"Doing Good" Scholarship: Considerations for Building Positive Social Change Through the Emerging Field of Public Interest Communications

Edward J. Downes

Boston University

Article Information	Abstract
	Recognizing the birth and potential of the emerging field of public interest communications (PIC), and building on Fessmann's work summarizing the field's foci presented elsewhere in this journal, this article offers 10 considerations for PIC's proponents to think about as the field's body of knowledge begins to grow. These considerations suggest we consider that: doing good is a relative concept; interdisciplinary scholarship has great value; understanding practitioners' lives in the field will enhance PIC scholarship; organizing PIC scholars will empower them; social media empower advocacy; a humanistic philosophy should drive the field's research and teaching; multiple actors in the public policy process influence PIC; and being a do-gooder might not be such a bad thing.

Introduction

This article speaks to the birth of this journal: a scholarly collection of inquiry, results, and commentary valuing interdisciplinary scholarship, social scientific inquiry, and positive social change. What follows are 10 considerations to ponder as public interest communications (PIC) makes its way onto the intellectual stage. These reflections are intended solely to encourage readers to think about the suggestions they pose with the hope these considerations might, perhaps, help PIC to grow as a field of intellectual (and practical) inquiry.

The considerations were brought forth from a review of the literature informing the PIC field, building in particular on Fessmann's (2017) analysis appearing elsewhere in this publication in which he describes PIC scholarship as "a new academic field of strategic communications to advance social causes" (p. 16).

Among the seminal concepts Fessmann shares, and which his article builds on, are what differentiates PIC from traditional public relations. Here Fessmann points out that PIC, unlike public relations, puts the public's (not the organization's) interest first; seeks social change (not relationships and reputation) as its ultimate goal; focuses on one-time responses to triggering events (rather than building long and continuous relationships with publics); and others. Foremost in the author's considerations is his assertion that "achieving positive behavioral change is in the final analysis the only valid measurement of the success of a public interest campaign" (Fessmann, 2017, p. 21-22). That is, results matter.

Consideration 1: (Relative) good

"A good head and good heart are always a formidable combination. But when you add to that a literate tongue or pen, then you have something very special."
Nelson Mandela (Strauss, 2013, para. 5)

Good is often relative. For example, advocacy is good when it equalizes the playing field and bad when it reinforces unfounded stereotypes; professors are good when they work to enhance their field and their students and bad when their sole purpose is to advance themselves; in a capitalist context, environmental regulations on auto manufactures are good when clean air results, but are bad when car prices increase because of them. And in an economic context, the free market is good when it uplifts a society/culture, offers an array of choices, and competes fairly, and bad when it exploits workers, gouges consumers, and engages in price fixing. Thus good, with its multiple perspectives, is often situational.

With this in mind, achieving positive social change can--depending on the issue, program, or policy--be perceived as very good by some and very bad by others. Thus, as PIC comes into its own, its scholarly community might benefit by remembering that doing good is often a subjective call. This is true even if we, as PIC proponents, are convinced that our outlook, desire, advocacy, and righteousness to "achieve…positive behavioral change" through PIC (Fessmann, 2017, p. 21-22) is unquestionably the right course to take.

This nebulous nature of good, however, does not necessarily necessitate that we refocus our convictions, particularly when critics question our values, attack our motives, or disapprove of our politics. It does not even require we reexamine our convictions. It does necessitate, however, that we recognize--as we pursue PIC--that everyone (even good people) may not see good through the same lenses.

It is important to remember, however, that good is not as nebulous as we might think. In fact, much of the world sees good in similar contexts. Massive majorities of the globe's citizens, for instance, in spite of extreme cultural difference, agree that feeding hungry people, fighting disease, and providing for public safety are good. Conversely, lying, deceiving, and withholding necessary information from people are bad.

Thus, good generally, and social good specifically, is often a subjective concept. At other times, however, it is a notion representing near universal consensus.

