

Personalized Recommendation of TV Programs^{*}

L. Ardissono¹, C. Gena¹, P. Torasso¹
F. Bellifemine², A. Chiarotto², A. Difino², and B. Negro²

¹ Dipartimento di Informatica, Università di Torino, Corso Svizzera 185, Torino, Italy
{liliana, cgena, torasso}@di.unito.it

² Telecom Italia Lab, Multimedia Division, via Reiss Romoli 274, Torino, Italy
{bellifemine, chiarotto, difino, barbara.negro}@tilab.it

Abstract. This paper presents the recommendation techniques applied in Personal Program Guide (PPG), a system generating personalized Electronic Program Guides for digital TV. The PPG recommends TV programs by relying on the integration of heterogeneous user modeling techniques.

Copyright Springer Verlag. This paper is going to appear in the Proceedings of the 8th AI*IA Conference, Pisa, 2003, published by Springer Verlag in the Lecture Notes for Artificial Intelligence collection (see <http://www.springer.de/comp/lncs/index.html>).

1 Introduction

The advent of Internet and Word Wide Web makes now available to the users a large amount of information, products and services. Recommendation techniques [13] based on the exploitation of AI techniques such as user modeling, content based and collaborative filtering are thus often presented as a solution to the information overload problem by helping the users to filter relevant items on the basis of their needs and preferences. With the recent expansion of TV content, digital TV networks and broadband, smarter TV entertainment is needed as well. As there are several hundreds of available programs every day, users need to easily find the interesting ones and watch such programs at the preferred time of day. Electronic Program Guides (EPGs) should recommend personalized listings, but they should also be deeply integrated in the TV appliance, in order to facilitate the access to the user's digital archive. For details, see [2].

This paper presents Personal Program Guide, a user-adaptive EPG that tailors the recommendation of TV programs to the viewer's interests, taking several factors into account. The PPG captures an individual model for each registered user and employs it to generate an EPG whose content and layout are tailored to the user watching TV.¹

^{*} This work was partially supported by the Italian M.I.U.R. (Ministero dell'Istruzione dell'Università e della Ricerca) through the Te.S.C.He.T. Project (Technology System for Cultural Heritage in Tourism). We are grateful to Flavio Portis, who helped us in the development of the Stereotypical UM Expert of the PPG.

¹ At the current stage, we have focused on the personalization of the EPG to individual TV viewers. The management of household viewing preferences is part of our future work.



Fig. 1. Personal Program Guide: PC simulator main window.

The personalized recommendation of programs is based on the integration of user modeling techniques relying on explicit user preferences, stereotypical information about TV viewer preferences, and the unobtrusive observation of the user's viewing habits. As the PPG has been designed to run within a Set-Top box, the user's behavior can be continuously monitored, in contrast to the Web-based EPGs, which can only track the interaction while the user browses them. In particular, we preferred to focus on the observation of real user's behavior and to implement the PPG on the client-side. Basing the system on a server-side architecture would support the application of social recommendation techniques, such as collaborative filtering, but would waste the rich information coming from the direct observation of the user's behavior.

In the following, Section 2 gives an overview of the facilities offered by the system, Section 3 sketches the system architecture and then faces with the management of the sources of information about the users, Section 4 discusses the recommendations of TV programs, Section 5 describes the results of an evaluation, Section 6 presents related works and Section 7 concludes the paper.




Fig. 2. Architecture of the Personal Program Guide.

2 The facilities offered by the PPG system

The PPG, which acts as a personal assistant offering advanced TV services, is designed for a set-top box, but it is currently implemented in a simulator running on desktop environments for demonstration purposes. In order to make our description more concrete, we will use an example of the GUI of this prototype: see Figure 1. The system offers advanced facilities for browsing the TV events: programs can be searched by channel, category, viewing time, etc.. Moreover, the user may ask for details about a program (e.g., cast, content description), record it, ask to be advised when the transmission of the program starts (Memo TV events button), and so forth. The archived programs are retrieved by means of functions that enable the user to get the list of programs she wishes to be alerted about, she has recorded (Recorded TV Events), or she has bought (Bought TV Events). By default, the PPG works in personalized mode (Personalization ON): the less suitable programs are filtered out and the most promising ones are shown at the top of the recommendation list. The recommendation degree of a program is represented by a list of smiling faces close to the program description, in order to make the ranking information independent of the visualization criterion (time, channel, etc.). The personalization facility can be switched off by the user.

