|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions** | N\_P1 | N\_P2 | L\_P3 | L\_P4 | S\_P5 | S\_P6 |
| summarize the videos | So, I think the first video she spoke about how these different, how she views each cinema or each movie. And she tells that in her experience that she doesn't view with the same way because there are different characters and different actors involved and each story is different, and it gives a different feel at the end of the duration. And about the second video where Tom Cruise says that he's confirming that he literally does his own stunts and records his own music, and he tells he is all he also likes music, and he has a sweet spot for a few favorite musicians of his. | The first video is a 13 second video in which a man tells his experience about football, like kind of trauma in which we he had concussions while playing football due to the all the ramming between the players and all. And in the second video, there's a wave of Tom Cruise performing a magic trick. So it it was good to watch, but it is very, very normal magic trick. and behind that I saw bird stating its new net Los Angeles. | Not really. I don't recall what they were talking about. Or maybe, yeah, maybe the video's a little bit too short. | the first one was about the concussions and playing football and boxing. I think it was a boxer, but he was talking about football originally and then getting hit with helmets to helmets playing football and how that can lead to concussions. And he started that a young kid and looked to me like he was playing later in life, you know, more than a young kid. And I inferred he had some problems from that. The next one was talking about that kind of magic and getting you to focus your attention on the coin and looked like he was trying to do some magic to confuse you. So I was looking to see if there was something else going on that it's going to redirect my attention. Like I thought he was trying to make it look something here, but doing something else somewhere else. | In the first video of cricket, I was talking all these experiences and the second one, this guy he was talking about charge GPTS latest module O1. | In these two videos, the actors were basically describing situation. In the first video she was talking about just regular stuff and in the second video Tom Cruise was talking about that. He also like makes his own music. He completed with. |
| overall experience after watching the video | It was nice. It was short and momentary, so I could, like, grasp most of the things. It was not lengthy and boring. It was just like any other normal social media video. | those are pretty normal videos like what we watch in Instagram reels and YouTube shots. There is not much appealing about them to explain a lot about it. | I think they're both, they're both pleasant. Both pleasant. to watch, but I don't know why I don't remember what they were talking about. I don't know, maybe they started talking about some details right away. I don't know. I just don't remember what they were talking about. | The first one seems like a social issue, like the the, the, the people playing with the football and injuring their heads. And they're talking about the social issue of the impact of that. So there's kind of like the negative impact of playing. He's rough football and rough sports. The first one was more about information, letting me know some serious topic. And then the second one, seemed to be kind of trying to entertain. The second one was more about entertaining and, and the, you know, it was a good looking guy. He kind of captured the the smile of his face and he tried to, you know, try to was kind of more playful. | I'm not sure, I mean, it was a pretty short clip, | So, I mean, the clips are very short, but like they were just talking regularly about I guess someone must have asked them a question and they must be just replying to those questions. |
| focusing on any particular thing | I was focusing on Tom Cruise. from the first video, I think I was focusing on her facial expressions. About first video, that's it for how her expression changes when she is trying to describe things. again, the face. | Yes. focused on his face. The mic right below his neck. Then coming to second video, I was least concentrated on the coin because I know there was something behind him may be a blue frame hanging and I was trying to read it. I concentrated on Tom Cruise's face. Yeah, it comes a little on it because I at initial glance I thought it was a deep fake, but then the hair gave it away. so hair swing | No, I think I was trying to focus on what they were talking about. And then then it stopped. | the first one I was focusing on the person and trying to understand what the overall message was getting towards. And then second one is focusing on the coin and trying to see what kind of game he was going to play. And I was looking for some kind of misdirection. | Well, I was looking at the video as a whole. t's I found that the first video was quite clear, like it had defined textures and stuff, but in the second one it was it was a bit blurred and part of the videos had fuzzy details. | So in the first video, there was not really much going on. So I was just focused on her face the entire time, what she was saying basically on her face. And in the second video at the beginning, I was looking at the face, but I briefly looked at the painting hanging on the wall in the background and briefly on the guitar. But more or less I was focused on the face. |
| help mark it on the screenshot | Circled Faces | Face, Mic (V1), Face, Blue frame (V2) | Circled faces | Circled face (V1), Mouth & Coin (V2) | Circled Face (V1), Face and Shoulder (V2) | Circled on Face (V1), Face (V2) |