Consideration 2: Interdisciplinary scholarship--and admitting we are not the smartest in the room

"For scholarship, if it is to be scholarship, requires, in addition to liberty, that the truth take precedence over all sectarian interests, including self-interest."
John Charles Polanyi (Danieli, Stamatopoulou, & Dias, 1999, p. xii)

The opportunity for PIC's scholarly community to integrate findings, theoretical constructs, research methods, curricula, presentation, and pedagogical foci from across disciplines--resulting in a rich, inclusive formula for promoting and moving the field forward--is ever-present. In fact, an immediate, often untapped advantage to PIC scholarship is its ability, indeed its receptiveness, to utilize cross-disciplinary approaches to enhance its empirical and other inquiries.

As an illustration, Fessmann (2017) suggests that the fields of political science, sociology, marketing, advertising, public relations, journalism, and documentary filmmaking all speak to PIC. To illustrate this respect for interdisciplinary inquiry, he notes that two fields, political science and sociology, "contribute to the political and sociobiological underpinnings to PIC" (Fessmann, forthcoming).

With Fessmann's assertions in mind, we might consider the benefits of a cross-disciplinary receptiveness when examining a concept such as perception and social good. One of the safest routes would be to first examine the public relations literature, as well as the literature from related mass communication disciplines. Next, perhaps, a look at the literature from the field of perceptive psychology would follow. A case also could be made for a literature review that consults a wider breadth of disciplines.

What might art historians tell us about the power of perception when it comes to the emotions present in great works of art, or biologists about the biochemical reactions that occur as our brains perceive, or sociologists about the evolution of social perceptions, or anthropologists about cultural ones? PIC is too young, with too much potential, to be boxed-in by any academic discipline or, for that matter, by a single scholar's work, a one-perspective group of scholars, or an individual department, college, or university. Competing forces must not restrain PIC. Any constraints that

stifle impartial, orderly, and controlled approaches to collaborative inquiry should perhaps be discouraged.

While the case for cross-disciplinary scholarship in a PIC environment is strong, it is important to point out that pushing for interdisciplinary approaches does not suggest all disciplines provide equal starting points for addressing PIC's rich and evolving research questions. Indistinct searches among disparate disciplines for the answer, for example, can diminish valuable research time, emphases, and verity. Thus, we must be careful not to get lost in the woods when conducting the interdisciplinary research so beneficial to PIC. We must also keep in mind, perhaps, that, academic disciplines rooted in communication management--at least during this stage of PIC's evolution--are likely the best sources for beginning to address the field's research questions.

Finally, PIC's interdisciplinary approach requires scholars across their respective disciplines to check their egos at the door. That is, scholars need to admit (publicly, loudly, even proudly) that they are not necessarily the smartest people in the room. Other scholars, other fields of study, might more accurately address PIC's challenges and opportunities than theirs. Regrettably, some academics, particularly perhaps those who do not value interdisciplinary scholarship, may have a hard time admitting they lack the tools or knowledge base to address fully PIC's multiple perspectives. Perhaps, at their core, these sages are insecure, and thus hesitant to admit another discipline should take center stage. Perhaps some are hesitant to admit a competing scholar within or outside their field is smarter than they. Or maybe not. Who knows?

Thus, PIC scholarship is promptly enhanced when it draws readily via a broad, interdisciplinary approach--particularly when various/competing fields' scholars readily admit to their discipline's (and their own) shortcomings. In doing so, however, PIC must not lose its focal point rooted, at least in part, and presently in, the communication management fields.

Consideration 3: Research readily informed by those "in the field"

"For the things we have to learn before we can do them, we learn by doing them."
Aristotle (Ross, 2009, para. 2)

PIC professors should share with their students a deep respect not only for their academic colleagues' research pushing PIC forward, but also a great respect for those who do PIC. These practitioners are those who influence, who generate, who carry out, or who are responsible for, the *actual social/cultural changes* resulting from PIC consciousness. Among these individuals are activists, lobbyists, fundraisers, volunteers, nonprofit CEOs, and others whose daily work is doing/generating PIC outcomes. These PIC practitioners--these field workers--range from the radical to the mundane, from the progressive to the conservative, and from the formally educated to those who learned their crafts on the street, on the ground, or in the community. That is, these

field workers are those who do not operate within the walls of academia, but whose work is to *make/do/lead* direct social change.

