WERONIKA WIORA
JAGIELLONIAN UNIVERSITY
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3089-8793
weronika.a.wiora@student.uj.edu.pl

KATARZYNA MOLEK-KOZAKOWSKA
UNIVERSITY OF OPOLE/VILNIUS GEDIMINAS TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9455-7384
molekk@uni.opole.pl

Rhetorical strategies of counter-journalism: How American YouTubers are challenging dominant media election narratives
Strategie retoryczne w kontrdziennikarstwie: Jak amerykańscy youtuberzy krytykują dominujące narracje medialne w okresie przedwyborczym

Abstract

The standards and practices in journalism that best serve democratic deliberation remain a matter of intense scrutiny in the digital age. The United States has a long history of journalists exposing self-interested behaviors of political or corporate elites with investigative journalism. With online media, journalistic practices encompass fact-checking against a variety of sources, and countering the claims of other journalists from competing outlets. This article aims at delimiting the rhetorical properties of an emerging genre of YouTube counter-journalism. The study reports on a rhetorical and eristic analysis of the main patterns of countering in a sample of videos posted on YouTube on the subject of the US presidential campaign in spring 2020. The analysis reveals some ways in which YouTube journalists break down the dominant media narratives and present counterclaims and critiques, which is usually accompanied by fact-checking, showcasing evidence and providing alternative explanations or counterarguments. However, counter-journalism is not free from eristic devices that may misrepresent political issues for the subscribers.

Standardy i praktyki dziennikarskie, które mają służyć demokratycznej deliberacji w erze cyfryzacji są stałym przedmiotem analiz. Stany Zjednoczone to kraj o długiej tradycji dziennikarstwa śledczego, które wielokrotnie odkrywało szkodliwe działania polityków i biznesmenów. W dobie dominacji nowych mediów, do tych praktyk dziennikarskich dołączyła jeszcze konieczność sprawdzania faktów i kontrowania narracji i twierdzeń propagowanych w upolitycznionych mediach komercyjnych. Niniejszy artykuł poświęcony jest retoryce nowego gatunku kontrdziennikarstwa cyfrowego. Przedstawia wyniki analizy strategii retorycznych i erystycznych zidentyfikowanych w krótkich filmach rozpowszechnianych przez popularne na kanały YouTube, za pomocą których dziennikarze krytykują bądź kontrują doniesienia medialne dotyczące kampanii prezydenckiej w USA w 2020 r. Analiza ukazuje wybrane sposoby używane przez youtuberów-dziennikarzy, gdy omawiają oni oficjalne narracje medialne, przedstawiają kontrargumenty i krytykę, uzupełniając to weryfikowaniem stanu faktycznego, ujawnianiem dowodów, czy podawaniem alternatywnych wyjaśnień. Jednocześnie kontrdziennikarstwo nie jest wolne od erystyki, która może wpłynąć na odbiór kwestii politycznych przez widzów.

Key words

License

WERONIKA WIORA
JAGIELLONIAN UNIVERSITY
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3089-8793
weronika.a.wiora@student.uj.edu.pl

KATARZYNA MOLEK-KOZAKOWSKA
UNIVERSITY OF OPOLE/VILNIUS GEDIMINAS TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9455-7384
molekk@uni.opole.pl

Rhetorical strategies of counter-journalism: How American YouTubers are challenging dominant media election narratives

1. Introduction

Due to a rapid development of new media technologies, there is a growing number of news outlets providing daily (if not hourly) information updates, including those generated by corporate media, political institutions, politicians themselves, public enterprises and opinion-leading citizens. The younger the consumers, the more likely they are to use primarily internet news outlets and a third of 18-24-year-olds admit that "social media are their main source of news" (Newman et al. 2017), with social media defined as "highly interactive platforms via which individuals and communities share, co-create, discuss, and modify user-generated content" often with the use of mobile and web-based technologies (Kietzmann et al. 2011, 241).

Launched in 2004, YouTube is often treated as a social media platform as well. It features mostly video content or graphics, either user-made or clipped from footage made for television, with the function to add comments, tags, and links (Soukup 2014, 4). Its initial aim was to enable sharing personal and entertaining material; however, as the platform grew in popularity, its content diversified and became more public-oriented. Uunsurprisingly, YouTube has an uneasy relationship with mainstream television, as content it provides, together with streaming services, might eventually cause its extinction.

YouTube now has over one hundred language versions and as of mid-2020, more than two billion logged-in users visited it each month and watched over a billion hours of video daily generating billions of views (YouTube 2020). In 2017 one-third of users from the US admitted to watching more than two channels regularly (Statista Survey 2017). In the US it has recently been found that

twenty-three percent of users (fifteen and older) treat YouTube as a "news source" (AudienceProject 2019). A factor behind the growth of the platform is that the creators are able to derive profits from their posted work, according to specific rules for monetization. Annual earnings of the most "subscribed to" channels go well beyond a middle-class family income. Consequently, the emerging format of YouTube journalism has become a popular tool for capitalizing on issues drawing the most attention, such as presidential elections.

YouTube journalism features mainly political analysis of important events, citizen journalism, niche/local news reporting, and infotainment. In recent years, it has also become popular for YouTubers to "directly evaluate the accuracy of the substantive claims made by politicians," which is known as fact-checking (Graves et al. 2016, 102), or take apart content presented by the mainstream media and provide the audience with anything from a rejoinder to an in-depth critique. It might appear that such work borrows from investigative journalism aimed at interfering with the agendas of institutions and business. Now, however, instead of exposing, say, the corruption of manufacturing industries, some online journalists specialize in exposing what they deem to be harmful narratives of the media outlets owned by huge conglomerates. As most YouTube journalists' are non-affiliated with mainstream media, they maintain the semblance of independent, hence trustworthy, political commentators (save those that are sponsored by political organizations). It should be noted, however, that these journalists often revel in discussions at the level of ideological positions, not facts, sometimes by mocking and vilifying professional journalists (Almiron and Pineda 2013, 571).

Since this is an emerging field of journalistic activity that has not been researched extensively yet, this study constitutes a pilot analysis that identifies the prevalent rhetorical strategies found in YouTube counter-journalism. Its main goal is to capture the typical *patterns of countering* of official media narratives, which are understood here as coordinated scripts for the interpretation of political reality. It aims to delimit YouTube counter-journalism as a new journalistic genre and place it in a historical context (section 2), research context (sections 3 and 4) and deliberation and information literacy context (section 5). It also validates counter-journalism as a compensatory field in the context of mediascapes with high political/corporate control, and possibly as a contribution to election discourses in particular and deliberative democracy in general provided it is consumed by information literate audiences.

The empirical part starts with a content analysis and proceeds to an inductive (data-driven) rhetorical analysis of a sample of thirty-six political videos thematically linked the 2020 US presidential election campaign. The format of the sampled videos most often involves playing a fragment of official news footage

and breaking it to give a correction, refutation or an alternative interpretation to what the featured politician/presenter claims. Sometimes this is accompanied by confronting the claim with alternative source or earlier footage (fact-checking). The objective is to search for patterns of both argument-based and eristic-based countering: refutation or confrontation strategies, forwarding counterclaims, as well as foregrounding judgments and using fallacies aimed at condemning bias or misinformation. In conclusion the article discusses the validity and implications of election discourses emerging through the counter-journalistic work on YouTube. The term "discourse" is understood as a publically shared way of representing, and thus constituting, power relations in a society through textual expression and reproduction of politically or ideologically laden content (Danesi 2009, 98).