3 Overview of the System Architecture

The architecture of the PPG is sketched in Fig. 2. In particular, the Recommendation Module makes use of the information about TV programs and preferences of the users (managed by the UMC Manager) to generate the recommendation lists for the user.

The representation of TV programs is an extension of the Digital Video Broadcasting standard [6].² Each program is described by a set of fields specifying data such as the starting time of the program, the transmission channel and the stream content (video, audio or data). The descriptor also includes one or more program categories representing the program content and format: e.g., Movie, Serial, News; see [4]. The program categories are organized in a taxonomy, the General Ontology, which includes several broad categories, such as Serial, and specializes such categories into more specific ones, such as Soap Opera, and Science Fiction Serial. The management of the user model is aimed at achieving a precise description of her interests and viewing preferences, during different times of day (and weekdays). In the design of the user model (UM), we considered the following information:

- *Explicit preferences* for categories of TV programs (e.g., movies, documentaries, etc.) that the user may want to notify the system about.
- The *estimates on the viewing preferences* for the program categories (related to the number of programs the user watches, for each category).
- *Socio-demographic information*, such as her age, occupation, and so forth.
- Information about the user's general *interests and hobbies*.
- *Prior information about the preferences of stereotypical TV viewers*.

Such different types of information provide multiple points of view on the user, useful for personalization, but require a separate information management. To this purpose, we have designed the User Modeling Component of the PPG as an agent that exploits three specialized user modeling modules (Explicit Preferences Expert, Stereotypical UM Expert, Dynamic UM Expert), each one managing a separate user model that reflects the viewpoint of the module (see Figure 2):

- The *Explicit User Model* stores the information elicited from the user in an explicit way: personal data, interests, and preferences for TV program categories.
- The *Stereotypical User Model* stores the prediction on the user's preferences inferred by exploiting general information about TV viewer categories.
- The *Dynamic User Model* stores the system's estimates on the user's preferences, as observed by analyzing the individual user's viewing behavior .

Each expert manages a different TV program ontology depending on the information about user preferences available to the expert. Then, mapping rules are applied to relate the different TV program characterizations to the categories of the General Ontology.

The User Modeling Component (UMC) maintains a Main User Model as a synthesis of such views, used by the system to personalize the interaction with the TV viewer. The UMC integrates the predictions provided by the experts into the Main User Model by taking the experts' confidence in the predictions into account (the confidence is based on the estimation of the quality of the data used to generate the prediction). For space reasons, we skip the description of the Explicit User Model, which manages in a direct way the explicit user's preferences and interests, and we focus on the other two user models, where inference mechanisms play a major role.

² The DVB has been defined at the international level to specify standards for the global delivery of digital television and data services.

<u>Classification data</u>	
Age [personal data]	Importance: 1, Values: (< 15, 0) (15/24, 0) (25/34, 0) (35/44, 0.5) (45/54, 0.5) (55/64, 0) (> 64, 0)
Gender [personal data]	Importance: 1, Values: (male, 0) (female, 1.0)
Books[interest]	Importance: 0.6, Values: (low, 0.8) (medium, 0.2) (high, 0)
<u>Prediction part</u>	
movies-sentimental, Interest degree: 1; serial-soap, Interest d.: 1; TV news Interest d.: 0.2; fashion programs, Interest d.: 0.5; cooking program, Interest d.: 1, etc;	

Fig. 3. The "Housewife" stereotype.

