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Applied research sets out to contribute to knowledge by answering a real, pragmatic, social question or by solving a real pragmatic, social problem. Applied communication research involves such a question or problem of human communication or examines human communication in order to provide an answer or solution to the question or problem. The intent or goal of the inquiry (as manifest in the research report itself) is the hallmark of applied communication research. Applied communication research involves the development of knowledge regarding a real human communication problem or question. (Cissna, 1982, p. iv)

Applied communication scholarship, as this handbook demonstrates, is a well-respected intellectual pursuit that spans (and even pervades) every area of the communication discipline, as attested to, for instance, by the use of the word *applied* in the titles of recent books on such diverse topics as communication studies (Bollinger, 2005), nonverbal communication (Riggio & Feldman, 2005), interpersonal communication (Buzanell, Sterk, & Turner, 2004; Dailey & Le Poire, 2006; Motley, 2008), organizational communication and public relations (Fine & Schwandt, 2008; Harris & Nelson, 2008; Lamb & McKee, 2005; Oliver, 2004; Veech, 2002), health communication (e.g., Wright & Moore, 2007), intercultural communication (Sharifian & Palmer 2007), performance studies and theater (Nicholson, 2005; Prentki & Preston, 2008), media studies (Rosenberry & Vicker, 2008, Zettl, 2008), and even communication research methods (Buddenbaum & Novak, 2001). Cissna, Eadie, and Hickson’s (this volume) historical overview documented how this form of scholarship became institutionalized in the communication discipline. The institutionalization of applied communication scholarship, however, did not come without costs; many great debates, heated arguments, and growing pains occurred along the way, as well as, more recently, nuanced issues and concerns that emerged once the legitimacy of this research had been established.

This chapter provides an intellectual history of some great debates about deep divides characterizing the development of applied communication scholarship. These developmental growing pains include moving from applied communication and organizational communication consulting to applied communication research; deconstructing the basic–applied research dichotomy to link communication theory and application; employing the wide range of available methodologies to produce both rigorous and relevant applied communication scholarship; and, most recently, recognizing the continuum of, but also the chasm between, observational and intervention-oriented applied communication scholarship (see Figure 2.1).
Figure 2.1 Prominent debates and divides in applied communication scholarship.
Most programs in organizational communication, public relations, and advertising are narrow, theoretically vacuous, without a research base, and, just as an aside, morally degenerate and politically naive.... These professional arms of speech communication do a disservice to the true goal of scholarly inquiry. (Ellis, 1982, pp. 1, 2)

Applied research is crucial to the professional and intellectual development of communication. (Ellis, 1991, p. 122)

Although Ellis’s (1982) statement was directed toward professional communication education programs and related outreach efforts (i.e., organizational communication consulting), it was widely interpreted (including by Ellis, 1991) as an indictment of applied communication scholarship that generated fierce counter-responses (see, e.g., Eadie, 1982; Hugenberg & Robinson, 1982). Ellis’s (1982) objection to professionally oriented communication programs and activities certainly was contestable, for historically, the “practical discipline” (Craig, 1989, 1995) of communication (dating back at least to antiquity and rhetoric’s “original concern with applicability and application”; Weick & Browning, 1991, p. 16) emerged from seeking solutions to practical issues related to communication, such as teaching people to become better speakers in everyday interactions and the public sphere, and to engage in effective communicative practices for democratic group decision making.

More important, however, Ellis (1982) conflated “applied communication” with “applied communication scholarship.” Ellis’s inability to draw this distinction was understandable given, at the time, that (1) applied research was a relatively new concept in the communication discipline, (2) newly created applied communication graduate education programs were not informed by a research orientation, and (3) consulting and organizational communication (more generally) had been conflated with applied communication scholarship.

First, as the historical overview by Cissna et al. (this volume) made clear, despite the initial focus of communication scholars and educators on applied matters, it took a relatively long time to apply the concept of “applied” to communication research—most notably, at the 1968 New Orleans Conference on Research and Instructional Development (Kibler & Barker, 1969), followed shortly thereafter in 1973 by the creation of the Journal of Applied Communication Research (JACR). Given communication scholars’ tendency to emulate the more established social sciences, primarily psychology (Frey, Botan, & Kreps, 2000), it is somewhat surprising that applied communication research did not emerge sooner. After all, the concept had a long history in the social sciences (Hickson, 1973), with, according to the U.S. Library of Congress, the first book on “applied psychology” written in 1833 (Braddock) and the first book on “applied sociology” published in 1883 (Ward); the Journal of Applied Psychology appearing in 1917 (see Hall, Baird, & Giessler’s foreword and Giessler’s article on defining applied psychology in the inaugural issue); Allen’s (1927) description of journalism as an “applied social science”; the Social Science Research Council’s sponsorship, starting in the late 1920s, of projects connected to public issues, such as the creation of the U.S. Social Security system (Calhoun, 2008); and probably most famous, Lazarsfeld’s “administrative” (market and mass communication) research (e.g., Lazarsfeld, 1941) conducted during the 1930s and 1940s to solve clients’ specific problems, including his creation in 1944 of the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University (see, e.g., Barton, 1982; Delia, 1987).

This orientation toward research that produced useful knowledge, however, changed
after World War II, with “pure” knowledge or “knowledge for knowledge’s sake” taking precedence over applied research, largely because U.S. government financial support shifted from emphasizing practical applications of research knowledge (e.g., the 1887 Hatch Act and 1914 Smith-Lever Act) to privileging basic scientific research (Byerly & Pielke, 1995; England, 1982; McCall & Groack, 2007), with the social sciences soon emulating that orientation. It took until the late 1960s—perhaps most famously, G. A. Miller’s (1969) call in his presidential address at the American Psychological Association convention “to give psychology away” to practitioners, policy makers, and the general public to improve the human condition—for psychology and other social sciences (including communication) to reclaim the concept and significance of applied research (see also Hilgard, 1971).

Second, McCroskey (1979), an early proponent of an applied communication graduate education that represented a “shift from a single-minded emphasis on research and theory generation to one which recognizes the importance of both knowledge generation and the application of that knowledge,” argued that this pedagogical approach was most appropriate for “non-research-oriented students” (pp. 353, 356). These non-research-oriented (and non-theory-oriented; see Powers & Love, 1999) applied communication graduate students were to be taught by “high quality practicing communication professionals, people at the top levels of their respective professions” (Steinfatt, 1997, p. 131), to produce, according to Powers and Love’s (1999) survey of applied mass communication master’s programs, “practitioners with enhanced career potential in the work place” (p. 105; see also Davis & Krapels, 1999). As applied communication scholarship developed, however, applied communication graduate programs—such as those at the University of South Alabama (Stacks & Chalfa, 1981) and Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (Schrader, Mills, & Dick, 2001)—started to emphasize research (and theory) as integral to application (Plax, 1991).