2. Theories and origins of counter-journalism

There are several roles that journalism occupies in democratic societies. The informational one assumes that journalists should provide the public with relevant knowledge about incidents of social importance, and at election times about current social issues and political platforms. The facilitative role refers to journalism as a means of providing information that benefits other domains in society: political, social or educational. According to the third – collaborative – role, during states of emergency, the press and authorities should cooperate to ensure safety of citizens. Finally, the radical role stresses the importance of journalists holding those in power accountable by monitoring actions of governments and other important institutions (McQuail 2013, 97).

Due to its significance, the press is sometimes described as the fourth branch of a democratic government. "The fourth estate" theory emphasizes the informational and radical role of journalism, especially since the media enjoy privileges in seeking access to information (McQuail 2013, 39-40). Media outlets' ability to influence public opinion and set the agenda of issues is not without importance either. Also, for this theory to be put into practice, journalists need to be granted the right to freedom of expression. Some investigative journalists focus on exposing unacceptable behaviours of political or corporate institutions, increasingly "despite the opposition of their managers who would prefer a more compliant, more entertaining and less critical approach" (Schultz 1998, 6). As a result, more journalists pursue a less controversial and more profitable work, which may lead to self-censorship for the sake of meeting expectations of their employers.

Another normative theory claims that, with citizens' best interest in mind, the state should "compensate" for eventual failures of the media industry (McQuail 2005, 100). In the context of Bourdieu' social fields theory, "free market fails"

when economic capital supersedes cultural capital. As explained by Benson and Neveu, "economic capital is expressed via circulation, or advertising revenues, or audience ratings, whereas the 'specific' cultural capital of the field takes the form of intelligent commentary, in-depth reporting" (2005, 4). Thus, governments' regulations are needed because sometimes profit-driven motives of media corporations are detrimental to the people's interest. Some recent practices include suppressing expensive investigative journalism in order to cut costs, or introduce charismatic celebrity presenters and guests, and elements of confrontainment to increase ratings and thus generate higher revenues (Almiron and Pineda 2013).

Bourdieu's theory of social fields is related to Habermas' theory of the public sphere, which is defined as a space where citizens are able to freely exchange their ideas and opinions, with the media providing an open arena for dialogue (Constantinescu 2012). McQuail (2013, 42) lists possible ways in which journalism contributes to the public sphere: "maintaining and managing public debate, circulating opinions and ideas, extending freedom and diversity to the public, connecting citizens with governments, giving opportunities to voices of organised civil society (NGOs) to speak out, mobilisation towards civic engagement." In fact, Habermas (1962, 189) himself was concerned about the growth of corporate mass media – newspapers, television, radio – designated to reach a very large audience and turning public spheres into "field[s] for business advertising" (Smythe 1977, 4), not only venues for propaganda.

2.1. Investigative journalism

In *The Evolution of American Investigative Journalism*, Aucoin assumes that journalism is a "social practice" whose genres, including investigative journalism, involve "the historical development of technical skills and ways in which practitioners conceptualise the practice's goals, standards of excellence, and internal values" (2005, 19). Likewise, this perspective should help to understand counter-journalistic practices as an inheritance of a tradition of exposure of "wrongdoing by powerful individuals and institutions" (Feldstein 2009a, 797). Practices mentioned above, often expressed through opinion columns in newspapers, led to journalists becoming important social influencers.

In the early twentieth century, the muckraking spirit of journalism tended to dominate. The term itself comes from Theodore Roosevelt's 1906 speech, as he used the phrase "[t]he man with the Muck-rake" to describe "dirt-digging" journalist William Randolph Hearst (Feldstein 2009b, 919). When it comes to muckrakers, some focused on lurid and salacious contents and techniques that bring to mind contemporary tabloid paparazzi, while others championed investigative journalism, and advocated for "greater media regulation, civil service reforms,

and other measures to safeguard the public from special interests and emerging corporate power" (Bekken 2009, 31). Such was the famous case of Ida Tarbell, who caused an eventual breakup of the Standard Oil Company in 1911, after the US Supreme Court had ruled the business tactics she exposed to be unlawful and unethical (King 2012).

As time went by, however, the media industry outgrew its underdog position and the news became "big business in its own right" (Aucoin 2005, 42-43). Post-war journalism in America displayed two main characteristics: being pro-government and promoting consumer culture. It was not profitable for news outlets anymore to challenge institutionalized politics or investigate corporations, as advertisers demanded their products be shown in positive, uncontroversial environment. Nevertheless, the 1960s brought yet another generation of well-trained investigative journalists interested in truth-seeking, focused on government's wrongdoings and fond of journalistic neutrality, observable through a tone of their work (Feldstein 2009a). These reporters tried to preserve democracy amidst a cultural revolution that was taking place, with the government failing to maintain trust and many mainstream media blindly pursuing their own agendas (Aucoin 2005, 48-50).

In the 1980s, however, many expressed an opinion that investigative journalism went out of date, as the majority of media professionals became reluctant to engage in it. In his article for *The Nation*, Wolfe used the term "counter-journalism" while referring to journalists who once dedicated their time and energy to exposing unethical businesses and politicians, but then embarked on an "easy journalism" of critiquing the work of other journalists: "the anger and indignation that once moved reporters to uncover the crimes of the powerful has turned on those who challenge power's prerogatives" (1984, 351). In addition, Wolfe outlined contexts these counter-journalists were faced with, such as the mainstream media's disinterest in in-depth reporting and rivalry that caused the focus on dissecting competing media narratives in place of exposing dubious politicians. This said, it is not implied that investigative journalism is absent (as we are periodically reminded with WikiLeaks, Panama Papers or Trump tax evasion investigation by NYT), but that it evolved in new directions. Some of these investigative practices were partly taken over by the emerging digital, participatory and alternative journalism genres (Constantinescu 2012; Lievrouw 2011).

2.2. Web-based deliberation?

When social media were first introduced as a tool to circulate information and opinion, optimists believed that services such as YouTube could finally open the way towards a Habermasian public sphere and allow multiple political positions to be articulated, especially by marginalized groups that contested dominant ideas.

Interactivity was applauded as it could offer the technical capacity for new forms of social cooperation and collaboration to emerge with debate and argument that eventually allowed to arrive at agreement and consensus. Social media were also to create networks of attention and affect for depoliticized publics to mobilize around important social issues (Dahlberg 2011). And yet, a decade of studies into the role of social media in the public sphere revealed that the new technologies mostly weighed towards short-term disruptions rather than long-term positive projects, and displaced opportunities for sustained action. Social platforms enable established actors to amplify their messages (cf. Trump's Twitter feed) without increasing the capacity for ordinary people's voices to be heard. Instead of mobilization, affects become magnified and destabilized in ways that constrain well-organized political action due to a general inability to engage in rational argumentation. With more on-demand, personalized material, people tend to live in (mis)information bubbles, often oblivious or hostile to alternative positions and views (Couldry 2012).

