September 16, 2008
Senior administrator	September 16, 2008
Student	September 16, 2008
Faculty member	September 16, 2008
Affiliated Chaplain	October 7, 2008
Student Services staff member	October 7, 2008
Sana Sheikh, Undergraduate Student, Rutgers University	October 7, 2008
Religious Life staff member	October 10, 2008
Religious Life staff member	October 22, 2008
Student Services staff member	October 30, 2008
Affiliated Chaplain (former)	October 31, 2008
Religious Life staff member	November 3, 2008
Student	November 3, 2008
Stanley Katz, Professor of Public and	November 3, 2008

International Affairs, Princeton University	
Faculty member	November 3, 2008
Natasha Piracha, Undergraduate Student, Rutgers University	November 17, 2008
Student	November 17, 2008
Student	November 17, 2008
Affiliated Chaplain	November 17, 2008
Alumnus	November 20, 2008
Thomas Breidenthal, Former Dean of Religious Life, Princeton University	November 25, 2008
Alumnus	December 5, 2008
Faculty member	December 5, 2008
Muslim Chaplain	January 8, 2009
Affiliated Chaplain	January 14, 2009
Student	January 14, 2009
Alumnus	January 14, 2009
Student Services staff member	January 14, 2009
Student	February 26, 2009
Student	February 26, 2009
Religious Life staff member	March 4, 2009
Muslim Chaplain	March 4, 2009
Muslim Chaplain	March 5, 2009
University Chaplain	March 5, 2009
Muslim Chaplain	March 5, 2009
Muslim Chaplain	March 6, 2009
Muslim Chaplain	March 6, 2009
David Coolidge, Muslim Chaplain, Dartmouth College	March 7, 2009
Muslim Chaplain	March 7, 2009
University Chaplain	April 3, 2009
Alumnus	April 3, 2009
Muslim Chaplain	April 10, 2009
Religious Life staff member	April 10, 2009
University Chaplain	April 11, 2009
Muslim Chaplain	April 12, 2009
Faculty member	April 23, 2009
Student	April 23, 2009
Faculty member	April 24, 2009
Faculty member	April 24, 2009
Faculty member	April 24, 2009
Senior administrator	April 24, 2009
Sue Anne Steffey Morrow, Former Associate Dean of Religious Life, Princeton University	April 24, 2009
Senior administrator	May 19, 2009
Community member	May 19, 2009
Student Services staff member	June 16, 2009

Student Services staff member	June 16, 2009
Alumnus	July 30, 2009
Muslim Chaplain	August 15, 2009
Alumnus	August 19, 2009
Alumnus	August 25, 2009
Senior administrator	August 27, 2009
Student Services staff member	August 27, 2009
Senior administrator	August 27, 2009
Janet Cooper Nelson, University Chaplain, Brown University	September 9, 2009
University Chaplain	September 10, 2009
University Chaplain	September 10, 2009
University Chaplain	September 11, 2009
Administrator	October 6, 2009
Alumnus	October 13, 2009
Muslim Chaplain (former)	October 14, 2009
Religious Life staff member	October 15, 2009
Muslim Chaplain	October 15, 2009
University Chaplain	October 15, 2009
Muslim Chaplain	October 15, 2009
Senior administrator (former)	October 21, 2009
Student Services staff member	October 22, 2009
Ingrid Mattson, Director of Islamic Chaplaincy, Hartford Seminary	January 12, 2010
Marwa Aly, Muslim Chaplain, Trinity College and Wesleyan University	January 12, 2010
Affiliated Chaplain (former)*	March 1, 2010
Muslim Chaplain	March 8, 2010
University Chaplain	March 8, 2010
Nadeem Baig, Board Member, Office of the Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers University (OMCRU)	March 23, 2010
Muslim Chaplain	March 30, 2010
Muslim Chaplain	April 23, 2010
Muslim Chaplain	April 24, 2010
Student Services staff member	May 20, 2010
Muslim Chaplain (former)	July 29, 2010
Administrator (former)	March 30, 2011
Religious Life staff member*	September 12, 2011
University Chaplain*	September 26, 2011
University Chaplain*	March 27, 2012
Student*	April 14, 2012
Sohaib Sultan, Muslim Chaplain, Princeton University*	April 16, 2012

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

This is an aggregate interview schedule that includes questions asked of a wide a range of people (University administrators, students, Muslim Chaplains, faculty members, and others). Not all questions were asked of all types of interviewees. For example, some questions below were only asked of students or Muslim Chaplains.

Since these were semi-structured interviews, I did not ask questions in a linear or rigid way. I found that allowing the natural course of a conversation to develop led to a richer, more honest and sometimes unexpected dialogue.

Introduction

- Tell me a little about your career and how you came to [University X]?
- What are your roles and responsibilities here?
- Where did you grow up? When did you arrive at [University X] and what are you studying? Are you enjoying it? [students only]
- Tell me about your involvement, if any, with the Muslim Student Association (MSA). Are you involved with other Muslim student groups beside the MSA? [students only]

Background Questions

- What are the demographics of the Muslim student population – domestic/international students, race, gender, sect, undergraduate/graduate?
- What types of accommodations do Muslim students currently have at [University X]? [such as prayer room, halal food, wu'du facilities]
- Tell me about the Muslim Student Association (MSA). Are there other Muslim student groups besides the MSA?
- How would you characterize the goals/concerns of Muslim students? How are they brought to the administration? How has the university responded?
- How have you been involved in bringing Muslim student goals/concerns to the university administration? [Muslim Chaplains only]
- What type of relationship does the administration have with Muslim students? Which members of the administration are involved?
- What relationship do Muslim students have with students of other faiths?

- What are the challenges or limitations (if any) the university faces in meeting the needs of Muslim students?
- What roles and responsibilities does the Muslim Chaplain have? [in relation to students, staff, faculty, administration, other chaplains, community members, donors, alumni] How role does the chaplain play in interfaith efforts?
- What is your relationship with Muslim Chaplains at other institutions? [Muslim Chaplains only]
- How was the decision made to hire a full-time/part-time/occasional chaplain?
- Have there been issues around which Muslim students have been especially active or involved? [reference specific incidents such as the Danish cartoons, Israel/Palestine, speaker controversies, tenure cases, or Islamo-Fascism Awareness Week] How have these issues played out on campus? What role has the Muslim Chaplain played? How did the administration respond?

Questions about Muslim Chaplaincy

- When (and by whom) was the issue of Muslim Chaplaincy first raised and when was the first chaplain hired?
- How was the search for a Muslim Chaplain conducted? Who was involved? What role did students play in the process?
- At any point in the process, did you speak with your peers at other institutions? What did they tell you? What influence did this have on your decision to hire a chaplain?
- What skills, experiences, and traits were you looking for in a Muslim Chaplain?
- What types of candidates did you consider? [female/male, Shia/Sunni candidates, American-born/immigrant candidates]
- How does the work of the Muslim Chaplain compare to the roles and responsibilities of chaplains from other faith backgrounds? How does s/he compare to the leaders of minority student resource centres?
- What do you think about the current/former chaplain? Does s/he meet your needs? [students only]
- How has the Muslim Chaplain been received by various campus constituencies? Has this new position created any apprehension or discomfort on campus?
- Why did the university decide to hire a Muslim Chaplain? Who were the primary advocates for this new position? As far as you can tell, were there individuals or groups that were apprehensive about Muslim Chaplaincy?

- Which individuals have been most involved in guiding and supporting the Muslim Chaplain?
- What have been the benefits and drawbacks of having a Muslim Chaplain?
- Some individuals I've spoken to have suggested that Muslim Chaplains have been hired to prevent extremism among Muslim students or to appease/attract donors. Do you agree?
- A number of colleges and universities hired Muslim Chaplains in a short window of time between 2006-2011. Do you have any thoughts about why? Some have suggested that hiring a Muslim Chaplain is about keeping up with peer institutions. What do you think about that?

