

Video Social Tagging and Tagging Entertainmentization: A Case Study of Bilibili Postprint

Authors: Yang Yuyu, Zhang Pengyi

Date: 2023-04-01T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] With the widespread use of video resources, new indexing purposes have emerged in video social tagging to express users' viewpoints and emotions, rather than for traditional information organization and retrieval. This study analyzes and investigates video tags on Bilibili to explore video tag content and a new trend in video indexing—entertainment-oriented indexing. [Method/Process] Using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods such as log analysis and user interviews, this research investigates video tag content, as well as the motivations and functions of entertainment-oriented indexing. [Results/Conclusions] The most frequently used video tag types by users are “content theme” and “character subject”; Entertainment tags constitute an important component of Bilibili's tag content; Users' motivations for using entertainment tags are primarily social communication-oriented; Entertainment tags have many special functions that differ from traditional tags, such as “enhancing video viewing experience”. This study provides a preliminary exploration of video indexing content and entertainment-oriented indexing, and the findings contribute to a deeper understanding of new trends in video indexing and social tagging.

Full Text

Social Tagging of Videos and the Entertainment Tagging Trend: A Case Study of Bilibili

Yang Yuyu¹, **Zhang Pengyi**² ¹School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill 27599 ²Department of Information Management, Peking University, Beijing 100871

Abstract: [Purpose/Significance] With the widespread use of video resources, new tagging purposes have emerged in social video tagging that express user

opinions and emotions, rather than serving traditional information organization and retrieval goals. This study analyzes video tags on Bilibili to explore video tag content and a new trend in video indexing—entertainment tagging. [Method/Process] Using a mixed-methods approach combining log analysis and user interviews, this research examines video tag content and the motivations and functions of entertainment tagging. [Results/Conclusion] The most frequently used video tag types are “content theme” and “people/characters”; Entertainment tags constitute an important component of Bilibili’s tag content; Users’ motivations for employing entertainment tags are primarily social and communicative; Entertainment tags have many special functions that distinguish them from traditional tags, such as “enhancing video viewing experience.” This study provides preliminary exploration of video tagging content and entertainment tagging, with findings that contribute to deeper understanding of video indexing and emerging trends in social tagging.

Keywords: social tagging; video tagging; entertainment tagging; Bilibili **Classification Number:** G254 **DOI:** 10.13266/j.issn.0252-3116.2020.08.014

Social tagging has become a prominent research topic in recent years as a method for indexing information resources [1]. While existing studies have examined tags for textual resources, images, and web links [2-6], research on video tags remains relatively scarce and warrants further investigation.

Video resources contain more complex content, encompassing text, images, and audio simultaneously, which increases the difficulty of organizing and retrieving these resources. Currently, the primary methods for indexing video resources include subject indexing and social tagging. Subject indexing is not suitable for large-scale video resource organization, first because it requires substantial expert labor, and second because video content complexity far exceeds what controlled vocabularies can cover. Social tagging, grounded in broad user participation and allowing free vocabulary use, significantly improves the efficiency and quality of video resource organization [7]. At present, video resource indexing primarily relies on providers tagging according to specific metadata, which is relatively inefficient. Some platforms and systems (such as Flickr) have introduced social tagging functionality.

N. Postman argued that text cultivates rationality while television fosters entertainment that abandons rationality [8]. This perspective illuminates how different media formats influence human thinking patterns. Applied to the context of social tagging, video and text may lead to two distinct tagging approaches, with video tagging potentially becoming more “entertained.”

This study defines the entertainment tagging phenomenon as the emergence and increasing prevalence of entertainment tags in social tagging language. Entertainment tags refer to tags that users employ to describe resources in ways that are more interesting and attention-grabbing than traditional descriptive language. For example, when describing video quality, users might traditionally use tags like “high-definition,” but in entertainment tagging, they use expres-

sions like “touching picture quality” (画质感人).

