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POSITIVE STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP: LESSONS FROM A UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

Gretchen M. Spreitzer, Mary Sue Coleman and Daniel A. Gruber

ABSTRACT

In this chapter, two academics from the Stephen M. Ross School of Business at the University of Michigan collaborate with the President of their university to present their experiences and ideas about positive strategic leadership. Positive strategic leadership is derived from the juxtaposition of ideas from the growing movement on positive organizational scholarship with what is already known from the literature on strategic leadership. The authors embed new views into current theoretical perspectives on strategic leadership to attempt an integrative overview and use the president’s experiences during the nationally followed Affirmative Action cases as a vehicle for illustrating five themes: (1) A lifetime of experiences shapes who you are, (2) issues commonly choose you before you choose them, (3) begin with a purpose in mind, (4) appreciate divergent views, and (5) be a beacon for the future. Additionally, the authors provide practitioners with some “takeaways” on positive strategic leadership.
Our goal in this chapter is to apply a Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) perspective to the scholarly literature on strategic leadership. Strategic leadership is traditionally defined as a series of decisions and activities by a top manager (CEOs, presidents, and senior executives) in which the past, the present, and the future of the organization coalesce (Boal, 2004). Strategic leadership researchers have provided remarkable insights in several areas. First, much research has focused on what leaders do (Hambrick, 1989; Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1990). That is, how do strategic leaders go about “making decisions; creating and communicating a vision of the future; developing key competencies and capabilities; developing organization structures, processes, and controls; managing multiple constituencies; selecting and developing the next generation of leaders; and sustaining an effective organizational culture” (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001, p. 516). Second, strategic leadership researchers have focused on the role of leader cognitions in strategic change (Rajagopalan & Spreitzer, 1997). That is, how do leaders perceive and make sense of their environment in order to determine the appropriate course of strategic action (Walsh, 1995).

What is largely absent in the literature on strategic leadership, however, is a focus on the importance of how who the leader is shapes what the leader thinks and does. We know little about how the life experiences, character, and values of the leader shape his/her approach to strategic leadership. Quinn (2004) suggests that the foundation of leadership is not behavior, competencies, techniques or position; rather, the foundation of leadership comes from who we are, or the “person within” the leader.

To begin to understand the “person within” the strategic leader, we seek to learn from the experiences of a manifest leader – Mary Sue Coleman, President of the University of Michigan and a co-author of this chapter. The University of Michigan was established in 1817; it has an enrollment of 53,000 across three campuses with 3,700 faculty and more than 420,000 alumni around the world.

We are particularly interested in learning from President Coleman, because she arrived at Michigan just as the nationally contentious affirmative action lawsuits were playing out in the courts. In 1997, three students filed two separate suits in the U.S. District Court (Detroit), alleging unlawful consideration of race in the University of Michigan’s undergraduate and law school admissions policies (Gratz and Hamacher v. The Regents of the University of Michigan/Grutter v. The Regents of the University of Michigan). These lawsuits received national attention as test cases for the permissible use of race in university admissions and generated considerable controversy. In late 2000 and early 2001, two separate U.S. District Courts ruled
that the use of race in admissions in the undergraduate case was constitutional, but that the use of race in the law school case was unconstitutional.

When President Coleman came to the office in 2002, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals had just overturned the earlier district court decision in the law school case by ruling that the law school’s use of race was in fact constitutional. The plaintiffs appealed both cases to the Supreme Court for a final ruling in 2002. In June 2003, the Supreme Court ruled that the law school’s use of race was narrowly tailored to achieve the compelling educational benefits of diversity, but that the undergraduate policy was not so tailored and therefore did not pass constitutional muster. The court’s recognition that universities can consider race in admissions to achieve a diverse student body was considered to be a big victory, not just for the University of Michigan, but also for affirmative action more generally. As such, the affirmative action lawsuits provide a “looking glass” into how who President Coleman is as a leader significantly impacted the actions she undertook in this case of national importance. In sharing her experiences, she can enrich our understanding of the “person within” the strategic leader.