APPENDIX C: CUREC FORMS

University of Oxford

Department of Education
15 Norham Gardens, Oxford OX2 6PY

Director: Professor John Furlong, B.A., M.A., Ph.D., F.R.S.A.
Tel: +44 (0)1865 274024 Fax: +44 (0)1865 274027

Islam on Campus: Muslim Chaplaincy, Religious Diversity and Contemporary Higher Education in North America

Information for Interview Participants

Invitation

You are being invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide to participate, it is important to understand why the research is being conducted and what your participation entails. Please take time to read the following information carefully. Please ask if there are any aspects of the project that are unclear or if you would like more information.

Focus

I am conducting research on the relationship between Muslim students, faculty members and administrators on American university campuses. I am particularly interested in colleges that have appointed or sanctioned part-time and full-time Muslim chaplains. I want to explore how and why these chaplains have been hired, and how different campus constituencies have responded to them. The findings of this study may provide insight about the changing nature of diversity and multiculturalism in contemporary higher education in America.

Methodology

For this research I will select two campuses as in-depth case studies. I plan to speak with a variety of people on each campus including administrators, students, faculty members and others. I will also conduct interviews with Muslim chaplains and other administrators at a variety of universities beyond the two case studies. You have been identified as someone with insight into these complex issues. Therefore I invite you to participate in an hour-long, audio-recorded interview.

Participation

Your participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without academic penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You also have the right to refuse to answer particular questions.

Results

The results of this research will form the basis of an Oxford doctoral dissertation. Some results may be published in journals, magazines or books. If you wish to obtain a copy of the published results, please let me know. My study will take place over the next two to four years, after which time the published results will be publicly available.

Privacy

Your privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from this study. The interview will be treated confidentially, though you may choose to say certain things with attribution. All data will be kept on a secure password-protected and encrypted computer in accordance with the United Kingdom Data Protection Act of 1998. One year after the project is complete, the original data will be archived in a secure location.

Benefits and Risks

I will share my results with all participating individuals and institutions with the hope that it will provide context, insight and feedback about Muslim chaplaincy and religious diversity on your campus and others across North America. Every effort will be made to preserve your confidentiality, but as this can never be fully guaranteed, there is a remote possibility that you may be able to be identified in the final report. Other than this, there are no known risks to taking part in this research. There is no financial compensation for your participation in this study.

Contact Details

Should you have any further questions about this research, please feel free to contact me at the address below. If you have any further information, insight into these issues, or questions, your inquiries are most welcome.

Mr. Aly Kassam-Remtulla, Doctoral Candidate
Department of Education, Oxford University
15 Norham Gardens
Oxford OX2 6PY United Kingdom
Email: aremtulla@stanfordalumni.org or aly.kassam-remtulla@education.ox.ac.uk
U.S. Mobile: 917-292-6746

This project has been reviewed by, and received ethics clearance through, the University of Oxford Central University Research Ethics Committee.

Thank you for taking the time to read this information sheet.

University of Oxford

Department of Education
15 Norham Gardens, Oxford OX2 6PY

Director: Professor John Furlong, B.A., M.A., Ph.D., F.R.S.A.
Tel: +44 (0)1865 274024 Fax: +44 (0)1865 274027

Islam on Campus: Muslim Chaplaincy, Religious Diversity and Contemporary Higher Education in the United States

Interview Consent Form

Contact Details

I am conducting this research as part of my doctoral thesis in the Department of Education at Oxford University in Oxford, United Kingdom. Please contact me if you have any questions about this study.

Mr. Aly Kassam-Remtulla
Doctoral Candidate, Department of Education
Oxford University
15 Norham Gardens
Oxford OX2 6PY
United Kingdom
Email: aremtulla@stanfordalumni.org or aly.kassam-remtulla@education.ox.ac.uk
U.S. Mobile: 917-292-6746

Research Focus

I am conducting research on the relationship between Muslim students, faculty members and administrators on American university campuses. I am particularly interested in colleges that have appointed part-time and full-time Muslim chaplains. I want to explore how and why these chaplains have been hired, and how different campus constituencies have responded to them.

Study Methodology

For this research I have selected two campuses as case studies. In addition, I am speaking to people at other institutions who have worked as or with Muslim chaplains. Given your role and experience, I invite you to participate in an hour-long, audio-recorded interview.

Your participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without academic penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You also have the right to refuse to answer particular questions.

Possible Risks

There are no risks associated with participation in this study.

Possible Benefits

I will share my results with all participating individuals and institutions with the hope that it will provide context, insight and feedback about Muslim chaplaincy and religious diversity on your campus and others. There is no financial compensation for your participation in this study.

Data Storage

Your privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from this study. The interview will be treated confidentially, though you may choose to say certain things with attribution. All data will be kept on a secure password-protected and encrypted computer in accordance with the United Kingdom Data Protection Act of 1998. One year after the project is complete, the original data will be archived in a secure location.

This project has been reviewed by, and received ethics clearance through, the University of Oxford Central University Research Ethics Committee.

Participant Consent

I have read the information above. I agree to participate in an audio-recorded interview as part of this research project. I know that, at any point, I can withdraw my participation without penalty or loss. I also know that I can ask questions about the research at any time.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Email/phone number: _____

GLOSSARY

The names of religious sects and words commonly used in English (such as Qur'an, Eid, Imam, Ramadan, and halal) are not italicised in this glossary or in the main text. Less common words are italicised.

Ahmadiyya – an Islamic religious movement that originated in 19th century India; the community is considered heretical by some Muslim sects

'Alim – religious scholar, singular of *'ulama'*

As-salamu alaykum (or the shortened version *salam*) – greeting, literally "peace"

Druze – an esoteric, monotheistic, religious community based largely in Syria, Lebanon, and Israel; some consider themselves Muslim and others do not

Eid – festival, often referring to the festival marking the end of Ramadan

Fatwa – Islamic legal opinion

Fiqh – Islamic jurisprudence which involves interpreting the Qur'an and the *Sunnah*

Hadith – a saying ascribed to Prophet Muhammad

Hajj – holy pilgrimage to the *Kaaba*. This is meant to be an egalitarian experience where distinctions of class, race, nationality and religious sect are unimportant.

Halal - food that is permissible by Islamic law. Most importantly, this means that animals are slaughtered according to Qur'anic tradition, but it also prohibits consumption of food made with alcohol, blood, carnivorous animal meat and some seafood.

Halaqa – a religious gathering to learn about theology

Hijab – a headscarf – usually covering the hair and ears – worn by some Muslim women. The word may also refer to modest Muslim clothing in general.

Iftar – evening meal to break fast the daily Ramadan fast

Ijazah – scholarly licenses, a certification that someone has been authorized to teach a certain Islamic text or subject

Imam – a male Muslim religious leader

Insha'Allah – literally "God willing"

Ismaili – a religiously syncretic and culturally liberal Shia sect

Jum'ah (also *Jumu'ah*) – Friday afternoon prayers: the main weekly prayer service for Muslims.

Kaaba – Islam's most sacred site. Based in Mecca, Saudi Arabia, this is the place to which all Muslims are supposed to make a *hajj* at least once in their lives.

Khutbah – sermon

Kosher – food that is permissible by Jewish law

Masjid – Muslim place of worship, origin of the word mosque

Mikveh – Jewish ritual cleansing bath

Qur'an – Muslim holy book, also sometimes spelled as Koran

Ramadan – the Islamic month of fasting during which Muslims refrain from eating, drinking, smoking, and sexual activity during daylight hours.