In the current era of the so-called "post-truth," new genres of journalism are emerging online to respond to the inability of mainstream media to evaluate and call out "the truthfulness of claims made by public figures such as politicians or pundits" (Vlachos and Riedel 2014, 18). In addition, the 2020 election cycle has been marked by "a war" between the Republican-dominated political establishment and established media outlets, which may have led to public concern about their integrity and to bringing the US citizens' trust in the mass media to its all-time low (thirty-two percent) in 2016, increasing only to forty-one in 2019 (Milbank 2017; Brenan 2019). At the time of a global pandemic, looming economic crisis and racial tensions, election discourses are likely to use the crisis and the prevailing sentiments to garner political support, which is easier than deliberating on the substance of policy-making and stabilization packages. According to Roig-Franzia and Ellison (2020), criticizing the media is a good strategy for Trump in 2020, because his supporters "see it as fair pushback against a journalism establishment they are convinced is unduly harsh on their leader." The transformation from public sphere to a network society has led to election discourses being increasingly hosted by social media platforms, which further relaxes the rules of reporting and political commentary (Danesi 2009, 211; Barlow 2008). In a way, counter-journalistic work arises as a response to the lowering of standards in mainstream journalistic practices and the possibility to capitalize on highly contested presidential race.

What is analysed here is how YouTube journalists tend to parse and expose the narratives of the mainstream media outlets in the election year. It is assumed that the emerging genre of YouTube counter-journalism has its own distinguishable characteristics that make it rhetorically different from previous investigative

journalism, or civic interest journalism. However, non-affiliated counter-journalism does not mean independent, as running a popular YouTube channel might be a profitable career opportunity, for instance, from receiving ad revenue from display and video ads, subscription fees and membership premiums (Google Support 2020). The most popular video genre on YouTube is the commentary genre characterised by "sharing thoughts and opinions on a topic" and those on the subject of politically charged conspiracy theories, providing viewers with an alternative version of events (Mediakix 2019).

3. The notion of rhetorical strategy of countering

The term "rhetorical strategy of countering" is adopted in this study to identify and exemplify the most pervasive patterns of countering in a purposefully garnered sample of popular YouTube videos. The theory of argumentation has much to offer about how to approach counterarguments. Walton (2006) defines counterarguments as rebuttals of an argument's premise(s) or conclusion, or undercutting the reasoning between them. Given this, there is usually a tight, even if implicit, logical relation between the points presented and their rebuttals. However, other theorists see countering as noting "exceptions" to argumentative reasoning or undermining an argument's "validity" (Toulmin 1958). As a result, one can envision a more confrontational approach to countering in the sense of attacking, or a more consensual one in terms of the counterer introducing a more balanced view of the matter with additional data and examples that aims at settling the dispute and arriving at a reasonable consensus (van Eemeren et al. 2009).

Apart from argumentation, countering may be seen as an area of rhetorical expression. Following Aristotle (2008), persuading the audience successfully to dismiss an argument of an opponent may take a combination of modes of proof. For example within logos, providing counterexamples, exceptions, newer data or a different reasoning strategy can undermine a point made by an antagonist. Otherwise, within ethos, building credibility and expertise around one's own stance, while discrediting the opponent's stance, cause or motivation, may be useful tactics with audiences that do not have enough knowledge to judge the soundness of links between data, examples, conclusions or reasoning (Cockcroft and Cockcroft 2005). Last but not least, it is possible to develop a rhetorical strategy of countering based on pathos, for example by generating a strong emotional disposition in audiences that makes it likely for them to disagree with the opponents' claims, or to fail to see the arguer's fallacious thinking (Gula 2002). The notion of "strategic maneuvering" has been introduced (van Eemeren and Houtlosser 1999) to account for the increasing of effectiveness of argumentation by drawing on expressiveness

(metaphors, allusions, euphemisms, favorable comparisons). It was needed to distinguish the ethical uses of strategic expressions for persuasiveness from purely linguistic games, logical fallacies or eristic tricks (Schopenhauer 2008).

However, it can be assumed that in a politically engaged televisual mode, some strategies of countering will be supplemented with, if not based on, eristic or fallacious thinking such as binary oppositions, false analogies, overgeneralizations, and reductio ad absurdum, as well as overlaid with emotional expressions of outrage, sarcasm and with personal remarks (*ad hominem*). As there are no ready-made coding schemes for rhetorical strategies of countering in argumentation and eristic that would be applicable to YouTube videos, and because of the variety of YouTubers' styles and formats of expression, attention in this study is paid to three general (though not mutually exclusive) patterns:

- *counterargumentation*, such as refutation or confrontation with other sources, previous footage, fact-checking and constructing valid alternative interpretations (section 4.2.1.);
- *undermining journalistic ethos*, namely exposing insufficient journalistic standards represented by mainstream reporters (4.2.2.);
- *counterevaluation with eristic tricks*, such as emotion-laden judgments, reframing, rhetorical questions, or eristic arguments (4.2.3.).

4. Counter-journalism on YouTube

4.1. Sampling method

The dataset is a purposefully garnered sample of thirty-six videos posted on fourteen different YouTube channels between March 23 and May 9, 2020. The criteria for inclusion in the dataset were: (1) a quantitative parameter of high channel popularity, (2) a thematic parameter of videos primarily on US election (rather than other policy issues), (3) a qualitative parameter of the presence of instances of countering, and (4) a political parameter of affiliation (to offer a balancing material comprised from both right- and left-leaning YouTubers). Given the limited scope of this analysis, and its focus on rhetorical strategies rather than political content, attention was not given to such issues as political biography of the creator/host, ownership or sponsoring of the channel, or monetization model adopted by the channel.

Firstly, the sampled videos have drawn the attention of millions of viewers, which means the discourses they contributed to are a substantial contribution to the presidential election narrative and allow public deliberation (Table 1). In May all fourteen channels had almost fifteen and a half million subscribers in total.

The most watched channels were at the same time the most subscribed to, and had over thirty-one million views and a little over twenty million views respectively in the previous thirty days (as of May 21, 2020). From the four most-watched channels, two are leaning left and two are leaning right. Most of the journalists presenting the content in the videos are male. There is only one channel run exclusively by a female reporter ("Rebel HQ") and three with female co-hosts appearing occasionally ("The Young Turks" and "One America News Network"). Information about the number of views the channels receive is taken from their individual pages on the Social Blade website.

