The Second Layer

How Tagging Transforms Hierarchical File Systems into Contextual Knowledge Networks

The Second Layer

How Tagging Transforms Hierarchical File Systems into Contextual Knowledge Networks

Michiel A.M. Arens

My thanks go to Ruud Duivenvoorden and Johan Goosen.
Without their critical attitude and their incredible dedication to the work they carried out for this book, it would not have come into being.

Author: Michiel A.M. Arens
ISBN 9789403881348
First edition
April 2026

Publisher: Uitgeverij Jupiter
Email: uitgeverij@jupiternederland.nl

CIO Foreword

By Paul Wyman, Chief Information Officer

In my career, I have overseen multiple digital transformation initiatives. Most promised efficiency. Some delivered incremental improvements. Few addressed the structural foundation of how organizations manage knowledge.
This book does.

For decades, enterprise file systems have relied on hierarchical containment as their primary organizing principle. That approach is not flawed — but it is incomplete. It was designed for a world in which information moved slowly, projects were more linear, and organizational boundaries were clearer.
That world no longer exists.

Today's enterprises operate in networks of interdependence. Strategic initiatives cut across departments. Regulatory requirements intersect with operational execution. Regional decisions influence global risk exposure. Yet our digital infrastructure still assumes that information belongs in one place.

Tagging introduces a contextual layer that complements hierarchy. It does not dismantle structure; it enriches it. By embedding multi-dimensional attributes directly into documents, organizations gain visibility without restructuring their entire archive.

From a CIO perspective, the value is threefold:

First, tagging reduces structural fragility. Strategy shifts no longer require wholesale reorganization of folder trees.

Second, tagging improves traceability. Audit and compliance readiness become systemic rather than reactive.

Third, tagging lays groundwork for intelligent systems. Artificial intelligence relies on structured metadata. Contextual tagging provides that structure.

Technology alone does not modernize organizations.
Architecture does.

This book reframes tagging not as a feature, but as architectural evolution. It challenges leaders to think beyond containment and toward contextual integration.

That shift is overdue.

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Tagging as a Structural Upgrade for Modern Knowledge Work

The Problem

- Modern professionals operate in environments characterized by:
- Overlapping projects
- Cross-functional collaboration
- Increasing regulatory layers
- Rapidly shifting priorities
- Growing volumes of digital information

Yet most digital file systems remain organized primarily through hierarchical folders — a model inherited from physical filing cabinets. Hierarchies are effective for containment but inadequate for multi-dimensional retrieval. They force exclusive placement, increase cognitive friction, and obscure cross-boundary connections.
The result is:

- Time lost searching
- Repeated structural reorganization
- Duplication of files
- Reduced visibility across initiatives
- Increased cognitive load

The issue is not information volume. It is structural misalignment.

The Core Argument
This book argues that Tagging should be understood not merely as a feature, but as a structural upgrade.
Tagging introduces a second layer of organization based on context rather than location.
While folders answer:
“Where does this belong?”
Tags answer:
“What is this related to?”

This shift enables:

- Multi-dimensional classification
- Recognition-based retrieval
- Cross-boundary visibility
- Reduced decision fatigue
- Greater adaptability over time

The optimal system is hybrid:
Folders provide stability.
Tags provide flexibility.
Together, they reflect the reality of modern networked work.

Theoretical Foundation
Tagging is supported by multiple research domains:

- **Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller)**: Reduces extraneous decision effort.
- **Spreading Activation (Collins & Loftus)**: Aligns with associative memory.
- **Recognition vs Recall (Tulving)**: Supports more efficient retrieval.
- **Network Theory (Barabási, Watts)**: Mirrors interconnected systems.
- **Behavioral Economics (Kahneman, Thaler)**: Explains adoption barriers.
- **Knowledge Management Research (Alavi & Leidner; Davenport & Prusak)**: Emphasizes metadata-driven retrieval and cultural reinforcement.

Tagging aligns with both cognitive architecture and organizational complexity.

Practical Implementation
The book provides:

- A step-by-step introduction strategy
- A five-dimension tagging framework:
    - Entity
    - Initiative
    - Stage
    - Time
    - Theme
- Guidelines for avoiding over-tagging
- Governance principles for collaborative environments
- Integration methods within Windows-based workflows
- Advanced portfolio and risk management use cases

The emphasis is gradual adoption, minimal complexity, and consistent habit formation.