Shari'ah – Islamic religious law

Shia – the second largest branch of Islam. Adherents follow Imams that are descendents of the Prophet's family beginning with his cousin Ali.

Sufi – a mystical tradition within Islam

Suhoor – meal eaten before dawn during Ramadan

Sunnah – the acts of Prophet Muhammad that he taught as the exemplar of *Shari'ah*

Sunni – the largest branch of Islam practiced by over 80% of Muslims worldwide. Adherents are committed to the *Sunnah* and follow leaders from among the capable.

Taqiyah – cap worn by some Muslim men

Wahhabi – Wahhabism is an orthodox 18th century Sunni reformist movement which advocates a return to the practices of early Islam. A fundamental belief is Tawheed, the oneness of God, which has been used to label Shia and other sects that revere saints, Imams, and other holy figures as apostates.

Wu'du – the act of performing ritual ablutions before prayer

Yom Kippur – Jewish day of atonement, the holiest day in the Jewish calendar

WORKS CITED AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note: Since most newspaper and magazine articles were accessed online, their citations and references do not include page numbers.

Abu-Ras, W. (2010). Chaplaincy Services for Muslim Patients in New York City Hospitals: Assessing Needs, Barriers, and the Role of Muslim Chaplains. Clinton Township, MI, Institute for Social Policy and Understanding.

Adamuti-Trache, M. and L. Andres (2008). "Embarking on and persisting in scientific fields of study: Cultural capital, gender, and curriculum along the science pipeline." International Journal of Science Education **30**(12): 1557-1584.

Ahmed, B. (2012). Milestone at University of Michigan: Muslim chaplain. National Public Radio. Washington, DC. February 8, 2012.

Ajrouch, K. J. (2004). "Gender, race, and symbolic boundaries: Contested spaces of identity among Arab American adolescents." Sociological Perspectives **47**(4): 371-391.

Alaya, A. M. (2008). Rutgers' rich mix of cultures: The students get to learn from each other. Star-Ledger. Newark, NJ. November 13, 2008.

Ali, A. I. (2009). Finding home: Formulations of race and nationhood among Muslim college students in Southern California. Education. Los Angeles, UCLA. **PhD**.

Ali, S. R. and E. Bagheri (2009). Practical suggestions to accommodate the needs of Muslim students on campus. Intersections of religious privilege: Difficult dialogues and student affairs practice. S. K. Watt, E. E. Fairchild and K. M. Goodman. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass: 47-54.

American Civil Liberties Union (2009). Blocking faith, freezing charity: Chilling Muslim charitable giving in the 'War on Terrorism Financing'. New York, NY, American Civil Liberties Union.

Amos, A. (2007). "Death in hospital: The place of religion in the care of the patient." Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations 18(3): 325-331.

Amusin, S., S. Bier, et al. (2006). Bringing interfaith to the University of Illinois. Building the interfaith youth movement: Beyond dialogue to action. E. Patel and P. Brodeur. Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield: 125-9.

Ancheta, A. N. (2006). Race, rights, and the Asian American experience, 2nd edition. New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press.

Anderson, T. H. (2004). The pursuit of fairness: A history of affirmative action. New York, NY, Oxford University Press.

Antonio, A. L. (2001). "The role of interracial interaction in the development of leadership skills and cultural knowledge and understanding." Research in Higher Education **42**(5): 593-617.

Arenson, K. W. (2001). Princeton to replace loans with student scholarships. New York Times. New York, NY. January 28, 2001.

Arenson, K. W. (2007). Fracas erupts over book on Mideast by a Barnard professor seeking tenure. New York Times. New York, NY. September 10, 2007.

Aron, J. (2008). New Muslim chaplain looks forward to year ahead. Wesleyan Argus. Wesleyan, CT. September 12, 2008.

Aronowitz, S. (2000). The knowledge factory: Dismantling the corporate university and creating true higher learning. Boston, MA, Beacon Press.

Arthur, J. and A. Shapiro, Eds. (1995). Campus wars: Multiculturalism and the politics of difference. Boulder, CO, Westview.

Associated Press (2006). West Point dedicates space to Muslim worship. Times Herald-Record. Middletown, NY. October 23, 2006.

Axtell, J. (2006). The making of Princeton University: From Woodrow Wilson to the present. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.

Bacharach, S. B. and E. J. Lawler (1980). Power and politics in organisations. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.

Bagby, I. (2012). The American mosque 2011: Basic characteristics of the American mosque and attitudes of mosque leaders. Washington, DC, Council on American-Islamic Relations.

Baldridge, J. V. (1971). Power and conflict in the university: Research in the sociology of complex organizations. New York, NY, Wiley.

Baldridge, J. V. and T. E. Deal (1983). The basics of change in educational organizations. The dynamics of organizational change in education. J.V. Baldridge, T. E. Deal, et al. (eds.). Berkeley, CA, McCutchan Publishing Corporation: 191-210.

Becher, T. and M. Kogan (1992). Process and structure in higher education. London, Routledge.

Becker, H. S., B. Geer, et al. (1961). Boys in white. Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press.

Beinin, J. (2006). The new McCarthyism: Policing thought about the Middle East. Academic freedom after September 11. B. Doumani. Zone, Brooklyn, NY: 237-268.

Belluck, P. (2002). Defector indignant at president of Harvard. New York Times. New York, NY. April 16, 2002.

Benner, K. (2007). Language focus leaves Europe. Daily Princetonian. Princeton, NJ. February 19, 2007.

Berger, P. L. (1999). The desecularization of the world: a global overview. The desecularization of the world: Resurgent religion and world politics. P. L. Berger, J. Sacks, D. Martin et al. Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans: 1-18.

Bernstein, M. F. (2006). A calling to Princeton: Khalid Latif is the university's first Muslim Chaplain. Princeton Alumni Weekly **107**(3): 20-22.

Bischoff, H. (2004). Ethnicity. Encyclopedia of New Jersey. M. N. Lurie and M. Mappen. New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press: 260-2.

Boden, A. L. (2006). Articulating what is at stake in interreligious work. Building the interfaith youth movement: Beyond dialogue to action. E. Patel and P. Brodeur. Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield: 131-6.

Bolman, L. G. and T. E. Deal (1997). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership, 2nd edition. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.

Borsch, F. H. (2012). Keeping faith at Princeton: A brief history of religious pluralism at Princeton and other universities. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.

Bosch, L. (2008). "Installing footbaths at the University of Michigan-Dearborn: Is the university preventing slip and fall or falling further down the establishment clause's slippery slope?" Michigan State Law Review **1151**(Winter): 1151-1193.

Bowen, W. G. and D. C. Bok (1998). The shape of the river. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.

Boxer, M. J. (1998). When women ask the questions: Creating women's studies in America. Baltimore, MD, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Brodeur, P. and E. Patel (2006). Introduction: Building the interfaith youth movement. Building the interfaith youth movement: Beyond dialogue to action. E. Patel and P. Brodeur. Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield: 1-13.

Bradley, S. M. (2009). Harlem vs. Columbia University: Black student power in the late 1960s. Urbana, IL, University of Illinois Press.

Bramadat, P. A. (2000). The church on the world's turf: An Evangelical Christian group at a secular university. New York, NY, Oxford University Press.

British Educational Research Association (2004). Revised ethical guidelines for educational research, British Educational Research Association.

Bruinius, H. (2009). When NYPD wears a Muslim topi: Police chaplaincy lets Khalid Latif embody both Islam and American culture. Christian Science Monitor. Boston, MA. March 19, 2009.

Bryant, A. N. (2006). "Exploring religious pluralism in higher education: Non-majority religious perspectives among entering first-year college students." Religion & Education **33**(1): 1-25.

