
“Although Clydesdale’s work has a multitude of strengths, I will isolate my analysis to the top four. First, Clydesdale’s assessment is holistic and total, both in terms of his methodology and the depth of his interviews. Not leaving a stone unturned, he rigorously investigated each of the participating institutions and has illuminated several keys to the success of these types of programs. He is also not reluctant to examine the weaknesses of those programs that were not successful, often underscoring that their lack of success was due to poor design or poor leadership. His depth of insight can be attributed to his detailed and rigorous methodology, delineated in appendix two. Second, Clydesdale does not solely focus on the effect of these programs on the students’ current development. He also assesses the impact of these programs on alumni and on faculty and staff development, then looks at the way these programs affect the campus as a whole. In other words, Clydesdale’s assessment is comprehensive—each of the 26 participating institutions stands as a unique case study in the potential effectiveness of purpose exploration programs. Third, Clydesdale’s sociological perspective functions as a benefit in his analysis. Although he recognizes that higher education shares some of the blame for the decline of the prominence of the liberal arts emphasis in larger society, he positions higher education as the location of the resurgence of the liberal arts emphasis. By locating his examination in an evaluation of current cultural priorities, he brings clarity to the importance and need to prioritize these types of conversations on university campuses. Finally, Clydesdale leaves readers with substantive resources in appendix four of his work. This compilation is Clydesdale’s gift to the reader—he or she is provided a multitude of ideas, insights, and partners to aid in the effective administration of these types of programs.”