3.1 The Stereotypical User Model

We used the Sinottica lifestyle study conducted by Eurisko data analyzers [7] as a basis for specifying the characteristics and preferences of stereotypical TV viewer classes. Since the Eurisko survey relates homogeneous group of users and their corresponding interests and preferences, we structured the stereotypes in two parts: *i*) classification data characterizing the individuals of the represented stereotype, and *ii*) prediction part, containing the typical preferences of such individuals. Regarding the prediction part of stereotypes, we further analyzed a survey on the exposure to the TV, made by Eurisko and Auditel [1], which measures the audience of each lifestyles class. For more details about the knowledge engineering approach applied to collect and to process all the gathered data, see [8]. We defined a *Stereotype Ontology* defining the TV program categories to be considered as far as the stereotypical preferences are concerned. Mapping rules relate the preferences of the Stereotype Ontology to those ones of the General Ontology. The representation of the stereotypes is the one adopted in the SeTA system [3]; see the Housewife lifestyle in Fig. 3.

Each classification datum (socio-demographic feature, user interest) is represented as a slot with three facets: the *Feature Name*, the *Importance* (relevance of the feature to the description of the stereotype) and the *Values* (a frequency distribution on the values of the feature). For instance, the interest for *Books* has medium importance to the characterization of the users of the "Housewife" class (Importance is 0.6). Moreover, 80% of the "housewives" have low interest in reading books (frequency is 0.8); some have medium interest (0.2), but no one is highly interested in this activity.

The slots in the *prediction part* describe the preferences (for categories of the Stereotype Ontology) of the typical user belonging to the represented stereotype. A prediction slot is represented as follows: the *Program category* specifies the TV program category. The *Interest degree* represents the user's interest in the category and takes values in [0,1], where 0 denotes lack of interest and 1 is the maximum interest. E.g., the *Housewife* really likes sentimental movies, soap opera and cooking programs; she moderately likes fashion programs and she does not like TV news.

To estimate the user preferences, the Stereotypical UM Expert first classifies the user with respect to the stereotypical TV viewer classes. This is aimed at estimating which lifestyle descriptions are best suited to predict her preferences. The classification is performed by matching the user's classification data with the stereotypical descriptions, according to the approach described in [3]. The result of the classification is a

Preferences for TV program categories		Degrees of matching with stereotypes		
Movie-All	0.65	collef: 0.43 ⁴	Colleagues	0.34
Movie-Sentimental	0.65	conf: 0.43	Engaged women	0.24
Movie-Comedy	0.65	conf: 0.43	Refined women	0.26
Movie-Detective	0.65	conf: 0.43	Dolphins	0.16
News All	0.65	conf: 0.43		
Serial Fiction	0.65	conf: 0.43		

Fig. 4. Portion of Francesca's Stereotypical User Model.

degree of matching with respect to each stereotype: this is a number in $[0, 1]$, where 1 denotes perfect matching (the user data perfectly match the classification of a stereotype), while 0 denotes complete mismatch.³

Given the user's stereotypical classification, the predictions on the user's preferences (Spref in Fig. 2) are estimated by taking the contribution of each stereotype into account, proportionally to the degree of matching associated to the stereotype. Let's consider a program category C and the stereotypes $\{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$. The user's degree of interest in C (Interest_C) is evaluated by means of the following weighted sum:

$$Interest_C = \sum_{i=1}^n DM_{S_i} * Interest_C_{S_i}$$

$Interest_C_{S_i}$ is the degree of interest in C predicted by a stereotype S_i and DM_{S_i} is the degree of matching between the classification data of the user and S_i . Fig. 3 shows the classification of a user Francesca and the stereotypical predictions on her preferences.

Confidence in the stereotypical predictions. The confidence in the stereotypical predictions depends on the confidence in the user classification that, in turn, depends on the amount of information about the user available at classification time and on "how stereotypical" is the user.