Strategic Implications
For leaders and organizations, tagging delivers:

- Faster executive preparation
- Portfolio-level visibility
- Improved audit readiness
- Cross-functional transparency
- Reduced structural reorganization
- Lower cognitive friction across teams

Tagging transforms the file system from static archive into contextual intelligence layer.

Final Insight
The central insight of this book is simple but structural:
Folders are not wrong.
They are insufficient alone.
In an era defined by digital complexity and networked interdependence, organizations require systems that combine hierarchical stability with contextual flexibility.
Tagging is that second layer.

When implemented thoughtfully, it is not a minor efficiency gain.
It is architectural modernization.

Signature Idea

The fundamental problem of modern digital work is not the volume of information we manage. It is the structure we use to manage it.
Hierarchical folders were designed for a world in which information moved slowly and belonged to clear categories.
Today's work operates as a network of relationships—projects intersect, initiatives overlap, and documents connect to multiple contexts simultaneously.
When we force this networked reality into a rigid tree structure, friction appears.
Tagging introduces a second layer of organization that reflects how work actually happens: not as a set of isolated containers, but as a web of meaningful connections.

Core Thesis

Folders are not wrong. They are simply insufficient for the complexity of modern work.
As knowledge work becomes increasingly networked, dynamic, and multi-dimensional, hierarchical file structures can no longer carry the cognitive load we place upon them. Tagging introduces a second layer of organization — one based on context rather than location — that aligns digital systems with the associative way human memory actually functions.

This book argues that tagging is not merely a feature, but a structural upgrade in how we think, retrieve, and manage information.

Who This Book Is For

This book is written for professionals who feel that managing digital information has become harder than it should be.
It is for people who spend time searching for documents they know exist, restructuring folders that once made sense but no longer do, and navigating file systems that struggle to reflect the complexity of modern work.
The central idea of this book is simple: the way we organize digital information has not evolved at the same pace as the work we now perform.

Professionals Managing Complexity
This book is particularly relevant for professionals whose work spans multiple contexts simultaneously:

- project managers coordinating cross-functional initiatives
- consultants managing multiple client engagements
- knowledge workers handling complex documentation
- analysts and strategists working across teams and departments

In these environments, documents rarely belong to a single category. They connect to projects, clients, timeframes, strategic themes, and regulatory frameworks at the same time.
Traditional folder systems struggle to represent this complexity. Tagging introduces a second layer of organization that makes these relationships visible.

Leaders Responsible for Information Architecture
The ideas in this book are also relevant for leaders responsible for digital structure within organizations:

- CIOs and IT leaders designing information environments
- knowledge management professionals
- digital transformation leaders
- operations and governance teams responsible for document systems

For these roles, tagging is not merely a convenience feature. It represents a structural improvement in how organizations retrieve, connect, and interpret information.

Individuals Building Personal Systems

Finally, this book is useful for individuals seeking to create more effective personal knowledge systems.

Even without enterprise platforms or complex software, the principles of contextual organization can dramatically improve how professionals manage their own files and archives.

What This Book Is Not

This is not a technical manual.

It does not attempt to replace existing enterprise systems, nor does it propose abandoning hierarchical folders entirely.

Instead, it explores how a contextual layer can complement hierarchy—transforming file systems from static storage structures into flexible knowledge environments.

The Core Question

If modern work operates as a network of relationships rather than a simple hierarchy, then our information systems must reflect that reality. This book explores how tagging can provide that missing layer.

Core Ideas of the Book

Folders are not wrong. They are simply insufficient for the complexity of modern work.
Hierarchical organization provides stability, but modern information environments require an additional layer of contextual connection.

Tagging does not replace hierarchy; it complements it.
Folders provide containment. Tags provide context. Together they create a hybrid structure capable of handling complexity.

Information rarely belongs to one place. It belongs to multiple contexts simultaneously.
Tagging allows those contexts to coexist without forcing artificial prioritization.

The true purpose of organization is not storage. It is retrieval.
Systems should be designed around how people find information, not merely where they place it.