This does *not* suggest that professors whose home is primarily in academia leave the academy and work in the field so they can see what it's really like out there. Nor does this suggest that a professor of practice[1] whose training is primarily outside academia get a Ph.D. and master social scientific research methods. What it does suggest, however, particularly for empirical researchers studying the PIC field, is the importance of readily respecting insights generated from those working daily in the field.

With this in mind, neither nebulous pronouncements housed in jargon-filled academic literature intended for scholars speaking to scholars, nor neat war stories, trendy readings, or an abundance of tales of the instructor's real world experience should dominate the course content. Rather, as an example, a combination of lectures/readings/discussions/cases related to the activities of those in the field along with judiciously precise information generated from peer-reviewed social scientific findings should inform the information shared in PIC's classrooms.

Thus, PIC scholarship is enhanced when the field--that is, when the living, moving, evolving social/cultural organism outside the walls of academia--remains in the forefront of scholars' minds, informing decisions related to what, when, and how to approach PIC investigation and instruction.

Consideration 4: Detente among the academic and the practitioner professors

"Intelligence plus character--that is the goal of true education."
Martin Luther King, Jr. (Strauss, 2014, para. 6)

Building on the just-discussed importance of having PIC scholars keep one foot in the academy and one in the field, it is important to note PIC is not an applied field in the same sense as, say, public relations, advertising, or filmmaking (or for that matter, business or nursing). PIC does have applied considerations and, in turn, presents the question of whether PIC scholarship can inform the work of PIC practitioners working in the field such as the previously mentioned activists, lobbyists, fundraisers, volunteers, nonprofit CEOs, and others. The answer is yes.

This collaboration sounds fine until we realize that the nexus where the academic professor and the practitioner professor meets represents a sore spot in many higher education settings.[2]

---

[1] See www.aaup.org/report/professors-practice for information on the concept.

[2] This distinction between academic professors and practitioner professors is not intended to suggest a perfect separation or to describe mutually exclusive concepts. Rather, it is used for the sake of discussion to help clarify two types of professors whose work might influence PIC. Academic professors generally hold doctorates and hold primary accomplishments in the

Simply put, an applied field's academics may believe their practitioner colleagues do not understand (and thus cannot appreciate) the advanced knowledge their high-level training has provided.

Doing a terminal degree (especially a doctorate) is tough, demanding, potentially humiliating, and time consuming. Its recipient has usually foregone an industry salary and lived off a miniscule stipend for some years. Further, some unfortunate doctoral students are subjected to the whims, biases, and personal agendas of professors who will determine whether they will be granted the degree (or, down the road, tenure). Academic professors realize the professional professor did not go through this rigorous process.

On the other hand, a department's practitioner-professors may believe the academic-professors have lost grounding in the real world and thus do not understand how to prepare students about to enter the rough-and-tumble demands of the workplace.

Rising up the industry ladder--not being home to watch children grow up; taking innumerable business trips; meeting a payroll; and working in an office with fluorescent lights for 60 hours/week, 50 weeks a year, for 20 years--is also demanding. Further, some unfortunate professionals are subjected also to the whims, biases, and personal agendas of bosses who determine whether they will be promoted and how much money they will make. Practitioner professors realize the academic professors did not go through this rigorous process.

With this potential dichotomy in mind, it is important that professors--whether academic or professional--recognize the others' gifts. This recognition will enhance the field of PIC. Consider, for example, a top-notch college of communication. Here, future print and broadcast journalists, film, and television program makers, advertising executives, and public relations professionals receive degrees. Within this college, academic professors will have offices next to practitioner professors who wrote the television shows they grew up watching; were reporters for publications they read; wrote scripts for films they saw; designed advertisements for products they used; and created public relations campaigns to which they were exposed.

Conversely--breathing the same air--practitioner professors will meet leading scholars in the halls who wrote the articles and textbooks they read in college/graduate school; who decipher whether popular research claims are valid and reliable; who can speak to the societal effects of media for which they worked; and who created the body of knowledge on which the foundation of their field has been built.

