**Hypothesis**

Study 6 has both confirmatory and exploratory elements.

**Confirmatory analyses**

We wanted to confirm our finding that audio clips which vary in their informational content can establish evaluations towards an unknown individual. Specifically, participants exposed to *positive variant* audio clip should demonstrate relatively more positive evaluations of the target individual (Chris) than those in *negative variant* audio clip. We also expect evaluations to be independently significant in both conditions, such that the *positive variant* audio clip elicit self-reported evaluations that significantly differ from zero in a positive direction whereas the *negative variant* audio clip elicit self-reported evaluations that significantly differ from zero in a negative direction. Although we also expect pIAT scores to differ as a function of informational content, we do not expect scores in the negative variant condition to differ from zero (in light of the results of Studies 1-5).

We also wanted to confirm our prior finding that synthetically-created (Deepfaked) audio are also capable of establishing novel evaluations, and critically, that these audio clips would lead to evaluations that are ***similar*** to those established via the genuine audio. Specifically, we expect a similar pattern of evaluations to emerge in the Deepfake conditions relative to those produced by the genuine audio (i.e., for a main effect of informational content, no main effect of informational type, nor an interaction between informational content and informational type).

**Exploratory analyses**

We also wanted to explore several questions in addition to our confirmatory analyses. First, would the magnitude of self-reported and automatic evaluations vary as a function of the demographic and individual difference factors measured in this study? Second, would the magnitude of evaluations vary as a function of ‘Deepfake detection’ (i.e., would those who self-report that the video was manipulated/faked/Deepfaked show weaker evaluative responses relative to those who failed to detect that the video was manipulated in some way)? Third, would any of the demographic or individual difference factors assessed in this study correlate with Deepfake detection (e.g., would a preference for effortful thinking, actively open-minded scores, or higher cognitive ability correlate with higher rates of Deepfake detection or evaluations? Would lower scores on those variables, or higher scores on the religiosity measures correlate with lower rates of Deepfake detection)? Likewise, would those participants who fail to discriminate fake news stories as being fake also fail to detect the current deepfake attempt (relative to their counterparts who do detect at higher rates)? We also wanted to explore if demographic factors were also related to Deepfake detection and the strength of subsequent evaluations.