Tagging transforms the file system from a static archive into a contextual intelligence layer.
When documents carry meaningful attributes, patterns emerge across projects, teams, and time.

PART I: When structure starts to fail

There is a moment in most professional lives when something subtle begins to feel heavier than it should.
It is not dramatic.
Nothing crashes.
No system collapses.
But friction increases.
You search longer than expected.
You duplicate a file “just in case.”
You hesitate before saving because you are unsure where it belongs.
You restructure folders for the third time in two years.
At first, this feels personal.
Disorganization.
Lack of discipline.
Too many projects.
But what if the problem is not behavioral?
What if the structure itself is misaligned with the way modern work actually functions?

Hierarchical folders were inherited from a different era — one defined by containment. Filing cabinets. Clear departmental boundaries. Linear reporting chains. Stable categories.
That world rewarded exclusive placement.
Today’s work is different.
Projects overlap.
Initiatives intersect.
Regulations cross departments.
Decisions ripple across teams.
Information flows laterally as often as vertically.
Yet our digital infrastructure still asks a single question:
Where does this belong?
That question assumes singular identity.

Modern work is multi-dimensional.

A document may relate simultaneously to a client, a project, a regulatory framework, a strategic initiative, a fiscal quarter, and a board meeting. To force it into one location is not simplification. It is compression.
Compression creates friction.
In this first part, we examine that friction closely.
We explore:

- Why hierarchical systems feel orderly even when they conceal inefficiencies
- The hidden cognitive cost of forced categorization
- The moments that trigger professionals to seek alternatives
- The breaking point where refining the tree no longer works

This section is not about advocating tagging yet.
It is about recognizing structural misalignment.
Only when we understand why the current system strains under complexity can we responsibly explore an alternative.
Folders are not wrong.
But they may no longer be sufficient.

1 The Quiet Chaos of Digital Files

The Missing Layer of Organization

Folders are not wrong. They are simply insufficient.

For decades, the folder has been the dominant metaphor for digital organization. It offers clarity, containment, and the reassuring logic of hierarchy. A document lives inside a folder; that folder lives inside another; and so on, until everything has its assigned place. The structure resembles a tree: stable, orderly, and easy to visualize.

When digital work was simpler, this metaphor worked remarkably well. Projects were linear. Teams were small. Information moved at a manageable pace. A document typically belonged to one category, and retrieving it meant remembering where you had placed it.

But the nature of work has changed.

Today, most professionals operate in environments that are fluid rather than linear. A single document may relate to a client, a strategic initiative, a financial quarter, a regulatory requirement, and an internal team — all at the same time. Projects overlap. Roles blur. Collaboration spans departments and time zones. Information is no longer static; it evolves, branches, and recombines.

Yet despite this complexity, we continue to rely primarily on hierarchical folder structures designed for a different era.

The result is subtle but pervasive friction. We hesitate before saving a file because we are unsure where it “belongs.” We duplicate documents to satisfy multiple contexts. We reorganize folder trees every few months in an attempt to restore clarity. We search through nested directories, hoping that recognition will replace memory. Over time, this friction becomes normalized. We accept it as the unavoidable cost of digital work.

But what if the problem is not the volume of information we manage, but the structure we use to manage it?

The folder system assumes that each item has one proper location. Modern work rarely conforms to that assumption. Information today is multi-dimensional. It exists within networks of relationships rather than single branches of a tree. When we force it into exclusive categories, we create tension between the structure and reality.

Tagging offers a different approach.

Instead of asking, “Where does this belong?” tagging asks, “What is this related to?” A document can be associated with multiple contexts simultaneously: a client, a project phase, a priority level, a year, a status. None of these associations compete for ownership. They coexist. Retrieval becomes a matter of filtering by relevant attributes rather than navigating a rigid path.

This shift may appear small, but it represents a fundamental change in how we think about organization. It replaces location-based storage with context-based retrieval. It transforms classification from an exclusive decision into an inclusive one. Most importantly, it reduces the cognitive load associated with managing information in complex environments.

Interestingly, many professionals already experience the power of tagging — often without naming it as such. In email systems, labels allow a message to be associated with multiple categories. In knowledge management tools, tags create flexible connections between ideas. These environments feel intuitive because they align with how memory works: through association, not strict hierarchy.