Evidence of entertainment tagging has appeared in previous research. J. Beaudoin’s study of Flickr tags found that some image descriptions contained humorous content, which she categorized as “humor” tags [9]—an embodiment of entertainment tagging.

This research selects Bilibili as its case study. Founded in June 2009, Bilibili’s content focuses primarily on Japanese anime and ACG (Animation, Comic, Game) culture. In addition to officially licensed content, the platform hosts numerous user-generated videos, with users predominantly under 30 years old. These users form a strongly ACG-oriented video community. Bilibili allows users to add tags that appear below videos.

This analysis of Bilibili video tags aims to understand users’ video indexing language and conduct in-depth research on entertainment tags to explore their content dimensions, causes, and functions. The findings will enhance understanding of video indexing language and illuminate this new trend in social tagging—entertainment tagging.

Literature Review

2.1 Tag Content

Research shows that tag content characteristics vary for different objects. Existing studies on multimedia resource tags have covered television programs, images, and music.

For television program tags, V. Søbakk and N. Pharo’s study of Norwegian TV tags found that approximately 61.5% were thematic, about 26% were names of people or organizations, and 8% were geographical names. Among thematic tags, the most common were activities (such as homework help) and products (such as “telephone”) [11].

For image tags, J. Beaudoin’s sampling of Flickr tags revealed content primarily including place names, compound words, objects, and events [9]. Additionally, user studies found that “region” and “emotion” were the two most frequently used dimensions in image description [12].

For music tags, A. E. Thompson’s research found that tags describing popular music mainly included genre and personal opinions [13].

Research on video tags remains limited. Some studies have explored using the game-based tagging software Waisda for movie indexing [14-16], while others have examined television and news tagging [11, 17], with virtually no research on large-scale applied video social tagging systems.

2.2 Image and Visual Information Indexing

The most widely used model for image tagging description in academia is the Panofsky/Shatford model, which combines theories by E. Panofsky and S. Shatford. E. Panofsky proposed that image indexing could be analyzed through three dimensions: primary subject matter, intrinsic content, and symbolic meaning. Primary subject matter refers to basic elements; intrinsic content is more abstract, requiring background knowledge about the depicted object; symbolic meaning is even more abstract, sometimes including emotional terms [18]. S. Shatford reinterpreted Panofsky's three dimensions as generic, specific, and subject attributes, adding four additional dimensions—who (people and organizations), what (subject), where (location), and when (time)—to create twelve tag categories based on Panofsky's original three [19]. C. Jørgensen conducted content analysis of image description language, extracting three dimensions: perceptual features, interpretive features, and reactive features, with reactive features comprising viewer response dimensions [20].

In video description research, R. Gligoro et al. categorized video tags into: non-visual types, primarily describing video background information; perceptual types, describing low-level auditory and visual elements; and conceptual types, describing video content, directly adopting the Panofsky/Shatford model [15].

2.3 User Tagging Motivations

Tag content is also influenced by user motivations, with different motivations leading users to select different tag content. T. Coates suggested that user motivations can be divided into two fundamental types: categorization and description. Categorization refers to using tags to classify resources according to their characteristics, while description refers to using tags to describe resource features [21]. M. Heckner built upon Coates' work, proposing that user motivations should be divided into personal information management and resource sharing types, finding through user experiments and interviews that motivations differ across social tagging platforms (YouTube and Delicious) [22]. M. Ames and M. Naaman distinguished user motivations from social (self-interest, social) and functional (organization, communication) dimensions, creating four types: social organization, social communication, self-interest organization, and self-interest communication. Social organization refers to using tags that make resources more discoverable to others; social communication refers to using tags to interact with others; self-interest organization means using tags for personal information management; and self-interest communication refers to using tags to add background information for future recall [23].

These studies show that user tagging motivations can be distinguished along functional and social dimensions [23], including resource organization, resource description, and opinion expression. Different motivations lead users to employ different tag types, and entertainment tagging may be associated with specific motivation types.