To illustrate, if an education professor discussed age-related brain development in the classroom, that professor's students should be able to visit a school and observe the age-specific behavior. If a media studies professor described the foundational mass communication theory of gatekeeping, that professor's students should be able to go to a newspaper and ask an editor if the theory is plausible. If a business professor described Theory X versus Theory Y management

---

academy. Professors of practice generally do not have doctorates but after gaining substantial industry experience joined the academy. Professors of practice include activists, lobbyists, fundraisers, volunteers, and nonprofit CEOs who have reached high levels of responsibilities in their (non-academic) workplaces.

styles, that professor's students should be able to visit an organization, observe its managers' styles over time, and determine which dominates.

This nexus where a discipline's academic professors and the discipline's practitioner professors intersect is amazing, extraordinary, and unique. Sadly, however, this potential for rich exchange is hindered by professors who hide behind their industry experience or their academic credentials. In turn, they risk losing opportunities for valuable information exchanges, rich discussions about the industry about which both teach, collaborative efforts, and collegial exchanges and friendships.

With this in mind, as PIC scholarship evolves there should be receptiveness, almost constantly and on the part of all professors, to have their claims--whether theoretical or practical in the vernacular--tested in the real world. A professor teaching in a major city where vibrant efforts at social change are underway, for example, should encourage students to visit an appropriate entity, location, or individual to test whether what the professor said is right.

Thus, rich intellectual growth, which will build a solid foundation for PIC scholarship, occurs at the point where the academic and the practitioner meet--as long as both are willing to.

Consideration 5: The power of organizing

"Your most important 'want' should be the one you can control!"
                    Shannon L. Alder ("A quote by Shannon L. Alder," n.d.)

Why were social movements in the United States, including the civil rights movement of the 1960s, the feminist movement of the 1970s, and the more recent marriage equality movement, successful? Because activists brought like-minded people together and *organized* them. PIC should consider doing the same.

A theme throughout the activist literature is that collective (i.e., organized) voices are usually more powerful than single ones. The collective voices--the organizing voices--present at events such as the *frank scholar* academic conference and in scholarship that comes to life in this new journal are not only nice or helpful. They are arguably imperative for PIC to grow, flourish, and, most important, make an impact.

The January 2017 Women's March in cities throughout the United States, a triggering event generated by U.S. President Donald Trump's election, provides lessons in organizing. This is valuable as a mini-case study on what can go well when organizing as well as what types of opportunities are missed when uniting behind a cause--or, as PIC is concerned, behind a new field of study.

First, and surely relevant, the March's organizers realized a tremendous goal. Massive numbers of people participated not only in the nation's capital but also throughout the country. Some suggest, however, that the organizers (perhaps willingly and intentionally) may have missed

two additional opportunities. First, they did not form a cohesive message or a single phrase to describe the march's purpose. Second, they risked exclusivity by eliminating some groups (such as pro-life feminists).

Thus, as PIC evolves, the field may be well served when its organizers keep three principles in mind: first, to have large numbers participating in PIC inquiry and advocacy; second, to have a succinct, illustrative, easy-to-grasp PIC mission/message; and third, to remain as inclusive as possible when building the universe of PIC adherents.

Thus, as PIC progresses it will benefit through organizing--particularly if the organizing effort addresses the three criteria summarized above.

Consideration 6: Virtual communities and instant responses toward social change--an activist illustration

"Invisible threads are the strongest ties."
Friedrich Nietzsche (Kirov, 2016, p. 259)

In 1996, former U.S. President Bill Clinton said, "When I took office, only high-energy physicists had ever heard of what is called the World Wide Web. Now even my cat has its own page" (Sambaluk, 2016, p. 1). He was onto something.

In a new/social media environment, PIC is no longer limited by time. Instead the field's messages may be sent and received at any point. It is also no longer limited by distance. Instead, the field's messages from across the globe are immediately accessible. Increasing numbers of the world's population have virtually unlimited access to information that is unprecedented, unparalleled, and unmatched in the history of humankind.

Traditionally, activists' (and others') messages arrived straight from one point (e.g., an activist organization) through traditional media outlets (such as daily newspapers or television broadcasts) to multiple points (that is, to individual audience members). In this scenario, those with whom activists hoped to organize watched the same evening news broadcasts, read the same daily newspaper, and listened to the same radio programs as they fell asleep. In other words, they attended to single messages, sent to them by a single messenger, namely a traditional news outlet.