Channel's name (in alphabetical order)	Political affiliation	Views in the past thirty days (in millions)	Subscription count (in millions)
"Conservative Twins"	Right-leaning	1,827	0,346
"Don't Walk, Run! Productions"	Right-leaning	1,315	0,297
"Mark Dice"	Right-leaning	4,957	1,560
"Mr Reagan"	Right-leaning	0,573	0,228
"No B. S."	Right-leaning	1,505	0,661
"One America News Network"	Right-leaning	6,097	0,664
"Rebel HQ"	Left-leaning	3,270	0,261
"Secular Talk"	Left-leaning	10,444	0,841
"StevenCrowder"	Right-leaning	20,690	4,420
"The Majority Report w/ Sam Seder"	Left-leaning	9,620	0,845
"The Humanist Report"	Left-leaning	1,246	0,286
"The Progressive Voice"	Left-leaning	0,931	0,070
"The Young Turks"	Left-leaning	31,827	4,730
"Zeducation"	Right-leaning	1,010	0,267
In total	—	95,312	15,476

Table 1. Information about sampled channels, as of May 21, 2020

The sampled channels had to be uploading videos on a daily basis and producing diverse content, notably commentary, analysis, and fact-checking in connection with the critique of the coverage offered by the mainstream outlets, such as the CNN, MSNBC, Fox News.[1] Through qualitative content analysis, the thirty-six videos selected here were identified to (1) refer to US elections, (2) to refer to the work of other media outlets, (3) to represent a political affiliation of the creator/ host (not always equivalent to support of a given candidate). The videos were uploaded at a time when the US presidential campaign entered the new stage,

---

1. In this paper, the videos are labelled either right or left-leaning as it is the most accurate description of the political affiliation. "Right-leaning" content endorses a conservative political ideology, which includes (but is not equivalent to) supporting president Trump in 2020 presidential elections. "Left-leaning" content promotes progressive political ideology, which includes an observable tendency of supporting anti-establishment politicians, such as Bernie Sanders.

namely when Joe Biden emerged as a presumptive Democratic nominee, and both parties started to present new campaigning strategies. Furthermore, in April the public started to regain the interest in the presidential race, as prior to that, the coverage focused mostly on the Covid-19.

To offer a better overview of the sample it is useful to describe the format as well. Many of the videos in the sample aim at replicating the mainstream outlets' format of reporting news; for example, the creator would have a studio setting (e.g. a desk, headlines, or the name of the show in the background, etc.) and the style of addressing the audience would be similar to network anchors. Channels such as "The Young Turks" (Figure 1.) relatively faithfully imitate traditional media outlets with their formats and news delivery. However, other channels create more amateur and simplistic content, where, for example, a person is talking to a camera with no special setting ("Conservative Twins," "No B.S.,", "Rebel HQ," "The Progressive Voice," "Zeducation"). Some channels, such as "Mr Reagan," "StevenCrowder," or "Secular Talk," upload videos in the form of podcasts. On closer inspection it is evident that the videos with better quality production attract more viewers, as four out of five most-watched channels adopted a format resembling the mainstream news-anchor presentation type.

Figure 1. "The Young Turks" and its newscast format: accessed on April 20, 2020
from youtube.com/watch?v=DCEdEQvEH9Y

The fourteen channels collectively had over ninety-five million views in the preceding thirty days (as of May 21, 2020). The number of views divided by the thirty days' time span gives a result of an over three million views a day on average. To make a rough comparison, according to ratings from April, mainstream television station CNN "averaged 1.364 million" in number of viewers in total a day, "surpassing MSNBC's 1.291 million" (CNN 2020). It was, in fact, the best turnout the station had in fifteen years, mostly due to extremely high interest of

the public in the news about the coronavirus. Admittedly, the projected global audience of YouTube is much wider, but the point of this comparison is to show that the videos have been followed by a large segment of voters and not a niche group of politically involved citizens. Thus, it is important to study this emerging genre of political communication in order to identify recurring rhetorical strategies of countering (full list of videos sampled in the appendix).

4.2. Analysis: rhetorical strategies of countering

As regards content, all videos selected for analysis have a common goal of countering the dominant narratives of the mainstream media – which the creators/hosts themselves call "the national media," "the corporate media" or the "establishment press." CNN is the news station whose coverage is discussed most often (13 videos) in both conservative and progressive channels. The next is Fox News, whose coverage is countered only by the left-leaning videos (8 times). MSNBC, in the third place, is the station only countered by the conservative channels (7 times).

By referring to the mainstream media outlets as "the corporate media," YouTubers imply that these news providers mainly serve the interests of a privileged groups of owners and stakeholders. In turn, YouTube counter-journalism appears as if it was fighting for democratic public sphere on behalf of the people. These *ad populum* strategies are instantiations of building one's ethos by discrediting the opponent's. Not incidentally, left-wing or progressive counter-journalism leans towards "anti-establishment ideology" most often. Such names of the channels as "Rebel HQ," "The Majority Report," "The Humanist Report," "The Progressive Voice" indicate that they are dedicated to work for the common people and fight elite interests. The names of the right-leaning counter-journalistic channels, on the other hand, are supposed to be satirical (Don't Walk, Run! Productions," "Zeducation," "No B.S."), or imply an affiliation with conservative political ideology ("Conservative Twins," "Mr Reagan"). Preliminary analysis reveals that left-leaning content is, generally speaking, focused on breaking down the narrative to offer counterarguments and counterclaims, while the conservative content is more often made to be entertaining through counterevaluation (e.g., ridiculing the antagonists). This is a general trend that is moderated by the topic and that needs to be verified against a larger sample.

The videos' visual format is mostly "talking-head" journalists commenting on clips excerpted from the mainstream media broadcasts, press conferences or news articles. There are a few ways of doing so; for example, by playing the clip, highlighting some passages and then commenting on them, or by playing the clip while occasionally pausing to refute the claims or present counterclaims

(and afterwards a more specific commentary), or by reading an article aloud while occasionally making remarks about its unreasonable claims a biases (logos-based persuasion). Showing the actual video clips or screenshots of articles to the audiences is important for counter-journalistic reporting, as it makes the videos more credible (ethos-building). To balance this dry, dissecting format, reporters often engage in emotional, sometimes even colloquial, expression of their critique through prosody and exclamations (pathos), hoping to generate a similar response in the viewers (Longaker and Walker 2011). However, it is thus rather difficult and not very productive to insist on isolating specific modes of proof, as they often work together and enhance one another. Instead, a more inductive categories – counterargumentation, undermining journalistic ethos, and counterevaluation with eristic devices – have been used to present the findings.

The analysis below documents recurring patterns of expression and argumentation in the videos. In the following paragraphs, if a certain feature was shared by a few videos, their numbers (corresponding to those in the appendix) appear in brackets.

4.2.1. Counterargumentation

Counter-journalistic commentary consists in negating some elements of mainstream media content, which amounts to breaking down the narrative while presenting counterarguments supported by evidence. Examples include criticising the way interviews are conducted on mainstream television (3, 18, 21) by pointing to journalists "not calling politicians out" on untrue or blatantly evasive answers, or pointing out leading, biased or dishonest questions directed towards politicians during press conferences (1, 5, 14, 24). This form of countering is often accompanied by YouTubers' conducting their own research on the topic in the tradition of investigative journalism (3, 4, 12, 13, 22, 36) and presenting alternative data and information, for example from institutional or polling firms. YouTubers engage in fact-checking also by confronting claims of the TV station's political commentators with other sources (2, 9, 10, 13, 15, 22, 23, 24, 28, 29, 36). Discovering false claims or blatantly biased comment is rarely done in a neutral style, but accompanied by expressions that involve humour and wit and may be seen as mocking mainstream media's "objectivity" or strategically undercutting established journalists (1, 2, 10, 13, 15, 17, 26, 27, 29, 32).

