

inclined readers will be interested to learn that this residential program jolted student satisfaction rates upward—which in turn improved recruitment, retention, and even alumni giving” (pp. 77–78). Purpose exploration programming didn’t seem to impact Richboro’s students’ future plans, as it was designed to do, but at least it increased recruitment, retention, and donations.

I don’t want it to appear that I’m cherry-picking results that don’t exactly support the purpose-exploration-programming-is-wonderful theme that is explicit throughout *The Purposeful Graduate*. The online questionnaire’s aggregate results also caused me to seriously doubt the programs’ overall effectiveness. Only one out of every three respondents agreed that campus vocation programming “led me to alter my life plans”—which was the stated purpose of the programming! The same proportion *disagreed* that the programs “helped me identify skills and talents.” Half the respondents didn’t even agree with the simple statement that “students on campus often use the terms *vocation, calling, or purpose*” (Table 4.1, p. 103).

All of the above—and there’s much more that I don’t have the space to recount, including data from interviews with individual students—casts doubt on whether Clydesdale adequately achieved two of his three stated aims; that is, to evaluate the PTEV initiative and to provide a sociological analysis of the purpose exploration programs’ successes and failures (or “strategic blunders,” as Clydesdale prefers to call them). Between the conflicts of interest and the methodological concerns I raised above, the rigor of the evaluation of PTEV can certainly be called into question. Clydesdale’s analysis of the programs’ successes and failures made for interesting reading in Chapters Three through Five, but ultimately boiled down to a fairly predictable mixture of institutional structure, campus politics, and individual dynamism (or lack thereof) on the part of the program directors. As a result, the author’s conclusion that purpose exploration programming “helped thousands of students, faculty, and staff across the United States renew their humanity and enhance the lives of others” rang a bit hollow. So, too, did his repeated recommendation—which was

the third aim of the book—that purpose exploration programming “be developed and systematically implemented at colleges and universities of every sort” (p. 23).

I wanted to believe in the good news *The Purposeful Graduate* proclaimed in the Preface. Instead, the book left me with the distinct feeling that purpose exploration programming represents much less a “garden oasis,” as Clydesdale called it, than the latest educational gimmick.

---

*Employment and Development under Globalization: State and Economy in Brazil*, by **Samuel Cohn**. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. 236 pp. \$105.00 cloth. ISBN: 9781137001405.

GIANPAOLO BAIOCCHI  
New York University  
gb97@nyu.edu

---

Samuel Cohn’s latest book, *Employment and Development under Globalization: State and Economy in Brazil*, uses the case of Brazil to revisit some of the classic debates in development and make a case for the usefulness of “Palliative Development,” alongside the better-known strategies of “Transformative Development.” Palliative development, for Cohn, “is concerned about the economic benefits of growth being widespread [and is] opposed to the benefits of development being limited to a select few” (p. 2). It emphasizes stimulating “small, labor intensive enterprises that provide services to the local population” (p. 180). This is in sharp contrast to analyses of “economic miracles” and rapid social changes.

The book draws significant inspiration from James O’Connor’s (1973) classic account of the fiscal crisis of the state and extends that argument to look at the developmental state. As is well known, O’Connor argued that the state manages the externalities of capitalism, while assuring an environment propitious for profit. It does so by different kinds of public spending but is constantly in threat of fiscal crisis because of revolt by competitive sectors of capital that resist paying taxes. Cohen, in extending this model to development, argues for the centrality of state investments in public goods

like infrastructure, as well as the constant threat of fiscal constraints that could disable those mechanisms.

Brazil, of course, is today a marquee case of the possibilities and limits of BRICS countries, a symbol of the possibilities of the "Pink Tide," and a traditional national case in development studies. Cohn uses the case of Brazil in the last decades as a way to argue for a renewed look at the importance of state policies in reproducing capitalism, particularly in the post-1980s moment when debt and the pressures of globalization made earlier strategies reliant on import substitution and heavy state investments unviable. Like other recent optimistic accounts of the Brazilian model (such as Montero's *Brazil: Reversal of Fortune*), Cohn spends some time analyzing a number of successful, pro-poor, pro-development, creative, and efficient policies. But unlike most other accounts, he does not focus on prominent industries, like Brazilian aviation or auto, or even on well-known social policies, like the Bolsa Familia. He focuses instead on small and relatively prosaic policies that exemplify palliative development.

With admirable empirical rigor, and based on a decade of research throughout the country, Cohn sets out to test the impact of these specific policies on employment using official data and econometric modeling. He first explores the what-if scenario of no government intervention on employment through residuals analysis, finding, perhaps not surprisingly, that intervention is impactful. Much of the subsequent analysis delves into the outcomes of specific policies: he looks at the effect of vocational education, the creation of infrastructure, rent control of commercial spaces, tax reduction strategies, and the opening of frontiers. He examines employment in "hotels, restaurants and barber and beauty shops in Brazil from 1940 to 2000" (p. 9). The overall findings are that some of these policies, particularly the creation of airports, job training and vocational education, downtown rent control, and the opening of frontiers, have positive outcomes in terms of employment. Reducing taxes on employers, on the other hand, does not. The book closes with a series of lessons from the Brazilian case for development policies elsewhere.

*Employment and Development under Globalization* is an important account by a leading sociologist of development that calls for a recalibration of development studies in the current era. It is precisely argued, brings a wealth of data to make its case, and fundamentally asks scholars to shift their gaze. But perhaps because the book opens up new terrain, it also raises a number of questions. Arguably, the book is less attentive to "politics" (either more formal or the social movement kind that has been so important in Brazil) than either O'Connor's original account or other accounts of the Brazilian developmental state, such as Peter Evan's 1979 classic *Dependent Development*. It is not the book's purpose to analyze these dimensions, but there are lots of specificities about the Brazilian developmental state and, therefore, the conditions of possibility for the reproduction and applicability of these policies elsewhere. Some of these policies began in dictatorship-era Brazil, when there was a specific political calculus of the state vis-à-vis monopolistic and competitive sectors of capital that made some of these policies more likely in the first place.

The book says little of the monopolistic sections of capital and how the Brazilian state was able to carry out these policies in the first place. There are other questions to be asked, too, of popular demand (or even tolerability) for certain policies or not in more democratic contexts. "Frontier development" in Brazil dates back to dictatorship-era "colonization" strategies that have often had disastrous socio-environmental impacts and worsened patterns of land concentration (which Cohn briefly discusses). These questions, of course, do not take away from the book's very significant achievements, which are to raise a number of new questions about policies that may be less glamorous, but ultimately more important, for development.

## References

- Evans, Peter B. 1979. *Dependent Development: The Alliance of Multinational, State, and Local Capital in Brazil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- O'Connor, James. 1973. *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*. New York: St. Martin's Press.