ISSN 1533-9211

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10531943

INVESTIGATING VIEWER INTEREST AREAS IN VIDEOS WITH VISUAL TAGGING

DENI ADHA AKBARI [1]*, UJANG SUMARWAN [2], NURHASANAH [3] and RIZKI EDMI EDISON [4]

[1] Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka (Uhamka), Jakarta, Indonesia.
*Corresponding Author Email: deni@uhamka.ac.id
[2, 3] School of Business, IPB University, Bogor, Indonesia.
[4] Neuroscience Institute, Universitas Prima Indonesia, Medan, Institute of Leadership, Innovation, and Advancement, Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Bandar, Seri Begawan, Brunei Darussalam.
Research Center of Public Policy, National Research and Innovation Agency, Jakarta, Indonesia.

Abstract

This article explores the quickly developing field of video analysis, concentrating on using visual tagging to measure and identify viewer interest areas. The potential for this field to completely change how marketers and content producers determine viewer engagement and preferences is the reason for the growing interest in it. The approach incorporates a methodical examination of current literature, primarily drawn from original research articles published in esteemed international scientific journals. These resources provide a comprehensive understanding of the current state, future directions, and uses of visual tagging technologies in video content analysis. They were carefully picked because of their dependability and relevance.

Keywords: Area of Interest, Eye Tracking, Visual Tagging.

1. OVERVIEW

Recent advancements in marketing research have highlighted the significance of video content analysis in understanding consumer behavior and preferences (Afzal et al., 2023). Using visual tagging technology, this method provides a deeper understanding of viewers' emotional responses and attention patterns, which enhances the customization of marketing strategies (Balkan & Kholod, 2015). In market surveys, intelligent video analytics has reduced cognitive biases and enhanced decision-making (Balkan & Kholod, 2015). New methodological approaches are being developed, and the use of visual research methods—such as eye-tracking technology—has increased (Knoblauch et al., 2008). These developments have resulted in the creation of systems and tools for content-based media analysis, including automatic metadata extraction methods (Chang, 2002). With encouraging findings, the investigation of user search behavior has also been investigated for video tagging (Yao et al., 2013). Additionally, research on quantifying and forecasting participation in online videos has been done, with an emphasis on aggregate engagement at the video level (Wu et al., 2017). Lastly, the Interest Meter system has been proposed for automatic home video summarization by analyzing user-viewing behavior (Peng et al., 2011).

ISSN 1533-9211
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10531943

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Identifying Relevant Topics for Video Content

Recent studies (Arapakis et al., 2014) have highlighted the significance of locating Areas of Interest (AOI) in video content for understanding viewer engagement and preferences. This process has greatly benefited from advanced visual tagging techniques, such as facial expression recognition and eye-tracking data analysis (Mansor & Mohd Isa, 2022). By combining artificial intelligence and machine learning, these methods have been improved even further, allowing for a more complex comprehension of how viewers engage with various kinds of video content (Ciubotaru et al., 2009). Additionally, AOI identification has improved content relevancy and the user experience (Ma et al., 2019). Additionally, the analysis of AOI features like color, movement, and thematic elements has been done to determine why particular areas receive more attention than others (Sorschag, 2009). For content creators and marketers, this knowledge is essential because it guides decisions about the placement and design of content, which in turn improves viewer engagement and message retention (Lu et al., 2018).

2.2. The Psychology of Video Viewers' Visual Attention

Research on visual attention in videos has identified several key factors that influence viewer engagement. Nuthmann & Henderson (2010) and Ladeira et al. (2019) both highlight the role of object-based attentional selection and the impact of top-down and bottom-up factors, respectively. Shukla et al. (2018) emphasize the importance of visual context and attention in driving affect in video advertisements, while El-Nasr & Yan (2006) and Ballan (2015) discuss the significance of understanding visual attention patterns in 3D video games and the use of data-driven approaches for social image and video tagging. Lastly, Hong et al. (2004) underscore the effects of flash animation on online users' attention and information search performance. These studies collectively underscore the need for content creators to consider a range of factors, including narrative changes, audience diversity, viewing context, and advanced technologies, in order to effectively capture viewer interest in videos.