Now, however, when it comes to organizing people/groups, activists' use of virtual communities and group messaging is increasingly becoming the norm. In turn, as social change advocates move from communicating at to communicating with, their messages grow broader, more circular, and more scattered.

Activists leading the PIC charge use virtual communities with increased ease and access to span political, social, economic, and geographical boundaries. These change agents interact over shared channels through community message boards, chat rooms, and social networking sites. These platforms allow those who support (and do not support) the activists' cause to collaborate,

organize, and join alliances with others--particularly like-minded others--both within and far beyond any singular geographical location. They can do this with historically unprecedented speed and accuracy and with boundless potential to enhance social good.

Thus, never until now have virtual communities been a rich source, a solid foundation, on which to build PIC scholarship, particularly as that scholarship refers to the work of activists/advocates.

Consideration 7: A philosophy to consider

"Changes are products of intensive efforts."
                    Muhammad Yunus ("Muhammad Yunus Quotes," n.d., para. 1)

The goal of achieving positive social change can risk becoming one built on self-righteousness and *I know best and you're misguided*, an exclusionary premise.

Perhaps a philosophy for PIC educators to consider, in whole or in part, might begin with the recognition that the education they provide to students ought not be intended--for either the professor or student--as means to acquire control over another, self-promotion, prestige in a community, or an exalted sense of importance. Further, PIC's place in higher education ought not be to collect or to disseminate knowledge simply for knowledge's sake, but rather to disseminate information to empower others who can rally around causes leading toward the good.

The author's undergraduate institution, St. Bonaventure University, speaks to this suggestion. To paraphrase the University's philosophy: the outcome of an advanced education (for the purpose of this paper, an education promoting PIC), when best practiced, is to serve other human beings (About SBU, n.d.). Knowledge of economic principles eliminates poverty, law promotes justice, literature and the arts exalt the human spirit, communication promotes understanding, business provides livelihoods, medicine cures diseases, and PIC makes for a more just world. The professor facilitates such learning opportunities.

Foremost in the professor's mind as she or he shares new knowledge of PIC must be the realization both the professor and student remain shockingly similar. Both lead a full existence outside the protection of the classroom. Both have shortcomings. Both have strengths. Both want success. Both hope to be acknowledged. Both know things the other does not. Most important, both have unlimited potential to succeed. The professor, promoting a PIC philosophy while acting with both confidence and humility, will realize this. So will his or her students.

Finally, the professor must remember that the birth and new excitement around PIC scholarship is the beginning of an evolutionary process. Intellectual inquiry surrounding PIC is a continuum, now in its starting phase. Francis of Assisi said, "Let us begin again…for up until now, we have done little or nothing" (McIntosh, 2017, para. 1). As the PIC field grows these words should be remembered by its scholars, its leaders, it proponents, its students and even, perhaps, its

detractors. Concurrent with this new beginning is the challenge for PIC's researchers, when beneficial to the field, to remain receptive to moving beyond political dichotomizations, beyond either-or thinking, and to think beyond the status quo.

Positive, productive growth among PIC's scholarly community will come from aggressively conducting original research, often for peer/industry review; examining new pedagogical approaches; and recognition of collaborative receptiveness with others who also want to grow the field. No doubt, PIC will be enhanced by keeping one foot within the walls of the academy and the other outside those walls and by monitoring ever-changing social, political, economic, and cultural events that shape, sometimes daily, practical PIC. By staying current on the rapid, massive evolution of new/social media PIC will remain cutting edge. Doing these things will help to assure a robust research and teaching community, building a solid foundation for vigorous, meaningful, contemporary PIC scholarship.

Thus, PIC academicians should readily welcome, particularly when working with students, the opportunity to walk down the field's emerging paths with a philosophy capitalizing always (or almost always) on empowering others via PIC.

Consideration 8: PIC builds workplace awareness and (perhaps) organizational change

"We cannot change what we are not aware of, and once we are aware, we cannot help but change."