| talk more about your focusing parts | I think because first of all, it's both, both are attractive and that's where the focus goes. Apart from that, because they're moving and talking and it's a human tendency to obviously distract or put your action in the way of what is moving or yes, attractive. | in the first video while this guy is explaining about his past, he was like he can see that wrong on his face. hat is the whole thing. I was focusing on this little mic. I was thinking where is the receiver? And his traumatized eyes. Then coming to Tom Cruise's video I was just thinking I have seen this video before and it was a very very bad magic trick which he did but later this blue color thing behind him was appealing like. I catch him and I had to read it. So I was just thinking is it a window or a portrait? I was just thinking must be a portrait. initially felt like a deepfake, which is like very good deepfake, but you know, it cannot be a deepfake most probably I guess. |  | - | But in the second one, the lip, the lip movement seemed a bit unnatural and also the right hand shoulder, it seemed quite blurred. | - |
| Why that part captured your attention | I think because they're the only people in the frame who are talking. If there was another person, then maybe I would have options. But because it's just one person, I don't have anywhere else to look at. |  |  | - | - | - |
| your thoughts on the two videos! explain separately | maybe if I had the context of what they were speaking because both are related to cinema. I don't, I can't really relate to what they're directly talking about. But because they're talking general terms and what has already reached the audience, then based on that I can like, OK, I can understand, | They both were like not at all related to any each. |  | - | - | So if I had to rate 1, then the first video would be real and the second would be a deep big. |
| V1 | same for her. She's from Harry Potter. So, both are already talking about a topic that has reached the audience. | This thing seems like some video from an interview from an interview. So, I will definitely watch this video again to know all his trauma. |  | It feels real. Because it was sort of a serious topic. And then the person was describing their experiences and it appeared to me that they had experienced some brain injury or had damage from playing sports, that they had some kind of personal experience with that. | - | I think the first video was more convincing as the real one because the expression, the range of expressions in the first video was large and in the second video the range of expressions were like comparatively smaller. |
| V2 | Tom Cruise is talking about his stunts because people believe it's not it's not human to do stunts like he does. So, it has already reached the audience for him to speak about it. | and this the other video of Tom Cruise. I have no words like there's nothing more to explain about. It's just a simple video. |  | The Tom Cruise one, I thought it was more of an entertaining, trying to be entertaining type video. So I wasn't taking it quite as seriously as the first video. | - | - |
| Which video seems real | I feel both are natural | The first one. | I don't know. | First one | The first one I think is a is a real video and the second one is a deep fake. | I think the first video was more convincing as the real one |
| Why did you pause/rewind the video | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| What were your thoughts when you paused the video | - | - | - | - | - | - |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions** | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | P6 |
| summarize the videos | So, the first video again talks about physics theory, relativity and how the author or the speaker is trying to say that there is a contradiction that people are not aware and he's trying to come to the point and the video stops there. And the following video talks about I think a general help that someone did to another person and the other person was offering monetary or check and the guy refused it by saying if he were providing the money for it, he would not. He would just take back the service he provided, and he didn't basically he didn't want the money. | Both the videos of are of Obama OK, who is The Who was the president in the 2016 elections of the United States. And in that in the first video very evident that it is a deep fake because of the lip movement. he is even though there was a pause in the vocals, the lips were still moving, which is and also they are like very bad editing over the lips. they tried to match it with the words that are being pronounced and it didn't happen. And then the second video that's very real. It's from an interview of Obama. So the in that thing he was just explaining about something.  I didn't much focus on what he was explaining. And the first ones thing was good, like will robots take over. It was it was foolish. | the first lady was talking about relativity, relative, time traveling. she's going to having she's going to have someone, maybe some specialist on the topic talking about relative time, whatever that Einstein's topic to talk about the topic. And the the the second lady was talking about someone too, and she was making some judgement about someone. | First one was about talking about AI. And you don't need to be afraid of technology and AI coming. Second video was something it looked to me like it was about jobs for young people. | The first video, the person in the video was talking about some professor. And second one, I'm not really sure because it was just a 10 second clip. | I mean, the in both the cases, they were just like speaking again. The readers were too small for like any sort of meaningful context, but they were just talking about just general stuff. |