2.3. Visual Tagging's Function in Studying Consumer Behavior

Marketing research methodologies have undergone a revolution with the integration of visual tagging in the analysis of consumer behavior through video content (Simmonds et al., 2020). It has been demonstrated that this method of locating and analyzing areas of interest (AOIs) in videos is an effective way to gauge viewer engagement (Manic, 2015). According to Argyris et al. (2020), visual tagging has the ability to decipher intricate viewer interactions with video content and reveal hidden consumer preferences. What draws viewers' attention, for how long, and in what order can be determined by tracking eye movements and fixation points (Teixeira et al., 2012). The precision of this technology has increased recently, thanks to developments like sophisticated eye tracking and machine learning algorithms (Boerman et al., 2015). According to Amin et al. (2018), there is a chance that this focused method of content optimization will greatly boost audience engagement and brand recall.

ISSN 1533-9211
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10531943

3. REVIEW METHODOLOGY

The selection criteria for literature in the review are based on their relevance to visual tagging technologies, their application in video content analysis, and their contributions to understanding viewer interest areas (Hannes & Aertgeerts, 2014). A qualitative thematic analysis is used to group results into related themes, and a comparative analysis technique is used to see how well and how poorly visual tagging tools work (Liu et al., 2013; Ribeiro et al., 2014). However, the review process has limitations, including the potential exclusion of foundational studies and relevant findings from less renowned journals (Jahangirian et al., 2011).

4. VISUAL TAGGING TOOLS AND METHODS

4.1. An Overview of the Technologies Currently in use for Visual Tagging

Convolutional neural networks (CNNs), in particular, have made significant strides in the understanding of consumer behavior and video content analysis (Bondi et al., 2017). Marketers and content creators can now determine which segments of their videos most effectively connect with viewers thanks to these technologies (Metternich & Worring, 2013). Real-time tracking and eye-tracking technology have further improved these instruments' accuracy and precision (Ballan et al., 2015). However, employing these technologies raises concerns about data privacy and ethics (Ballan et al., 2015). To address these challenges, methods for assistive tagging that combine computer and human intelligence have been developed, allowing for more accurate and efficient multimedia tagging (Wang et al., 2012). These methods have proven particularly useful in studies attempting to decipher consumer behavior and preferences based on visual focus (Ballan et al., 2015).

4.2. A Comparative Analysis of Methods and Tools

Advances in computer vision and machine learning in recent times have resulted in the creation of advanced tools that can precisely tag visual elements in videos (Li et al., 2019). These tools make use of neural network-based algorithms, specifically convolutional neural networks (CNNs), which have demonstrated impressive efficacy in tasks involving the recognition of images and videos. When these tools are critically compared, different approaches to their tagging methodologies become apparent. Some use algorithms for object recognition to identify particular objects or people in a frame of video. Some, on the other hand, create heat maps to graphically depict the parts of a video that draw the most attention from viewers (Li et al., 2019). The accuracy of these tools is highly dependent on the complexity of the scene, the quality of the video, and the training data used by the algorithm (Li et al., 2019). The accuracy and generalizability of tools trained on a wider range of datasets are generally higher (Li et al., 2019). This is especially relevant for marketing research. These instruments have been used in a number of marketing research scenarios, including assessing the success of advertising campaigns (Li et al., 2019). However, they also present challenges, particularly regarding privacy concerns and the ethical use of data (Li et al., 2019).

ISSN 1533-9211

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10531943

4.3. Limitations and Effectiveness in the Context of Marketing

In order to increase viewer engagement and recall, visual tagging has been extensively used in marketing strategies, especially in video ad placements (Razikin et al., 2007). Unfortunately, depending on the demographic group, its efficacy can differ, which raises questions regarding the accuracy of the data (Ivanov et al., 2012). The power of visual imagery in marketing is well-established (Branthwaite, 2002), but the ethical use of visual tagging, particularly regarding user privacy, is a key consideration (Vairavasundaram et al., 2015). The challenge of evaluating the effectiveness of visual tagging tools is also highlighted (Plaisant, 2004). Individual characteristics, such as cognitive differences, can further impact the perception of visual information (Falschlunger et al., 2015). Despite these challenges, the potential of visual tagging to empower users and its business benefits are recognized (Weinberger, 2005). The relationship between tagging behavior and image content is an area for further exploration (Golbeck et al., 2011).

