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Are Web 2.0 tools and technologies changing how and why scholars annotate their research sources? We begin to answer this question by current technology and tools that support new functions for research of one of the most common scholarly research activity: taking notes. The results suggest a new approach to personalized information retrieval.

Introduction and Research Questions

• Taking notes has always been one of the most common activities performed by scholars.
• Since Medieval Age [1], paper-based annotation practices have changed in the kind of marks applied – from glosses in the margins to sticky notes, from the use of the nib strokes to highlighting with colors – but have not changed significantly in the function they perform.
• Essentially, the creators’ intention has not changed much over the centuries.

So… In trying to answer the question “what is the purpose/function of annotation?” we could say:

Drawing attention to a particular portion of the text, and attaching personal context/content to the text

However…

• Is it still true that annotation functions are basically unchanged when we change the medium from fixed paper to more fluid digital resources?
• Moreover, is the possibility of annotating content in a Web 2.0 networked environment changing the nature the annotation practice itself?

Research Framework

The first systematic attempt to classify annotations from a functional perspective was Renear et al. with their Functional Taxonomy of Annotation [12].

Renear’s study was intended to support the development of digital annotation able to fulfill at best the functions that were already established on the paper medium.

This research extend the Functional Taxonomy of Annotation to the Web 2.0 environment.

Five different annotation tools that comply with the “web as a platform” paradigm were reviewed. Most of them extend the functionalities of the browser and are implemented via the Firefox Web Browser extension system (Diigo, SparTag), as a Greasemonkey script (ShiftNote) or as a Bookmarklet (Diigo, SharedCopy), only one (Annotate) is a full-featured server-side web application that requires only the browser itself.

Annotation…

The Functional Taxonomy of Annotation [12] provided a framework of six macro-categories of annotation functions:

A – Recording and Scheduling Reading
B – Basic Highlighting
C – Commentary
D – Classification
E – Copyediting / Editing / Joint Authoring
F – Speech Acts

… Evolution

G – Selecting and Clustering

Instantiate relations among annotations through their metadata / tagging systems

Cluster logical component of texts exploiting the relations in the overlaying annotation graph

Retrieve the relevant annotated texts over your “personalized” annotation network

Observations and discussion

• All annotation objects can be enriched with descriptive metadata, tagged, shared, retrieved, aggregated, and clustered independently from the target resource;
• Annotations can themselves be the target of further annotations [6], therefore the annotation network is multi-layer;
• Web 2.0 environment annotation systems share features with the already established social bookmarking and social tagging systems [4, 5, 14] integrating them as scholarly communication tools.

Moreover…

• Annotation objects form a distinct network where links are established on the basis of shared properties of the annotations;
• Every annotation object now support multiple trail function;
• Folksonomy over shared annotations can extend the annotation network at a community level.

These relations can be – and in fact are – exploited to support new annotation functions

A new function category

Understanding the notes-to-notes relations supported by these new tools suggests extending Renear’s taxonomy with at least one new fundamental category:

Selecting and Clustering

• Scholars take advantage of the annotation metadata – in particular the note-level tagging system – to instantiate relations among annotations;
• The overlaying annotation graph reflects a connection between the annotated portions of texts;
• The established relations are exploited to cluster and retrieve selected logical components of the text over the network.

Summarizing,…

• Clustering annotations enables the subsequent grouping and retrieval of selected fragments of text, creating new, transversal, and semantically enriched reading-paths across documents.
• This is a new approach to personalized information retrieval, and can be considered a first level of strategic reading, i.e. move
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