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



This annotation was particularly interesting to me as research can be so tasking sometimes and a lot of people get discouraged when they continuously have to sift through a lot of data to be able to facilitate their own. Not to say that we should completely ignore the process of research or allow anyone to "cheat" their way through. But if the information is available, what's the harm in sharing? There's this mentality of "my" research in academic; everyone is laying claim on data because they were able to bring that data together to make sense. But this data is out there for consumption and use, and it happened that you perhaps got there first. I can understand the need to lay claim/ownership on your work especially after putting a countless amount of hours into it, but open access allows development of new ideas and the enhancement of old ideas to occur under a shorter time span.

There's also the issue of plagiarism! Credit needs to be given where it's due. This is where ethics comes into play. Academia sometimes is about dirty competition. A race to some end; who can publish first, who can make the most of their work etc.; in the words of Michelle Moravec, "Academic

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.