From President Coleman’s commentary on her leadership of the affirmative action lawsuits, we evince five principles of what we term “positive strategic leadership.” Positive strategic leadership is derived from the juxtaposition of ideas from the growing movement on POS with what we already know from the literature on strategic leadership. POS is an emerging movement within organizational studies – drawing from the fields of organizational studies, psychology, and sociology. This perspective focuses on the generative dynamics in leadership and organizations that promote human strength, resiliency, restoration, and the extraordinary (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003), and positive deviance (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2004). We draw from several POS perspectives to gain insights into President Coleman’s experiences with the goal of expanding the notion of positive strategic leadership.

We close the chapter by embedding these new views into current theoretical perspectives on strategic leadership to attempt an integrative overview. Additionally, we provide practitioners with some “takeaways” on positive strategic leadership.
In this section of the chapter, President Coleman shares some lessons of experience as a strategic leader. The five themes of positive strategic leadership we evince include:

- A lifetime of experiences shapes who you are;
- Issues commonly choose you before you choose them;
- Begin with a purpose in mind;
- Appreciate divergent views; and
- Be a beacon for the future.

Following the words of President Coleman on each theme, Gretchen Spreitzer and Daniel Gruber provide a brief discussion on the links between President Coleman’s commentary and conceptual aspects of positive strategic leadership.

A Lifetime of Experiences Shape Who You Are (The Voice of Mary Sue Coleman)

As a child who was raised in the South in the late 1940s and early 1950s, segregated schools and segregated daily living were facts of life. In elementary school in Tennessee and Georgia, I was not aware of the great injustice of the social system, but I certainly knew that the African-American children with whom I played in our rural neighborhood were not permitted to attend my university-operated school. Looking back, I remember how the streets in the areas of the town where most African-American families lived lacked pavements, sidewalks, and street-lamps. Like towns throughout the South, there were signs for “colored” and “white” in commercial establishments and on drinking fountains.

To those of us who were children, this façade seemed calm, but the “normality” of this way of life began to crumble with the critical, successful challenge to school segregation in the 1950s, culminating with the monumental Supreme Court decision in the Brown v. Board of Education case in 1954. Ironically, the consequences of that decision provided the impetus that propelled my family out of Georgia, raising my awareness of the terrible injustices segregation had wrought.

Officials in the State of Georgia did not acquiesce readily to the ruling handed down by the Supreme Court. In fact, political leaders in the state
entered into discussions and debates that could have resulted in the aban-
donment of all public education, including the de-funding of schools in order to avoid desegregation altogether. There was a genuine fear that public schools would not survive, so my parents uprooted our family and sought employment in a state where “equal education for everyone” was a core value. We moved to Iowa in 1955 after listening to a full year of the divisive, vicious rhetoric that followed the Brown decision.

What a contrast Iowa provided to Georgia! While the African-American population in Iowa was small, it had deep roots and was fully integrated in schools and businesses. Social justice in Iowa was not perfect, but it was immeasurably more equitable than we had seen in the South. In my school, the faculty did address issues of racial discrimination and social injustice. Through their efforts, and because of the new social landscape of Iowa, I was finally able to begin to understand the terrible legacy of slavery and discrimination in our country.

My experience in college and graduate school only enhanced the lessons I learned about social justice in Iowa. At Grinnell College and the University of North Carolina, I met African-American students with a broader range of first-hand experience of the inequities and humiliation of segregated schools and towns. When I was a child in Georgia, no one I knew was able to articulate the depth of feeling on this issue. The Brown decision provided much more than the starting point for the end of school segregation. It allowed us to enter the continuing public discussion that has informed so much of the social policy of our government in the past 50 years, and the decisions I have made as a faculty member and administrator. It was these critical experiences that shaped the passion and energy in which I embraced the affirmative action lawsuits as the new President of the University of Michigan. I knew from my life experiences growing up in the South that these lawsuits provided a critical response to the years of racial discrim-
ination in our country and our universities.