Confidence in the user classification with respect to a stereotype. The user's degree of matching with respect to a stereotype S is considered reliable if it is based on complete information about her classification data. The confidence in the classification is thus evaluated by considering the minimum and maximum degrees of matching the user might receive, if complete information about her were available:

- The lower bound of the degree of matching (DM_{min}) is evaluated by pessimistically assuming that, for each classification datum she has not specified, the user matches the value(s) less compatible with the stereotype. For instance, several values of Age in Housewife have a compatibility equal to 0 (see Fig. 3). Thus, the lower bound of the compatibility of Age is 0.

³ For each datum F (e.g., "Age"), the suitability of the stereotype S is captured by a compatibility value, evaluated by matching the value v of S specified by the user (e.g., "35/44") with the corresponding datum in S . This match depends on the frequency of users belonging to S fitting the v value (e.g., 50% "housewives" are between 35 and 44) and on the importance of F in S . The degree of matching of the user with respect to the stereotype is then evaluated by combining the compatibility values of her classification data by means of a fuzzy AND operation; see [3] for details.

- The upper bound (DM_{max}) is evaluated by optimistically assuming that, for each missing classification datum, the user matches the most compatible value (0.5 for Age in Housewife).

The lower and upper bounds define the interval of admissible values for the matching degree (DM), given the user data: $DM_{min} \leq DM \leq DM_{max}$. The larger is the interval the lower is the confidence in the classification. Thus, the confidence can be evaluated as: $confS = 1 - (DM_{max} - DM_{min}) / \delta_{max}$ where δ_{max} is the maximum distance between DM_{max} and DM_{min} and corresponds to the case where no classification datum is set.

Confidence in the predictions on the user's preferences. To evaluate the confidence in the predictions on the user's preferences, an overall assessment of the quality of the user classification is needed, which takes all the stereotypes into account. We noticed that the estimates on the user preferences are accurate if she matches few stereotypes, while the predictions downgrade if she loosely matches many stereotypes. Thus, we evaluate such confidence by combining the average confidence in the stereotypical classification (Confstereotypes) with an evaluation of its focalization degree (Focus).

$$\text{StereotypicaExpertConfidence} = \text{Confstereotypes} * \text{Focus}$$

The focalization degree is derived from the evaluation of Shannon's entropy on the degree of matching of the stereotypes. Suppose that the $\{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ stereotypes receive the following matching degrees $\{DM_1, \dots, DM_n\}$. Then, the entropy is:

$$\text{Entropy} = \sum_{i=1}^n -DM_i * \log_2 DM_i$$

As the number of stereotypes is fixed, the entropy may be normalized in $[0,1]$, thus obtaining a normalized entropy normEntropy. The focalization degree is:

$$\text{Focus} = 1 - \text{normEntropy}$$

The focalization degree is 0 when the entropy is maximum, i.e., the classification is extremely uncertain. In contrast, when a single stereotype matches the user, the focalization degree is 1. In turn, the confidence in the prediction is high when the classification relies on complete information about the user and is very focused.

3.2 The Dynamic User Model

The Dynamic User Model specifies the user preferences for the program categories and subcategories of the General Ontology and for the TV channels available. Different from the other UM experts, the preferences can be related to various contexts because the expert has direct access to the user's behavior. In particular, this expert monitors user actions such as playing a TV program, recording a program and the like: see Fig. 1. In order to face the uncertainty in the interpretation of the user's viewing behavior, a probabilistic approach is adopted, where discrete random variables encode two types of information: preferences and contexts (viewing times). The sample space of the preference variables corresponds to the domain of objects on which the user holds preferences; the corresponding probability distributions represent a measure of such preferences (degrees of interest). The sample space of every context variable is the set of all possible contexts. We encoded this type of information by exploiting Bayesian Belief Networks (BBNs). Fig. 5 shows the structure of the BBN representing the user




Fig. 5. Portion of the BBN that represents the Dynamic User Model.

preferences. The network models the contextual information by means of context variables representing the conditions in which the user preferences for the TV programs may occur, the root nodes. We describe a context with temporal conditions, represented by the two variables "DAY" and "VIEWINGTIME" encoding, respectively, the 7 days of the week and the 5 intervals of time in which the day can be subdivided (morning, noon, ..., night). The leaf nodes of the BBN represent the user's contextual preferences, providing the probabilities for every program category, subcategory and channel.