Countering, in one instance, involved a right-leaning YouTuber reading an online article from March and pausing in order to refute a claim about President Trump's poor response to the coronavirus outbreak: "but that's not true. He's handled it very well. If you look at the fatality rate amongst Americans versus other countries, we are doing incredibly well" (8, 14:33). In another video, the YouTuber shows a clip in which the mainstream media host claims that Sanders

supposedly did not communicate with Biden after having dropped out of the race. "Counterpoint. He did. You just did not notice," says the reporter and proceeds to showing a clip proving his argument (29, 5:16). Similarly, fact-checking is applied by a YouTuber who refutes an argument that already in January 2020 every leader (including Trump) was aware of the coronavirus and its possible consequences. The reporter says: "What is absolutely hilarious about that is the WHO …, they went on record, and they said there was no clear evidence of human to human contraction," showing screenshots of the WHO official Twitter page with statements proving the counterpoint (36, 6:47). The word "hilarious" is sarcastic here and stylistically complements the way the source is critiqued here.

Some YouTubers may use the strategy of diversion. While arguing against an alleged improvement of the health care system in the US, one reporter adds later on that: "[over] half of Americans… want a 'Medicare for all' system by the way. I know that's inconvenient for you and healthcare has always been great on your News Corp health insurance plan, Laura Ingram" (17, 1:12). In this way the counter-journalist shifts the attention to the conflict of interests of some mainstream TV broadcasters, whose parent companies in fact profit from certain regulations of the healthcare system, which leads to their biased coverage, pointing the finger at News Corp-owned Fox News Channel and its lead pundit Laura Ingram.

Yet another strategy is countering points while focusing strictly on the opponent's weak evidence supporting the claim. For example, in one video a mainstream media correspondent asks Trump if he thinks he should be reelected, given the fact that the number of deaths from Covid-19 in the US exceeds the number of deaths from the Vietnam War. This was countered by the YouTuber by ridiculing the comparison that was used: "Listen to this stupid question: can you name the illogical reasoning in this one?'" (1, 0:08). Appealing to authorities is also a strategic maneuver employed for countering. One video, for instance, informs the audience that a *law professor* "[took] to Twitter to express his distaste with CNN White House correspondent" (14, 0:03).

4.2.2. Undermining journalistic ethos

YouTubers also provide the critique of the mainstream media narrative on the basis of its not being professional journalism (8, 17), rooted in facts and evidence (3, 13, 27, 31). Such examples reveal a mixture of *ad personam* and *ad rem* criticism. For example, some videos involve directly calling out a particular journalist (2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 14, 21), and furthermore critiquing their ethos or professionalism (1, 3, 10, 21): "this shows Miko's shortcomings as a journalist. What she should have asked was…" (3, 1:51), "[the journalists'] question was based a logical fallacy known as… false equivalence" (1, 0:28). In a similar vein, mainstream journalists

are attacked for the lack of integrity (8, 10, 15, 16): "Lou Dobbs probably has some money invested in a defence contract or weapons manufacture … He is putting his morals into his portfolio. His non-existent morals" (15, 1:18).

The most common attack against the mainstream media outlets is that they are biased (6, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 24, 29, 31), or misinforming – sometimes to the point of accusing them of lying (4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 31, 34, 36) and hypocrisy (8, 10, 11, 16, 26, 36). Examples of how counter-journalists call out biases of the mainstream media include exaggerations: "it blows my mind that this is the state of American media. … I do [not] know if we had ever seen something of this calibre, where there is an entire block in the morning just dedicated to making Trump specifically … feel better about himself" (16, 1:30), where a YouTuber bemoans the sad state of professional journalism in the US and the extent of the mainstream media pampering to political elites.

Some YouTubers criticise the media for failing in two principal areas: awarding all candidates similar coverage time, and trying to balance the coverage. Note the example: "there are numerous examples and even data that proves that the media was against Bernie Sanders. I mean, there was a quantitative analysis from *In These Times* that revealed MSNBC did [not] just give Bernie Sanders the least amount of coverage of the three front-runners, but also covered him most negatively overall" (30, 4:22). At the same time, some YouTubers explicitly compare themselves favourably in terms of being honest with the audience: "I never denied to have a personal bias, as I make my commentary videos… but … liberal news stations like CNN, they are [not] straightforward like this at all… even though, we all know they are obviously liberals who side with Democrats on everything" (11, 3:56). Admittedly, such self-interested positive portrayal is bordering on a false dichotomy between "honest YouTubers" and "corrupt reporters," which is not conducive to informed debate. As can be seen, exaggerations, binary opposites and emotive expressions are not uncommon in the style of expression here.

Additionally, the videos foreground the idea that the mainstream media are spreading propaganda (11, 15, 17, 30, 31, 35): "I think this is actually good propaganda… a lot of people who tune in into Fox News, they are working class people…, just brainwashed, and so you have to at least pay them service a little bit" (31, 3:06). YouTubers also blame the mainstream media for entrenching the partisanship, polarization and lack of dialogue in the US (20, 21, 29): "what do you get from corporate media is what? Enforcing the logic of the two-party system" (18, 7:37), "eye opening moment for the people too mired into the partisan game, the cult of the personality nonsense also happens on the left" (19, 5:32), which, in turn, fuels the "us versus them mentality" (11, 17, 21). The journalistic ethos is attacked by YouTubers who see the corporate media acting as if they were

propaganda outlets for the party interests rather than spaces for public deliberation.

Also labelled as "fake news" (4, 6), the media outlets subjected to critique supposedly have a hidden agenda that the YouTubers are now discovering (16, 25, 27, 33): "this is what happens when you watch [a Fox News host] … There is a very smart Republican movement… in the so-called populist direction" (25, 5:33), "if you are wondering why there was one tiny piece of coverage on Fox News about Tara Reade… It is most likely because they are saving it up for the general elections" (33, 3:00). In such cases, counter-journalists purport to "see through" the strategic manoeuvring of the mainstream media editors, whose interests are aligned with certain party interests and who may interfere in election campaigns by withholding some important information.

In general, in some of the videos, YouTubers directly appeal to voters not to trust the mainstream media (13, 19, 31, 35): "[w]hy anybody listens to the mainstream media anymore is beyond me" (13). YouTubers highlight the unhealthy symbiotic relation between political elites and corporate media and demonstrate how their "dirty tactics" tend to diminish democratic deliberation.

4.2.3. Counterevaluation with eristic devices

Most of the videos are examples of infotainment, even though some are styled in a more comedic (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 36) and some in more informative (33, 34) manner. All of the YouTubers aim at being transparent regarding their leaning, as political beliefs of the content creators are no secret to the viewers. Being politically incorrect is also a feature of the counter-journalistic content. First of all, there are fewer regulations on YouTube about the language which can or cannot be used; secondly, by using explicitly pejorative language, content creators appear straightforward and relatable; finally, colloquial speech, with elements of wit and sarcasm, distinguishes them from the traditional news media outlets. Some examples of emotion-infused eristic-based countering, such as exaggerations, false dichotomies, and diversions were mentioned above.