Insights for Positive Strategic Leadership (The Voice of the POS Scholars)

The positive strategic leader does not work in a vacuum, but everything that one thinks and does is embedded in a lifetime of experiences. Positive psychologists have defined authenticity as both owning one’s personal experiences and acting in accord with the true self (Harter, 2002). Personal authenticity in adolescents has been demonstrated to be positively associated with adaptive psychological characteristics including self-esteem, affect, and hope for the future (Harter, 2002; Harter, Marold, Whitesell, & Cobbs, 1996). President Coleman illustrates how formative experiences, challenges
or triggers in life shape one’s authenticity as a leader (Avolio & Luthans, 2003). These life experiences create strong impressions because they take people out of their comfort zone by stretching them in new ways (Quinn, 2004). These jolts can also stimulate the leader to revise one’s sense of self and personal identity (Roberts, Dutton, Spreitzer, Heaphy, & Quinn, forthcoming). The jolt President Coleman experienced in her move to Iowa as a child exposed her to positive possibilities in race relations. And it is from sensemaking about these life experiences that leaders learn about their authentic self. For President Coleman, witnessing discrimination in the South while growing up imparted a critical sensitivity and propensity for action in her future role as a senior executive.

Issues Commonly Choose You Before You Choose Them (The Voice of Mary Sue Coleman)

In every leadership position, new administrators need to enter with a zeal for innovation and a responsibility for the institutional agenda that exists in any organization. When I was approached about the presidency at the University of Michigan, I knew about the admissions lawsuits that the University had committed to defend, and knew that it would be a major focus of the presidency. The Michigan Regents and the search committee clearly indicated that they were dedicated to finding a president who would be able and willing to lead the final stages of the admissions lawsuits (already five years old at that point).

They saw that I was completely committed to the principle and the practice of diversity in higher education, and I viewed the opportunity to provide leadership for the lawsuits as a great expression of my personal and professional beliefs. This was just one of several continuing issues that awaited me, but it was the one with the most significant potential impact, not just for this University, but also for higher education throughout the nation.

This University is justifiably proud of its historically strong commitment to diversity, and it was actually one of the attributes that convinced me to come to Michigan. At that time, I had no idea of how consuming these lawsuits would become in my first year. I not only needed to become involved with the legal complexities of the cases, but also had to become the public face of the University on this issue. With the strong support of the administrators, faculty, and students I found at Michigan, I was able to take on this critical issue and to identify it as my own.
Three months after I arrived, the United States Supreme Court decided to hear our admissions cases. Preparing for the oral arguments in April, and the final successful rulings in June, provided me with a full docket of significant and national-level matters in my first year at Michigan. Ultimately, by making the institutional agenda my own agenda, I was able to work with our constituencies to advance our issues in ways that productively defined my inaugural months, enriched my experience, and greatly benefited the University.

Insights for Positive Strategic Leadership (The Voice of the POS Scholars)

The literature on strategic leadership emphasizes the importance of leaders crafting their own vision or agenda for change. The assumption is that leaders must make their mark right away to command the respect of others and the conversation rarely considers the importance of the leader, completing any unfinished business when they begin a role. But President Coleman explains how critical it was for her to forego setting her own agenda for the University of Michigan. She put all of her energy into the Affirmative Action cases and other lingering issues, knowing that it was the right thing to do for the University but also knowing that it would table any agenda items of her own for some time. This left her open to potential cynics who could complain that she didn’t have a vision of her own – that she wasn’t a strong leader with her own point of view. But President Coleman was ready to live with that possibility, because she knew it was the right thing for the institution.

Quinn (2004) calls this humble approach the fundamental state of leadership. In the fundamental state, a leader transcends his or her own ego, moves outside the comfort zone, clarifies the results he or she wants to create, and aligns values and behaviors. President Coleman was able to transcend her own vision for the future and focus on bringing the final stages of the lawsuits to a successful conclusion by taking ownership and responsibility for them. Rather than laying out her own strategic plan from the start of her Presidency, President Coleman had to “build the bridge as she walked on it” – having faith that she would be able to shape her own agenda for the University as time passed. And as time has shown, by spring of 2004, almost one year after the landmark decision was issued by the Supreme Court, President Coleman announced her own strategic vision for the University. Thus, as President Coleman’s stories have illustrated, positive strategic leaders often transcend their own ego and agenda, putting the common good and welfare of the institution first.
Begin with a Purpose in Mind (The Voice of Mary Sue Coleman)

My entire professional life has unfolded in public universities, the character of which I find fascinating and inspiring. Because these institutions were created to be supported by the public and to support the public, they have an obligation to address important societal issues as well as to educate the citizens of the state.