Third, initial conceptions often conflated applied research with consulting. DeMartini (1982), in sociology, and Levy-Leboyer (1988), in psychology, for instance, referred to applied research as “client-centered efforts.” In a seminal essay on applied communication scholarship, G. R. Miller and Sunnafrank (1984) contended that “applied research is undertaken after an area of social concern to a sponsoring agency has been identified” (p. 257). Although they were talking about sponsorship of applied communication research by grant-funding agencies, such as the National Science Foundation, most scholars (and practitioners) during the 1980s and 1990s viewed for-profit organizations as the primary sponsor of such research and, consequently, framed applied communication scholarship as a form of, or arising from, communication consulting (e.g., Browning & Hawes, 1991; Cragan & Shields, 1995, 1999; DeWine, 1987; Jarboe, 1992; Lange, 1984; March, 1991; O’Hair, Kreps, & Frey, 1990; Skopec, 1992; Stewart, 1983; Weick & Browning, 1991), with Plax (1991) advancing a “consultancy model for conducting applied communication inquiry” (p. 60). Undoubtedly because of the perceived connection between consulting and applied communication research, relatively early issues of JACR featured articles about consulting (e.g., Browning, 1982; Harrison, 1982; Lange, 1984; Stewart, 1983). Indeed, in summarizing the essays in a special issue on “The Agenda for Applied Communication” (Eadie, 1991a) that began the publication of JACR by the National Communication Association (NCA), Eadie (1991b), the editor, pointed out that “a common theme running through the essays was the relationship between research and application, mainly through consulting” (p. v). The relationship between applied communication scholarship and consulting was so taken for granted that DeWine (1987) and Kreps, Frey, and O’Hair (1991) identified it as a major misconception about applied communication research (see also Phillips, 1992).
A related misconception that Kreps et al. (1991) identified, stemming, in part, from its conflation with consulting, was viewing applied communication research as being synonymous with “organizational communication research and...concerned exclusively with organizational issues” (p. 78). March (1991, p. 22), for instance, contended that applied communication research “involves gathering systematic data about organizations or speculating about them in a systematic way,” and Browning and Hawes (1991) noted that the common image of the applied communication researcher was “an intervener coming into an organization to alter its communication” (p. 47). Undoubtedly because of the assumed connection between applied communication research and the organizational context, much of the early work published in *JACR* focused on (for-profit) organizational communication (e.g., Beaver & Jandt, 1973; Falcione, 1974; Rudolph, 1973; Stacks, 1974). Applied communication research, however, as this handbook shows (see especially the fourth section on applied communication research contexts), was then and still is conducted in a wide variety of contexts and addresses many communication issues other than those relevant to organizational settings. Moreover, not all organizational communication research (or research conducted in any other context) necessarily is applied; some of that research addresses philosophical, conceptual, or theoretical issues (Cisna, 1982; Kreps et al., 1991; Seibold, Lemos, Ballard, & Myers, this volume).

As scholars worked through these issues, they moved away from viewing applied communication as nonresearch oriented or research related to organizational communication consulting to conceiving of applied communication research that spanned the communication discipline. Although some scholars continued to perceive such research as client centered (e.g., Buddenbaum & Novak, 2001), the great divide between applied communication scholarship and applied communication and organizational communication consulting had been crossed. Crossing that divide explains, in part, Ellis’s (1991) epiphany, less than 10 years after his inflammatory statement, about the importance of applied research to the communication discipline. Applied communication scholarship, however, faced an even larger challenge—linking theory and application to deconstruct the supposed divide between basic and applied communication research.

### Across the Great Divide: Linking Theory and Application in Applied Communication Research

There is nothing so practical as a good theory. (Lewin, 1951, p. 169)

There is nothing so theoretical as a good application. (Levy-Leboyer, 1988, p. 785)

There is an old saying that there are two types of people: those who divide people into two types or those who do not. Of course, carving out any new discipline, field, area, or approach—in this case, applied communication scholarship—requires simultaneously defining the referent and distinguishing it from related terms—in this case, other forms of scholarship.

Although scholarship can be categorized in various ways, probably the most popular way across the social sciences (Johnson, 1991; O’Hair, 1988) has been to distinguish applied research from basic (pure or “fundamental”) research. In essence, *basic research* tests theories (or, more accurately, propositions derived from theories) to advance disciplinary knowledge, whereas *applied research* seeks knowledge to address real-world practical problems.

Distinguishing theory-oriented and practical-oriented research offered an initial way to carve out a niche for applied communication scholarship. It did not take long to real-
ize, however, that drawing a hard distinction between theory and application, and treating basic and applied research as parallel types of scholarship ("practice and theory," as Seibold et al., this volume, labeled it, p. 345), was detrimental to those conducting applied communication research. Conquergood (1995) noted that whenever a binary opposition is proposed, "one term is privileged by virtue of its domination over the other term" (p. 80). Not surprisingly, given the emphasis across academic disciplines on generating knowledge for the sake of knowledge, theory-oriented research was privileged over application-oriented research and, consequently, basic researchers were viewed quite differently from applied researchers. As G. R. Miller and Sunnafrank (1984) put it:

"The bright, shiny connotations of the term ‘pure research’ conjure images of persons of unquestioned ability and impeccable ethics pursuing essential theoretical work. Theirs is the seeking after knowledge for its own sake. They are the truly important scholars and their labors culminate in truly significant work."

