

The “Our” Mentality

Open Access is a model of communication that relaxes accessibility to results of research. Times are changing, and we are moving from the age of searching through tons of physical data to a more comfortable digital form of accessibility. As other areas of disciplines evolve, so does history, and open access research has become a more emphasized conversation. McDaniel discussed in his article on open history that **open** can mean two different things. [Some people take the concept of open to mean sharing once the research is either dead or complete, while some allow for collaborative work as the research proceeds towards completion.](#) These two different ideologies behind openness guided my thoughts as I continued to navigate the readings. Caleb posed a question, asking what it might look like to have open access to source codes from the start to the finish of a project. This question is reflected on in the other articles which made the annotation made by [Shannon](#) stand out to me.

This seems counterintuitive to me. Why should someone else waste their time collecting data when someone else has already done it? It could be so much easier to build on what’s already out there if it was already available...

Digitally Connected

writing practices mystify the labor writing takes.” Under the same breath, I’d say most academics are full of pride; there’s that instinct to produce good works, not only good but “ours.”

In the end, we are reminded that everyone needs to make a living and it’s unfortunate that it sometimes is at the expense of open access. I’d like to see grants and funding options from government and other agencies supporting researchers, so there’s less hesitation to be so tight-mouthed with research data.