For each individual user, the BBN is initialized with a uniform distribution of probabilities on its nodes where all values assumed by the preference variables have equal probability. The BBN is updated by feeding it with evidence about the user's actions, starting from the first time she watches the TV. Each time the user interacts with the program guide (to record a TV program, play it, etc.), the category and the subcategory of the event and its transmission channel are retrieved. Then, the BBN is fed with evidence that a new observation for that category is available. Not all the user actions have the same impact on the learning phase: e.g., playing a TV program provides more important evidence about the user's preferences than asking for more information about the same TV program. This fact is reflected in the definition of different learning rates for the possible user actions.⁴

Confidence in the predictions of the Dynamic UM Expert. The confidence of the Dynamic UM Expert in the predictions on the user's preferences is based on the amount of evidence about the user's viewing behaviour provided to the BBN since the first user interaction. At the beginning, the expert has low confidence in its predictions. As the number of observations increases, the Dynamic UM Expert becomes more confident. In fact, although noise can be present in the user's behaviour, the BBN tolerates such noise much more in the presence of a large corpus of data. A sigmoid function is used to define the confidence, given the number of events observed within the context. This function is normalized in the interval [0,1] and is defined as follows:

$$Conf(x) = 1 / (1 + e)^{(k-x)*s}$$

⁴ The BBN exploited has been implemented using the Norsis' toolkit [12], which provides algorithms for general probabilistic inference and parametric learning.

The function returns a confidence close to 0 if no user-events are observed in a specific context. The function returns a confidence of 0.5 after k events are observed and the confidence gets close to 1 after the observation of 2*k user-events. The s coefficient (in [0, 1]) defines how steep has to be the function (s has been set to 0.1).

3.3 Integration of the predictions provided by the User Modeling Experts

The Main User Model is instantiated by merging the predictions on the user's preferences provided by the Explicit, Stereotypical and Dynamic UM Experts. For each preference P, the predictions on P ($Interest_1, \dots, Interest_3$) are combined into an overall Interest as follows:⁵

$$Interest = [\sum_{e=1}^n Conf_e * Interest_e] / [\sum_{e=1}^n Interest_e]$$

The formula merges the predictions in a weighted way, on the basis of the experts' confidence, in order to privilege estimates based on higher quality information about the user. The confidence may change along time and eventually, the Dynamic UM Expert influences the predictions in the strongest way, providing an estimation of the user's long-term viewing preferences.

4 Personalized recommendation of TV programs

The Recommendation Module (Fig. 2) suggests TV programs as follows:

- the TV programs satisfying the user's search query are retrieved from a local database storing the information about available programs;⁶
- the programs are ranked on the basis of the user's preferences (Main User Model). The score associated to each the program is used to sort the recommendation list and to enrich the presentation with smiling faces representing the expected degree of appreciation;
- if several programs are retrieved from the user query, the rank associated to the items is exploited to filter out the worst programs, therefore reducing the length of the recommendation list.

Indeed, the generation of the scores for the TV programs is performed by taking into account both the user's preferences for the program category of the event and her preference for the transmission channel. The former type of information is the basis for the recommendations, but we use the latter to refine the score associated to the items, and thus the system's suggestions, with evidence about the user's viewing habits. The integration of these information sources is useful because the preferences for program categories do not support the comparison between individual programs belonging to the

⁵ The Explicit and Stereotypical UM experts do not predict the preferred channels; thus, the confidence in such predictions is 0. Moreover, we assume that their (a-contextual) predictions are the same in all viewing contexts.