"The images associated with ‘applied research’ are tawdry by comparison. Here are the users and abusers of the substantive knowledge and methods of inquiry produced by the scholarly community. Theirs is the seeking after knowledge and information for self-enhancement: at worst, they are snake oil salesmen who distort and twist knowledge for personal gain; at best, they are naïve scholarly drones who dirty their hands with dull, theoretically trivial labor." (p. 255)

In such a dichotomized world, applied research becomes "prostituted science" (Conquergood, p. 81) conducted by "have-gun-will-travel social science mercenaries" (Sanjek, 1987, p. 168; see also Ellis, 1991; Goodall, 1995; Yep, 2008).4

One response to privileging basic over applied communication research was to suggest that it should be the other way around. Phillips (1981) articulated this position when he asserted that "most hard scientists recognize that pure research is nothing more than the preliminary phases of applied research" (p. 2). Other communication scholars did not necessarily argue for the superiority of applied over basic research but pointed out that, ultimately, theory and research must affect application. Thayer (1982, p. 22), for instance, asked the question, "What is a theory for?" and answered that it "has to be relevant to some human or social problem" (see also Seibold, 1995), and Craig (1995) argued that "all research in a practical discipline [such as communication] is ultimately pursued not for its own sake but for the sake of practice" (p. 151).

Most applied communication scholars, however, tried to "put Humpty Dumpty back together again" by weaving together theory and application. Most of those attempts assumed the legitimacy of and, thereby, reified the two forms of basic and applied scholarship, but argued for their inherent interdependence. Eadie (1982), for instance, claimed that although theoretical and applied communication research have different ends, the two can serve each other. The results of theoretical research can guide the applied researcher toward deciding both what variables to observe and what relationships are likely to exist among those variables. The applied researcher’s results can be useful to the theoretical researcher in providing evidence for the replicability of theoretical findings, as well as furnishing negative cases that allow the theorist to revise, to strengthen, and often to add to the power of the theory. (p. 4)

Moving beyond seeing theory and application as separate endeavors that can inform one another, Kreps et al. (1991) categorized studies with regard to their emphasis on
theoretical and practical issues. A study that places low emphasis both on theory and practice constitutes poor research; a study emphasizing theory but not practice constitutes the stereotypical view of basic research; and a study that emphasizes application but not theory represents the stereotypical view of applied research. Although there are many studies in-between, Kreps et al. argued that a study demonstrating high concern both for theory and practice
defies the stereotypes of basic and applied research suggested by the traditional definitional dichotomy, and illustrates what we claim is the best approach to applied communication research, a study that is grounded in theory and designed to solve a practical problem. (p. 75)

Infusing applied studies with theory (“theory into practice/theory from practice”; Seibold et al., this volume, p. 345) became part and parcel of conducting high-quality applied communication scholarship. G. R. Miller and Sunnafrank (1984, p. 262) claimed that “a concern for developing and testing communication theory is an indispensable dimension of applied communication research”; O’Hair et al. (1990, p. 13) asserted that “applied researchers need to be guided by theory. Underlying all good research is a theoretical position”; and in a special forum of JACR on “Defining Applied Communication Scholarship” (O’Hair, 2000a), O’Hair (2000b) concluded that “at least basic communication theorists are making a difference in the lives of applied scholars. I know that I cannot conduct my applied research without them” (p. 165).

The importance of using theory to guide applied communication scholarship became institutionalized in JACR when Porter (1986), the editor, explained that “the cornerstone of JACR’s mission is to provide an outlet for scholars who test communication theory in the crucible of applied communication settings” (p. 67). The emphasis on theory continued when Eadie (1990) became editor and articulated three criteria for publishing articles in that journal: In addition to exploring a specific communication problem or situation (called the “constitutive criterion”) and revealing significant and substantive information about that problem or situation (the “significance criterion”), the third criterion (the “focus criterion”) was that “the research is securely based in theory,” although “its purpose is not immediate theory building” (p. 4).

Frequently, however, applied communication scholarship privileged theory over application (see Barge & Craig, this volume). Keyton (2000), for instance, after reviewing manuscripts submitted to the Applied Communication Division for presentation at the 1998 NCA convention, noted that “too frequently, authors gave an overabundant focus to theory. Theories would be articulated and reviewed, and then the applied problem would appear as an incidental test of the theory” (p. 167; see also similar comments Keyton, 2005, made about manuscripts submitted during her editorship of JACR). Even Seibold (2000), probably the most theoretically oriented editor of JACR, remarked that

given my own strong commitment to pursuing theoretically driven applied communication research, I may have overemphasized theory at times during my editorship of JACR. This was especially evident when some authors struggled to specify the “implications for practice” associated with their findings. (p. 184)

This emphasis on theory still characterized JACR’s editorial policy in 2009, with the word “theory” (italicized for emphasis) occurring more than any other descriptive term:
The Journal of Applied Communication Research publishes original scholarship that addresses or challenges the relation between theory and practice in understanding communication in applied contexts. All theoretical and methodological approaches are welcome, as are all contextual areas. Original research studies should apply existing theory and research to practical situations, problems, and practices; should illuminate how embodied activities inform and reform existing theory; or should contribute to theory development. Research articles should offer critical summaries of theory or research and demonstrate ways in which the critiques can be used to explain, improve, or understand communication practices or process in a specific context. (Stafford, 2009, n.p.)

Although theory still may be overemphasized in research published in JACR, scholars have recognized the limitations of and deconstructed the theory–application divide (e.g., G. R. Miller, 1995). As Wood (1995) explained:

Applied communication research is practicing theory and theorizing practice. I am not contending merely that a dynamic dialectic of theory and practice should characterize applied scholarship, but that it necessarily does.... Theory is practice or, if you prefer, theoria is praxis. (pp. 157, 162)

This view of applied communication scholarship represents full integration of theory and practice (“theory with practice/practice with theory”; Seibold et al., this volume, p. 345). Emerging from this integrated view is the notion of “practical theory” (see Barge & Craig, this volume). Moreover, deconstructing the theory–application divide undoubtedly had a significant impact on the methodologies employed in applied communication scholarship and the recognition that both rigor and relevance could characterize such research.

Across the Great Divide: Practicing Rigor and Relevance in Applied Communication Research

In our view, social scientists are faced with a fundamental choice that hinges on a dilemma of rigor or relevance. If social scientists tilt toward the rigor of normal science that currently dominates departments of social science in American universities, they risk becoming irrelevant to practitioners’ demands for usable knowledge. If they tilt toward the relevance of...research, they risk falling short of prevailing disciplinary standards of rigor.... The challenge is to define and meet standards of appropriate rigor without sacrificing relevance. (Argyris & Schön, 1991, p. 85)

Debates about methodological procedures for conducting applied communication research and the methodological sophistication of such research accompanied the distinction drawn between basic and applied research, and the desire to infuse applied communication research with theory. These methodological debates about applied communication scholarship reflected, in part, larger debates that characterized the 1970s, and continued for some time, about theories and methods employed to study communication phenomena, in general (e.g., Benson & Pearce, 1977; Cronkhite & Liska, 1977; Fisher, 1978). As Frey (1996, pp. 25, 22, 26) noted in reviewing group communication research conducted during the “decade of discontent” (1970s) that followed the “grand old days” (1945–1970) where such research flourished, scholars experienced an “epistemic crisis” that led them to question taken-for-granted theoretical and methodological practices.
Given that applied communication research emerged during the time of those debates and was viewed by some scholars as the “black sheep” or “Rodney Dangerfield” (“I don’t get no respect”) of communication research, it was especially affected by those debates.