Bryant, A.N. and H.A. Astin (2008). "The correlates of spiritual struggle during the college years." Journal of Higher Education **79**(1): 1-27.

Burtchaell, J. T. (1998). The dying of the light: The disengagement of colleges and universities from their Christian churches. Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans.

Bush, T. (2010). Theories of educational leadership and management, 4th edition. London, Sage.

Cadge, W., J. Freese, et al. (2008). "The provision of hospital chaplaincy in the United States: A national overview." Southern Medical Journal **101**(6): 626-630.

Cady, D. M. (2007). Spirituality and student development. Searching for spirituality in higher education. B. W. Speck and S. L. Hoppe. New York, NY, Peter Lang: 97-109.

Cai, A. (2007). U. refuses to grant Chabad chaplaincy. Daily Princetonian. Princeton, NJ. March 26, 2007.

Cainkar, L. (2009). Homeland insecurity: The Arab American and Muslim American experience after 9/11. New York, NY, Russell Sage Foundation.

Calvanelli, E. and T. J. Frusciano (1992). Inventory to the records of the Rutgers College Office of Dean of Men, 1928-1947. New Brunswick, NJ, Special Collections and University Archives, Rutgers University Libraries.

Cameron, K. (1983). "Strategic responses to conditions of decline: Higher education and the private sector." Journal of Higher Education **54**(4): 359-380.

Carson, M. (2010). Carson: SHIFTing the blame. Daily Northwestern. Evanston, IL. October 6, 2010.

Castellanos, J. and L. Jones, Eds. (2003). The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators and students in higher education. Sterling, VA, Stylus.

Cesari, J., Ed. (2009). Muslims in the West after 9/11: Religion, politics and law. London, Routledge.

Chaffee, E. E. (1985). "Three models of strategy." Academy of Management Review **10**(1): 89-98.

Chait, R. (2002). The "Academic Revolution" revisited. The future of the city of intellect. S. Brint. Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press: 293-321.

Chang, M. J. (1999). "Does racial diversity matter?: The educational impact of a racially diverse undergraduate population." Journal of College Student Development **40**(4): 377-395.

Chen, A. S. and L. M. Stulberg (2007). Beyond disruption: The forgotten origins of affirmative action in college and university admissions, 1961-1969: 1-87.

Cherry, C., B. A. DeBerg, et al. (2000). Religion on campus. Chapel Hill, NC, University of North Carolina Press.

Chickering, A. W. (2006). Policy issues: legislative and institutional. Encouraging authenticity and spirituality in higher education. A. W. Chickering, J. C. Dalton and L. Stamm. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass: 97-112.

Chickering, A. W., J. C. Dalton, et al. Eds. (2006). Encouraging authenticity and spirituality in higher education. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.

Clark, B. R. (1970). The distinctive college: Antioch, Reed, and Swarthmore. Chicago, IL, Aldine.

Clark, B. R. (1980). Academic culture. Yale Higher Education Research Group, Report No. 42, New Haven, CT, Institute for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University.

Clark, B. R. (1983). The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective. Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.

Clark, R. T. (2001). "The law and spirituality: How the law supports and limits expression of spirituality on the college campus." New Directions for Student Services **95**: 37-46.

Clotfelter, C. T. (2003). "Alumni giving to elite private colleges and universities." Economics of Education Review **22**(2): 109-120.

Coffey, A.J. and P.A. Atkinson (1996). Making sense of qualitative data. London, Sage.

Cohen, P. (2009). Yale Press bans images of Muhammad in new book. New York Times. New York, NY. August 12, 2009.

Cohler-Esses, L. (2007). The new McCarthyism. The Nation. November 12, 2007.

Cole, D. and S. Ahmadi (2003). "Perspectives and experiences of Muslim women who veil on college campuses." Journal of College Student Development **44**(1): 47-66.

Colla, E. (2007). Academic freedom and Middle East Studies. Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP. **93:** 51-54.

Collisson, C. (2008). The fight to legitimize blackness: How black students changed the university. History. Seattle, WA, University of Washington. **PhD.**

Conti, J. A. and M. O'Neil (2007). "Studying power: qualitative methods and the global elite." Qualitative Research **7**(1): 63-82.

Cooperman, A. (2004). Harvard will refund sheik's $2.5 million gift. Washington Post. Washington, DC. July 28, 2004.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Cristillo, L. A. (2008). Religiosity, education and civic belonging: Muslim youth in New York City public schools. Muslim Youth in NYC Public Schools. New York, NY.

Cronbach, L. J. (1975). "Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology." American Psychologist **30**: 116-127.

Daley, S., D. L. Wingard, et al. (2006). "Improving the retention of underrepresented minority faculty in academic medicine." Journal of the National Medical Association **98**(9): 1435-1440.

Dalton, J. C. (2006). Integrating spirit and community in higher education. Encouraging authenticity and spirituality in higher education. A. W. Chickering, J. C. Dalton and L. Stamm. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass: 165-185.

Daneman, M. (2011). More U.S. colleges adding Muslim chaplains. USA Today. McLean, VA. March 24, 2011.

Davey, M. (2006). Illinois student paper prints Muslim cartoons, and reaction is swift. New York Times. New York, NY. February 17, 2006.

Diamond, M. R., Ed. (2011). Fostering religious literacy across campus. Stillwater, OK, New Forums Press.

DiMaggio, P. J. and W. W. Powell (1983). "The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields." American Sociological Review **48**: 147-160.

Donley Forcier, M. F. (2004). "Men of Dartmouth" and "The Lady Engineers": Coeducation at Dartmouth College and Lehigh University. Going coed: Women's experiences in formerly men's colleges and universities, 1950-2000. L. Miller-Bernal and S. L. Poulson. Nashville, TN, Vanderbilt University Press: 153-180.

Dorell, O. (2007). Some say schools giving Muslims special treatment. USA Today. McLean, VA. July 26, 2007.

Doumani, B., Ed. (2006). Academic freedom after September 11. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Echols, T. (2009). Georgetown University Business School receives $20M gift. Washington Business Journal. Washington, DC. July 10, 2009.

Eck, D. L. (2001). A new religious America: How a 'Christian country' has become the world's most religiously diverse nation. San Francisco, HarperCollins.

Eckstein, H. (2000). Case study and theory in political science. Case study method: Key issues, key texts. R. Gomm, M. Hammersley and P. Foster. London, Sage: 119-164.

Ehrenreich, B. (2007). It's Islamo-Fascism Awareness Week! The Nation. October 22, 2007.

Enerio, K. R. (2011). Muslim chaplains continue CILRU growth. Daily Targum. New Brunswick, NJ. March 2, 2011.

Exum, W. H. (1985). Paradoxes of protest: black student activism in a white university. Philadelphia, PA, Temple University Press.

Fairchild, E. E. (2009). Christian privilege, history, and trends in U.S. religion. Intersections of religious privilege: Difficult dialogues and student affairs practice. S. K. Watt, E. E. Fairchild and K. M. Goodman. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass: 5-11.

Feldman, K. A. and T. M. Newcomb (1969). Impact of college on students. San Francisco, CA, Jossey Bass.

Fenelon, J. (2003). "Race, research, and tenure - Institutional credibility and the incorporation of African, Latino, and American Indian faculty." Journal of Black Studies **34**(1): 87-100.

Finder, A. (2007). Embattled Barnard anthropologist is awarded tenure. New York Times. New York, NY. November 3, 2007.

Fitz, J. and D. Halpin (1994). Ministers and mandarins: Educational research in elite settings. Researching the powerful in education. G. Walford. London, UCL Press: 32-50.

Fitzpatrick, K. (2007). Republican group's event plans under fire. The Daily Californian. Berkeley, CA. October 12, 2007.