The University of Michigan, as one of the oldest, largest, and most eminent of the great public universities, has always displayed a special commitment to its mission of social responsibility. A stirring example of this is Michigan’s stance on diversity, extending to the defense of the use of affirmative action in admissions at universities. Leading the University, as these cases found their way to the Supreme Court, was one of the most important honors of my life, one that was accomplished because of the extraordinary talent and dedication of the entire leadership team and Regents of the University.

I was keenly aware of the high stakes these lawsuits represented. My childhood, my entire educational life, and my experience in administrative positions at the University of North Carolina, the University of New Mexico, and the University of Iowa taught me the value of diversity and the challenge of creating diverse learning environments when K-12 schools and opportunities are not equal for all racial and ethnic groups. In fact, de facto segregation in some cities in our country has created a college-age population in which students have rarely encountered classmates from a race other than their own.

By the time I arrived in Ann Arbor, the leadership of the University had been speaking openly about the importance of affirmative action to creating diversity in classrooms. Additionally, several prominent faculty members at the University undertook social science research on the impact of classroom and campus diversity on learning and on our students’ ability to function well in careers and community after graduation. The conclusions of these studies were persuasive, and we felt our arguments about taking a stand on this important principle were sound. Our legal team worked diligently to translate difficult analyses about our admissions processes into terms that could be more easily comprehended by the public. In short, the University embarked on a comprehensive, information-based public awareness program about affirmative action.

This meant that I also had to educate myself thoroughly about the contents of the massive amount of material that had emerged in the five years the two cases had been reviewed, were argued, and appealed for. Being
trained as a biological chemist, I had only a basic understanding of the legal process. I spent almost every waking hour being briefed and reading background materials on the case. This was essential because I needed to be able to speak with confidence on the issues with reporters, editorial boards, external organizations, and alumni groups. Almost always, I discovered recognition and pride about the public defense of this issue by the University.

Even when members of an audience did not agree with the premise of affirmative action, they understood that the University was taking a principled stand on an issue its Regents and leadership believed was critical. Indeed, I firmly believe that a consequence of this broad educational effort by the University eventually led to a more reasoned debate in the media about the ongoing legacy of discrimination and the importance of achieving diversity in our educational institutions. This massive educational effort also provided the impetus for a record number of amicus briefs (a brief filed with the court by someone who is not a party to the case) filed on our behalf by educational and civil rights organizations, corporations, and former military officers.

*Insights for Positive Strategic Leadership (The Voice of the POS Scholars)*

President Coleman had a clear purpose in mind as the leader of a public university. She believed there was a social responsibility as a public university to take a stand on diversity – her actions began with a purpose in mind. It might have been an easier road not to undertake the controversy and expense of the affirmative action lawsuits, but this leader lives out her presidency with clear purpose because she takes the mission of a public university to serve the public so seriously.

Authentic leaders are grounded with a purpose and a mission – living their values and using discipline and commitment to achieve great results (George, 2003). They know the true north of their moral compass. Quinn (2004) describes this as being purpose-centered. The leader clarifies the result they want to create, are committed and engaged, with unwavering commitment to pursue that purpose. Cameron (2003) talks about purposefulness as leading with virtue for human impact, moral goodness, and social betterment. And being purpose-centered is the engine of personal empowerment for leaders to take action and have real impact (Spreitzer, 1995).

Thus, a hallmark of the positive strategic leader is leading with purpose.
The affirmative action debate also provided ample opportunity for me, as a new president, to engage with campus stakeholders who held widely divergent views. While we enjoyed broad campus support for our position, we also realized that like any university, strongly held views would be part of our community discussion. Prominent faculty members and some student organizations at the University had reservations about using affirmative action as a tool for admissions. At the other end of the spectrum, other faculty members engaged in social science research to investigate the impact of a diverse student body on the educational environment of the University.

Students also held widely divergent opinions about affirmative action. Large numbers of students supported the University and its stand on this issue. Some believed that the leadership was not aggressive enough in defending these lawsuits. A number joined the effort as interveners in the lawsuits, attempting to create a more activist defense of the lawsuits. On the other side, some students were opposed to the policies of affirmative action. Public debates among students were vigorous throughout the six years the lawsuits traversed the court system.

Alumni, likewise, expressed intense interest in the cases, mirroring the range of opinions found on the campus. What held us together was our dedication to the ideals of the excellent academic traditions of the University of Michigan, a dedication on which I promised never to yield. I knew then, and I continue to see in our post-decision era, that we can be both diverse and excellent in our academic endeavors.