5. DETERMINING THE INTEREST AREAS

5.1. Approaches for Determining Interest Areas

Recent advancements in video analysis technologies have significantly improved the ability to locate and quantify areas of interest (AOIs) in video content (Zhao et al., 2018). This advancement has been largely attributed to visual tagging approaches that make use of complex algorithms and machine learning models (Cheng et al., 2005). These methods entail breaking up video material into separate frames, after which visual tagging algorithms are applied to identify and label regions that are likely to draw in viewers (Hollink et al., 2005). The accuracy of AOI identification has been further enhanced by incorporating eye-tracking data into these models (Akamine & Farias, 2014). The efficacy of visual tagging methodologies has been improved through the use of machine learning, especially deep learning techniques (Velsen & Melenhorst, 2008). Nonetheless, issues with addressing ethical concerns about privacy and the use of personal data in video analysis, as well as guaranteeing the generalizability of results across various viewer demographics and video genres, still need to be resolved (Karydis et al., 2014).

5.2. In Visual Tagging, "No Doubtful and Yes Answers"

Recent advances in visual tagging technologies have revolutionized the measurement of viewer interest in video content (Kodali & Berleant, 2022). In order to ensure definitive responses when identifying areas of interest (AOIs) within videos, the 'no doubtful and yes answers' approach has been emphasized (Kodali & Berleant 2022). High-precision algorithms that monitor viewer focus and eye movements have successfully measured AOIs (Kodali, 2022). It has been demonstrated how important content relevancy and visual clarity are to viewer engagement (Kodali & Berleant 2022). One of the challenges in this field is making sure that different demographic groups are consistently tagged (Kodali & Berleant, 2022). It is anticipated that adding AI and machine learning to visual tagging will improve AOI measurement even more (Kodali & Berleant, 2022).

ISSN 1533-9211
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10531943

6. VISUAL TAGGING ACCURACY AND RELIABILITY

6.1. Difficulties in Maintaining Precise Measurements

Visual tagging systems must be accurate and dependable, but they have many difficulties. Both Wang et al. (2012) and Xie et al. (2010), who concentrated on multimedia tagging and image tagging, emphasize the possibility of human-computer cooperation in enhancing tagging accuracy. In image quality research, Zhang & Liu (2017) highlight the significance of accurate eye-tracking data, and White hill et al. (2009) suggest a probabilistic model for combining labels from labelers with varying degrees of experience. Wu & Yang (2008) and Kumar (2017) talk about the difficulties in monitoring and assessing visual activity in videos; Wu suggests context-aware and attentional tracking, while Kumar concentrates on using deep learning methods. Two works that address the general problem of data quality and reliability are Kandel et al. (2011) and Wu & Yang (2008). Kandel promotes interactive visualization in data wrangling, while Yang draws attention to the unreliability of video concept detection.

6.2. Techniques for Enhancing Dependability

Video analysis has highlighted the need for precise and reliable visual tagging systems to identify viewer-interest regions. The identification and classification of visual elements in videos have greatly improved thanks to machine learning algorithms, especially convolutional neural networks (CNNs) (Karpathy et al., 2014). By directly revealing viewer focus, the integration of eye-tracking technology improves these systems' accuracy even further (Karpathy et al., 2014). High quality, diverse datasets are crucial for training visual tagging algorithms, ensuring their effectiveness across different video types and viewer demographics (Ballan et al., 2015). User feedback mechanisms, such as those used in social image retrieval, significantly refine these systems (Li et al., 2008). The collaboration between computer scientists, psychologists, and marketing experts is also essential in developing more nuanced and context-aware tagging algorithms (Wang et al., 2012).

6.3. Prospects in Accuracy Enhancement

Advancements in visual tagging technologies, particularly those based on deep learning models like CNNs, have significantly improved the accuracy of area-of-interest measurements in videos (Hansen & Ji, 2010). The integration of eye-tracking technology further enhances this accuracy, providing a more nuanced understanding of viewer attention and engagement (Ballan et al., 2014). However, the reliability of these methods still needs to be improved due to factors such as video quality and viewer perception (Fan et al., 2019). To address this, big data analytics can be used to process and analyze large datasets, providing a more comprehensive view of consumer behavior (Wang & Shen, 2017). The fusion of AI with augmented and virtual reality technologies presents an exciting frontier for enhancing the accuracy of visual tagging (Meur et al., 2007). Despite these advancements, there is stillroom for improvement, and continued research and development are essential (Wang et al., 2021).

