Mindset Matters
Deconstructing contextual video
To create people-centric experiences, brands must move beyond basic demographics...

Tapping into mindset 😊
Our Questions

Q1
Can contextual video targeting help brands tap into mindset?

Q2
Are all methods for contextual video targeting created equally?
Contextual, Under the Hood

Contextual via Metadata
Videos sourced contextually with metadata only (e.g. video title, video description, tags, etc.)

Contextual via Intelligence Engine
Videos sourced with a contextual intelligence engine, which uses a combination of machine learning techniques (computer vision & natural language processing) to analyze video frames, audio, and text. These techniques work together to understand the full nature of video content and classify full-page content like a human would for the analysis of: video metadata, audio transcription, on-screen imagery, and optical character recognition.

SPEED TRAVEL ADDS NEW OPTIONS TO BRING PETS ON TRAINS
Speed Travel is expanding its pet program, allowing animal lovers to bring their little furry friends on trains where it had not previously been allowed.

Keywords: pet travel, dog hotels, animals on trains

SPEED TRAVEL ADDS NEW OPTIONS TO BRING PETS ON TRAINS
Speed Travel is expanding its pet program, allowing animal lovers to bring their little furry friends on trains where it had not previously been allowed.

Keywords: pet travel, dog hotels, animals on trains
Our Research

Rigorously test the impact of contextual video targeting, and identify any differences between use of metadata only vs a contextual intelligence engine.

CONTROLLED TESTING ON MOBILE

Participants from nationally representative panel randomized into test and control groups

n=2,458

Each chose video content to view based on their interests, on premium websites and were then served a pre-roll ad

WHAT

3 TARGETING TIERS:

1. Demo Targeting
2. Metadata
3. Contextual Intelligence Engine

HOW

2 AD TYPES

Test (Brand Ad)  Control (PSA)*

*Control (public service announcement)
4 Brands Tested
Contextual video targeting drives metrics for brands

Impact on Brand Metrics - Contextual Targeting
Delta (Exposed – Control)

- Brand Favorability: +4%↑
- Recommendation Intent: +5%↑
- Search Intent: +6%↑

Total Contextual Targeting (Control n=814, Exposed n=822)
↑ = statistically significant difference between exposed & control at >=90% confidence
Contextual improves ad experiences for people

Ad Opinions Based on Targeting Method
Delta (Contextual Targeting % – Demo Targeting %)

- Relevant to me, +10%
- Ad not out of place, +5%
- Entertaining, +6%
- Would share, +5%

Total: Contextual Targeting (Exposed n=822); Demo Targeting (Exposed n=409)
Q: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the ad? The ad was...
*Statistically significant difference between exposed & control at >=90% confidence
We know contextual targeting works. But how?
Targeting video content is 47% more effective at reaching the right people

All brands more effectively reached people in the market for their product category with contextual targeting.

% Lift in Targeting Effectiveness by Brand
(% Difference in Effectiveness of Reaching Those In-Market for Product)

- BRAND 4: +47%
- BRAND 3: +15%
- BRAND 2: +13%
- BRAND 1: +6%

Total: Contextual Targeting (Exposed n=822); Demo Targeting (Exposed n=409)
Contextual video targeting reaches people at the right time

Ad Opinions Based on Targeting Method
% Strongly/Somewhat Agree

- Demo Targeting (A)
- Contextual Targeting (B)

AD WAS “SOMETHING I WAS IN THE MOOD FOR”
- 52% A
- 43% B

AD WAS “SOMETHING I WAS OPEN TO AT THE TIME”
- 60% A
- 51% B

Q: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the ad? The ad was...

A/B: Statistically significant difference between A/B at >=90% confidence
But, what’s the strongest driver of effective contextual video targeting?

In theory, 2 major factors are at play:

1. By targeting the content, brands reach relevant consumers (e.g. ad for new lipstick placed in content about top make-up trends)

Top Make-up Trends For This Winter

LONGER LASTING LIPSTICK COLORS

2. Because the ad is relevant to the content people have chosen to watch in that moment, the consumer is in a relevant mindset when viewing the ad

Travel & Discover

We used modeling to parse out these effects
Drivers of Brand Metric Impact - Contextual Targeting

- In Mood for the Ad
- In-Market For Advertised Product
- All Other Factors

Reaching relevant people is important, but mindset plays the biggest role in driving action.