Although a number of methodological issues were debated at that time, two interrelated issues were especially relevant to applied communication scholarship: (1) laboratory versus field research, and (2) quantitative versus qualitative methods. With regard to the site for research, in line with privileging basic research in the social sciences, social-scientific communication scholars had adopted the “gold standard” of conducting (quantitative, experimental) research under controlled conditions in a laboratory. A number of scholars, however, questioned the external validity (or “generalizability”) of the findings from such research because of the artificiality of the laboratory and what researchers often asked people to do in it. Applied communication scholars, in particular, threw this accepted practice into relief because of their desire to study communication in the natural contexts in which it occurred. G. R. Miller and Sunnafrank (1984), for instance, argued that a major practical concession of much communication research concerns the contrived nature of many research situations. For instance, research participants are frequently asked to role play situations of theoretical interest to the researcher, or to observe and to assess hypothetical communication transactions.… The best antidote consists of studies conducted in research settings closely approximating the actual communication environment of interest. (p. 260)

Cusella and Thompson (1995) were even more adamant, insisting that applied communication research “must be conducted in the field, where the interplay between context and process is an ever present empirical concern” (p. 182; see also Whitchurch, 2001).

The assumption that applied research should be conducted in the field was so prevalent (e.g., it was the definition employed in the first issue of *JACR* edited by Hickson, 1973) that Kreps et al. (1991) identified it as another major misconception of applied communication scholarship. The corresponding supposition that all field research was applied also was challenged, with Cissna (1982, p. iii) pointing out that “research conducted in field settings is often not applied research,” and Kreps et al. explaining that “basic research studies are often conducted in field settings to enhance the ecological validity of propositions derived from theory” (pp. 75–76). Moreover, scholars maintained that applied communication research could be conducted in the laboratory. In identifying problematic characteristics commonly associated with applied communication scholarship, Cissna (1982), as editor of *JACR*, explained that the assertion sometimes is made that applied communication research is conducted in the field (or in situ) rather than in laboratories, and hence uses “real people” rather than college students as subjects. Although this is often the case, and usually is desirable, it is not necessarily so. Applied communication research can be conducted in laboratory situations and can use students as subjects. (p iii; see also Whitchurch & Webb, 1995)

Cardy (1991a), arguing against what he perceived to be a knee-jerk reaction, claimed, in the context of studying organizational communication, that “laboratory studies have great applied value even though they are extremely artificial” (p. 112). To Cardy (1991a), only the internal validity of laboratory research was important and its external validity was irrelevant, for its applied value lay in testing theories and models. Steinfatt (1991a) agreed that external validity was not important to applied organizational communication
laboratory research, but argued that studying students rather than organizational employees and ignoring the significant contextual factors that affect employees was problematic precisely because such procedures called into question the internal validity of laboratory research (see the subsequent exchange between Cardy, 1991b, and Steinfatt, 1991b).

Closely related to the debate about conducting (applied) communication research in the laboratory versus the field was the debate about the merits of quantitative versus qualitative methods. Like their counterparts in the other social sciences, social-scientific communication scholars privileged methods that produced quantitative data (primarily experiments and surveys). Many applied communication researchers also relied on quantitative methods—most notably, the survey method. Indeed, as Query et al. (this volume) documented in their review of quantitative methods in applied communication scholarship, the survey method was used most often in articles published in JACR from 1973 to 1989. Because of its extensive use, Kreps et al. (1991) pointed out that another misconception of applied communication scholarship was that “applied researchers depend exclusively upon the survey research method” (p. 77).

Employing quantitative methods in applied communication research probably was due to graduate school training. Indeed, textbooks from psychology and sociology (e.g., Babbie, 1975; Kerlinger, 1973; Sellitz, Wrightsman, & Cook, 1976) used to teach research methods in communication graduate programs and early communication research methods textbooks (e.g., Bowers & Courtright, 1984; Emmert & Brooks, 1970; M. J. Smith, 1982; Tucker, Weaver, & Berryman-Fink, 1981; Wimmer & Dominick, 1983) emphasized quantitative methods.6

However, once qualitative methods, which had a long history in other social sciences, started to influence the study of communication,7 applied communication researchers were quick to argue for and adopt them. In articles published in early issues of JACR, Fish and Dorris (1975) explained how phenomenology could inform applied communication research, Shuter (1975) pointed to the promise of participant–observation research, Langan (1976) showed how speech act theory could stimulate research, Gonchar and Hahn (1978) argued for critical methodologies, Deetz (1981) explicated metaphor analysis, and Hickson (1983) championed ethnomethodology in applied communication scholarship. Cragan and Shields (1981) also published a book promoting a dramatistic approach to applied communication scholarship. The value of qualitative methods also was highlighted by scholars studying communication in natural settings that were considered most conducive for applied research, such as families (Riggs, 1979), organizations (e.g., Browning, 1978) and the media (e.g., Gelles, 1974).

Qualitative methods became so associated with applied communication scholarship that Cissna (1982) identified it as another perceived problematic characteristic, stating:

I have read or heard that applied research utilizes participant observation, non-quantitative, and phenomenological models of inquiry. While some applied communication studies are of these types, these qualitative studies are not necessarily (by their method alone) applied research, and research of these types is often not applied. (pp. ii–iv)

Perhaps because of the emphasis placed on studying communication in natural settings using qualitative methods, applied communication research was viewed by some scholars as being less rigorous than quantitative, laboratory communication research. Kreps et al. (1991, p. 71) noted that applied communication research “has long suffered from an unfortunate and inaccurate disciplinary stigma of appearing to lack scholarly rigor and merit,” and Pettegrew (1988, p. 331) sought to “inject more rigor into our field’s use of the term ‘applied research,’” because the quality of most applied research, according to
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Becker (1995), “has been terrible” (p. 100). DeWine (1987), however, questioned the view that applied communication research was “less rigorous” or “is only done by those who can’t do ‘real’ research” (pp. 3, 4). As DeWine explained, “There is nothing that inherently separates ‘pure’ research from applied research in terms of the rigor of the method” (p. 3; see also Frey, O’Hair, & Kreps, 1990). Moreover, social-scientific scholars who conducted rigorous quantitative laboratory research simultaneously were questioning the relevance of their research. Hirsh-Pasek and Golinkoff (2007) recently concluded about such research: “Ironically, as our methodological skills improved, relevance went out the window” (p. 185).