The Seybold Report
ISSN 1533-9211
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10531943

7. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Recent advancements in visual tagging technology, particularly in video analysis, have significantly improved the accuracy of identifying viewer interest areas (Geisler & Burns, 2007). This has been achieved through the integration of machine learning algorithms, which have enhanced the precision of these tools (Hollink et al., 2005). The implications of these advancements are substantial, particularly for marketers, as they enable more targeted and effective marketing strategies (Turaga et al., 2010). Furthermore, visual tagging can aid in better understanding consumer behavior, leading to more personalized content creation (Fu & Rui, 2017). Visual tagging and video analysis are poised for further innovations, with the potential for even greater accuracy and efficiency (Xie et al., 2010). However, it is important to consider ethical considerations and privacy when developing these technologies (Chen et al., 2014).

8. CONCLUSION

Recent studies have highlighted the potential of visual tagging technologies for capturing viewer engagement in videos (Li et al., 2019). These technologies effectively identify precise areas of interest, with advancements in machine learning and data analytics enhancing their accuracy and reliability (Wu et al., 2017). Integrating consumer psychology into visual tagging algorithms has deepened our understanding of viewer behavior (Oami et al., 2004). However, there is a need for further research to enhance the accuracy and reliability of these systems, particularly in interpreting complex viewer responses (Setz & Snoek, 2009). Visual tagging in diverse market segments could provide more nuanced insights into consumer preferences (Afzal et al., 2023). Ethical and privacy concerns about visual data collection must also be addressed (Yang & Marchionini, 2005). Despite these challenges, the evolution of visual tagging in marketing represents a significant shift towards more interactive and consumer-centric approaches in market research (Miyahara et al., 2008).

References

1) Afzal, S., Ghani, S., Hittawe, M.M., Rashid, S.F., Knio, O.M., Headwaiter, M., & Hoteit, I. (2023). Visualization and Visual Analytics Approaches for Image and Video Datasets: A Survey. ACM Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems, 13, 1 - 41. https://doi.org/10.1145/3576935

2) Akamine, W.Y., & Farias, M.C. (2014). Video quality assessment using visual attention computational models. Journal of Electronic Imaging, 23. https://doi.org/10.1117/1.JEI.23.6.061107

3) Amini, F., Riche, N.H., Lee, B., Leboe-McGowan, J., & Irani, P. (2018). Hooked on data videos: assessing the effect of animation and pictographs on viewer engagement. Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Advanced Visual Interfaces. https://doi.org/10.1145/3206505.3206552

4) Arapakis, I., Lalmas, M., Cambazoglu, B.B., Marcos, M., & Jose, J.M. (2014). User engagement in online News: Under the scope of sentiment, interest, affect, and gaze. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 65. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23096

The Seybold REPORT

ISSN 1533-9211

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10531943

5) Argyris, Y.A., Wang, Z., Kim, Y., & Yin, Z. (2020). The effects of visual congruence on increasing consumers' brand engagement: An empirical investigation of influencer marketing on instagram using deep-learning algorithms for automatic image classification. Comput. Hum. Behav, 112, 106443. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106443

6) Balkan, S., & Kholod, T. (2015). Video Analytics in Market Research. Information Systems Management, 32, 192 - 199. https://doi.org/10.1080/10580530.2015.1044337

7) Ballan, L., Bertini, M., Uricchio, T., & Bimbo, A. (2015). Data-driven approaches for social image and video tagging. Multimedia Tools and Applications, 74, 1443-1468. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-014-1976-4

8) Boerman, S.C., van Reijmersdal, E.A., & Neijens, P.C. (2015). Using Eye Tracking to Understand the Effects of Brand Placement Disclosure Types in Television Programs. Journal of Advertising, 44, 196 - 207. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2014.967423

9) Bondi, L., Güera, D., Baroffio, L., Bestagini, P., Delp, E.J., & Tubaro, S. (2017). A Preliminary Study on Convolutional Neural Networks for Camera Model Identification. Media Watermarking, Security, and Forensics. https://doi.org/10.2352/ISSN.2470-1173.2017.7.MWSF-327

10) Branthwaite, A. (2002). Investigating the power of imagery in marketing communication: evidence-based techniques. Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal, 5, 164-171. https://doi.org/10.1108/13522750210432977

11) Chang, S. (2002). The holy grail of content-based media analysis. IEEE MultiMedia, 9, 0006-10. https://doi.org/10.1109/MMUL.2002.10014

