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**Dictionary 3.0**

The name of the project, "Dictionary 3.0" places it in a developmental progression of lexicographic strategies from print (D1), to web- or electronic–media-based (D2), and then to what the PI refers to as D2.5 "attempts to utilize the multimedia power of Web 2.0" (Wordia and Vidtionary are specifically mentioned) and then to this project's Dictionary 3.0 approach where "word meaning will be illustrated via video rich in physical and social context clearly depict meaning (sic)". Funding is sought to create the database structure and user interfaces, including tutorials. Subsequent development will create substantive materials for D3 through both paid staff activity and crowdsourcing among the general public.

 D3 is presented as a potential "powerful reference tool for students, adult second language learners, and life-long learners, essentially anyone". However, there is another potential audience: those (historical lexicographers, sociolinguists) who document and study innovative shifts and varying patterns of word use: "As clips will be culled from video produced over the last 100 years it will also provide scholars with a historical database of language usage".

 To begin, the major differences between this D3 initiative and the extant D2.5 resources (Wordia and Vidtionary) is not clear (except, hopefully, better editorial content control). A quick review of the material on Wordia an dVidtionary is enough to convince this reviewer that Hamilton is wise to distance D3 from these extant multimedia, web-based, crowd-sourced dictionaries (which are not only confusing but often puerile).

 When developing a dictionary project it is best to have a very clear idea of who will use the dictionary, in what context and to what end. For example, when writing while online I often access a thesaurus (an onomasiological tool) because at the moment I am interested in production of text not reception. Or, if I am particular about a grammatical point I might access a usage dictionary. As a learner of Spanish I might be interested in a bilingual dictionary. But the type of bilingual dictionary entry I need for decoding (as an L2 speaker) is different than that of a Spanish speaker interested in encoding L2. In the present proposal the target audience is not defined beyond the general claim that it would serve a wide range of users. I do not think, however, that D3 (monolingual in English) would be useful for early stage language learners and I think that more advanced learners might find more useful some of the more innovative print dictionaries (e.g., Cobuild).

 One of the problems of video, as opposed to crowd-sourced text contributions such as Wikipedia and Wiktionary is that video is not anonymous. I would be worried about the dictionary entry becoming more about the creator than the content. I realize that there will be editorial control, but I am not sanguine about the quality of the contributions and the ability of create a critical density of material that will attract users beyond those curious for a look (much as I spent about 15 non-edifying minutes on Wordia).

 I would have also liked to see (online) some examples of the types of 500 videos that Hamilton proposes to create. I have read several print lexicography proposals in the past and am often taken by the absence of sample entries: the lack of a clear exposition of how entries would be structured and the paucity of substantive examples of content. It is clear from the presentation of the Crowdsourcing app that Hamilton has a clear idea of the structure of the entries ("word, definition, sample sentence, video url, and contact information"). In many ways, however, this is quite traditional, with the exception of the video.

 It would be possible, perhaps, to create a proposal that would be competitive. To do this I would suggest the following steps:

 1. Clearly indicate who the potential users are and be very clear (and not just anecdotally) as to how the D3 project will meet their specific needs. As McCreary is part of the team it would be helpful for a clear statement of how D3 meets the needs of language learners should these be the targeted users.

 2. Create several sample entries that would be placed online.

 3. Discuss how D3 would be different than the D2.5 projects that are already online.

 4. Discuss any possible inclusion of words that are either challenging to define through video (e.g., 'caveat') or for which video adds little value above that of the illustrations found in a visual dictionary (e.g. 'mast'). There is also the question (which comes up in considering 'spooky') as to whether most English speakers will know the word before they will be accessing online resources. I do think that certain videos would be helpful for children language learners (e.g., 'spooky') but I think that it would be unwise to crowdsource the content instead one might have professionals develop "entrie" for a focused basic vocabulary resource. Again, the question arises as to the targeted audience/users and creating a consistency across the entries that serve this group.

 **Overview**

Intellectual significance: The D3 dictionary while it may be useful, if property executed, to a given audience (and once this audience is identified the mechanisms for creating the D3 entries need to be refined based on the needs of this audience), its general intellectual impact on the humanities will be slight.

Impact on research and technology: It is not likely that this project will stimulate new humanities research.

Innovation: Despite the claim of a new level of lexicography (D3) the project is not much different than other efforts out there.

Proposal development: The proposal is well presented.

Feasibility: The project is feasible in terms of execution.

Qualifications: The team is qualified to undertake the project.