61% of the impact on Search Intent is driven by the individual being in the mood for the brand’s message.

Values are modeled using linear regression to determine the impact of being in the mood and in-market on brand metrics.

↑ = statistically significant difference between exposed & control at >=90% confidence.
**But you need to get contextual targeting right**

Big difference in performance when alignment between ad and content is strong vs weak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Metrics by Perceived Alignment of Ad and Content</th>
<th>Delta (Exposed – Control)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Weak Perceived Alignment Between Ad & Content**

- **Search Intent**
  - **Exposed:** +1%
  - **Control:** +7%

- **Brand Is “Relevant To Me”**
  - **Exposed:** +0%
  - **Control:** +6%

- **Brand That “Knows How To Get My Attention”**
  - **Exposed:** 5%
  - **Control:** 5%

**Strong Perceived Alignment Between Ad & Content**

- **Search Intent**
  - **Exposed:** +7%
  - **Control:** +7%

- **Brand Is “Relevant To Me”**
  - **Exposed:** +6%
  - **Control:** +6%

- **Brand That “Knows How To Get My Attention”**
  - **Exposed:** 5%
  - **Control:** 5%

Total: Strong Perceived Alignment (Control n=700, Exposed n=778); Weak Perceived Alignment (Control n=297, Exposed n=209)

↑ = statistically significant difference between exposed & control at >=90% confidence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ad is “Aligned with Content”</th>
<th>Ad is “Something I Was in the Mood For”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demo (A)</strong></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual via Metadata (B)</strong></td>
<td>67%&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual via Intelligence Engine (C)</strong></td>
<td>75%&lt;sup&gt;AB&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>56%&lt;sup&gt;AB&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: Demo Targeting (Control n=413, Exposed n=409); Contextual via Metadata (Control n=408, Exposed n=415); Contextual via Intelligence Engine (Control n=406, Exposed n=407)

Q: How much do you agree or disagree that the ad was relevant to the video you watched on [website name] today?
Q: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the ad? The ad was...

A/B/C: Statistically significant difference between A/B/C at >=90% confidence
Video ads are 2.3x more memorable with intelligence engine in place.
Brand rejectors see the brand anew when advanced contextual video technology is used

Advanced tech can be used as a acquisition tool to convince people with low pre-existing brand affinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Brand Metrics Among Brand Rejectors*</th>
<th>Delta (Exposed – Control)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation Intent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual via Metadata</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual via Intelligence Engine</td>
<td>10%†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brand That “Cares About Its Customers”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual via Metadata</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual via Intelligence Engine</td>
<td>9%†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Brand Rejectors: People with no pre-existing brand affinity (B2B)
Total (Brand Rejectors): Demo Targeting (Control n=218, Exposed n=194); Contextual via Metadata (Control n=176, Exposed n=170); Contextual via Intelligence Engine (Control n=182, Exposed n=181)
† = statistically significant difference between exposed & control at >=90% confidence
People are 16% more likely to skip the ad if only metadata is used
Precise content alignments demand advanced methods for content identification

While broader contextual categories (beauty) are often ideal to extend reach, sometimes more precise contextual alignments are desired (lipstick).

Impact on Brand Metrics By Targeting Type | Precise Content Categories
Delta (Exposed – Control)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Contextual via Metadata</th>
<th>Contextual via Intelligence Engine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation Intent</td>
<td>+12%†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Favorability</td>
<td>+9%†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is “Relevant To Me” (TB)</td>
<td>+2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↑ = statistically significant difference between exposed & control at >=90% confidence

Total (Precise Content Categories): Contextual via Metadata (Control n=171, Exposed n=167); Contextual via Intelligence Engine (Control n=235, Exposed n=142); (Broad Content Categories): Contextual via Metadata (Control n=237, Exposed n=248); Contextual via Intelligence Engine (Control n=271, Exposed n=265)
Summary
Implications

Contextual can achieve what other targeting can’t: *mindset*

Reaching people when they are in a relevant mindset for the ad is the powerhouse behind contextual effectiveness.

Contextual is where the interests of people and brands collide

When ads are delivered in contextually relevant environments, ad experiences are more positive for people and work harder for brands.

Leveraging an intelligence engine best achieves the promise of right person, right mindset

The more data used to identify contextual matches, the more effective contextual targeting becomes.
Thank You