⁶ The local database is populated by the TV Program Collector that downloads from the MPEG-2 satellite stream information about the TV programs available in a restricted time interval and integrates such information with data retrieved from the providers' web sites.

same category. In contrast, the preference for the channel (per viewing time) enables the system to take the user's preferences for individual programs into account, without explicitly modeling the characteristics of such programs. In fact, the system relies on the criteria applied by the provider in the selection of the programs to be shown: the scheduling of palimpsest (and of advertisements) is based on the supposed TV audience in a given time slot that influences the quality and the characteristics of the programs.

5 The evaluation of the system's recommendation capability

In this initial phase of the project we carried out a formative evaluation of the system's recommendation capability. As the Dynamic UM Expert's predictions are not available at moment we focused on the other experts. 62 subjects, 22-62 aged and representing all the possible types of PPG users, have been interviewed by means of a questionnaire. To obtain the desired information, we collected the following data: general questions, information about general user's interests (books, music, sport, etc.) and preferences for categories (Movies, News, etc.) and subcategories (Action Movies, Cooking Programs, etc.) of TV programs. The final questionnaire was made up of 35 questions where both the questions and the answers were fixed. The questionnaires were auto-filled by the users to avoid any possible interviewer's interferences and gained some days after the distribution. The questionnaire was anonymous and introduced by a written presentation explaining the general research aims. For the items concerning general data, participants were required to check the appropriate answer from a set of given answers. In the other questions, users had to express their level of agreement with the options concerning the given questions by choosing an item of a 3-point Likert scale. Then, the collected information has been entered into the system to evaluate the validity of the user classification and the accuracy of the recommendations. Concerning the first point, we have compared the system classification with the classification of two domain (human) experts. The comparison showed that 70% of the users have been correctly classified by the system, while the remaining 30% have been incorrectly classified for two main reasons:

- the system classification fails when the user's interests are different from those evaluated according her socio-demographic data;
- the data provided by Eurisko does not cover the whole Italian population.

The TV program predictions generated by the system have been then compared to the explicit preferences expressed by the users. As outlined before, this testing has mainly evaluated the recommendations provided by the Stereotypical UM expert in conjunction with the Explicit UM expert. In this case, when the user's explicit preferences are not available, the system takes in consideration just the Stereotypical expert. This situation is not unusual, since it is well known [5] that users do not like spend time filling questionnaires and evaluating items because they would get their tasks done immediately. Moreover, users are usually uncomfortable in answering personal questions.

To test the performance of the system, we evaluated the distance between the system predictions and the users' preferences by means of mean absolute error (MAE,⁷ for details see [9]). In addition, to test the accuracy of the selection process we measured the *precision* of the collected data.⁸

We obtained a mean absolute error value of 0,10 (the values are expressed on a scale ranging from 0 to 1) with a precision of 0.50. These values have confirmed our hypothesis about the validity of an integration of different sources of information. We believe that the contribution of the Dynamic UM Expert and a broader coverage of the stereotypical KB can still improve these measures.

6 Related Work

Several recommender systems are exploited in Web stores, electronic libraries and TV listing services; e.g., see [13], [10] and [11]. The PPG differs from such systems in two main aspects: our system integrates multiple acquisition techniques for the identification of the user preferences and the consequent recommendation of items. Moreover, the system privileges the local execution of tasks with respect to a centralized management of the EPG. In particular, the decentralization of the system execution supports the generation of precise user models (the TV viewers are frequent users of the TV) and limits the amount of explicit feedback required from the user, because her behavior can be analyzed at any time she watches the TV. In contrast, if a central server manages the EPG, the user's interaction with the TV is carried out in a distinct thread and can only be monitored while she browses the program guide, unless special hardware is used to connect the TV to the internet in a continuous way. See, for instance, [14].

Some recommender systems integrate multiple prediction methods by evaluating their precision, given the user's reactions to the system's recommendations (programs she watches, etc.). For instance, Buczak et al. (see [2]) fuse three recommenders by means of a neural network. In contrast, the PPG currently merges the predictions provided by different UM Experts on the basis of their confidence in the predictions. Indeed, we want to exploit relevance feedback to fuse our UM Experts, as well. However, we will combine such feedback with the experts' confidence, because in this way the system can benefit from an informed tuning parameter during its whole lifecycle. In fact, as the confidence depends on the amount of information about the user available to the system, it can be employed since the first interaction, while relevance feedback takes a significant amount of time before being effective.