Ford Foundation. (2007). Inclusive scholarship: developing black studies in the United States. New York, NY, Ford Foundation.

Fullinwider, R. (2010). "Affirmative action." Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy, from http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2010/entries/affirmative-action/.

Gardner, O. S., J. W. Keller, et al. (1996). "Retention issues as perceived by African-American university students." Psychology: A Journal of Human Behavior **33**(1): 20-21.

Geiger, R. L. (2002). The competition for high-ability students: Universities in a key marketplace. The future of the city of intellect: The changing American university. S. G. Brint. Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press: 82-106.

Geller, P. (2010). The post-American presidency: The Obama administration's war on America. New York, NY, Threshold Editions.

George, S. (2011). A mild-mannered professor is not the face of Islamic fury, despite what state Sen. Bill Ketron wants you to think. Nashville Scene. Nashville, TN. May 26, 2011.

Ghaffar-Kucher, A. (2008). Academic engagement and socialization of Muslim youth: A case study of Pakistani immigrants in New York City. Muslim Youth in New York City Public Schools Study Conference. New York, NY, Columbia University.

Gilliat-Ray, S. (2000). Religion in higher education: The politics of the multi-faith campus. Aldershot, U.K., Ashgate.

Gilliat-Ray, S. (2008). From 'Visiting Minister' to 'Muslim Chaplain': The growth of Muslim Chaplaincy in Britain, 1970-2007. The centrality of religion in social life: Essays in honour of James A. Beckford. E. Barker. Aldershot, Ashgate: 145-160.

Ginsberg, B. (2011). The fall of the faculty: The rise of the all-administrative university and why it matters. New York, NY, Oxford University Press.

Goldscheider, E. (2002). Colleges are scrambling for Muslim chaplains New York Times. New York, NY. February 16, 2002.

Gomm, R., M. Hammersley, et al. (2000). Case study and generalization. Case study method: Key issues, key texts. R. Gomm, M. Hammersley and P. Foster. London, Sage: 98-115.

Gorski, P. S. and A. Altinordu (2008). "After secularization?" Annual Review of Sociology **34**: 55-85.

Gould, E. (2003). The university in a corporate culture. New Haven, CT, Yale University Press.

Graves, K. (2008). "University accommodation of non-majority religions: Legitimate protection of students' right to practice or unconstitutional governmental endorsement?" Journal of Law and Education **37**(2): 291-296.

Green, D. O. (2004). "Justice and diversity: Michigan's response to Gratz, Grutter, and the affirmative action debate." Urban Education **39**(4): 374-93.

Green, J. (2000). "The impact of coeducation at Rutgers College on Douglass College." Towards a new history of Douglass College: Essays by students from the Douglass Scholars Program Retrieved June 7, 2012, from http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/rul/libs/scua/douglass_scholars/article8.shtml.

Greenberg, D. (2008). The Ivies' curious surge to aid needy students. Chronicle of Higher Education. Washington, DC. February 25, 2008.

Greenberg, J. (2010). Muslim students discourage negative views on Islam. Daily Bruin. Los Angeles, CA. May 11, 2010.

Groen, J. A. and M. J. White (2004). "In-state versus out-of-state students: The divergence of interest between public universities and state governments." Journal of Public Economics **88**(9-10): 1793-1814.

Guba, E. G. and Y. S. Lincoln (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. Handbook of qualitative research. N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage: 105-117.

Guenther, K.M. (2009). "The politics of names: rethinking the methodological and ethical significance of naming people, organizations, and places." Qualitative Research **9**(4): 411-421.

Gumport, P. J. and B. Pusser (1995). "A case of bureaucratic accretion: Context and consequences." Journal of Higher Education **66**(5): 493-520.

Gumport, P. J. and B. Sporn (1999). Institutional adaptation: Demands for management reform and university administration. Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, Vol. XIV. J. C. Smart. New York, NY, Agathon: 103-145.

Gurin, P. Y. (1999). "Expert report of Patricia Gurin." Michigan Journal of Race & Law **5**(1): 363-425.

Gurin, P.Y., E. L. Dey, et al. (2002). "Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes." Harvard Educational Review **72**(3): 330-366.

Hamilton, K. (2006). "A call to lead." Diverse Issues in Higher Education **23**(7): 28-30.

Hammersley, M. and R. Gomm (2008). Assessing the radical critique of interviews. Questioning qualitative inquiry: Critical essays. M. Hammersley. London, Sage: 89-100.

Hammersley, M. and P. Atkinson (1995). Ethnography: Principles in practice. London, Routledge.

Hamza, D. R. (2007). "On models of hospital chaplaincies: Which one works best for the Muslim community?" Journal of Muslim Mental Health **2**(1): 65-79.

Harvey, W. B. and J. Valadez, Eds. (1994). Creating and maintaining a diverse faculty. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.

Hassan, S. (2010). Jesuit college with a Muslim chaplain say what? Fairfield Mirror. Fairfield, CT. October 20, 2010.

Healy, P. (2011). CUNY blocks honor for Tony Kushner. New York Times. New York, NY. May 4, 2011.

Hecke, D. (2010). U.S. colleges attract undergraduate international students both by recruitment and reputation. Insight into Diversity. St. Louis, MO. December 2010.

Helm, D. M., M. Janis, et al. (2010). "A model minority faculty fellowship program: enhancing minority faculty in health professions and reducing inequity in health services." Journal of Allied Health **39**(3): 111-115.

Hermansen, M. K. (2003). How to put the genie back in the bottle: Identity Islam and Muslim youth cultures in the United States. Progressive Muslims: On pluralism, gender and justice. O. Safi. Oxford, Oneworld Publications**:** 303-319.

Herriott, R. E. and W. A. Firestone (1983). "Multisite qualitative policy research: Optimizing description and generalisability." Educational Researcher **12**(2): 14-19.

Herschtal, E. (2003). NES enrollment slows after two years of growth for department. Daily Princetonian. Princeton, NJ. September 23, 2003.

Higher Education Research Institute. (2004). The spiritual life of college students: A national study of college students' search for meaning and purpose. Los Angeles, CA, UCLA.

Hine, D. C. (1990). Black studies: An overview. Three essays: Black Studies in the United States. R. L. Harris, D. C. Hine and N. McKay. New York, NY, Ford Foundation: 100-112.

Holdsworth, C. (2006). "'Don't you think you're missing out, living at home?' Student experiences and residential transitions." Sociological Review **54**(3): 495-519.

Holland, D. C. and M. A. Eisenhart (1990). Educated in Romance: Women, achievement and college culture. Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press.

Horowitz, H. L. (1987). Campus life: Undergraduate cultures from the end of the eighteenth century to the present. Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press.

Howell, S. F. (2009). Inventing the American mosque: Early Muslims and their institutions in Detroit, 1910-1980. American Culture. Ann Arbor, MI, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. **PhD:** 316.

Hu, M. (2009). Chaplain's email sparks controversy. Harvard Crimson. Cambridge, MA. April 14, 2009.

Ihle, E. L. (2004). Women's admission to the University of Virginia: Tradition transformed. Going coed: Women's experiences in formerly men's colleges and universities, 1950-2000. L. Miller-Bernal and S. L. Poulson. Nashville, TN, Vanderbilt University Press: 181-197.

Institute for International Education (2011). Open doors 2010: Report on international educational exchange. New York, NY, Institute for International Education. Retrieved from: http://www.iie.org/opendoors

Jacobsen, D. and R. H. Jacobsen, Eds. (2008). The American university in a postsecular age. New York, NY, Oxford University Press.

Jaschik, S. (2005). Middle East wars hit Princeton. Inside Higher Education. Washington, DC. April 25, 2005.

Jaschik, S. (2006). Blackballed at Yale. Inside Higher Education. Washington, DC. June 5, 2006.