| overall experience after watching the video | Overall, I think the context was very, I couldn't follow up for the second one because it was because all the characters were not introduced and it directly went to the plot, directly to the plot. And I don't know the side characters of who's speaking what to whom. So, there was no proper introduction. It was just right direct in the middle, like middle of nowhere. And the first one was fine because it gave an introduction. But if there were no introduction for people who don't know gravity or relativity, it wouldn't be helpful. | Overall experience is like I got to know how bad people can do deep fix by seeing the first one and that's it like yeah, this is this is like one of the defects I have seen in a while with that bad editing. | No, I'm not I don't think I feel anything about just like normal videos. | the overall experience of the first one I thought was fake and the second one I thought was real. | - | - |
| focusing on any particular thing | I don't know why I go for the face (V1, V2). His ring (V2) | first video of Obama talking about robots taking humanity. His lips were not dull In Sync words. And first of all, there, there were no lips only for in the first 5 seconds. later then lips came then. as I told earlier, there was a pause in the vocals and still the lips were moving. So it's definitely a deep effect and in this thing because there is this was the thing which the lips was the things, things which gave away that this is a deep fake. Second video: I focused in here also on the lips because I have the second video, the second video because I thought this might also be a deep fake. If this is a deep fake, I will leave my masters. | Most videos are pretty short. I think the first one looks more professional to me. The second one, she's having too much movement with her eyes and the expression. I felt that it's a little bit distracting. | The first one, I was focusing on the mouth and the words more. And then the mouth seemed fake to me. It didn't feel like it was real and it didn't align with what the speaking wasn't completely aligned with what I know Barack Obama to be. the second one, I focus more on the hands and, and the, the gestures that were being made. The second one felt like the speaking was more aligned with what I've seen of Barack Obama in the past. The way he talks is the, the, the movement of the hands and then the second one, it, it feel like a little bit like it wasn't the real Barack Obama talking | Again, I was looking at the video as a whole. seconds  I mean, I noticed that the textures in the first video were kind of abnormal. | I was focusing on the faces because there was not much else in the frame in both the cases pretty much like compared to the video in the first phase like that the presence of warning label on the 1st like change your perception of watching the second video. |
| help mark it on the screenshot | Circled Faces (V1 & V2), Ring (V2) | Circled Lips (V1), Lips and Watch(V2) | Circled face (V1), Eyes (V2)- because she made a lot of eye movements which is distracting | Circled mouth & subtitle (V1), mouth, hand gesture & subtitle (V2) | Circled on Face (V1), Face and Headphone (V2) | Circled on Face (V1), Face (V2) |
| talk more about your focusing parts | I wouldn't say I was focusing more on the phase. I was also listening to him, so I was just looking at the looking at the screen. It could have been anything I could have, but I was like focusing on what he's saying more than what he's doing. OK for this, because I felt he was trying to say, describe something important like gravity and relativity. But the second one, I was not able to focus because the context was not clear in the starting. So, I was not in focus the first time I heard anything, but then I had to like replay it once more time one more time to get to know what he's actually talking about. | Yeah First video, this the focus parts which I was focusing on was the lips and the video also, I was looking for any other evidence of this thing being a deep fake or a generator or whatever. if it's an AI-generated thing, there must be some blurry parts in the video or blurry areas. But since it's a deep fake, it's definitely a deep fake because there the movement is real. The movement is real but the lips are not real. second video it I was just focusing on the lips after like the first 5 seconds I got to understand that it is not a deep fake or an age generated video. Later I started focusing on his watch. I was thinking the strap was familiar to mine, which is Nike watch, but this the the strap looked familiar and it had I thought it was a Apple Watch, but it's I don't think it's an Apple Watch. It has some boxy shape to it. | For First video, I'm focusing and listening.  So I remember. For second video, this time in her eyes because she was doing a lot with her eyes. | It's not really Barack Obama in First video. And then and then it was then it the the mouth seemed a little bit different and the the the words weren't quite the way I would pronunciation was exactly the way pretty close, but wasn't exactly Barack Obama is my impression. So the attention to his like accent and like the content and that caused me to think it wasn't a real it was a generated video. | In the first video, there were no physical features of the face were not clearly defined as compared to that in the second video. | - |