However, when professionals return to their primary file systems — especially within Windows environments — they often encounter limitations.

Tagging is either restricted to certain file types or insufficiently integrated into daily workflows. As a result, the benefits of contextual organization remain fragmented across applications rather than embedded in the core structure of digital work.

This book exists to address that gap.
It introduces tagging not as a technical feature, but as a conceptual framework for organizing complexity. It explores the theoretical foundations of context-based organization, including cognitive science, network thinking, and the evolution of knowledge work. It then translates these principles into practical steps for implementing tagging in everyday professional environments. Finally, it examines how tagging can be integrated directly into Windows File Explorer through dedicated tools, enabling a seamless second layer of organization.

The goal is not to eliminate folders.
Hierarchies remain useful for broad structure and containment. The goal is to complement them with a contextual layer that reflects the true nature of modern work.
When folders are supported by tags, organization becomes less about placement and more about meaning. Retrieval becomes faster, decisions about storage become simpler, and the mental effort associated with digital management decreases.

In a world defined by interconnected information, we need systems that acknowledge connection.

Tagging for Windows is that system.

2 The Illusion of Order

Order feels comforting.
A well-structured folder tree offers a visual representation of control. At the top level, broad categories define the main domains of activity: Clients, Finance, Marketing, Operations. Within each category, subfolders refine the classification. The deeper one navigates, the more specific the structure becomes. On the surface, everything appears contained and logical.
This structure reflects a deeply ingrained way of thinking. Hierarchies have long been used to organize knowledge, institutions, and physical archives. Libraries classify books by subject. Governments divide responsibilities into departments. Corporations establish reporting lines.

The tree structure feels stable because it mirrors many organizational systems we encounter in the physical world.
However, digital work introduces a level of complexity that stretches this model beyond its limits.
Consider a proposal document created for a major client. It relates to the client's account, to a specific project within that account, to the financial forecast for the upcoming quarter, and to a broader strategic initiative within your organization. It may also be relevant to future training materials or internal case studies. In a hierarchical folder system, the document must ultimately reside in one location. Every other potential context is secondary.
The act of saving the document therefore becomes a decision about priority: which context is most important? This decision may seem minor, but it has long-term consequences. Retrieval depends on remembering that choice. If your future self searches within a different branch of the hierarchy, the document effectively disappears until rediscovered through search or chance.

As projects multiply and relationships between them become more intricate, the folder tree expands. New subfolders are created to capture emerging categories. Old structures are archived or reorganized. Periodically, many professionals feel compelled to redesign their entire

directory system in pursuit of renewed clarity. The cycle repeats because the underlying limitation remains unchanged: the system allows only one primary location per file.
This limitation produces subtle inefficiencies. Documents are duplicated to satisfy multiple needs, creating version control challenges. Teams disagree about where shared materials should reside. Time is spent navigating rather than engaging with content. These inefficiencies rarely appear dramatic in isolation, yet collectively they consume significant cognitive energy.
The deeper issue lies in the mismatch between hierarchical structures and networked reality.

Modern knowledge work operates within overlapping systems. A single task may serve multiple objectives. A single document may inform several decisions. Relationships between pieces of information are not linear but web-like. When we impose a strict tree structure onto this web, we flatten complexity into a single dimension.

Hierarchies are powerful for containment and broad segmentation. They provide an initial framework that prevents chaos. However, when relied upon exclusively, they create the illusion of order while obscuring the multi-dimensional nature of the work itself.
Recognizing this illusion is the first step toward structural improvement. The alternative is not disorder. It is augmentation. By introducing a contextual layer — one that allows documents to be associated with multiple relevant attributes — we move closer to a system that reflects reality rather than constraining it.

Tagging for Windows provides that layer.
In the chapters that follow, we will examine why contextual association aligns more closely with human cognition and how it can be systematically introduced into professional environments without abandoning the benefits of hierarchical structure.

3 The Hidden Cost of Hierarchy

Hierarchical systems impose costs that rarely appear on balance sheets. They accumulate quietly in small increments: a few minutes spent searching for a document, a duplicated file created to avoid navigating a complex folder tree, a delayed insight because related information lives in separate branches of the structure.
Individually these moments seem trivial.
Collectively they shape how organizations think, work, and decide.
Understanding these hidden costs clarifies an important point:

Tagging for Windows is not a cosmetic improvement to folder systems. It is a structural correction.

