Assumptions about Social Tagging

Stephan Doerfel, Daniel Zoller, Philipp Singer, Thomas Niebler, Andreas Hotho and Markus Strohmaier

Social

How **social** is social tagging? Do users **(re)use resources** that have been shared and tagged **by others**?



The pie chart shows the request shares to the (logged-in user's) own content, to content from other users, or to general

Popularity

Does the popularity of a user/resource/tag in **posts** match its popularity in **requests**?

Analysis Assumption Behavior Popularity in posts is used BibSonomy blog bookmark - in recommendations, bookmarking citation correlation equality Folksonomy fun java keyword - in rankings, and LogFiles myown Popularity - in tag clouds. Sharing Social Tagging User Web WWW Distribution of tag requests posts frequencies in posts 10⁵ and resources. 10^{4} Empirical data requ 卫 10³ Power law requests Lognormal requests PL exp. cutoff request 10² Empirical data posts Power law posts 10^1 Lognormal posts PL exp. cutoff post Fits of candidate 10⁰ 10^{3} 10^{4} distributions to 10^{1} 102 104 10^{0} 10^{3} the cumulative requency tag frequency distributions. Tags with occurrences in requests and occurrences in posts **Results:** - similar results for resources, users, and tags - frequency distributions are heavy-tailed and similar in posts and requests # requests - on the level of individual tags



The histogram shows how resources are posted: through manual input, through a bookmarklet, through copying posts, or through other methods (extremely small share).

Results:

Visit

- in a large number of requests (32%) users target content of others
- the majority of requests (68%) target a user's own pages

Copied Posts

- 11% of all posts have been copied from other users
- if a post's resource had already been shared publicly, in 42% of the cases, that post was created as a copy

Copied Tags

- tags are adopted frequently (at least one tag in 42% of all copies)
- 44% of those copied posts, where no tag of the original post was used, had only special tags (e.g. "imported")
- user's own vocabulary was used in
- 87% of all copy requests



Summary

- visit and copy requests reveal a strong interest in other users' content
- a larger part of system interaction happens with the own collection

Equality

Are users, resources, and tags equally important?

Analyzing the Bookmarking System BibSonomy



and Request Logs



Abstract	Of course we share! Testing Assun
Social tagging systems have established themselves as an	Tagging System A Case Study of the Social Tagging St
important part in today's web and have attracted the interest	Stephan Deorful Dearist Zator Strong Gazani Associa Deraway Monther, Germany doartog Cause Association
overall vision of our community is that simply through	Thomas Makker 1-9 Browers of Broker 1-9 Browers of Broker 1-0 Brokers and Brokers 1-0 Brokers 1-1 Broker
interactions with the system, i.e., through tagging and sharing of resources, users would contribute to building more Tags	ADDREAT both suggestions are matched denotes as an intervention of the second parts and a second and the second parts and a second and the second parts and a second parts and
2014 analysis assumptions bibsonomy	The sector of th
data folksonomy log myown share	K.1.1 Judicanzing Holman and Bracinal, Harman and Lation Algorithm Roberts Krywards Krywards and taging insurant instantial formation (1997) and taging insurant and t

social tagging testing weblog

tem BioSonomy Price Singer Independently for Ind

the paper, or size to region their association towards assault to been lipiding complete using its discusse", a second singular prices, on association pro-

to Evaluate Assumptions about Social Tagging

occurrences in posts and in requests

moderate correlation between

we observe only weak or

especially for tags it is surprising that there is no stronger correlation, given that tags are presented to the user in clouds reflecting popularity

Retrieval

Do users **retrieve** their posts and tags later on?









60.07

The transition graph shows that self-transitions are dominant, whereas intercategory transitions occur very rarely and are also distributed unequally.

Results:

- the numbers of requests to tags and resources are similar
- requests to users dominate requests to resources and tags
- there are far less users than resources or tags, thus this imbalance in requests is even more surprising

Results:

- about 49% of all publications are revisited by their owner at least once
- only 17% of used tags are queried at least once
- publications and tags are mostly revisited only once
- revisits often take place shortly (within a day) after a resource/tag has been posted

٩ŋ ENDOWED CHAIR OF THE HERTIE FOUNDATION Knowledge and Data Engineering **oo** ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING & COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF KASSEL







