Two reflections on Janet Fulk, Peter Monge, and the future of communication research.

I'm going to spend my four minutes working up to two reflections on the topic at hand.
I am not, as the program suggests, Aaron Shaw because I am Benjamin Mako Hill. But I am here in his place as a representative of the Community Data Science Collective which I started with Aaron.
The collective is a multi-institution network with students and faculty at the University of Washington (where I am) and Northwestern University, the University of North Carolina, Carleton College, and (in a few months) Purdue.
Our research focuses on the production of communal public goods and the social and communicative dynamics that support the production, organization, and maintenance of knowledge bases and online communities.
This is a sampling of the communities we've studied. They are all online communities involved in the collaborative production of knowledge bases and as sites for connections. And today, these types of communities are producing some of the world's most popular and important information goods (like Wikipedia and Linux).
Many of you will realize that the term we use to describe our work is a concept defined by Janet and Peter and it's difficult to overstate the importance of their work in the context of our group. None of the founding members of the collective have PhD's in communication.

And although none of us has worked with Janet or Peter directly, I think it's not exaggeration to say that the work our group is housed in communication departments, published in communication journals, is producing a new generation of communication scholars, because of Janet and Peter. Not just this study, but their body of work.

We came to communication from sociology, organization science, and computing because the best theoretical tools for understanding the organization of knowledge bases and online communities are communication theories. And they are communication theories in large part because Janet and Peter were involved in much of the most important work.
1. The path to the future of communication research was created by Janet and Peter.
This is a picture of the whiteboard in my lab at UW as it has been for the last year or so.

Kaylea Champion, a PhD student at UW explained that there were “three successive heuristics for graduate school.”
DYR

Do Your Research

DYR is Do Your Research is reminder that one will be judged by one's research output. This is obviously a criteria by which Janet and Peter will do very well.
ATOTI is “Also True On The Internet” and it's cautionary acronym. It's a thing not to do.

Understanding that things that are true offline are also true online has been an important part of Internet research. But we should aspire to go further beyond that, especially with several decades of such research behind us.

One of the most important features of Janet and Peter's work about the Internet is that it is never ATOTI. And not only because quite a bit of was before the Internet was widespread.

Janet and Peter's has used technology, and Internet-mediated communication, as opportunities to build new theory about organization in general. We aspire to follow their lead.
AAPMDITYA

As Always Peter Monge Did It Twenty Years Ago

For example, there was that time that we were struggling with framing hypotheses about dynamic organizational processes... And then found a Peter published paper about it in 1990. The third or fourth time this happened, somebody wrote it on the board to help short-circuit the process.

As Kaylea explained over chat last week (and I paraphrase) "When you're stuck, don't worry. Peter and Janet solved your problem for you when you kindergarten."
2.

When we arrive in the future, Janet and Peter are waiting for us.

And so my second reflection is really a prediction:
When we arrive at the future of communication research—Janet and Peter are weirdly somehow already there.