Jaschik, S. (2007a). DePaul rejects Finkelstein. Inside Higher Education. Washington, DC. June 11, 2007.

Jaschik, S. (2007b). Are you ready for 'Islamo-Fascism Week'? Inside Higher Education. Washington, DC. October 9, 2007.

Jones, V. E. (2007). A study in comfort: More Muslims hear the call to chaplaincy as a way to share their faith yet minister to all. Boston Globe. Boston, MA. March 7, 2007.

Josephs, D. (2007). Under one roof: The Middle East Coexistence House as a model for conflict resolution. Political Science. New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University. **Bachelor's degree**.

Kaplan, E. (2007). The culture war descends on Columbia. The Nation. October 26, 2007.

Karabel, J. (1984). "Status-group struggle, organizational interests, and the limits of institutional autonomy: The transformation of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, 1918-1940." Theory and Society **13**: 1-40.

Karabel, J. (2005a). The chosen: The hidden history of admission and exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. Boston, MA, Houghton Mifflin.

Karabel, J. (2005b). "How affirmative action took hold at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton." Journal of Blacks in Higher Education **48**: 58-77.

Kassam-Remtulla, A. (1998). (Dis)placing Khojahs: Forging identities, revitalizing Islam, and crafting global Ismailism. Department of Anthropology. Stanford, CA, Stanford University. **Bachelor's degree**.

Kassam-Remtulla, A. (2010). Chaplains. Encyclopedia of Muslim-American History. E. E. Curtis. New York, NY, Facts on File: 98-100

Kay, S. (2008). Princeton Chabad Rabbi becomes university chaplain: Announcement reverses last year's rejection of Rabbi's application New Voices: National Jewish Student Magazine. September 23, 2008.

Kazanjian, V. H. and Students of the Wellesley College Multi-faith Council (2000). Beyond tolerance: From mono-religious to multi-religious life at Wellesley College. Education as transformation: Religious pluralism, spirituality, and a new vision for higher education in America. V. H. Kazanjian and P. L. Laurence. New York, NY, Peter Lang Publishing: 213-230.

Kennedy, E. L. and A. Beins, Eds. (2005). Women's studies for the future: Foundations, interrogations, politics. New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press.

Khoja-Moolji, S. (2011). An emerging model of Muslim leadership: Chaplaincy on university campuses. Cambridge, MA, Pluralism Project, Harvard University.

Kim, R.Y. (2006). God's new whiz kids? Korean American evangelicals on campus. New York, NY, New York University Press.

Kirsch, M. (2006). Queer theory, late capitalism, and internalized homophobia. LGBT studies and queer theory: New conflicts, collaborations, and contested terrain. K. E. Lovaas, J. P. Elia and G. A. Yep. Albany, NY, Harrington Park Press: 19-46.

Kling, L. (1981). Chaplains assail Rutgers cutback. New York Times. New York, NY. November 22, 1981.

Knight, R. (1990). Sanctions, disinvestment, and U.S. corporations in South Africa. Sanctioning Apartheid. R. E. Edgar. Trenton, NJ, Africa World Press: 67-89.

Kolko, V. B. (2002). A history of Jews in American higher education, Indiana University at Bloomington: 1-22.

Lave, J. and E. Wenger (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.

Lebowitz Rossi, H. (2002). Muslim chaplains a new priority for colleges. Religion News Service. Washington, DC. May 16, 2002.

LeCompte, M.D. and J.P. Goetz (1982). "Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research." Review of Educational Research. **52**(1): 31-60.

Lee, D., E. A. Olson, et al. (2009). "The effects of college counseling services on academic performance and retention." Journal of College Student Development **50**(3): 305-319.

Legard, R., J. Keegan, et al. (2003). In-depth interviews. Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers. J. Ritchie and J. Lewis. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage: 138-169.

Lenhardt, R. A. (2008). "Beyond analogy: Perez v. Sharp, antimiscegenation law, and the fight for same-sex marriage " California Law Review **96**(4): 839-900.

Leonard, K. (2003). Muslims in the United States: The state of research. New York, NY, Russell Sage Foundation.

Leonard, K. (2006). American Muslims mobilize: Campus conflicts in context. Conference on Jews and Muslims in the UK, Europe, and the US. Royal Holloway College, London, U.K..

Leslie, L. L. and G. Ramey (1988). "Donor behavior and voluntary support for higher education institutions." Journal of Higher Education **59**(2): 115-132.

Lewin, T. (2007). Universities install footbaths to benefit Muslims, and not everyone is pleased. New York Times. New York, NY. August 7, 2007.

Lewin, T. (2008). 'Sisters' colleges see a bounty in the Middle East. New York Times. New York, NY. June 3, 2008.

Lewin, T. (2009). China is sending more students to U.S. New York Times. New York, NY. November 16, 2009.

Li, S. (2008). Brown's first Muslim chaplain to leave at semester's end. Brown Daily Herald. Providence, RI. February 7, 2008.

Lichter, J. (2009). Muslim Life center officially opens. The Chronicle. Durham, NC. April 10, 2009.

Lincoln, Y. S. and E. G. Guba (2000). The only generalization is: There is no generalization. Case study method: Key issues, key texts. R. Gomm, M. Hammersley and P. Foster. London, Sage: 27-44.

Lipson, D. (2007). "Embracing diversity: The institutionalization of Affirmative Action as diversity management at UC-Berkeley, UT-Austin, and UW-Madison." Law and Social Inquiry **32**(4): 985-1026.

Lowe, E. Y. (1999). Promise and dilemma: Incorporating racial diversity in selective higher education. Promise and dilemma: Perspectives on racial diversity and higher education. E. Y. Lowe. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press: 3-43.

Lunsford, T. F., Ed. (1963). The study of campus cultures. Boulder, CO, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

MacFarquhar, N. (2007). Iraq's shadow widens Sunni-Shiite split in U.S. New York Times. New York, NY. February 4, 2007.

MacFarquhar, N. (2008a). For Muslim students, a debate on inclusion New York Times. New York, NY. February 21, 2008.

MacFarquhar, N. (2008b). At Harvard, students' Muslim traditions are a topic of debate. New York Times. New York, NY. March 21, 2008.

Maira, S. (2004). "Youth culture, citizenship and globalization: South Asian Muslim youth in the United States after September 11th." Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East **24**(1): 219-231.

Maira, S. (2009). Missing: Youth, citizenship, and empire after 9/11. Durham, NC, Duke University Press.

Malinowski, B. (1922). Argonauts of the Western Pacific. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Marcus, R. (2008). Hijabs at a Harvard gym. Washington Post. Washington, DC. March 26, 2008.

Marsden, G. M. (1992). The soul of the American university: A historical overview. The secularization of the academy. G. M. Marsden and B. J. Longfield. New York, Oxford University Press: 9-45.

Marsden, G. M. (1994). The soul of the American university: From Protestant establishment to established nonbelief. New York, NY, Oxford University Press.

Martins, H. (2009). Egyptian activist's invitation withdrawn. Daily Princetonian. Princeton, NJ. November 19, 2009.

Marya, R. (2005). Islamic society's rules challenged: Role of women, Sunni membership debated after alleged election fraud. Daily Targum. New Brunswick, NJ. February 6, 2005.

Masland, A. T. (1985). "Organizational culture in the study of higher education." Review of Higher Education **8**(2): 157-168.

Mattie, J. (2007). Meeting the challenges of enterprise risk management in higher education. Washington, DC, National Association of College and University Business Officers and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

May, T. (2001). Social research: Issues, methods and process (3rd edition). Buckingham, U.K., Open University Press.

McCormick, R. P. (1990). The Black student protest movement at Rutgers. New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press.