In order to refute particular claims, YouTubers often employ eristic devices in their line of reasoning. As previously indicated, situations where countering the narrative involves mocking mainstream journalists themselves, rather than the substance of their claims, is not unusual (1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 21). Apart from *ad hominem* attacks, counter-journalists' manoeuvres include posing multiple questions to what can be seen or heard on the screen. One right-leaning presenter, for example, starts developing his point by asking rhetorical questions: "how more clearly we can see the media overreach? … After years of the anti-Trump [agenda]; the Russian collusion, Ukraine's quid pro quo, … how can the [general public] trust the media at all?" (22, 11:01).

Questions can also be ironic and directed towards a popular commentator. In one video, a journalist argues against the claim that the two-party system works well for the US citizens by stating: "nearly half of the country decided *not to* vote in 2016 and *your* argument is … 'do people really dislike [having two options]?'" (21, 4:36, emphasis added). In the latter example, leaving certain questions unanswered does not only make the viewers consider the original claims, but also re-evaluates the problem of disenfranchisement and attributes it to the skewed party system. Finally, a question of "who makes it with no help at all?" is supposed to invalidate the criticism that Trump's success is due to his father's support (2, 1:22). The right-leaning pro-Trump YouTuber in this case reframes the scope of the question and seems to ask each member of the viewing public if they would not themselves use the help they were offered. In this he appeals to the common-sense and values inherent in American entrepreneurship to position Trump's critics as unreasonable in their attacks.

Another YouTuber denounces a clip described by the mainstream reporters as an alleged proof of "dangerous manoeuvres" towards US ships and asks: "so I guess that the dangerous maneuvers that they were committing were just piloting their boats too close to the US warship?" (32, 11:20). In this case, the purportedly threatening act is re-assessed as a trivial bit of news that was probably blown out of proportions by conservative mainstream media to give substance to their attempt at portraying the Trump administration as standing in defense of American interests.

Overstating opposing arguments or *reductio ad absurdum* are frequently used countering patterns as well. For example, a journalist describing the article he disagrees with presents it as: "if you believe Biden is a rapist, should you vote for him anyway" (10, 1:09), when in fact its title is worded as "Biden denies sex assault claim. If you don't believe him, should you vote for him anyway?" (Powers 2020). In another video, a journalist ridicules the idea of immigration ban not applying to au pairs by alluding to "slave-owning" mentality and selfishness of those who proposed it: "if you're really rich, you get to have an immigrant … as long as somebody owns the immigrant, then it's okay" (26, 2:20).

4.3. Synthesis: Election discourses generated by YouTube counter-journalism

Regarding the presidential election of 2020, YouTube counter-journalists frequently discuss mainstream media's unfair coverage of a particular candidate or topical issue – both favourable and unfavourable. Most notably, they highlight the inaccurate representations of Sanders and Trump, by implying the media are too biased or hostile towards those politicians. However, they have also called out the media for showing Biden's campaign in positive light too often, especially after

he became the presumptive Democratic nominee. All but one right-leaning video (12) supported the idea that left-leaning or liberal TV networks give the incumbent president unfairly negative coverage. Five of the left-leaning videos (18, 25, 29, 31, 35) expressed the sentiment that the media from both sides of the spectrum unfairly covered Sanders' campaign. The rest of the left-leaning videos aim at countering, for instance, Fox News' narratives about the Trump administration's "good work" during the pandemic (15, 28), the president's tough stance with China (16), the states' precautions taken due to coronavirus outbreak (17, 27, 32), the alleged establishment of a Democratic agenda (20), and the other mainstream media outlets not informing citizens sufficiently about the pandemic (19).

As stated above, the idea that journalists should monitor the actions of those in power is one of the most fundamental assumptions behind professional journalism. YouTubers involved in counter-journalism exercise their right to criticising the government, the media establishment, and other privileged groups in society when they act in self-interested ways. Many of the election-related videos, however, expose the corporate media outlets being able to exploit their position to make more profit (e.g., from carrying political advertising, or a symbiotic relationship with a party in power) abdicating their social responsibility and public mission. YouTube counter-journalism could generate meaningful discourses about presidential election also due to the role of YouTubers as fact-checkers – with facts being allegedly disregarded by the mainstream media. Their commentary is an example of the citizens' own initiative and could be seen as a more adequate representation of the variety of views on the developments during the 2020 presidential campaign.

However, the proportion of rhetorical strategies of countering that is not argument-based, but primarily eristic, generates growing fears of a future (YouTube-like) media universe, where little attention is paid to evidence-based interpretations of events, and where the facts and the values of intersubjectivity are sidelined in favor of an increasingly fragmented and emotionally unhinged digital morass, in which any idea, no matter how destructive, could find a forum and an audience.

5. Discussion and conclusion

The idea of counter-journalism is rooted in the work of journalists countering the mainstream narratives in good faith. Despite political differences, all of the creators expressed similar critiques of the media and adopted varied repertoires of rhetorical strategies of proving their points. As members of the new mediascape, and using new media technologies that are seen as empowering for individuals, they present themselves as the balancing opposition to the overwhelming corporate control of

the American public sphere. The main rhetorical strategies characterising counter-journalism involve breaking down the narrative and presenting counterarguments, accompanied by fact-checking, showcasing evidence from alternative sources and refuting judgments provided on the basis of misinformation. The stylistic overlay of countering may vary from serious outrage and personal attacks to sarcasm and irony.

Importantly, this form of counter-journalism generates new possibilities for deliberation. After all, it encompasses not only the content presented on the channels, but also subscribers' responses to it. Due to the ability to leave comments, viewers can immediately see various reactions to the presented counterarguments. In general, this allows them to be exposed to alternative narratives and discourses and to critically weigh the evidence, interrogate claims or compare opinions. Moreover, within the broader genre of online political commentary, there is a place for sustained dialogue on specific issues covered in the video, as some YouTubers engage in online debates or forum discussions, which further enable civil disagreements, foster diversity of opinions and challenge entrenched political beliefs. Admittedly, this could be done mostly for self-promotional reasons and in order to cultivate loyal subscribers, but the diversity of opinions by itself tends to be useful to upset informational bubbles.

What the theories such as the fourth estate, field theory or the public sphere have in common is, generally speaking, pointing out harmful effects of journalism disabled by corporate ownership and dependent on economic revenue or symbiotic relation with the government. Apparently, such dependence is also one of the main concerns of non-institutional counter-journalism, which fulfils its "radical" role of holding powerful institutions accountable. Throughout the history of American journalism, the profession underwent significant changes due to new ownership patterns, technological advances and social changes. It could be argued, however, that journalists keep being responsible for ensuring the debate in the public sphere in one way or another. Some media studies scholars observe that is some voices are marginalised, "counter-public spheres" emerge around measures taken by social movements, non-governmental organisations, subcultures, and most often, blogs and other "participatory media outlets in the Internet" (Wimmer 2012, 6).