| Why that part captured your attention | The first I, I didn't take time to grasp, so that was fine. I was just looking at him because he's the only one talking. I focused on his ring because I couldn't focus on what he was saying. | - | In Second Video, a lot of eye movements. |  | - | - |
| Compared to the videos in phase 1, did the presence of a warning label change your perception of the videos | No, I actually forgot the warning. because I was listening to them. | I mean, the warning label said may this might be this may be generated by or might be generated.  but despite of the label people did see that it it was a generated. you could have just stated that it it is generated by you instead of may or might. | No. I didn't feel anything different. It did not because they were not talking about anything controversial. | I think initially it did. | Maybe. But if the warning would not have been there, I think I would have deemed that to be deep, to be a deep fate because of the texture of the texture and the quality of the video. | I think yeah, definitely the warning label did change my perspective. I was more focused on like if I can find any signs that this video has been AI generated like I was looking for the signs more than the in the 1st place. |
| Does the presence of the warning label from the first video change your perception of the second video? | No, it didn't. I don't think it would affect. it was not really like unbelievable. It felt like someone was telling the real things. So, it was not like they're making up stuff and talking. I honestly forgot that the label exists. | Yeah, sure for sure. Because the first videos warning label and the use of the defect then did make me to look at Obama's lips more in the second one. So it definitely did an impact. | No, it's if it's just saying something about pretty much about nothing. I don't think it's provoking any dislikeness in me. | I think my initial assumption is question, was this real or not? And then was this an AI one. But then when I listened to him and it, it more aligned with how I've seen Obama talk in the past than the first one. So it's because of that I thought it would, the second one was probably real | And it was not just because of the warning label, it was just the quality of video and the texture of video | Yes |
| your thoughts on the two new sets of videos! explain | I feel like I said before, they need, they lack introduction, and they like, they like, they like laying out the platform for the listener to start with or so can the content the person is about to start speaking about. first 2 videos I saw were easy to easy to take along. I was able to understand what the context was because maybe because of the familiarity with the characters on the video, I could relate that, OK, they are from the movie industry and they're talking something about the movies. But because I don't know any of these 2 people here, I had to take in time to understand what the context starts because he can literally talk about anything. And it took me time because I don't know them, and I don't know what the. And also, they didn't layout a pretext or a introduction for what they're speaking. | it's a good attempt to make us focus on one thing just to, you know, think if if it's the same thing, like see if I if it was not a deep fake, the first one was not a deep fake, I wouldn't have focus about that in the second one. Or if there is another aspect, if it's a different phase, but it was Obama's voice, I would have focused on the phase more than the voice in the second one is that way. the label and the person. Yeah, it would have it made an impact. So, like apart from the label, the persons are also same that is also like gave you interesting point to observe more. | the second girl was using a lot of facial, especially eye expression and that's pretty much it I've noticed. I don't think either one of them is more real or less real. | the first one didn't have much of an impact on me. And then the second one, I thought he was trying to say something important, but it I didn't the full video message didn't quite get out. So I don't know exactly what his point was, but something about I think jobs for young people are related, waiting for something. | - | - |
| Which video seems real | Both | Definitely the second one for there's no inhale. | Both are pretty much the same. | the first one I thought was fake and the second one I thought was real. | I feel the second one is the real one, whereas the first one is a deep fake one. | in this phase, I think the second video seemed to be the one which is real. first would say that it had a high probability of being deepfake because in the second, in the first video, the camera angle, I mean the expressions and overall the moment of the body was very rigid and the expressions weren't changing that much. While in the second video there was a lot of changing of expression as well as the hand moment. So I think that made the second video more real. |
| Why did you pause/rewind the video | I could not understand what he's talking about.  I was, there was no context laid before. So OK, I had to like rethink or reassure myself that OK, this might be what he's talking about. | - | - | - | - | - |
| What were your thoughts when you paused/rewind the video | - | - | - | - | - |  |

**Codebook:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Code** | **Definition** | **Example Excerpt** | **Application Guidelines** |
| **content\_focus** | Mentions of focusing on what the speaker/person in the video is saying or the message they are conveying. | “I was trying to focus on what they were talking about.” | Use when participants describe paying attention to spoken content or ideas presented in the videos. |