Hierarchy remains useful for storage. But when it becomes the primary mechanism for organizing knowledge, it begins to carry a burden it was never designed to bear.
The consequences appear in several forms.

Cognitive Cost
Every time a user saves a document, a decision must be made about *where it belongs*.

Every time a document is retrieved, the user must reconstruct the path used during storage.

Where did I put it?
Projects → Client → Phase → Draft?
Or
Finance → Contracts → Client?

Each decision consumes attention.
Each reconstruction requires recall.
Each moment of hesitation introduces friction.

Over time this cognitive load accumulates. Instead of focusing on the substance of their work, people spend mental energy navigating the structure of the system itself.
What appears as a minor inconvenience becomes a steady tax on attention.

Strategic Cost
Hierarchical systems hide relationships.
A document placed under **Finance** may also belong to **Risk**, **Compliance**, and **Strategy**.
Yet a hierarchy allows only one location.
As a result, patterns that span departments remain invisible. Similar risks repeat unnoticed. Insights that could emerge from connecting information across boundaries remain hidden.
The cost here is not inefficiency.
It is **missed insight**.

Organizational Cost
Hierarchies also create coordination overhead.
Every time the structure evolves—when departments reorganize, projects multiply, or priorities shift—the folder system must be adjusted. Files are moved. Links break. New employees must learn a logic that often reflects historical decisions rather than current reality.
Over time, individuals create personal shortcuts and parallel structures to cope with the complexity.
The result is fragmentation.
The cost is not simply time spent reorganizing folders.
It is the growing effort required to keep everyone aligned around a shared structure.

Emotional Cost
There is also a subtle human dimension.
Repeated friction in finding information produces a form of low-level stress. When people feel that systems are harder to use than they should be, frustration accumulates quietly.
The result is digital fatigue.
Systems begin to feel heavier than necessary. Small inefficiencies erode confidence in the tools meant to support work.

Hierarchy itself is not the problem.

The problem arises when hierarchy is expected to carry more meaning than it can sustain.

Folders remain effective containers for storing files. But when they are forced to represent multiple contexts simultaneously—projects, clients, phases, risks, and topics—the structure becomes overloaded.

Tagging for Windows addresses this problem by redistributing the organizational burden.

Folders continue to store information.

Tags provide the contextual connections that hierarchies cannot represent.

The Tagging Maturity Model

Organizations rarely transition from pure hierarchy to fully contextual organization overnight. Instead, they evolve through recognizable stages. Understanding these stages helps organizations recognize where they are—and what the next step looks like.

Level 1 — Pure Hierarchy
Information is organized exclusively through folders.
Documents must be placed in a single location, and retrieval relies heavily on browsing through nested structures.
Characteristics:

- Folder-only organization
- Exclusive placement of documents
- High reliance on browsing
- Frequent structural reorganizations

Symptoms

- Search frustration
- Duplicate files
- Structural fatigue

Level 2 — Ad Hoc Tagging
Some tagging begins to appear, often informally.
Individuals experiment with labels or keywords, but no shared conventions exist. Tags are applied inconsistently and rarely used as a primary navigation method.
Characteristics:

- Occasional tagging
- No common vocabulary
- Limited filtering capabilities

Symptoms

- Fragmented tag names
- Unreliable retrieval
- Low trust in the tagging system

Level 3 — Structured Personal Tagging
Users begin to apply tagging systematically within their own workflows. Core tag dimensions emerge—such as project, client, or status—and naming conventions become more consistent.
Characteristics:

- Defined core tag categories
- Consistent naming patterns
- Habit-based tagging when saving files
- Regular use of filtering

Result
Retrieval becomes faster and friction decreases.

Level 4 — Collaborative Tagging
Tagging becomes shared across teams.
Organizations develop common tag vocabularies, and filtered views begin to reveal connections across projects and departments.
Characteristics:

- Shared tag vocabulary
- Smart Views and filtered dashboards
- Cross-functional tags such as status, theme, or risk
- Light governance structures

Result
Improved coordination and cross-project visibility.