Counter-journalism, until recently, has not been primarily profit-oriented, hence at least theoretically it has the potential to become a sort of public sphere envisioned by Habermas (Breen 2007, 64). YouTube counter-journalism poses a challenge to established groups in politics or in the media industry and democratizes public discourses as alternative voices are heard by millions of people on a daily basis. It is possible to notice that a dynamic between mainstream news outlets and counter-journalistic blogosphere resembles the interplay between Bourdieu' social fields,

where the corporate media represent the economic capital and counter-journalism – the cultural capital. In election time, counter-journalism breaks mainstream media's monopoly on agenda-setting and delivering news. However, one should not disregard the fact that in a current deregulated media landscape in the US, these alternative outlets are also prone to monetization and incorporation.

The study reveals that new information literacy skills are needed for users to engage with online content in ways that would foster deliberation, especially at crucial election times or at a time of a social or economic crisis. Nowadays, many media outlets offer fact-checking services, including *the New York Times*, *the Washington Post*, and *USA Today* as well as NPR, CNN, ABC, CBS, and NBC (Graves et al. 2016, 103). Fact-checking aligns with the sentiment that a journalist should not be a gatekeeper of information, but rather "a referee" or an arbitrator. Andersen and Søe (2019) point out, however, that the availability of fact-checking tools dedicated to fighting misinformation, unreliable messages and fake news has not raised the trust in media. The options for tagging or flagging certain posts on social media platforms that seem to promote content "with no significant third party filtering, fact-checking, or editorial judgment" are not sufficient to counter misinformation (Allcott and Gentzkow 2017, 211-213).

The present study does not claim that YouTubers are a panacea for setting the public sphere straight: after all some of the worst conspiracy theories have proliferated in YouTube and it is possible that users would subscribe to partisan social media channels that already align with their worldview and thereby continue to live in echo chambers that perpetuate social fragmentation and division. Yet, encouraging good counter-journalism, and a coordinated effort to monitor the media, increases citizens' information literacy and makes them savvier consumers of commercial media narratives.

It should also be noted that YouTube videos are recommended to users based on, among others, the number of views a particular video received in a short period of time. In the situation when someone chooses to watch primarily left-leaning content on the topic of the election, it is very likely that, at some point, they will encounter at least some exceptionally popular videos from the other side of the political spectrum recommended to them. Of course, high view count does not always equal good counter-journalistic work. However, given the multitude of similar content available on YouTube, it could be assumed that if a counter-journalistic video unexpectedly reaches a very wide audience (e.g., the number of views the video received is unproportionally high comparing to the number of subscribers that creator of the video has), it will often include accurate reporting and informative content.

Apart from individual counter-journalists, (crowd-sourced) media monitoring websites that have become proxies of investigative journalism could be further supported and become more systematic. The way they usually operate is through alerts and reports that carefully evaluate news stories and their sources (e.g., Snopes 2020). In order to align with that, counter-journalists could agree on using special common rating systems. PolitiFact (2020), for instance, has a six-point scale: "True," "Mostly True," "Half True," "Mostly False," "False," and "Pants on Fire" (Lim 2018, 3). Meanwhile, Annenberg Public Policy Centre of the University of Pennsylvania has been operating a successful project called *Fact-check.org* for years, with the mission "to reduce the level of deception and confusion in U.S. politics." Importantly, these organizations must continue to be transparent about how they are funded, which is also the case for counter-journalistic YouTube content.

Bibliography

Allcott, Hunt, and **Matthew Gentzkow.** 2017. "Social Media and Fake News in the 2016 Election." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 31 (2): 211–236.

Almiron, Nuria, and **Antonio Pineda.** 2013. "Ideology, Politics, and Opinion Journalism: A Content Analysis of Spanish Online-only Newspapers." *TripleC: Communication, Capitalism & Critique* 11 (2): 558–574.

Andersen, Jack, and **Sille O. Søe.** 2019. "Communicative Actions We Live By: The Problem with Fact-checking, Tagging or Flagging Fake News – The Case of Facebook." *European Journal of Communication* 35 (2): 126–139.

Aristotle. 2008. *The Art of Rhetoric*, trans. W. Rhys Roberts. Megaphone ebooks.

AudienceProject. 2019. "Insights 2019 – Apps & Social Media Usage in the US, UK, & Nordics." Access Feb 20, 2020. audienceproject.com/wpcontent/uploads/audienceproject_study_apps_social_media.pdf

Aucoin, James. 2005. *The Evolution of American Investigative Journalism*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Barlow, Aaron. 2008. *Blogging America: The New Public Sphere*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Bekken, Jon. 2009. "Advocacy Newspapers." In *Encyclopedia of Journalism*, ed. C.H. Sterling, 30–33. London: Sage Publications.

Benson, Rodney, and **Erik Neveu.** 2005. *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Breen, Michael J. 2007. "Mass Media and New Media Technologies." In *Media Studies: Key Issues and Debates*, ed. Eoin Devereux, 55–77. London: Sage Publications.

Brenan, Michael. 2019. "Americans' Trust in Mass Media Edges Down To 41%." *Gallup*. Access April 20, 2020. news.gallup.com/poll/267047/americans-trust-mass-media-edges-down.aspx

CNN. 2020, April 28. "CNN Has Most-watched Month in 15 Years." *CNN*. Access April 30, 2020. cnnpressroom.blogs.cnn.com/2020/04/28/cnn-has-most-watched-month-in-15-years/

Cockcroft, Robert, and **Susan Cockcroft.** 2005. *Persuading People: An Introduction to Rhetoric*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Couldry, Nick. 2012. *Media, Society, World: Social Theory and Digital Media Practice*. Malden: Polity Press.

Constantinescu, Sorana. 2012. "Public Sphere and New Media. Case Study: WikiLeaks." *Journal of Media Research* 5 (14): 95–106.

Dahlberg, Lincoln. 2011. "Re-constructing Digital Democracy: An Outline of Four 'Positions'." *New Media & Society* 13 (6): 855–872.

Danesi, Marcel. 2009. *Dictionary of Media and Communications*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Feldstein, Mark. 2009a. "Investigative Reporters." In *Encyclopedia of Journalism*, ed. C.H. Sterling, 797–805. London: Sage Publications.

Feldstein, Mark. 2009b. "Muckrakers." In *Encyclopedia of Journalism*, ed. C.H. Sterling, 919–921. London: Sage Publications.

Google Support. 2020. "How to Earn Money on YouTube." Access April, 29, 2020. support.google.com/youtube/answer/72857?hl=en

Graves, Lucas, Nyhan, Brendan, and **Jason Reifler.** 2016. "Understanding Innovations in Journalistic Practice: A Field Experiment Examining Motivations for Fact-checking." *Journal of Communication* 66: 102–138.

Gula, Robert J. 2002. *Nonsense: A Handbook of Logical Fallacies*. Mount Jackson, VA: Axios Press.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1962. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

Kietzmann, Jan, Hermkens, Kristopher, McCarthy, Ian, and **Bruno S. Silvestre.** 2011. "Social Media? Get Serious! Understanding the Functional Building Blocks of Social Media." *Business Horizons* 54 (3): 241–251.