Over time, scholars demonstrated how various methods (many of which are documented in the second section of this volume) could be employed to achieve both rigor and relevance in field- and laboratory-based applied communication research. Indeed, today, no one debates the use of quantitative and qualitative methods to study (applied) communication phenomena, whether applied communication research can or should be conducted in the natural setting or the laboratory, the supposed divide between research rigor and relevance, or the quality of applied communication scholarship. As Wood (2000) concluded:

A primary reason for the change in many communication scholars’ views of applied communication research is the indisputable quality of much published applied work. The scholarship done under the name of applied communication research has established its validity and value both in and beyond the ivory tower. (p. 191)

Across the Great Divide: From Observation to Intervention

We should start from the premise that, in research, “to put into practice” [the dictionary definition of “applied”] applies to researchers.... Accordingly, applied communication scholarship might be defined as “the study of researchers putting their communication knowledge and skills into practice.” Hence, applied communication scholarship involves scholars bringing their communication resources to bear to make a difference in people’s lives. (Frey, 2000, p. 179)

Although the debates described above resulted in the legitimation and institutionalization of applied research in the communication discipline, with applied communication scholars no longer having to justify their research, the debates did not cease but, instead, turned inward to confront issues raised by those who conduct such scholarship. Perhaps the greatest of those divides has been between applied communication scholars who observe how people manage pragmatic communication issues and those who intervene to facilitate change, engaging, in the most extreme case, in communication activism to promote social justice.

At the minimal definitional end of the applied communication scholarship continuum, researchers observe people confronting pragmatic communication issues to describe, interpret, explain, and, in some cases, critique what occurs for the purpose of enlightening other scholars. Although many communication scholars engage in these practices, applied communication scholars include in their written reports recommendations for practitioners or people affected by the communication issue to influence subsequent practice. Indeed, the editorial policy of JACR now requires that “all manuscripts must include a separate section detailing the intended or potential practical applications of findings, critique, or commentary” (Stafford, 2009, n.p.). First recommended by Eadie (2000), Keyton (2005) started this “Practical Applications” section...
When she edited the journal to demonstrate that “communication scholars can draw meaningful conclusions and make meaningful contributions to how people practice communication” (p. 289). Including such applications, according to this flagship journal, by definition, makes the scholarship applied.

Although providing practical applications of communication research studies should be relatively easy, as Keyton (2005) noted toward the end of her editorship:

Some authors remarked on the difficulty of moving from theoretical platforms to practical ones. Others struggled with what should be done versus what can be done in a particular communication setting. Such difficulty suggests that we are more comfortable working in idealized forms, and are perhaps less knowledgeable about contexts than we should be. For JACR, I believe, we must find a way to bridge from theory to practice. (p. 289)

Despite these difficulties, the majority of applied communication research, especially articles published in JACR, is of this type.

To illustrate the observational end of the observational–intervention continuum using a recent example, consider K. I. Miller and Koesten’s (2008) study of the emerging role of emotion in the workplace—in this case, among professional financial planners—which revealed that there is a great deal of emotion experienced in the financial planning profession and that relationships and communication with clients may indeed be more central to the work of financial planners than portfolio reports and changes in estate tax laws. (p. 23)

After explaining insights gained about how financial planners’ emotions and communication relate to burnout and job satisfaction, and after discussing the findings in light of theory and research, the authors offered, in the practical applications section, ideas for training financial planners (and other service providers) that stressed understanding relationships and providing them with skills in relational development. K. I. Miller and Koesten, thus, observed people confronting important pragmatic issues (burnout and job satisfaction) related to communication (of information and emotion), addressed the traditional scholarship requirement of situating their findings within relevant theory and research, and met the minimal applied communication scholarship requirement established by JACR of offering recommendations for practice. Their research, however, did not constitute (or study) an intervention with financial planners, nor did they enact any of their recommendations for training financial planners. Indeed, there is no indication in the article that the findings from the study even were shared with participants.8

The approach to applied communication scholarship that relies on observations and recommendations without intervening in some way is what Frey and Carragee (2007b) called “third-person-perspective research” (p. 6). This research approach may be derived from the traditional privileging of theory over application in the academy, with the word theory coming from the Greek words theoría (“contemplation”), theorein (“look at”), theoros (“spectator”), and thea (“a view”; Online Etymology Dictionary, 2006). Hence, from such a perspective, scholars are supposed to be, and most likely were trained to be, spectators whose work is best done by looking at and contemplating what occurs without trying to affect it.

Almost from the beginning of applied communication scholarship, however, some scholars questioned this observational-spectator model that now culminates in offering...
recommendations for others to enact. Cissna (1982), for instance, argued that “applied communication is not sufficiently characterized by a particular kind of discussion and conclusions” (p. iv). As Cissna (1982) explained:

Some have argued that applied communication research contains discussion and conclusions sections which orient the reader toward the policy implications (broadly construed) of the research which has been undertaken, regardless of any of its other characteristics. The practical orientation of the discussion and conclusions is necessary but not sufficient to describe applied communication research. (p. iv)

Johnson (1991) went even further, questioning, in the context of organizational communication, whether observing and offering recommendations constitutes applied communication research:

That a study is conducted in an organizational setting, is grounded in the research literature, provides logically and empirically valid explanations and predictions, and offers some practical implications of these findings in the discussion section does not make the study “applied.” Applied communication research centers on solving existing and real problems.... Research that is strictly descriptive, explanatory, and/or predictive is not applied communication research because it does not meet the criterion of control. (pp. 341–342)

A stronger position about applied communication scholarship than observing and offering recommendations, which developed, in part, because it never is clear whether practitioners and the public can physically obtain or understand studies published in scholarly journals, even applied articles, is that of translational scholarship, advanced by Petronio (1999, 2002, 2007a), in which applied communication researchers “take the knowledge discovered through research or theory and interpret it for everyday use” (Petronio, 1999, p. 88). Petronio (2007a) identified five pathways for translating research knowledge into practice: (1) selecting societal problems most likely to benefit from translational research, (2) assessing the fit between audience needs and research applications, (3) redesigning research to accomplish translation (which was considered the most pressing need), (4) converting research findings into practices that benefit people, and (5) developing delivery systems to bring translational knowledge to those who most need it.