7 Conclusions

This paper has presented the Personal Program Guide (PPG), a prototype system generating personalized EPGs, which we are developing in a joint project between Telecom

⁷ The local database is populated by the TV Program Collector that downloads from the MPEG-2 satellite stream information about the TV programs available in a restricted time interval and integrates such information with data retrieved from the providers' web sites.

⁸ The precision is defined as ratio between the user-relevant contents and the contents presented to the user.

Italia Lab and the University of Torino. A demonstrator of the PPG running on a PC simulator of the Set-Top Box environment is available.

The PPG integrates different user modeling techniques for the recognition of the TV viewer's preferences and the consequent generation of personalized recommendation listings. The management of multiple perspectives on the recognition of the user's preferences, and the cooperation/competition between the different user modeling methods has revealed to be fruitful to enhance the system's recommendation capabilities. As expected, the personalization based only on stereotypical suggestions is problematic, because not always people match stereotypes in a precise way. At the same time, the recommendations based on explicit user information are subject to failures: users often refuse to declare their real preferences or they provide the system with weak information about themselves. Finally, the recommendations based on the observation of the user behavior suffer from the *cold start* problem and, mirroring the user's usual selections, do not support the variety in the system's recommendations. The integration of three (or more) user modeling techniques enhances the reliability and richness of the system's predictions.

References

1. Auditel. <http://auditel.it>, 2000.
2. L. Ardissono and A. Buczak. <http://www.di.unito.it/~liliana/tv02/>. In *Proc. of TV'02: the 2nd workshop on personalization in future TV*, Malaga, Spain, 2002.
3. L. Ardissono and A. Goy. Tailoring the interaction with users in Web stores. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction*, 10(4):251–303, 2000.
4. L. Ardissono, F. Portis, P. Torasso, F. Bellifemine, A. Chiarotto, and A. Difino. Architecture of a system for the generation of personalized Electronic Program Guides. In *Proc. of the UM2001 Workshop on Personalization in Future TV*, Sonthofen, Germany, 2001.
5. J.M. Carroll and M.B. Rosson. The paradox of the active user. In J.M. Carroll, editor, *Interfacing thought: cognitive aspects of Human-Computer interaction*, pages 80–111. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1987.
6. DVB. Digital video broadcasting. <http://www.dvb.org>, 2000.
7. Eurisko. Sinottica. <http://www.eurisko.it>, 2000.
8. C. Gena. Designing TV viewer stereotypes for an electronic program guide. In *Proc. 8th Int. Conf. on User Modeling*, pages 274–276, Sonthofen, Germany, 2001.
9. N. Good, J.B. Shafer, J.A. Konstan, A. Botchers, B.M. Sarwar, J.L. Herlocker, and J. Riedl. Combining collaborative filtering with with personal agents for better recommendations. In *Proc. 16th Conf. AAAI*, pages 439–446, 1999.
10. GroupLens. Grouplens research. <http://www.ncs.umn.edu/Research/GroupLens>, 2002.
11. A. Kobsa, J. Koenemann, and W. Pohl. Personalized hypermedia presentation techniques for improving online customer relationships. *The Knowledge Engineering Review*, 16(2):111–155, 2001.
12. Norsys. Application for belief networks and influence diagrams, user's guide. <http://www.norsys.com>, 2001.
13. P. Resnick and H.R. Varian, editors. *Special Issue on Recommender Systems*, volume 40. Communications of the ACM, 1997.
14. B. Smyth, P. Cotter, and J. Ryan. Evolving the personalized EPG - an alternative architecture for the delivery of DTV services. In *Proc. of the AH'02 Workshop on Personalization in Future TV*, pages 161–164, Malaga, 2002.