**Hypothesis**

Study 5 has both confirmatory and exploratory elements.

**Confirmatory analyses**

We wanted to confirm our finding that videos which vary in their informational content can establish evaluations towards an unknown individual. Specifically, participants exposed to *positive variant* videos should demonstrate relatively more positive evaluations of the target individual (Chris) than those in *negative variant* videos. We also expect evaluations to be independently significant in both conditions, such that the *positive variant* videos elicit self-reported evaluations that significantly differ from zero in a positive direction whereas the *negative variant* videos 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 1-4).

We also wanted to confirm our prior finding that synthetically-created (Deepfaked) videos are also capable of establishing novel evaluations, and critically, that these videos would lead to evaluations that are ***similar*** to those established via the genuine videos. Specifically, we expect a similar pattern of evaluations to emerge in the Deepfake conditions relative to those produced by the genuine videos (i.e., for a main effect of informational content and 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, or higher cognitive ability correlate with higher rates of Deepfake detection? Would lower scores on those variables, or higher scores on the conspiratorial thinking, religiosity, or over claiming measures correlate with lower rates of Deepfake detection)? We also wanted to explore if demographic factors were also related to Deepfake detection and the strength of subsequent evaluations.