12) Chen, Y., Chen, T., Hsu, W.H., Liao, H.M., & Chang, S. (2014). Predicting Viewer Affective Comments Based on Image Content in Social Media. Proceedings of International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval. https://doi.org/10.1145/2578726.2578756

13) Cheng, W., Chu, W., & Wu, J. (2005). A Visual Attention Based Region-of-Interest Determination Framework for Video Sequences. IEICE Trans. Inf. Syst., 88-D, 1578-1586. https://doi.org/10.1093/ietisy/e88-d.7.1578

14) Ciubotaru, B., Ghinea, G., & Muntean, G. (2009). Objective Assessment of Region of Interest-Aware Adaptive Multimedia Streaming Quality. IEEE Transactions on Broadcasting, 55, 202-212. https://doi.org/10.1109/TBC.2013.2290238

15) El-Nasr, M.S., & Yan, S. (2006). Visual attention in 3D video games. IFAC Symposium on Advances in Control Education. https://doi.org/10.1145/1178823.1178849

16) Falschlunger, L., Treiblmaier, H., Lehner, O.M., & Grabmann, E. (2015). Cognitive Differences and Their Impact on Information Perception: An Empirical Study Combining Survey and Eye Tracking Data. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18702-0_18

17) Fan, D., Wang, W., Cheng, M., & Shen, J. (2019). Shifting More Attention to Video Salient Object Detection. 2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 8546-8556. https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2019.00875

18) Fu, J., & Rui, Y. (2017). Advances in deep learning approaches for image tagging. APSIPA Transactions on Signal and Information Processing, 6. https://doi.org/10.1017/ATSIP.2017.12

19) Geisler, G., & Burns, S.A. (2007). Tagging video: conventions and strategies of the YouTube community. ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries. https://doi.org/10.1145/1255175.1255279

20) Golbeck, J., Koepfler, J.A., & Emmerling, B. (2011). An experimental study of social tagging behavior and image content. J. Assoc. Inf. Sci. Technol., 62, 1750-1760. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21522

The Seybold Report
ISSN 1533-9211
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10531943

21) Hannes, K., & Aertgeerts, B. (2014). Literature reviews should reveal the reviewers' rationale to opt for particular quality assessment criteria. Academic medicine: journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges, 89 3, 370. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000128

22) Hansen, D.W., & Ji, Q. (2010). In the Eye of the Beholder: A Survey of Models for Eyes and Gaze. IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, 32, 478-500. https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2009.30

23) Hollink, L., Nguyen, G.P., Koelma, D.C., Schreiber, A.T., & Worring, M. (2005). Assessing User Behaviour in News Video Retrieval.

24) Hong, W., Thong, J.Y., & Tam, K.Y. (2004). Does Animation Attract Online Users' Attention? The Effects of Flash on Information Search Performance and Perceptions. Inf. Syst. Res., 15, 60-86. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1040.0017

25) Ivanov, I., Vajda, P., Lee, J., & Ebrahimi, T. (2012). In Tags, We Trust: Trust modeling in social tagging of multimedia content. IEEE Signal Processing Magazine, 29, 98-107. https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2011.942345

26) Jahangirian, M., Eldabi, T., Garg, L., Jun, G.T., Naseer, A., Patel, B., Stergioulas, L.K., & Young, T. (2011). A rapid review method for extremely large corpora of literature: Applications to the domains of modelling, simulation, and management. Int. J. Inf. Manag., 31, 234-243. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2010.07.004

27) Kandel, S., Heer, J., Plaisant, C., Kennedy, J., Ham, F.V., Riche, N.H., Weaver, C.E., Lee, B., Brodbeck, D., & Buono, P. (2011). Research directions in data wrangling: Visualizations and transformations for usable and credible data. Information Visualization, 10, 271 - 288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473871611415994

28) Karydis, I., Avlonitis, M., Chorianopoulos, K., & Sioutas, S. (2014). Identifying Important Segments in Videos: A Collective Intelligence Approach. Int. J. Artif. Intell. Tools, 23. https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218213014400107

29) Karpathy, A., Toderici, G., Shetty, S., Leung, T., Sukthankar, R., & Fei-Fei, L. (2014). Large-Scale Video Classification with Convolutional Neural Networks. 2014 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 1725-1732. https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2014.223

30) Knoblauch, H., Baer, A., Laurier, E., Petschke, S., & Schnettler, B. (2008). Visual Analysis. New Developments in the Interpretative Analysis of Video and Photography. Forum Qualitative Social Research, 9, 14. https://doi.org/10.17169/FQS-9.3.1170