From my arrival on campus in August 2002, there was intense interest in my stance on the Affirmative Action cases. I was questioned vigorously by students, by faculty, and certainly by alumni groups. In each instance, I talked openly about my beliefs and often referred to my own background and experiences in segregated communities and in preparing for a field of study not common among women. With personal stories, I attempted to explain my strong support for diversity on the campus. I always listened to divergent views and invited people to share their perspectives with me. But in the end, sometimes we had to agree to disagree.

Quinn (2004) describes positive strategic leaders as being externally open. Like President Coleman, they move outside their comfort zone, appreciate others' points of view, and are open to learning from others who hold different conflicting perspectives. By seeking to understand the perspective
of others, particularly those who hold divergent points of view, the positive strategic leader can not only demonstrate empathy, but can also learn important things from others that may strengthen the leader’s own perspective. And in some cases, their openness can also create openness to those with divergent views to temper or even change their perspectives. Recent research has indicated that respectful engagement with others is critical for personal growth (Spreitzer, Sutcliffe, Dutton, Sonenshein, & Grant, 2005). Positive strategic leaders can display respectful engagement with others by conveying presence (i.e., “just being there”), being genuine (i.e., reacting from a real and honest place), and confirming affirmation (i.e., actively looking for the positive core in another) (Dutton, 2003). So while the positive strategic leader may not agree with others, they seek to hear, understand, appreciate, and learn from divergent perspectives.

Be a Beacon for the Future (The Voice of Mary Sue Coleman)

The University of Michigan undertook a unique role in advancing diversity and civil rights. The six-year journey of the admissions lawsuits, and the landmark decision of the Supreme Court, placed us in the center of the public debate about affirmative action. Because we staked out such a public presence with our defense of the lawsuits, our subsequent actions are receiving intense scrutiny, and we need to turn that scrutiny to our advantage as we move forward, continuing to lead the way on the issue of diversity.

An outstanding university that is diverse has a strength that comes from the hybrid vigor of a multitude of ideas and perspectives. I expect us to have a university that continues to provide an intellectually engaging and challenging environment that other universities will want to emulate. We are committed to the core principles that will inform our next steps: a real commitment to a welcoming climate, accountability to diversity on both an institutional and an individual level, and the recognition that the vigor of diversity will create a better and more intellectually rich university.

There are several areas we are exploring as we bring these principles to life. We must develop institutional best practices to create a diverse academic community and a truly welcoming environment. We need to focus on aggressive recruitment and retention efforts for diverse and exceptional faculty, students, and staff, and we need to understand better how issues of climate are affecting those who decide to join us, or to leave. We also need to infuse our curriculum with a multicultural and interdisciplinary content, so the richness of our intellectual environment is deepened. To accomplish all
of this, we need to establish a broad strategy for an institutional commit-
ment to a diversity that is effective and long-lasting.

I have said on many occasions that the true impact of any landmark
decision is determined by the actions taken in the eras between decisions. I
will continue to advance the principles of the University by reminding our
many constituents that we can never rest, and we must continue to reinvent
the meaning of diversity at this University and in our broader society.

*Insights for Positive Strategic Leadership (The Voice of the POS Scholars)*
Positive strategic leaders are bullish on the future. They lead with a hope for
a better tomorrow, even when tomorrow is potentially threatening or dis-
concerting. Rather than dwelling on the negative, positive strategic leaders
see opportunities rather than threats (Jackson & Dutton, 1988). They invent
possibilities for the future (Zander & Zander, 2000). They discover and
dream about their positive destinies through techniques, such as appreci-
ative inquiry – a positive methodology for strategic organizational change
(Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2003). For example, after the successful
decision on the lawsuit, it might have been easy to take a breather on
diversity issues after the frenetic pace of her first year. But President Cole-
man worked hard to keep the University community focused on creating a
community that would be welcoming to people from all backgrounds – how
Michigan could become the university of choice for minority students. In
this way, positive strategic leaders are resilient (Sutcliffe & Vogus, 2003) and
keep their sights looking forward with hope rather than cynicism (Spreitzer
& Mishra, 2000).

