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

Q1
What can contextual video targeting do that standard cookies can’t?

Q2
Are all methods for contextual video targeting created equally?
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

**WHY**

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

**HOW**

**CONTROLLED TESTING ON MOBILE**

Participants from nationally representative panel randomized into test and control groups.

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

**2 AD TYPES**

- Test (Brand Ad)
- Control (PSA)*

*Control (public service announcement)
4 Brands Tested

ESTÉE LAUDER

Tracfone

CENTURY 21

ULTA
Contextual video targeting drives metrics for brands.
Contextual improves ad experiences for people

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

*Statistically significant difference between exposed & control at >99% 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.
Contextual video targeting reaches people at the right time

**Ad Opinions Based on Targeting Method**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Strongly/Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Demo Targeting (A)</th>
<th>Contextual Targeting (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD WAS “SOMETHING I WAS IN THE MOOD FOR”</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD WAS “SOMETHING I WAS OPEN TO AT THE TIME”</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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...

A/B: Statistically significant differences 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)

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.

We used modeling to parse out these effects.
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.
But you need to get contextual targeting right

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

Brand Metrics by Perceived Alignment of Ad and Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak Perceived Alignment Between Ad &amp; Content</th>
<th>Strong Perceived Alignment Between Ad &amp; Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search Intent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1%</td>
<td>+7%↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Is “Relevant To Me”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+0%</td>
<td>+6%↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand That “Knows How To Get My Attention”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>+5%↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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>Weak Perceived Alignment Between Ad &amp; Content</th>
<th>Strong Perceived Alignment Between Ad &amp; Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search Intent</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1%</td>
<td>+7%†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Is “Relevant To Me”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+0%</td>
<td>+6%†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand That “Knows How To Get My Attention”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>+5%†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: Weak Perceived Alignment (Control n=297, Exposed n=209); Strong Perceived Alignment (Control n=700, Exposed n=778);
† = statistically significant difference between exposed & control at >=90% confidence
Going beyond metadata creates 12% stronger alignment between ad & video content

**Ad Opinions by Targeting Type**

% Strongly/Somewhat Agree

<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%A</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual via Intelligence Engine (C)</strong></td>
<td>75%AB</td>
<td>56%AB</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 an acquisition tool to convince people with low pre-existing brand affinity.

### Impact on Brand Metrics Among Brand Rejectors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommendation Intent</th>
<th>Brand That “Cares About Its Customers”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual via</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metadata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual via</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence Engine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Brand Rejectors: People with no pre-existing brand affinity (B3B)

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)

- Recommendation Intent
  - Contextual via Metadata: +12%
  - Contextual via Intelligence Engine: +4%
  - Contextual via Metadata: -9%
  - Contextual via Intelligence Engine: +5%

- Brand Favorability
  - Contextual via Metadata: +12%
  - Contextual via Intelligence Engine: +4%
  - Contextual via Metadata: -9%
  - Contextual via Intelligence Engine: +5%

- Brand is “Relevant To Me” (TB)
  - Contextual via Metadata: +12%
  - Contextual via Intelligence Engine: +4%
  - Contextual via Metadata: -9%
  - Contextual via Intelligence Engine: +5%

Total (Precise Content Categories): Contextual via Metadata (Control n=171, Exposed n=167); Contextual via Intelligence Engine (Control n=138, 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)
† = statistically significant difference between exposed & control at >=90% confidence.
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.
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