Some applied communication scholars have framed their research (often post hoc) as translational scholarship (e.g., Giles, 2008; Hecht & Miller-Day, 2007; Miller-Day, 2008; Parrott, 2008; Petronio, 2007b). Delivery systems also are being developed to bring translational knowledge to those who most need it. Keyton (2005) noted applied communication scholars’ inability “to talk more directly with public audiences about what we do and how our research can help identify communication problems and provide viable options” (p. 290; see also Avery & Eadie, 1993; Eadie, 1995; Goodall, 2004). In response, NCA created the online Web magazine (“ezine”) Communication Currents (http://www.communicationcurrents.com/) to translate communication journal articles into “a form understandable and usable for broad audiences, including communication experts working with lay audiences, instructors and students, the press, and other interested members of the public” (National Communication Association, 2008, ¶1). Recent articles in that magazine include “Communicating with In-laws: Reframing and Accepting Change” (Prentice, 2008b; based on Prentice, 2008a), “The Role of E-mail in Parent–Teacher Communication” (Thompson, 2008b; based on Thompson, 2008a), and “Fighting the Prison–Industrial Complex with Communication Activism” (Hartnett, 2007a; based on PCARE, 2007).
Communication scholars also have written (1) articles in practitioner journals, sometimes with practitioners, such as Adelman, Frey, and Budz (1994) on creating community in long-term care facilities, based on their longitudinal applied research program on communication and community at a residential facility for people with AIDS (see, e.g., Adelman & Frey, 1997); (2) books for practitioners, such as Sunwolf’s (2004, 2005, 2006b) translation of her research and other scholarship on jury communication tools and strategies for attorneys; and (3) books for the general public, such as Jamieson (2000) on political communication campaigns and Jackson and Jamieson (2007), founders of the Web site FactCheck.org, on distinguishing factual information from disinformation. Communication scholars also have produced video documentaries (e.g., Adelman & Schultz, 1991; Conquergood & Siegel, 1990; McHale, Wylie, & Huck, 2002, 2005). In fact, Freimuth (1995) argued that “to have an impact on public policy and social change, communication research must be disseminated in nontraditional ways” (p. 43).

Translational scholarship counters the notion that disseminating research is not a priority for scholars and, in fact, can be detrimental to them (e.g., for tenure and promotion; see the essays in Welch-Ross & Fasig, 2007). However, some translational research may be based on the questionable assumption (see McCall & Groark, 2007; Ruben, 2005) that simply making research accessible results in “usable knowledge” (Argyris, 1995, p.1). Instead, some scholars argue passionately, such as the quotation from Frey (2000) at the beginning of this section, that applied communication scholars should conduct research about their interventions with relevant audiences to manage or solve communication problems and to promote needed social change. Such intervention-oriented research is what Frey and Carragee (2007b, p. 6) called “first-person-perspective research” and represents the other definitional end of the applied communication scholarship continuum.

Some early applied communication scholars did engage in intervention (or facilitation) research. Perry (1973), for instance, conducted survey research about public sentiment in Bromley, Ohio about a proposed tax levy and, based on the findings, suggested communication strategies to overcome resistance to the levy that were enacted by a group of concerned citizens, with voters subsequently approving the levy. Peterson (1975) discussed his teaching of a basic communication course in a program providing college coursework and on-the-job-training for Choctaw Indian students in Philadelphia, Mississippi. Burke, Becker, Arborgast, and Naughton (1987) reported on their theoretically based intervention program to reduce adolescents’ tobacco use. Conquergood (1988) described his collaborative creation of a grassroots theater troupe in a Hmong refugee camp in Thailand that performed skits using proverbs, stories, and songs to promote hygiene and sanitation practices.

Although these studies were the exception to the observational research (including studies about interventions conducted by other people; e.g., Hunt & Ebeling, 1983; Lannamann, 1989; Pohl & Freimuth, 1983; Schwarz-Gehrke, 1983) that, until recently, dominated applied communication scholarship, over time, more applied communication scholars have engaged in intervention research. The interventions range from facilitating group interaction to promoting public dialogue to conducting media campaigns (Table 2.1 lists some interventions employed and an example of their use by applied communication scholars; see other studies in Frey, 1995, 2006b; Frey & Carragee, 2007a; the exemplary applied communication scholarship programs featured in this volume by Hecht & Miller-Day; Pearce, Spano, & Pearce; Poole & DeSanctis; Witte & Roberto). Although these interventions differed in important ways (e.g., short-term versus long-term or microlevel versus macrolevel interventions), in all cases, researchers intervened to address important communication issues, facilitated communicative practices, and studied the processes or effects of their interventions (e.g., conducted evaluation research).