2.4 Community Influence and Community Norms

Users, resources, and tags, along with their interactions, form a community. Previous research indicates that existing tagging norms within a community—how others use tags—influence user tagging behavior. S. Sen suggested that users in a tagging community perceive its norms and adjust their tagging behavior to fit these patterns, thereby reinforcing the norms (see Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper]). Novice users are more susceptible to existing community patterns, while experienced users invest more effort in creating personal tagging vocabularies [24-25]. J. Binkowski used user experiments to demonstrate that “social proof” from social psychology exists in tagging communities, meaning people judge their behavior’s correctness based on others’ actions. In tagging communities, users select tags based on existing ones [26]. J. Yew studied social tagging’s impact on group knowledge learning, finding that it helps students share knowledge using common language. The tagging process establishes norms to guide practice, such as users employing specific functional tags to indicate blog writing purposes [27].

As a video platform, Bilibili users browse danmaku (bullet comments) and comments while watching videos, and also view tags below videos—all manifestations of Bilibili’s tagging norms that may influence user tagging behavior, particularly entertainment tagging behavior.

Research Methods

This study selected Bilibili videos and conducted content analysis of their tags, followed by interviews with six Bilibili users to preliminarily explore the motivations, causes, and functions of entertainment tag usage.

3.1 Tag Content Analysis

3.1.1 Dataset This study used Python web scrapers to obtain Bilibili video tag data. Since non-popular videos have few or no tags, only the top 100 videos from 11 different Bilibili categories were selected for analysis. Bilibili video tag data fields are shown in Table 1 .

3.1.2 Coding Framework To understand video tagging content characteristics, this study employed qualitative content analysis to code video tags and understand users’ video description language. Drawing on R. Gligoro’s classification system of non-visual, perceptual, and conceptual tags [15], video tag content was divided into two basic categories: external video resource features and internal video resource features. Based on C. Jørgensen’s three dimensions of perceptual, interpretive, and reactive features [20], internal video resource features were further subdivided into visual and conceptual subcategories. According to Bilibili tag characteristics, “commentary” was made a primary category, with “other” and “unclear meaning” added as additional categories.

Existing image description systems, notably those by C. Jørgensen [20] and J. Beaudoin [9], only reach the third-level categories used in this study's video description framework. However, both focus solely on image tagging, with some categories like color and texture being too specific for video tag analysis. Therefore, this study inductively developed third-level categories through content analysis of Bilibili video tags. The final coding framework is shown in Table 2 .

3.1.3 Analysis Method Four coders participated in tag coding. Before formal coding, 432 tags were extracted from the sample by frequency for pre-coding. Inter-coder consistency results are shown in Table 3 , with an average Kappa score of 0.67, indicating high consistency. After pre-coding, each of the four coders analyzed and categorized approximately 900 tags.

3.2 Interviews

Previous research reveals video tag content composition but cannot capture users' subjective perspectives. To address this gap, semi-structured interviews were conducted to understand user tagging motivations, community norm influences, and views on entertainment tagging based on objective data analysis. Six respondents participated, with an average interview duration of 15 minutes. Respondent information is shown in Table 4 .

Research Results

4.1 Tag Content Distribution

Statistical results (see Figure 2 [Figure 2: see original paper]) show that “content theme” and “people/characters” are the most frequently used tag categories, accounting for over 50% of total tags. Next are “related works” (approximately 16.8%), “responsible parties” (approximately 10.1%), and “work commentary” (9.5%). Examples of each category are shown in Table 5 .

4.2 Entertainment Tag Content Distribution

As previously defined, entertainment tags refer to tags that users employ to describe resources in more interesting and attention-grabbing ways than traditional descriptive language. Analysis of tag samples found that entertainment tags account for approximately 16.2% of total tags, demonstrating that entertainment tags constitute an important component of Bilibili's tag ecosystem.