Mendez, T. (2005). The new role of Muslim chaplains. Christian Science Monitor. Boston, MA. January 18, 2005.

Meyer, J. W. and W. R. Scott (1992). Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality. London, Sage.

Miles, M. B. and A. M. Huberman (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Miller, H. D. R. (1995). The management of change in universities: Universities, state and economy in Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom. Buckingham, U.K., Open University Press.

Miller-Bernal, L. (2004). Coeducation: An uneven progression. Going coed: Women's experiences in formerly men's colleges and universities, 1950-2000. L. Miller-Bernal and S. L. Poulson. Nashville, TN, Vanderbilt University Press: 3-21.

Miller-Bernal, L. and S. G. Pevar. (2004). A historically black men's college admits women: The case of Lincoln University. Going coed: Women's experiences in formerly men's colleges and universities, 1950-2000. L. Miller-Bernal and S. L. Poulson. Nashville, TN, Vanderbilt University Press: 80-107.

Mir, S. (2006). Constructing third spaces: American Muslim undergraduate women's hybrid identity construction. Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Indiana University. **PhD**.

Moffatt, M. (1989). Coming of age in New Jersey: College and American culture. New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press.

Monks, J. and R. G. Ehrenberg (1999). U.S. News and World Report's college rankings: Why do they matter. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning. **31:** 42-51.

Morgan, G. (2006). Images of organization. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Moyser, G. and M. Wagstaffe. (1987). Studying elites: Theoretical and methodological issues. Research methods for elite studies. G. Moyser and M. Wagstaffe. Winchester, MA, Allen and Unwin: 1-24.

Mubarak, H. (2007). How Muslim students negotiate their religious identity and practices in an undergraduate setting, Social Science Research Council.

Murphy, C. (2005). Saudi gives $20 million to Georgetown. Washington Post. Washington, DC. December 13, 2005.

Murphy, C. (2008). Soldier of faith. Washington Post. Washington, DC. January 20, 2008.

Nash, R. J. (2001). Religious pluralism in the academy: Opening the dialogue. New York, NY, Peter Lang.

Nasir, N. S. and J. Al-Amin (2006). "Creating identity: Safe spaces on college campuses for Muslim students." Change (March/April): 22-27.

Nathan, R. (2005). My freshman year: what a professor learned by becoming a student. Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press.

New York University Center for Dialogues (2007). Muslim youth and women in the West: Source of concern or source of hope? Salzburg, Austria.

Newman, M. (2003). Mideast divide spawns another schism at Rutgers. New York Times. New York, NY. October 11, 2003.

Niebuhr, G. (1999). Religion journal: Georgetown U. names first Muslim Chaplain. New York Times. New York, NY. August 29, 1999.

Nunley, J. (2001). Episcopalians begin to battle "backlash violence" against Muslim neighbors, Episcopal News Service. **2001**.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

OMCRU (2007). Office of the Muslim Chaplain at Rutgers University. New Brunswick: 9.

O'Rourke, M. (2005). Don't let Larry Summers off the hook yet: Why the Harvard president's tactless social science was a bad idea. Slate. January 28, 2005.

Paget, N. K. and J. R. McCormack. (2006). The work of the chaplain. Valley Forge, PA, Judson Press.

Patel, E. and P. Brodeur, Eds. (2006). Building the interfaith youth movement: Beyond dialogue to action. Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield.

Pease-Kerr, S. (2008). U. to hire first full-time Hindu, Muslim chaplains. Daily Princetonian. Princeton, NJ. April 1, 2008.

Peek, L. A. (2003). "Reactions and response: Muslim students' experiences on New York City campuses post 9/11." Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs **23**(2): 271-283.

Peek, L. A. (2005). "Becoming Muslim: The development of a religious identity." Sociology of Religion **66**(3): 215-242.

Peek, L.A. (2011). Behind the backlash: Muslim Americans after 9/11. Philadelphia, PA, Temple University Press.

Pensak, M. (2010). STAR-K on campus: For some, a first taste of Judaism. ViewPoint. **52**.

Peshkin, A. (1986). God's choice: The total world of a fundamentalist Christian school. Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press.

Peterson, M. W. (2007). The study of colleges and universities as organizations. Sociology of higher education: Contributions and their contexts. P. J. Gumport. Baltimore, MD, Johns Hopkins University Press: 147-184.

Pettigrew, A. M. (1979). "On studying organizational cultures." Administrative Science Quarterly **24**: 570-581.

Pew Research Center (2007). Muslim Americans: Middle class and mostly mainstream. Washington, DC, Pew Research Center: 102.

Pfeffer, J. and G. R. Salancik. (1978). The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective. New York, NY, Harper and Row.

Poulson, S. L. and L. Miller-Bernal. (2004). Conclusion: Coeducation and gender equal education. Going coed: Women's experiences in formerly men's colleges and universities, 1950-2000. L. Miller-Bernal and S. L. Poulson. Nashville, TN, Vanderbilt University Press: 309-316.

Powell, W. W. and P. J. DiMaggio, Eds. (1991). The new institutionalism in organizational analysis. Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press.

Powers, E. (2006) A new faith at Catholic Colleges. Inside Higher Education. Washington, DC. April 3, 2006.

Price, J. (2010). "The effect of instructor race and gender on student persistence in STEM fields." Economics of Education Review **29**(6): 901-910.

Princeton University Archives (2002). Office of the Dean of Religious Life and the Chapel Records, 1906-1981 (bulk 1920-1981): Finding Aid. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Archives.

Pusser, B. (2003). "Beyond Baldridge: Extending the political model of higher education organization and governance." Educational Policy **17**(1): 121-140.

Pusser, B. (2004). Burning down the house: Politics, governance, and affirmative action at the University of California. Albany, NY, State University of New York Press.

Radick, C. (2006). Inventory to the records of the Rutgers University Chaplain (Bradford S. Abernethy), 1928-1974. New Brunswick, NJ, Special Collections and University Archives, Rutgers University Libraries.

Ragovin, H. (2007). The chaplain wears a hijab: Shareda Hosein is the new Muslim chaplain — and a lieutenant colonel. Tufts Journal. Medford, MA. December 2007.

Rasmussen, D. R. (2006). Salient publishes Danish cartoons. Harvard Crimson. Cambridge, MA. February 14, 2006.

Raushenbush, P. (2009). In praise of big (and smart) government. Huffington Post. New York, NY. February 16, 2009.

Redden, E. (2008). Why more colleges want Jewish students. Inside Higher Education. Washington, DC. October 29, 2008.

Reich, W. (2011). Saving the Yale anti-Semitism institute. Washington Post. Washington, DC. June 13, 2011.

Rhoades, G. (1995). "Rethinking restructuring universities." Journal for Higher Education Management **67**(6): 626-659.

Rhoads, R. A. (2000). Freedom's web: Student activism in an age of cultural diversity. Baltimore, MD, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Robson, Colin. (1993). Real world research: A resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.

Rojas, F. (2007). From Black Power to Black Studies: How a radical social movement became an academic discipline. Baltimore, MD, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rooks, N. M. (2006). White money/Black power: The surprising history of African American studies and the crisis of race in higher education. Boston, MA, Beacon Press.

Ross, J. (2002). "The sexualization of difference: A comparison of mixed-race and same-gender marriage." Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review **37**(2): 255-288.

Samarasekera, I. (2011). What global rankings ignore. Inside Higher Education. Washington, DC. July 12, 2011.

Scherr, S. (2008). "Anti-Semitism goes to school: Hate on California, Oregon campuses." Intelligence Report (131).

Schofield, J. W. (2000). Increasing the generalizability of qualitative research. Case study method: Key issues, key texts. R. Gomm, M. Hammersley and P. Foster. London, Sage: 69-97.