One important reason for the growth of intervention-oriented applied communication research is the amount of grant funding now available for it. The widespread recognition
Table 2.1 Interventions/Facilitations Employed by Applied Communication Researchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention/Facilitation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brochures:</td>
<td>Created by S. W. Smith et al. (2008) to increase agricultural workers’ intentions to use on-the-job hearing protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Conversations:</td>
<td>Developed by Sunwolf (2007) to facilitate discussions of the death penalty with citizens (“death talk”) and to teach attorneys how to embrace jurors’ opinions with which they disagree and to initiate collaborative talk with them about how to solve trial tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning:</td>
<td>Used by Walker, Daniels, and Cheng (2006) to work through conflict between stakeholder groups about environmental issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Assessment Instruments:</td>
<td>Orbe (2007) created an instrument to assess the civil rights health of communities, employed it in three communities in Michigan, and facilitated conversations about the results and strategic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Consulting:</td>
<td>Crabtree and Ford (2007) consulted with a sexual assault recovery center, engaging in media relations, promotion, fund-raising, training, and other activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills Training:</td>
<td>Seibold, Kudsi, and Rude (1993) provided presentational skill training to members of manufacturing, service, production, and research organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates:</td>
<td>Hartnett (1998) had students in his prison class restage the Lincoln–Douglas debates about slavery, adding the Black abolitionist David Walker, to see how the tropes of racism carried through to today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue Forums:</td>
<td>Facilitated by Murphy (1995) to increase awareness, identify issues, promote constructive dialogue, and propose solutions to gender issues in an international professional service firm concerned about the lack of women in its upper management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent Consensus Program:</td>
<td>Employed by Palmer (2007) to build consensus in a progressive activist antiglobalization group as it planned for and took part in an international trade summit protest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Attunement:</td>
<td>Created by Sunwolf (2006a) to help defense attorneys empathize with and develop new case strategies for their indigent incarcerated defendants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Techniques:</td>
<td>Keyton (1995) used SYMLOG (System for the Multiple Level Observation of Groups; a quantitative observational scheme that can help a group to reflect on its interaction) to ease tensions within a functional work group comprised of physicians, medical residents, and nursing staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups:</td>
<td>Employed by Zorn, Roper, Broadfoot, and Weaver (2006) to increase participants’ confidence and motivation to participate in public dialogues about controversial topics (in this case, human biotechnology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Decision Support Systems:</td>
<td>Used by Poole, DeSanctis, Kirsch, and Jackson (1995) to build teams involved in a quality enhancement effort at a large service organization (see also Poole &amp; DeSanctis, this volume)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inoculation Treatments:</td>
<td>Employed by Compton and Pfau (2008) to combat university plagiarism by protecting students’ attitudes against pro-plagiarism justification arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Management:</td>
<td>Used by Broome (2006) to manage conflict and build peace between Greeks and Turks on Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinetic Exercises:</td>
<td>Employed by Kawakami (2006) to promote group formation and development with diverse (e.g., ethnic) groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Literacy:</td>
<td>Cooks and Scharrer (2007) taught sixth graders, their teachers, and their families about media and interpersonal violence, and conflict resolution strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Campaigns:</td>
<td>Engaged in by Ryan, Caragee, and Schwerner (1998) to influence policy formation and public attitudes concerning workplace reproductive rights that resulted in a positive U.S. Supreme Court decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphoric Illumination:</td>
<td>Used by Gribas and Sims (2006) to reveal differences among team members in their understanding of the word “team” and to move the group forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers:</td>
<td>Novek and Sanford (2007) produced a newspaper at a state prison for women that examined, for instance, the harshness of prison life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance/Theatre:</td>
<td>Harter, Sharma, Pant, Singhal, and Sharma (2007) facilitated participatory theatre workshops and performances in India that protested the practice of dowry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the role of communication in managing significant societal issues has led to increased large-scale grants, especially from philanthropic foundations, for applied communication research about socially responsible intervention programs (Dearing & Larson, 2002; Slater, 2002).

Intervention-oriented research constitutes what has been called “engaged scholarship” (Applegate, 2002; Barge, Simpson, & Shockley-Zalabak, 2008; Cheney, Wilhelmsson, & Zorn, 2002; Van de Ven, 2007). Although generally welcomed by scholars, Seibold (2000) claimed that restricting applied communication scholarship to first-person-perspective research, as Frey (2000) argued, is too limiting. In fact, in some contexts, researchers’ intervention may be undesirable. Whitchurch and Webb (1995), for instance, argued that “applied family communication must address implications for practice with families while not conducting the actual interventions.... The appropriate role for applied family research is to inform practice, rather than be therapy per se” (p. 244).

Scholarship, however, can be engaged in another, more deeply ideological, sense, as Conquergood (1995) explained:

The choice is no longer between pure and applied research. Instead, we must choose between research that is “engaged” or “complicit.” By engaged I mean a clear-eyed, self-critical awareness that research does not proceed in epistemological purity or moral innocence. There is no immaculate perception. Engaged individuals take responsibility for how the knowledge that they produce is used instead of hiding behind pretenses and protestations of innocence.... As engaged intellectuals we understand that we are entangled within world systems of oppression and exploitation.... Our choice is to stand alongside or against domination, but not outside, above, or beyond it. (p. 85)

From such a perspective, significant differences exist not only between observational and intervention applied communication research but also between intervention research that potentially maintains systems of domination and that which challenges oppression.

Responding to Conquergood’s (1995) ideological challenge, Frey, Pearce, Pollock, Artz, and Murphy (1996) articulated a communication and social justice approach to applied communication scholarship that involves “engagement with and advocacy for those in our society who are economically, socially, politically, and/or culturally underresourced” (p. 110; see also Frey, 1998b, 2006a; Pearce, 1998; Pollock, Artz, Frey, Pearce,
As Frey, Pearce et al. noted, “A concern with social justice from a communication perspective...identifies and foregrounds the grammars that oppress or underwrite relationships of domination and then reconstructs those grammars” (p. 112). Frey (1998a) subsequently edited a special issue of JACR on “Communication and Social Justice Research” that featured “empirically grounded case studies that demonstrated ways in which applied communication researchers have made a difference in the lives of those who are disadvantaged by prevalent social structures” (Frey, 1998b, p. 158).

One important component of the communication and social justice approach is the adoption of an activist orientation. As Frey, Pearce et al. (1996) explained:

> It is not enough merely to demonstrate or bemoan the fact that some people lack the minimal necessities of life, that others are used regularly against their will and against the interests by others for their pleasure or profit, and that some are defined as “outside” the economic, political, or social system because of race, creed, lifestyle, or medical condition.... A social justice sensibility entails a moral imperative to act as effectively as we can to do something about sustained inequalities. To continue to pursue justice, it is perhaps necessary that we who act be personally ethical, but that is not sufficient. Our actions must engage and transform social structure. (p. 111)

Expanding on this orientation, Frey and Carragee (2007a, 2007b) recently articulated, and showcased research studies of, a communication activism approach to scholarship that involves researchers engaging in direct vigorous action to promote social justice (see also the activist approaches advanced by Broome, Carey, De La Garza, Martin, & Morris, 2005; Yep, 2008; Zoller, 2005). Although a number of scholars have pursued social justice and communication activism scholarship (e.g., Artz, 2000; Jones & Bodtker, 1998; Leets, 2001; Palmeri, 1996; Pestana & Swartz, 2008; Sorrells & Nakagawa, 2008; Swan, 2002; the essays in Swartz, 2006), many issues still need to be worked out about this approach (regarding ethical issues, see Seeger, Sellnow, Ulmer, & Novak, this volume). For instance, Sunwolf (2007) used the example of national workshops she conducts with lawyers who defend those facing the death penalty to discuss differences between local activism, where researchers are privy to the outcomes of their activism, and itinerate activism, conducted with people not from researchers’ local communities and with the outcomes perhaps never being known to researchers.