31) Kodali, V., & Berleant, D. (2022). Recent, Rapid Advancement in Visual Question Answering: a Review. 2022 IEEE International Conference on Electro Information Technology (eIT), 139-146. https://doi.org/10.1109/eit53891.2022.9813988

32) Kumar, N. (2017). Machine Intelligence Prospective for Large Scale Video based Visual Activities Analysis. 2017 Ninth International Conference on Advanced Computing (ICoAC), 29-34. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICOAC.2017.8441320

33) Ladeira, W.J., Nardi, V.A., Santini, F.D., & Jardim, W.C. (2019). Factors influencing visual attention: a meta-analysis. Journal of Marketing Management, 35, 1710 - 1740. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2019.1662826

34) Liu, T., lin, Y., Lin, W., & Kuo, C.J. (2013). Visual quality assessment: recent developments, coding applications and future trends. APSIPA Transactions on Signal and Information Processing, 2. https://doi.org/10.1017/ATSIP.2013.5

35) Li, X., Shi, M., & Wang, X. (2019). Video mining: Measuring visual information using automatic methods. International Journal of Research in Marketing. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJRESMAR.2019.02.004

The Seybold REPORT

ISSN 1533-9211

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10531943

36) Li, X., Snoek, C.G., & Worring, M. (2008). Learning tag relevance by neighbor voting for social image retrieval. Multimedia Information Retrieval. https://doi.org/10.1145/1460096.1460126

37) Lu, Y., Wang, H., Landis, S.T., & Maciejewski, R. (2018). A Visual Analytics Framework for Identifying Topic Drivers in Media Events. IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics, 24, 2501-2515. https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2017.2752166

38) Ma, H., Meng, Y., Xing, H., & Li, C. (2019). Investigating Road-Constrained Spatial Distributions and Semantic Attractiveness for Area of Interest. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/SU11174624

39) Manic, M. (2015). Marketing engagement through visual content. Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov. Series V: Economic Sciences, 89-94.

40) Mansor, A.A., & Mohd Isa, S. (2022). Areas of Interest (AOI) on marketing mix elements of green and non-green products in customer decision-making. Neuroscience Research Notes. https://doi.org/10.31117/neuroscirn.v5i3.174

41) Metternich, M.J., & Worring, M. (2013). Track based relevance feedback for tracing persons in surveillance videos. Comput. Vis. Image Underst., 117, 229-237. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cviu.2012.11.004

42) Meur, O.L., Callet, P.L., & Barba, D. (2007). Predicting visual fixations on video based on low-level visual features. Vision Research, 47, 2483-2498. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2007.06.015

43) Miyahara, M., Aoki, M., Takiguchi, T., & Ariki, Y. (2008). Tagging Video Contents with Positive/Negative Interest Based on User's Facial Expression. Conference on Multimedia Modeling. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-77409-9_20

44) Nuthmann, A., & Henderson, J.M. (2010). Object-based attentional selection in scene viewing. Journal of vision, 10 8, 20. https://doi.org/10.1167/10.8.20

45) Oami, R., Benitez, A.B., Chang, S., & Dimitrova, N. (2004). Understanding and modeling user interests in consumer videos. 2004 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME) (IEEE Cat. No.04TH8763), 2, 1475-1478 Vol.2. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICME.2004.1394514

46) Peng, W., Chu, W., Chang, C., Chou, C., Huang, W., Chang, W., & Hung, Y. (2011). Editing by Viewing: Automatic Home Video Summarization by Viewing Behavior Analysis. IEEE Transactions on Multimedia, 13, 539-550. https://doi.org/10.1109/TMM.2011.2131638

47) Plaisant, C. (2004). The challenge of information visualization evaluation. Proceedings of the working conference on advanced visual interfaces. https://doi.org/10.1145/989863.989880

48) Razikin, K., Goh, D.H., Cheong, E.K., & Ow, Y.F. (2007). The Efficacy of Tags in Social Tagging Systems. International Conference on Asian Digital Libraries. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-77094-7_69

49) Ribeiro, D.M., Cardoso, M., Silva, F.Q., & França, A.C. (2014). Using qualitative metasummary to synthesize empirical findings in literature reviews. International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement. https://doi.org/10.1145/2652524.2652562

