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Collaborative tagging

- Users add metadata/keywords to shared content on the web

- Different types of collaborative tagging: author-derived, editor-derived, authoritarian or user-assigned

- Different functions: to describe content, to categorize information for browsing & searching, users interact with information, exposure, voicing opinion, personal management, mashups. Primary use is to find the item again

- Social tagging studies examine HOW and WHY users tag an item a certain way
Tagging issues and application developments

Issues:
- No control of synonyms
- No control for grammatical forms, plural vs singular; noun vs adjective
- Potentially unhelpful personal tags
- Multi-lingual environment

Developments:
- LibraryThing provides for mapping equivalent terms which reduces duplication
- Zigtag maps tags to concepts to distinguish terms, apple (fruit) vs Apple (corporation), reduces confusion
- Frickr provides geotagging photos to Google maps
Previous studies of tagging behavior

Guy and Tonkin (2006); Marlow, Naaman, boyd & Davis (2006); Ames & Naaman (2007); Kipp (2007)

Golder and Huberman (2006) studied Del.icio.us users

- Tagging is about sensemaking. Information is categorized and labeled; highly personal as categories are not well defined or part of established taxonomies
- Found tags are used to identify what or who it is about; what it is; who owns it; describe qualities or characteristics; self-serving; task oriented
- Significant amount of tagging done for personal use rather than public benefit
- Users have a strong bias toward first using general tags
- Although a great variety of tags are used, minority views can coexist alongside popular ones without disrupting stable consensus choices by many users
Previous studies of tagging behavior

Wetterstrom (2008) and Rolla (2009) studied LibraryThing users

- Users assigned many more tags than professional catalogers; Wetterstrom’s users had 24.4, Rolla’s users had 42.78
- Users used many personal or individual terms, generally not useful for others
- Tags show how users think and feel (opinion) about book/subjects
- User’s tags included more general and broad terms
Comparative study of tagging: Flickr and ArtsConnectEd

Beaudoin (2007) studied Flickr users

- Looked for common patterns of tag use and what types of information users associated with their tags
- Categorized tags into 18 categories, based on concepts, grammar and affective terms
- Found named geographic locations used most frequently, followed by compound terms, thing, person, event
Beaudoin’s 18 categories in descending order of use:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Place-named</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Compound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thing (non-living)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Photographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Place-general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Living thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Poetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Emotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ArtsConnectEd (ACE) Study

- Controlled study, users were members of cataloging class, not tagging personal items

- Assignment: select an ACE work and tag it, explain why certain tags were chosen, compare tags with LCSH, a controlled vocabulary

- 31 instances of tagging a work, 256 tags used

- Range: 1 to 13 tags per work, average 6 tags per work

- Used Beaudoin’s 18 categories for comparison
ArtsConnectEd category usage in descending order:

1. Compound (26.56%)
2. Thing (non-living) (25.39%)
3. Person (13.28%)
4. Place-named (8.59%)
5. Photographic (5.86%)
6. Language (4.3%)
7. Time (3.52%)
8. Event (3.13%)
9. Rating (evaluation) (2.73%)
10. Living thing (2.73%)
11. Adjective (2.73%)
12. Place-general (2.34%)
13. Verb (0.78%)
14. Poetic (0.39%)
15. Humor (0.0%)
16. Number (0.0%)
17. Emotion (0.0%)
18. Unknown (0.0%)
ArtsConnectEd (ACE) Study Findings

- Organizing tags into categories was subjective & difficult
- Beaudoin’s model was moderately effective in describing and categorizing tags
- Compound and language terms were counted in two categories
- ACE most frequently used category for tagging was “Compound” suggesting users found single word tags inadequate for describing the work
- Next most used categories were: Inanimate things, Persons, and Place-named
- Beaudoin’s taggers and ACE taggers matched in the four highest used categories: Place-named, Compound, Thing (non-living), and Person
Tagging example

http://www.artsconnected.org/resource/19324/baroque-mexico

eexample of use of language, thing, person, compound tags
ArtsConnectEd (ACE) Users Comments

- I wanted to use tags that people might actually use
- I did not want to interpret the work, only describe it
- I found tagging overly simplistic
- I wanted to stick to pretty basic tags to describe the work
- I wanted to delete mine and others tags
- It was nice to have the liberty to add anything, but scary too
- Great idea to allow users to participate in the creation of access points
- Found tags and LCSH to be similar and where different LCSH was more specific
- Found LCSH terms that a user would not search under
ArtsConnectEd (ACE) Study Findings

Focus on users

- Users tagged differently, exo-tagging – unlike endo-tagging or tagging a social site with personal finding purpose, content for user had different meaning; evidence no humor, emotion or unknown tags
- Perceived themselves as novices not experts; some researched work before tagging it; evidence modest use of time, event and rating tags
- HOW users tagged: objectively and conservatively - used names and descriptive tags
- Motivation: WHY users tagged: for someone else - for others to find
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