Sheryl Sandberg ("Sheryl Sandberg Leans In," 2013, para. 12)

Few students presented with rich, emerging insights into PIC will become academics or social scientists. Few will learn advanced research methods inherent in doctoral programs. Few will become scholars. With this in mind, it is worth considering what our students might do with the call to action to which PIC has exposed them upon entering the labor force. While a definitive answer remains elusive, perhaps a partial response lies in recognizing the potential for our students to serve as catalysts for social change upon graduation and when employed in the for-profit, nonprofit, and governmental sectors.

Simply put, PIC's academic discussions of social, political, economic, and cultural variations and patterns will eventually (ideally) inform students' workplace decisions, increase their critical thinking and creative skills, and make them aware of models built from the theoretical literature that speak to antecedent conditions that must be present for the social/behavioral outcome they hope to be achieved. In turn, PIC's educators can build a solid foundation for bringing PIC to industry, particularly as our students eventually make their way up the ladder in their respective careers and have increased organizational power to steer organizational missions toward the social good.

Thus, the academic foundation, enlightenment, and awareness PIC awakens in students will ideally inform those students' eventual workplace choices.

Consideration 9: Remaining ever-aware of the actors in the public policy process

"Action expresses priorities."

Mahatma Gandhi (Honaman, 2012, para. 2)

Following is the opening section of a chapter the author co-wrote, "Political Communications and Lobbying in the United States," published in *North American Perspectives on the Development of Public Relations*:

> Each January 22th since 1974 a massive assembly of citizens gather on the mall in Washington, D.C. and march up Capitol Hill to the U.S. Supreme Court. Among them are moms, dads, single parents; Members of Congress; grassroots activists; leaders from multiple religious traditions; "students-for-life;" "feminists for life;" "atheists for life;" others representing a cross-section of the United States. Dozens of signs pop up throughout the crowd. They say things such as, "It's a Child Not a Choice!" and "Abortion Stops a Beating Heart!" One marcher holds a fully formed fetus/baby in a jar filled with formaldehyde; when heads turn away she says to those around her, "This is what's real!" All have just participated in the annual "March for Life," commemorating the day the United States Supreme Court legalized abortion. Their energy level is high; ironically, perhaps, the event is very much alive.
>
> As they rally in front of the Supreme Court, controlled chants ensue. A group of three from Planned Parenthood, the country's leading abortion provider, off to the side, holds signs that say, "It's Not Murder--It's My Choice!" A young woman glances over and says into a microphone: "There are four main people who are involved in an abortion: One is dead, and doesn't even know why. One gets money. Two are hurt forever, whether they realize it or not!" As the rally finishes, these marchers--these "citizen lobbyists"--spread across Capitol Hill. Some turn left and walk toward the 100 U.S. senators' offices. Others right toward the 435 U.S. representatives' offices. They are about to pay a visit to their Members of Congress…aware perhaps that the First Amendment of the United States Constitution allows for people to "petition the government for redress of grievances…" (Downes, Supa, & Austin, 2017, p. 98).

This excerpt was included to illustrate the energy, excitement, and conflict inherent in the public policy process that leads to the passage of laws. It is also a process about which PIC scholars, cognizant of the need for meaningful, long-term social change, should perhaps be aware.

While there is not one best illustration of this process, discussions regarding its influence throughout academic and popular literature often comment on its messiness and its muddled disorder. Inherent are examinations of the highs and lows of those involved with it, the power plays within it, and the lack of linearity throughout it.

The actors who influence the formation of public policies that result from this chaotic process are paramount for PIC scholars to recognize. Among them are, of course, the activists rattling the cage for social change. Also included are others at the local, state, and federal levels, such courts, lobbyists, chief executives (i.e., mayors, governors, presidents), and legislative bodies (i.e., city councils, state legislatures, Congress). Also included are actors such as the media (traditional and new/social) and the business community. All these voices add to the cacophony of opinions shaping public policy's eventual outcomes. They culminate in social, cultural, and economic changes once the policies are enacted and laws are passed.

PIC scholars would be remiss if they were familiar with, say, only one actor in this process (such as activists) without also appreciating the confluence of the others. This is not to suggest PIC scholars need to seek legal counsel or be attorneys themselves to understand the process--far from it. It does suggest, however, that if they seek to move forward social policies for the good, they should know the actors with the potential to help or hinder their vision.