Among entertainment tags, the highest proportion is work commentary (59.2%), followed by author commentary (9.1%), content theme (7.5%), people/characters (7.1%), and abstract description (6.3%) (see Figure 3 [Figure 3: see original paper]).

Analysis reveals that entertainment tags primarily appear in several dimensions: “work commentary,” “author commentary,” “content theme,” “people/characters,” “abstract description,” “series name,” “related works,”

“responsible parties,” and “viewing guide.” The content of entertainment tags in each dimension is as follows:

People/Characters: These entertainment tags are primarily nicknames for individuals or groups, such as “foreigner,” “Cheung Ka-fai,” and “Russian people.” Some tags also tease the subjects, such as “the landlord’s foolish son.”

Content Theme: Many entertainment tags in this category describe how video content is presented, such as “spoiler alert” and “all advertisements,” while others express themes through teasing, such as “plastic sisters.”

Abstract Description: These entertainment tags provide abstract descriptions of videos but use more exaggerated and humorous language, such as “utterly insane,” “explosively inspiring,” and “terribly unskilled.”

Related Works: Most entertainment tags in this category are teasing nicknames for specific works. For example, many Bilibili users created numerous nicknames for the punishing climbing game “Getting Over It with Bennett Foddy,” such as “digging to rise” and “playing with a hammer.” Another example is the classic piece “Canon,” where users attach tags like “eternal Canon” and “long live Canon” to express their affection.

Viewing Guide: Entertainment tags in this category provide guidance to viewers using humorous and teasing language, such as “OCD satisfaction” and “headphone treat.”

Responsible Parties: These entertainment tags are all nicknames for responsible parties, such as “seductive Xiao Yiqing” and “Van Fei.”

Series Name: While ordinary series names simply indicate the video’s series, entertainment tags in this category create series names based on prominent video characteristics, such as “hand-breaking series,” “kneel and sing conquest series,” and “one-person-supports-the-whole-crew series.”

Work Commentary: All tags in this category are entertainment tags, characterized by strong teasing that distinguishes them from traditional tags. Work commentary entertainment tags mainly fall into three types: teasing video content, such as “poverty limits imagination” and “money can really do whatever it wants”; describing user viewing reactions, such as “brainwashing loop” and “kneeling at first sound”; commenting on danmaku, including “danmaku carnival” and “danmaku is too brilliant.”

Author Commentary: Like work commentary, all tags in this category are entertainment tags, primarily praising video creators, such as “godly drawing” and “UP 主, you’re truly talented.”

Notably, many Bilibili entertainment tags can find similar language in video danmaku, indicating that danmaku has a significant influence on video tagging.

To understand the proportion of entertainment tags across dimensions, this study analyzed their distribution. Results show (see Figure 4 [Figure 4: see

original paper]) that the categories with the highest entertainment tag proportions are “author commentary” and “work commentary,” followed by “series name,” “viewing guide,” “abstract description,” “people/characters,” “content theme,” “responsible parties,” and “related works.”

4.3 Entertainment Tagging Motivations

Interview analysis revealed five main user motivations for entertainment tagging, as shown in Table 6 :

Respondents explained these motivations as follows:

“I used this tag (powered by love) without much thought, just to let everyone know the video contains advertisements.” [Respondent 1, helping other viewers understand video content (social-communicative)]

“I think it’s more about emotional reaction... I feel it’s (entertainment tags) more an expression, not for searching.” [Respondent 2, expressing emotional reactions to videos (social-communicative)]

“Many people don’t search for ‘cat’ directly; they search for ‘meow 星人’ more often, so I wrote meow 星人. I think this tag can help more people find my video because it’s more commonly used.” [Respondent 3, facilitating video retrieval (social-organizational)]

“Actually, I hadn’t thought of using this term (powered by love) before, but when watching anime commentary videos, when the video advertised heavily, danmaku would appear saying ‘this isn’t powered by love at all,’ and that’s how I learned this expression.” [Respondent 1, imitating other Bilibili users’ tagging behavior (community norms)]