50) Setz, A.T., & Snoek, C.G. (2009). Can social tagged images aid concept-based video search? 2009 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo, 1460-1463. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICME.2009.5202778

51) Simmonds, L., Bellman, S., Kennedy, R., Nenycz-Thiel, M., & Bogomolova, S. (2020). Moderating effects of prior brand usage on visual attention to video advertising and recall: An eye-tracking investigation. Journal of Business Research, 111, 241-248. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JBUSRES.2019.02.062

52) Sorschag, R., Mörzinger, R., & Thallinger, G. (2009). Automatic region of interest detection in tagged images. 2009 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo, 1612-1615. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICME.2009.5202827

The Seybold REPORT
ISSN 1533-9211
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10531943

53) Shukla, A., Katti, H., Kankanhalli, M., & Ramanathan, S. (2018). Looking Beyond a Clever Narrative: Visual Context and Attention are Primary Drivers of Affect in Video Advertisements. Proceedings of the 20th ACM International Conference on Multimodal Interaction. https://doi.org/10.1145/3242969.3242988

54) Teixeira, T.S., Wedel, M., & Pieters, R. (2012). Emotion-Induced Engagement in Internet Video Advertisements. Journal of Marketing Research, 49, 144 - 159. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.10.0207

55) Turaga, P.K., Chellappa, R., & Veeraraghavan, A. (2010). Advances in Video-Based Human Activity Analysis: Challenges and Approaches. Adv. Comput., 80, 237-290. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2458(10)80007-5

56) Vairavasundaram, S., Varadharajan, V., Vairavasundaram, I., & Ravi, L. (2015). Data mining-based tag recommendation system: an overview. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, 5. https://doi.org/10.1002/widm.1149

57) Velsen, L.V., & Melenhorst, M.S. (2008). User Motives for Tagging Video Content. International Conference on Adaptive Hypermedia and Adaptive Web-Based Systems.

58) Wang, M., Ni, B., Hua, X., & Chua, T. (2012). Assistive tagging: A survey of multimedia tagging with human-computer joint exploration. ACM Comput. Surv., 44, 25:1-25:24. https://doi.org/10.1145/2333112.2333120

59) Wang, W., & Shen, J. (2017). Deep Visual Attention Prediction. IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, 27, 2368-2378. https://doi.org/10.1109/TIP.2017.2787612

60) Wang, W., Shen, J., Xie, J., Cheng, M., Ling, H., & Borji, A. (2021). Revisiting Video Saliency Prediction in the Deep Learning Era. IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, 43, 220-237. https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2019.2924417

61) Weinberger, D. (2005). Tagging and why it Matters. https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.870594

62) Whitehill, J., Ruvolo, P., Wu, T., Bergsma, J., & Movellan, J.R. (2009). Whose Vote Should Count More: Optimal Integration of Labels from Labelers of Unknown Expertise? Neural Information Processing Systems.

63) Wu, S., Rizoiu, M., & Xie, L. (2017). Beyond Views: Measuring and Predicting Engagement in Online Videos. International Conference on Web and Social Media. https://doi.org/10.1609/icwsm.v12i1.15031

64) Wu, Y., & Yang, M. (2008). Context-aware and attentional visual object tracking.

65) Xie, L., Natsev, A., Hill, M.L., Smith, J.R., & Phillips, A. (2010). The accuracy and value of machine-generated image tags: design and user evaluation of an end-to-end image tagging system. ACM International Conference on Image and Video Retrieval. https://doi.org/10.1145/1816041.1816052

66) Yang, M., & Marchionini, G. (2005). Exploring users' video relevance criteria - A pilot study. ASIS&T Annual Meeting. https://doi.org/10.1002/meet.1450410127

67) Yao, T., Mei, T., Ngo, C., & Li, S. (2013). Annotation for free: video tagging by mining user search behavior. Proceedings of the 21st ACM international conference on Multimedia. https://doi.org/10.1145/2502081.2502085

68) Zhang, W., & Liu, H. (2017). Toward a Reliable Collection of Eye-Tracking Data for Image Quality Research: Challenges, Solutions, and Applications. IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, 26, 2424-2437. https://doi.org/10.1109/TIP.2017.2681424

69) Zhao, S., Ding, G., Huang, Q., Chua, T., Schuller, B., & Keutzer, K. (2018). Affective Image Content Analysis: A Comprehensive Survey. International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence. https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2018/780