Schwartz, S. (2005). A Wahhabi war at Rutgers University. Washington, DC, Front Page Magazine. May 18, 2005.

Scotch, R. K. (2001). From good will to civil rights: Transforming federal disability policy, 2nd edition. Philadelphia, PA, Temple University Press.

Scott, W. R. (2003). Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems, 5th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ, Prentice Hall.

Seaman, B. (2005). Binge: Campus life in an age of disconnection and excess. Hoboken, NJ, John Wiley & Sons.

Sethi, C. (2005). Debate grows over Khalidi candidacy. Daily Princetonian. Princeton, NJ. April 28, 2005.

Shimron, Y. (2008). Duke's Muslim chaplain faces challenges. News & Observer. Raleigh, NC. December 14, 2008.

Sidanius, J., S. Levin, et al. (2008). The diversity challenge: Social identity and intergroup relations on the college campus. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.

Sidanius, J., C. Van Laar, et al. (2004). "Ethnic enclaves and the dynamics of social identity on the college campus: The good, the bad, and the ugly." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology **87**(1): 96-110.

Siddiqui, A. (2007). Islam at universities in England: Meeting the needs and investing in the future. Markfield, United Kingdom, Markfield Institute of Higher Education.

Siegel, J. (2005). Jewish cadets find friendly environment at West Point. Forward. New York, NY. June 7, 2005.

Silverman, J. A. (2003). Where is Hillel? A case study of Hillel and the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia, PA, University of Pennsylvania. **EdD**.

Simmer-Brown, J. (1999). Commitment and openness: A contemplative approach to pluralism. The heart of learning: spirituality in education. S. Glazer. New York, Tarcher: 97-112.

Sirin, S. R. and M. Fine (2008). Muslim American youth: Understanding hyphenated identities through multiple methods. New York, NY, New York University Press.

Skrentny, J. D. (2002). The minority rights revolution. Cambridge, MA, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Slaughter, S. (1995). "Criteria for restructuring postsecondary education." Journal for Higher Education Management **10**(2): 31-44.

Small, M. J. (1999). "Departmental conditions and the emergence of new disciplines: Two cases in the legitimation of African-American Studies." Theory and Society **28**: 659-710.

Special to the New York Times (1993). Muslim chaplain sees historic role in army. New York Times. New York, NY. December 25, 1993.

Speck, B. W. (1997). "Respect for religious differences: The case of Muslim students." New Directions for Teaching and Learning **70**: 39-46.

Speck, B. W. and S. L. Hoppe, Eds. (2007). Searching for spirituality in higher education. New York, NY, Peter Lang Publishing.

Sporn, B. (1999). Adaptive university structures. London, Jessica Kingsley.

Stake, R. E. (1995). The art of case study research. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Stamm, L. (2006). The influence of religion and spirituality in shaping American higher education. Encouraging authenticity and spirituality in higher education. A. W. Chickering, J. C. Dalton and L. Stamm. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass: 66-91.

Stanley, A. (1990). Court tells Princeton clubs they must admit women. New York Times. New York, NY. July 4, 1990.

Stanley, C. A., Ed. (2006). Faculty of color: teaching in predominantly White colleges and universities. Bolton, MA, Anker Publishing.

Stearns, E., C. Buchmann, et al. (2009). "Interracial Friendships in the Transition to College: Do Birds of a Feather Flock Together Once They Leave the Nest?" Sociology of Education **82**(2): 173-195.

Steinback, R. (2011). The anti-Muslim inner circle. Intelligence Report (142). Summer 2011.

Steinberg, J. (2011). A college opts out of the admissions arms race. New York Times. New York, NY. February 14, 2011.

Stern, R. (2006). New dynamic to campus diversity; Chaplain to aid Muslim students. Trenton Times. Trenton, NJ. September 18, 2006.

Stimpson, C. R. and N. K. Cobb (1986). Women's studies in the United States. New York, NY, Ford Foundation.

Stripling, J. (2009). No sweat. Insider Higher Education. Washington, DC. January 29, 2009.

Stuber, J. (2011). Inside the college gates: How class and culture matter in higher education. Lanham, MD, Lexington Books.

Sturm, S. (2007). "Architecture of inclusion: Interdisciplinary insights on pursuing institutional citizenship." Harvard Journal of Law and Gender **30**: 409-424.

Synnott, M. (2004). A friendly rivalry: Yale and Princeton pursue parallel paths to coeducation. Going coed: Women's experiences in formerly men's colleges and universities, 1950-2000. L. Miller-Bernal and S. L. Poulson. Nashville, TN, Vanderbilt University Press: 111-150.

Syrett, N. L. (2009). The company he keeps: A history of white college fraternities. Chapel Hill, NC, University of North Carolina Press.

Tabb, M. (2011). Dining Services works to bring halal to campus. Student Life. St. Louis, MO. February 18, 2011.

Tierney, W. G. (1988). "Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials." The Journal of Higher Education **59**(1): 2-21.

Tieu, T.-T., S. M. Pancer, et al. (2010). "Helping out or hanging out: the features of involvement and how it relates to university adjustment." Higher Education **60**(3): 343-355.

Tilghman, S. M. and C. L. Eisgruber (2007). Princeton in the world. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University.

Trimberger, E. K. (1968). "Why a rebellion at Columbia was inevitable." Society **5**(9): 28-38.

Turner, L. (2010a). SHIFT chalks depictions of Muhammad. Daily Northwestern. Evanston, IL. May 10, 2010.

Turner, L. (2010b). Northwestern students have mixed feelings about chalking of Prophet Muhammad: SHIFT's drawings were aimed to generate discussion. Daily Northwestern. Evanston, IL. May 11, 2010.

Turner, L. (2010c). Schapiro: SHIFT's chalking 'a mistake': SHIFT discusses role of religion on campus, chalkings with NU president. Daily Northwestern. Evanston, IL. May 13, 2010.

Unknown (1965). Seymour raises seldom-considered points. The Dartmouth. Hanover, NH. April 5, 1965.

Valentine, J. C., A. S. Hirschy, et al. (2011). "Keeping at-risk students in school: A systematic review of college retention programs." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis **33**(2): 214-234.

Walford, G. (2001). Doing qualitative educational research: A personal guide to the research process. London, Continuum.

Walford, G. (2005). "Research ethical guidelines and anonymity." International Journal of Research and Method in Education **28**(1): 83-93.

Walker, C. (2006). Young Muslims in U.S. observe Ramadan on university campuses: Iftar dinners bring together Muslims, students of other faiths. Washington File, Bureau of International Information Programs, U.S. Department of State.

Wallace, W. L. (1966). Student culture: social structure and continuity in a liberal arts college. Chicago, IL, Aldine.

Watt, S. K., E. E. Fairchild, et al., Eds. (2009). Intersections of religious privilege: Difficult dialogues and student affairs practice. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.

Wells, C. J. (2007). 'Islamo Fascism' week fails to gain traction. Harvard Crimson. Cambridge, MA. October 26, 2007.

Wells, S. and C. Kocher (2007). The chapel and religious life at Duke: Some issues and proposals. Durham, NC, Duke University: 25.

Whyte, W. F. (1984). Learning from the field: A guide from experience. London, Sage.

Wuthnow, R. (2005). America and the challenges of religious diversity. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.

Yamane, D. (2001). Student movements for multiculturalism: Challenging the curricular color line in higher education. Baltimore, MD, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Yee, J. (2005). For God and country: Faith and patriotism under fire. New York, NY, PublicAffairs.

Yin, R. K. (2003). Case study research: Design and methods, 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Zureick, A. (2004). Cultural programs see growth: University added more than 100 courses over past seven years in response to concerns. Daily Princetonian. Princeton, NJ. February 26, 2004.