Bilibili users’ tagging behavior is also influenced by community norms. As mentioned, Respondent 1 learned “powered by love” from other users. When asked why they didn’t use more traditional language like “contains advertisements,” they replied: “Because ‘contains advertisements’ is too uncool; Bilibili has its own language system. I’ve seen people use ‘advertising zone expert’ or similar terms to describe video advertising, but I find those tags very uninteresting.” [Respondent 1]

Respondent 3 noted that Bilibili video danmaku contains content and language identical to entertainment tags. Respondent 2 also mentioned that Bilibili’s shared culture influences users’ tagging language: “People who like common cultures or film works tend to use their unique expressions to tag videos they watch. I think this is a form of cultural identity.” [Respondent 2]

In summary, users learn Bilibili’s unique language system by watching videos, danmaku, and browsing tags and comments, then apply this language to tagging. These unique tags are displayed below videos to all users, subsequently influencing later users’ tagging behavior.

4.4 Functions of Entertainment Tagging

Users identified six main functions of entertainment tagging, as shown in Table 7 :

This study divides entertainment tag functions into “traditional” (also possessed by non-entertainment tags) and “special” (unique to entertainment tags).

4.4.1 Traditional Functions of Entertainment Tags Regarding the first function (indicating video content and quality), interviews revealed that besides indicating content, some widely used entertainment tags that have become norms are used to judge video quality: “These three terms (Bilibili’s Fang Wenshan, soulful lyric-writing, divine Photoshop) actually represent very high evaluations of parody videos.” [Respondent 5]

For the second function (understanding other users’ views on the video), respondents stated: “It (entertainment tags) can reflect other users’ perceptions of the video.” [Respondent 1]

For the third function (using normalized entertainment tags for retrieval), one respondent noted they often search for videos by clicking tags, including entertainment tags that have become terminology: “(Tags I’ve clicked include) aniki, Zhuge Wanglang, MayJLee, and instrument names like FA instrument and Mom’s not home today, which are actually instrument names, all terms from the parody zone.” [Respondent 5]

4.4.2 Special Functions of Entertainment Tags Regarding the fourth function (helping viewers develop emotional resonance with other users), respondents stated: “You find common ground in these tags. What you like or dislike, you can feel or experience here.” [Respondent 2] “And I think there’s also a sense of validation, discovering ‘I seem to think the same as them.’” [Respondent 4]

For the fifth function (enhancing video viewing experience), respondents indicated that some entertainment tags help improve their viewing experience: “It adds an extra layer of fun. The video itself might not be that interesting, but there’s something really amusing below it.” [Respondent 6]

For the sixth function (providing users with appropriate vocabulary to describe inner feelings), some respondents noted that entertainment tags help them find words to describe their thoughts, similar to how retrieval systems provide vocabulary for search needs: “For soulful lyric-writing, I might not think of such precise words on my own. After seeing them, I think ‘oh, that’s exactly it,’ and might use such terms in the future.” [Respondent 4]

Conclusion and Discussion

5.1 Conclusion

Results show that content theme, people/characters, related works, and responsible parties are the most frequently used tag categories, with content theme and people/characters alone accounting for over half of all tags. This aligns with V. Søbakk's content analysis of Norwegian television program tags [11]. When indexing video resources, users most frequently describe content themes, followed by people/characters in the videos.

Analysis of entertainment tags reveals they constitute 16.1% of total tags, making them an important component of Bilibili's tag ecosystem, with over half being user commentary and teasing about works, followed by author commentary, then content themes. This demonstrates that entertainment-oriented tagging content has become a significant part of Bilibili's video indexing.