To paraphrase a classic saying among political scientists and others, "Those who enjoy either sausage or the law should not watch either being made" (Shapiro, 2008, para. 9). The exception to this is, of course, PIC scholars.

Thus, understanding the multiple actors in the public policy process will inform the decisions and outcomes of PIC's scholarly activities.

Consideration 10: Do-gooders?

"Nothing in the world is worth having or worth doing unless it means effort, pain, difficulty…"
Theodore Roosevelt (Feloni, 2016, para. 6)

Many of the scholars represented in this journal will share the goal of putting public interest first, responding to unethical practices in the world outside, and promoting the good through social scientific inquiry. Perhaps these scholars realize, by virtue of supporting a field that promotes positive social change, that the pejorative label of do-gooder is an easy one to stick on them, particularly by their critics.

They should *also* realize, however, that PIC scholarship is demanding and that the theoretical foundations and research practices that inform the new field are simultaneously immense, nebulous, rigorous, undiscovered, and solidifying. In other words, they should realize something those brushing them off as do-gooders may not: that it takes a lot of hard work, training, vision, and fortitude for today's PIC scholars to become do-gooders.

One hopes that they may also find out that pursuing, studying, and promoting the good can simultaneously be both a life-affirming scholarly pursuit as well as one of our highest callings.

Acknowledgments

References

A quote by Shannon L. Alder. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/6795760-your-most-important-want-should-be-the-one-you-can

About SBU (n.d.). [Website] St. Bonaventure University. Retrieved from http://www.sbu.edu/about-sbu

Danieli, Y., Stamatopoulou, E., & Dias, C. (Eds.). (1999). *The universal declaration of human rights: Fifty years and beyond*. Amityville, New York: Baywood Publishing.

Downes, E., Supa, D., & Austin, E. (2017). Political Communications and Lobbying in the United States. In T. Watson (Ed.), North American Perspectives on the Development of Public Relations: Other Voices (pp. 97–112). Palgrave Macmillan.

Feloni, D. B. (2016, February 14). 15 Teddy Roosevelt quotes on courage, leadership, and success. Retrieved April 27, 2017, from http://www.businessinsider.com/theodore-roosevelt-quotes-2016-2

Fessmann, J. (2017). Conceptual Foundations of Public Interest Communications. *Journal of Public Interest Communications, 1(1),* pgs. 16-30. Retrieved from http://journals.fcla.edu/.

Honaman, M. (2012, November 12). Remember AEP: Do Your Actions Express Your Priorities! Retrieved April 26, 2017, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/monique-honaman/life-priorities_b_2094125.html

Kirov, B. (2016). *Friedrich Nietzsche: Quotes & facts*. (R. Iotova, Trans.) (First Edition). Amazon Digital Services.

McIntosh, J. (2017, January 1). Let us begin again [Blog post]. Retrieved from https://usfranciscans.org/2017/01/01/let-us-begin/

Muhammad Yunus Quotes. (n.d.). Retrieved April 27, 2017, from https://yunuscentre.becker.edu/muhammad-yunus-quotes

W.D. Ross (Translator). (2009). Nicomachean ethics [Website]. Retrieved from http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/nicomachaen.2.ii.html

Sambaluk, N. (2016). Binary Bullets: The ethics of cyberwarfare. H-Net: Humanities and Social Sciences Online, (Generic).

Shapiro, F. R. (2008, July 21). Quote…Misquote. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from
    http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/21/magazine/27wwwl-guestsafire-t.html

Sheryl Sandberg Leans In. (2013, March 8). Retrieved April 27, 2017, from
    http://www.cosmopolitan.com/advice/work-money/sheryl-sandberg-lean-in-book-excerpt

Strauss, V. (2013, December 5). Nelson Mandela on the power of education. Retrieved April 26,
    2017, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2013/12/05/nelson-
    mandelas-famous-quote-on-education/

Strauss, V. (2014, January 20). MLK: "Intelligence plus character — that is the goal of true
    education." Retrieved April 26, 2017, from
    https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2014/01/20/mlk-intelligence-
    plus-character-that-is-the-goal-of-true-education/