Important concerns also have been raised about this approach by communication scholars who support and work conscientiously for social justice. Wood (1996), for instance, pointing to specific communication scholarship (some of which emerged from the decades-old feminist research tradition), took exception to Frey, Pearce et al.’s (1996) claim that “little research by communication scholars had focused on social justice and that work of this sort is not highly regarded in our discipline” (p. 128; although see the rejoinder by Pollock et al., 1996). Makau (1996, p. 140) argued for an “invitational approach to communication practice and pedagogy” rather than what she called the “adversarial model” implicit in Frey, Pearce et al. (cf. Frey’s, 2006a, criticism of the invitational approach to social change). Finally, Olson and Olson (2003) contended that the litmus test of “usable knowledge” in the approach of Frey, Pearce, et al. unduly restricted acceptable social justice communication research to “short-term case studies aimed at immediately measurable outcomes produced by the researcher him- or herself, qualities that do not necessarily match the complex nature of problems of social in(justice)” (p. 438). Hence, although communication activism for social justice is a significant form of applied communication scholarship, it is not without controversy and debate.
Conclusion

Applied communication scholarship has come a long way in the past few decades, scaling many heights and traversing many valleys as scholars engaged in great debates and confronted deep divides. These controversies and contestations included (1) establishing applied communication as a research endeavor, (2) linking theory and application, (3) using the wide range of methodologies to produce rigorous and relevant research, and (4) confronting the chasm between observation-oriented and intervention-oriented (and especially social justice activist) applied communication scholarship. Thus, as is the case for any developing field of study, applied communication research has addressed issues related to “finding identity, contesting foci, debating an agenda, [and] elaborating methods” (Seibold, 2008, p. 189). In confronting these issues, like Odysseus in Greek mythology, who maneuvered between Scylla and Charybdis, the two sea monsters situated on the opposite sides of the narrow Strait of Messina, applied communication scholars have navigated some treacherous waters. What emerged from that process is a well-respected form of scholarship that, as Seibold (2000) maintained, may have started as an extension of the communication field but increasingly has become a reflection of the purpose, potential, and promise of communication research to make an important difference in the world. Although debates about this scholarship undoubtedly will continue, the legitimacy, quality, and value of applied communication scholarship is no longer debatable.

Notes

1. Although (grant) funding always has been an important impetus for applied (communication) research, its impact never has been adequately appreciated or addressed. Some scholars undoubtedly became advocates for applied communication research as they evolved from nonfunded, laboratory-based basic researchers focused primarily on theoretical questions to funded, field-oriented applied researchers interested in practical problems (with theoretical implications), such as G. R. Miller's shift from laboratory research on persuasion and attitude change to applied research on videotaped courtroom testimony. With the exception of consulting, the significance of funding for applied communication research, including its enabling and constraining effects, however, has been virtually ignored; indeed, in contrast to the many articles in JACR about consulting, not a single article about funding appeared in that journal until a 2002 special forum on it (Buller & Slater, 2002). One reason for this omission may be that, with some exceptions, prominent figures who have shaped applied communication scholarship do not have a history of sustained, continuous, peer-reviewed, externally funded, (often) large-scale grant research from government agencies or philanthropic foundations. Moreover, those who have a record of very fine, fully funded applied communication research (for some specific people and projects, see the essays in Buller & Slater, 2002) typically have not served in leadership roles in the field (e.g., as JACR editor), contributed to debates about this scholarship, or necessarily published their work in JACR (and there is no list of publications resulting from such funding). This difference in funded applied communication research experience, especially in the current university climate promoting research funding, suggests another divide that has not (yet) been bridged. As Rogers (2002) maintained, “One can think of two categories of communication scholars: Those who conduct funded research versus those who do not” (p. 342).

2. Boyer (1990), for instance, proposed four forms of scholarship: discovery, integration, application, and teaching. The scholarship of application is designed to answer the question, “How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?” (Boyer, p. 21).

3. Other terms used to differentiate these two forms of scholarship include (corresponding to basic and applied, respectively) discipline and policy (Coleman, cited in Lazarsfeld & Reitz, 1975; with Craig, 1995, using the term disciplinary), and conclusion oriented and decision oriented (Tukey, 1960).
4. It should be noted that basic communication researchers routinely have been criticized (by themselves and others) for borrowing theories whole cloth or deriving their theories from other social sciences (see, e.g., Slater, 2002).

5. Stokes (1999) articulated a similar 2 × 2 matrix for categorizing scientific research using “quests for fundamental understanding” and “consideration of use” to identify the four categories of (a) explanation of the particular (low on both), (b) pure basic research (high on understanding, low on use), (c) pure applied research (low on understanding, high on use), and (d) use-inspired basic research (high on both).

6. Although some research methods textbooks in communication included qualitative methods, their coverage paled in comparison to quantitative methods and occurred after quantitative methods had been explained, thereby framing those methods through that lens.

7. Qualitative methods were employed in some early speech disorder research published in communication journals (e.g., Brown & Oliver, 1939; Steer, 1935) but virtually disappeared from communication journals until the 1970s.

8. K. I. Miller and Koesten may have engaged in these activities but not reported them, although JACR welcomes such information, unlike some journals in which applied communication scholarship is published that may ask authors to remove such information to discuss in more detail the development of theory (Cissna, 2000).

9. Krayer (1988) pointed out that the camps for deciding who has the responsibility for applied results are...divided. One view could be that academicians write for academicians and if laypeople cannot understand an article, they are at fault for not having the education or background to do so. Another view is that providing practical-based advice concerning how to use certain findings is as an inherent a part of a journal article as the method or results section or providing information about how the results affect theory or add to the body of knowledge. (p. 341)

10. Petronio (1999, p. 89) identified “interventions, training, distribution, and instruction” as potential ways to convert research findings into practices that benefit people, but she was suggesting translational activities that occurred after applied communication research had been conducted rather than being the initial basis for such research.

11. Other applied communication scholars may have conducted interventions as part of community service but did not write about them for scholarly publication.

12. The notion of activist scholarship resonates in other disciplines (e.g., G. L. Anderson & Herr, 2007; Hale, 2008; Lempert, 2001; Woodhouse, Hess, Breyman, & Martin, 2002), and there is a listserv for it (https://lists.riseup.net/www/info/activistscholarship).
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