M. Ames and M. Naaman analyzed user tagging motivations from social (self-interest, social) and functional (organization, communication) dimensions [23]. Interview analysis found that among the five tagging motivations, "helping other viewers understand video content," "attracting other users' attention," and "expressing emotional reactions to videos" are all social-communicative motivations, indicating that communication with other users is a key driver of entertainment tagging. Interviews also show that Bilibili users are influenced by community norms when using entertainment tags, learning Bilibili's cultural language through watching videos, danmaku, and browsing tags and comments, then applying this language to tagging. These unique tags are displayed to all Bilibili users below videos, subsequently influencing later users' tagging behavior.

Analysis of entertainment tag functions reveals that some entertainment tags have become terminology for describing specific video types, echoing J. Yew's research findings. That study found that when students freely used tags to index course materials, they gradually formed tagging norms, such as using specific functional tags to indicate blog writing purposes, thereby assigning particular meanings to certain tag languages [27].

To date, Bilibili is the only major domestic video platform in China that provides social tagging functionality. Research on Bilibili video tagging helps understand potential applications of social tagging systems for organizing online video resources in China and emerging trends (entertainment tagging), offering guidance for further utilization of social tagging systems to organize video resources.

5.2 Limitations and Future Directions

Regarding limitations, because only popular videos have sufficient tag quantities, this study only analyzed top-ranked videos from Bilibili's leaderboards, limiting the generalizability of findings. Additionally, few Bilibili users employ video tags, and even fewer use entertainment tags, making it difficult to recruit

interview participants. While the six interviewees provided rich information, the sample size is somewhat insufficient. Moreover, although three interviewees had used entertainment tags, they were not tag editors from the video dataset due to objective constraints, representing another limitation.

Future research could further investigate users' views on entertainment tags, exploring their impact on video viewing experience, advantages and disadvantages in retrieval, and the process by which an entertainment tag emerges and becomes normalized. Entertainment tagging language belongs to users and originates from their hearts. Developing and utilizing entertainment tags could help provide users with more precise vocabulary to describe their video needs.

References

- [1] Zhai Shuang, Song Wen. Overview of Social Tagging Research Progress [J]. *Library and Information Service*, 2010, 54(20): 41-44, 143.
- [2] Pirane CS, Ivan JK. Experts vs. Novices Tagging Behavior: An Exploratory Analysis [J]. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2013, 73: 456-459.
- [3] Rolla PJ. User Tags versus Subject Headings [J]. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 2011, 53(3): 174-184.
- [4] Lu C, Park J, Hu X. User Tags versus Expert-Assigned Subject Terms: A Comparison of LibraryThing Tags and Library of Congress Subject Headings [J]. *Journal of Information Science*, 2010, 36(6): 763-779.
- [5] Rorissa A. A Comparative Study of Flickr Tags and Index Terms in a General Image Collection [J]. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 2010, 61(11): 2230-2242.
- [6] Ransom N, Rafferty P. Facets of User-Assigned Tags and Their Effectiveness in Image Retrieval [J]. *Journal of Documentation*, 2011, 67(6): 1038-1066.
- [7] Darvish S, China. Dealing with the Video Tidal Wave: The Relevance of Expertise for Video Tagging [C]//*Proceedings of the 21st ACM Conference on Hypertext and Hypermedia*. New York: ACM, 2010: 289-290.
- [8] Postman N. *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business* [M]. New York: Penguin, 2006.
- [9] Beaudoin J. Folksonomies: Flickr Image Tagging: Patterns Made Visible [J]. *Bulletin of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 2007, 34(1): 26-29.
- [10] Li Yanhua. The Spread and Influence of Japanese ACG Culture in China [J]. *News Front*, 2016(12): 127-128.
- [11] Søbakk V, Pharo N. Decentralized Subject Indexing of Television Programs: The Effects of Using a Semi-Controlled Indexing Language [J]. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 2017, 68(3): 739-749.
- [12] Greisdorf H, O'Connor B. Modeling What Users See When They Look at Images: A Cognitive Viewpoint [J]. *Journal of Documentation*, 2002, 58(1): 6-29.
- [13] Thompson AE. *Playing Tag: An Analysis of Vocabulary Patterns and Relationships within a Popular Music Folksonomy* [D]. America: University of North Carolina, 2008.
- [14] Oomen J, Gligoro R, Hildebrand M. *Waisda?: Making Videos Findable Through Crowdsourced Annotations* [M]//*Crowdsourcing Our Cultural Heritage*. London: Ashgate, 2014: 161-184.
- [15] Gligoro R, Hildebrand M, van Ossenbruggen J, et al. On the Role of User-Generated Metadata in