**CONCLUSION**

When we started to work on this chapter on the Affirmative Action cases
with President Coleman, we thought that our focus would be on addressing
rather esoteric questions, such as: “How do leaders create and sustain
identity when they are managing multiple divergent stakeholders?” or “How
do leaders manage to craft their own agenda while tending to the inevitable
fires that flare up unexpectedly?” These kinds of topics are embedded in the
more traditional strategic leadership literature. However, as we spent time
with President Coleman and learned more about her, we expanded not only
our perspective on her as a person and as a leader, but also our perspective
on the larger issue of strategic leadership.
We began to see how we could juxtapose a growing body of research on positive organizational scholarship with current frameworks on strategic leadership. This pointed us toward the idea of the person within – that who the leader is as a person matters. For example, in defining strategic leadership, Boal (2004, p. 1,503) states: “Strategic leadership forges a bridge between the past, the present, and the future, by reaffirming core values and identity to ensure continuity and integrity as the organization struggles with known and unknown realities and possibilities.”

If we look at the same passage of Boal’s definition from the perspective of “who the strategic leader is as a person,” we could adapt the definition to define who positive strategic leaders are. Positive strategic leaders bridge the past, the present and the future by reaffirming their core values and identity to ensure their own continuity and integrity as they struggle with known and unknown realities and possibilities. In this way, positive strategic leaders are themselves strategic about bringing their whole person – past experiences, values, purpose, and personal vision – to their role as a leader who contributes to the collective good.

In order to illustrate how positive strategic leadership informs the strategic leadership discussion, we have adapted Rajagopalan and Spreitzer’s (1997) integrative model of strategic change. Their original model (see Fig. 1) demonstrates how an organization and its environment are perceived by the leader and influence the actions that he or she takes. Those actions...
then determine the impact that leader has and ultimately the organization’s outcome. While their model goes far in helping us understand strategic leadership, we believe it is incomplete. What is missing is who the leader is as a person – how they are shaped by their life experiences, their character, and their values. As such, we add the shaded circle to their model to reflect the role that the person within the leader plays in strategic leadership. The person within their experiences, character, and values underlie the thoughts, actions, and ultimately the impact of the leader. By adding these characteristics to the model, we are not suggesting that they are an additional node and/or step the leader takes in his or her leadership process, but rather they illustrate the gestalt of who they are as a person, or what Quinn (2004) called the fundamental state of leadership. As we have described throughout the chapter, we believe that President Coleman’s life and leadership experiences enabled her to adroitly guide the University at such a turbulent and critical time.

It is our hope that by using Mary Sue Coleman as a learning vehicle we have not only offered new insights to the literature on strategic leadership, but also to the POS body of knowledge. In the foundational book on POS (Cameron et al., 2003), there is only one chapter related directly to the topic of leadership (Avolio & Luthans, 2003), and none that focus specifically on senior-level leadership in organizations. Future work can move beyond this kind of qualitative work to more quantitative work that measures positive strategic leadership. This work could explore how these kinds of leaders may bring significant value to their organizations in terms of more effective strategic change and organizational performance. Additionally, future case studies and academic/executive collaborations focused on understanding the strategic leader and their impact would help to develop these theoretical ideas in greater depth.

We believe that practitioners can also learn from these ideas on positive strategic leadership. Whether a senior executive, a middle manager or a front-line employee, life experiences, personal character, and values shape how people think and what they do. Only when the person within a leader is congruent with their behaviors can leaders feel authentic. And we know from a growing body of research in POS that authenticity is critical for people to feel empowered, engaged, and be able to relate to others (Avolio & Luthans, 2003; Quinn, 2004). The five themes also provide practitioners some direction about how to create more alignment and authenticity between who they are and what they do as leaders. These lessons are relevant not only for themselves, but for also regarding how leaders can develop and grow their employees into positive strategic leaders.
In closing, our hope is that this work will inspire a new direction for strategic leadership research as well as leadership at all levels of the organization. Paraphrasing perhaps the most famous positive strategic leader, Mahatma Gandhi, positive strategic leaders must take the initiative to “be the change they wish to see” by becoming more humane and authentic leaders (Quinn, 2000).

NOTE

1. The former University of Michigan President Lee Bollinger, a constitutional law expert, helped to craft the admissions policies to pass constitutional muster.
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