| **background** | Attention focused on elements in the video’s background, such as objects or scenery. | “I briefly looked at the painting hanging on the wall in the background.” | Use when participants mention noticing or analyzing background elements in the videos. |
| **facial\_expressions** | Attention directed toward the facial expressions of individuals in the video. | “In the first video, I was focused on her face and how her expression changed while speaking.” | Apply when participants describe observing or analyzing facial expressions in the videos. |
| **lip\_movements** | Focus on the movement of lips and its synchronization with speech. | “The lip movements seemed a bit unnatural, and it didn’t align with the audio.” | Use when participants describe analyzing lip movements to assess video authenticity. |
| **peripheral\_elements** | Attention directed to non-central objects or elements in the video, such as properties, accessories. (E.g., ring, coin, watch, headphone, mic, hair, blue frame, guitar) | “But later this blue color thing behind him was appealing”  “The mic right below his neck.”  “I thought it was a deep fake, but then the hair gave it away. so, hair swing.” | Use when participants describe focusing on items like rings, coins, watches, headphones, mics, or other secondary visual elements. |
| **warning\_impact** | The impact of the deepfake warning label on participants' perception of subsequent videos. | “Warning label did change my perspective. I was more focused on like if I can find any signs that this video has been AI generated.” | Use when participants describe how the warning label altered their viewing experience or perception. |
| **authenticity**  **\_judgment** | Participants' judgment about whether a video felt real or fake. | “I think the first video was more convincing as the real one because the expression, the range of expressions in the first video was large and in the second video the range of expressions were like comparatively smaller.” | Use for comments related to deciding which video seemed real or fake. |
| **emotional\_response** | Emotional reactions to the videos, such as feeling entertained, confused, or neutral. | “It was nice. It was short and momentary, so I could, like, grasp most of the things.” | Apply when participants express emotions about their experience watching the videos. |
| **technical\_observations** | Remarks about video quality, such as resolution, texture, or editing inconsistencies. | “There were no physical features of the face were not clearly defined as compared to that in the second video.” | Use when participants comment on technical aspects of the video production. |
| **context\_clarity** | Comments on whether the videos provided enough background or introductory information for understanding. | “There was no proper introduction. It was just right in the middle, like middle of nowhere.” | Use when participants mention clarity or lack thereof in the videos' context or presentation. |
| **behavioral\_observations** | Observations of specific actions or gestures by individuals in the videos. | “In the second video there was a lot of changing of expression as well as the hand moment.” | Apply when participants mention movements, gestures, or expressions in the videos. |
| **attentional\_ shift** | Descriptions of changes in focus prompted by external factors like the warning label or video content. | “Yeah, sure for sure. Because the first video's warning label and the use of the deepfake then did make me look at Obama's lips more in the second one.”  “I think yeah, definitely the warning label did change my perspective. I was more focused on like if I can find any signs that this video has been AI-generated.” | Use when participants describe shifts in their attention due to specific elements in the study videos. |
| **deepfake\_detection** | Strategies or signs participants used to determine if a video was a deepfake. | “If it's an AI-generated thing, there must be some blurry parts in the video or blurry areas.”  “His lips were not dull In Sync words.” | Use when participants describe indicators they looked for to identify a deepfake. |
| **cognitive\_effort** | Situations where participants describe mental effort or challenges in processing video content. | “But then I had to like replay it once more time one more time to get to know what he's actually talking about.” | Use when participants describe difficulty or deliberate effort in understanding or analyzing the video. |

**Themes:**

1. Impact of Warning Labels
   * warning\_impact
   * attentional\_shift
2. Content vs. Visual Elements
   * content\_focus
   * face\_expressions
   * lips\_movements
   * Background
   * peripheral\_elements
   * Whole screen
   * context\_clarity
3. Judging Authenticity
   * Authenticity of Content
   * Credibility of Context
   * deepfake\_detection
   * technical\_observations
4. Cognitive and Emotional Reactions

* emotional\_response
* deepfake\_detection
* cognitive\_effort

1. **Detection of Deepfake Cues**
   * Facial movements
   * Visual Blurring or Texture
   * Discrepancy in Persona

Topic:

1. Judging authenticity (how do people judge/what component did they focus on that tells them it’s a deepfake/detection of deepfake)
2. Impact of the label (Yes: ; No: content focus/don’t care/knowledge; how do they perceive “how do you feel about the video” has shifted)
3. Attention shift (attention to details rather than perceive the video as a whole; the attention to content decreased / didn’t impact much)
4. Attitude towards deepfake