Audiovisual Collections [C]//Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Knowledge Capture. New York: ACM, 2011: 145-152. [16] Estrada LM, Hildebrand M, de Boer V, et al. Time-Based Tags for Fiction Movies: Comparing Experts to Novices Using a Video Labeling Game [J]. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2017, 68(2): 348-364. [17] Dowman M, Tablan V, Cunningham H, et al. Web-Assisted Annotation, Semantic Indexing and Search of Television and Radio News [C]//Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on World Wide Web. New York: ACM, 2005: 225-234. [18] Panofsky E, Drechsle B. Meaning in the Visual Arts [M]. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955. [19] Shatford S. Analyzing the Subject of a Picture: A Theoretical Approach [J]. Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, 1986, 6(3): 39-62. [20] Jørgensen C. Attributes of Images in Describing Tasks [J]. Information Processing & Management, 1998, 34(2/3): 161-174. [21] Coates T. Two Cultures of Fauxonomies Collide [EB/OL]. [2019-11-17]. http://plasticbag.org/archives/2005/06/two_{{cultures}}_{{of}}_{{fauxonomies}}_{{collide}}. [22] Heckner M, Heilemann M, Wolff C. Personal Information Management vs. Resource Sharing: Towards a Model of Information Behavior in Social Tagging Systems [C]//Third International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media. San Jose: AAAI, 2009: 42-49. [23] Ames M, Naaman M. Why We Tag: Motivations for Annotation in Mobile and Online Media [C]//Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. New York: ACM, 2007: 971-980. [24] Sen S, Lam SK, Rashid AM, et al. Tagging, Communities, Vocabulary, Evolution [C]//Proceedings of the 2006 20th Anniversary Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work. New York: ACM, 2006: 181-190. [25] Sen S, Riedl J. Folksnomomy Formation [J]. Computer, 2011, 44(5): 97-101. [26] Binkowski PJ. The Effect of Social Proof on Tag Selection in Social Bookmarking Applications [D]. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2006: 41. [27] Yew J, Gibson FP, Teasley S. Learning by Tagging: The Role of Social Tagging in Group Knowledge Formation [J]. Journal of Online Learning & Teaching, 2006, 2(4): 275-285.

Author Contributions: Yang Yuyu: Research design, data analysis, initial draft writing Zhang Pengyi: Research design, manuscript revision

Social Tagging of ACG Video Contents and the Entertainment Tagging Trend: A Case Study of Bilibili.com

Yang Yuyu¹, **Zhang Pengyi**² ¹School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill 27599 ²Department of Information Management, Peking University, Beijing 100871

Abstract: [Purpose/significance] Social tagging is widely used in organizing user-generated web contents. However, relatively less is known about the new motivations behind social tagging of user-generated video contents. This paper analyzes Bilibili.com's video tags to explore the new entertainment trend in

video tagging. [Method/process] It used a mixed-method approach by content analysis and interviews to understand the use of video tags to study the tag content, motivations and functions of the entertaining tags. [Result/conclusion]

The most common types of video tags used by users are “content theme” and “people”. Entertainment tags are an important part of the content of Bilibili tags. The motivation of users to use entertainment tags is mostly for social communication and interaction. Entertainment tags have special functions in addition to traditional tags, such as “improving video viewing experience”. This study provides some preliminary results on the tagging of ACG videos and insights to further understand the new trends of video indexing and social tagging.

Keywords: social tagging; video tagging; entertainment tagging; bilibili

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv — Machine translation. Verify with original.