King, Gilbert. 2012. "The Woman Who Took on the Tycoon." *Smithsonian Magazine*. Access April 29, 2020. smithsonianmag.com/history/the-woman-who-took-on-the-tycoon-651396

Longaker, Mark Garrett, and **Jeffrey Walker.** 2011. *Rhetorical Analysis: A Brief Guide for Writers.* New York: Pearson Longman.

Lievrouw, Leah A. 2011. *Alternative and Activist New Media*. New York: Polity Press.

Lim, Chloe. 2018. "Checking How Fact-checkers Check." *Research and Politics* 5 (3): 1–7.

McQuail, Dennis. 2005. *Mass Communication Theory*. London: Sage Publications.

McQuail, Dennis. 2013. *Journalism and Society*. London: Sage Publications.

Mediakix. 2019, May 16. "The Most Popular Type of YouTube Videos." *Mediakix*. Access April 28, 2020. mediakix.com/blog/most-popular-youtube-videos/

Milbank, Dana. 2017, June 28. "Trump, Fake News and the 'Crisis' of American Political Reporting?" *The University of Melbourne*. Access April 30, 2020. arts.unimelb.edu.au/school-of-social-and-political-sciences/resources/videos/trump-fake-news-and-the-crisis-of-american-political-reporting

Newman, Nick, Fletcher, Richard, Kalogeropoulos, Antonis, Levy, David, and **Rasmus Kleis Nielsen.** 2017. *Reuters Institute Digital News Report* 2017. Access May 12, 2020. https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/Digital News Report 2017 web_0.pdf

PolitiFact. 2020. "Who pays for PolitiFact?" Access June 21, 2020. politifact.com/who-pays-for-politifact/

Powers, K. 2020, May 1. "Biden denies sex assault claim. If you don't believe him, should you vote for him anyway?" Access May 2, 2020. eu.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2020/05/01/2020-choice-trump-outstrips-biden-sexual-assault-accusations-column/3056601001/

Ritz, Janet. 2013. "We're All Journalists Now." *Huffington Post*. Access April 20, 2020. huffpost.com/entry/were-all-journalists-now_b_3122817

Roig-Franzia, Manuel, and **Sarah Ellison.** 2020, March 28. "A History of the Trump War on Media – the Obsession not Even Coronavirus Could Stop." *The Washington Post*. Access April 28, 2020. washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/media/a-history-of-the-trump-war-on-media--the-obsession-not-even-coronavirus-could-stop/2020/03/28/71bb21d0-f433-11e9-8cf0-4cc99f74d127_story.html

Schultz, Julianne. 1998. *Reviving the Fourth Estate: Democracy, Accountability and the Media*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schopenhauer, Arthur. 2008. *The Art of Controversy*, trans. Thomas Bailey Saunders. Megaphone ebooks.

Smythe, Dallas W. 1977. "Communications: Blindspot of Western Marxism." *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory* 1 (3): 1–27,

Snopes. 2020. "Is Snopes Funded by Mega-donors such as George Soros or the Koch Brothers?" *Snopes*. Access April 20, 2020. snopes.com/faq/is-snopes-funded-by-mega-donors-such-as-george-soros-or-the-koch-brothers/

Soukup, Paul A. 2014. "Looking at, through, and with YouTube." *Communication Research Trends* 33 (3): 3–34.

Statista Survey. 2017. "U.S. YouTube Users Who Regularly Watch Favorite YouTube Channels." *Statista Survey*. Access March 15, 2020. statista.com/statistics/259490/us-users-who-regularly-watch-favourite-youtube-channels/

Toulmin, Stephen E. 1958. *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Eemeren, Frans, Garssen, Bartand, and **Bert Meuffels.** 2009. *Fallacies and Judgments of Reasonableness: Empirical Research Concerning the Pragma-dialectical Discussion Rules*. Dordrecht: Springer.

van Eemeren, Frans, and **Peter Houtlosser.** 1999. "Strategic Manoeuvring in Argumentative Discourse," *Discourse Studies* 1 (4): 479–497.

Vlachos, Andreas, and **Sebastian Riedel.** 2014. "Fact-checking: Task Definition and Dataset Construction." *Proceedings of the ACL 2014 Workshop on Language Technologies and Computational Social Science*, Baltimore: Association for Computational Linguistics.

Walton, Douglas. 2006. *Fundamentals of Critical Argumentation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wimmer, Jeffrey. 2012. "The Times They Are A-changin: The Digital Transformation of 'Classic' Counter-public Spheres." *Communication Management Quarterly* 23: 5–22

Wolfe, Alan. 1984, March 24. "The New Counter-journalism: Is Muckraking Passe?" *The Nation* 238.

YouTube. 2020. *YouTube for Press*. Access April 20, 2020. youtube.com/about/press/

Appendix:

List of primary sources (alphabetically, by channel name, and chronologically)

No	Channel name	Upload date	Title	Source	Source analyzed	Video duration	Number of views
1	"Conservative Twins"	2020, April 29	Amazingly beautiful reporter ask stupidest question in history	youtube.com/ watch?v=MjH_ebmG998	Press conference	05:00	129,808
2	"Conservative Twins"	2020, May 6	Don Lemon says Michelle Obama is more attractive than Melania Trump!	youtube.com/ watch?v=oh2H g3ChG8c	CNN	04:25	107,701
3	"Don't Walk, Run! Productions"	2020, May 5	Joe Biden has nothing to hide (except his past record)	youtube.com/ watch?v=OAxC bPc6fYA&t=2s	MSNBC/ The New York Times	15:06	209,511
4	"Mark Dice"	2020, Mar 31	Wrong again Rachel!	youtube.com/ watch?v=rOhdoc Nexvc&t=201s	CNN/ MSNBC	06:59	505,368
5	"Mark Dice"	2020, April 7	Jake Tapeworm has questions	youtube.com/ watch?v=MA EMt8LodsI	CNN	06:14	325,342
6	"Mark Dice"	2020, April 13	Oh, now they say it	youtube.com/ watch?v=sni41 zr2-SY	CNN	06:53	430,071
7	"Mark Dice"	2020, May 6	Who would have known?	youtube.com/ watch?v=il-1 UR-Pzp0	CNN	04:14	451,728
8	"Mr Reagan"	2020, April 29	Trump vs The Media	youtube.com/ watch?v=t5IkiKD 9Ng8&t=563s	Press conference	35:47	26,764
9	"Mr Reagan"	2020, April 30	Mr Reagan destroys Pierce Morgan	youtube.com/ watch?v=_zlzLx VxVIE&t=837s	MSNBC/ CNN/ABC/ ITV	21:40	40,891
10	"Mr Reagan"	2020, May 6	Vote Biden even if he's rapist!	youtube.com/ watch?v=AMBJSa KV3Io&t=1466s	MSNBC/ USA Today	28:29	42,911
11	"No B. S."	2020, April 15	Trump triggers CNN with press conference video	youtube.com/ watch?v=a8SR xbve1iM	Press conference	13:50	27,344
12	"No B. S."	2020, May 9	Jimmy Kimmel spreads lied about VP Mike Pence	youtube.com/ watch?v=5chyAY yDN0o&t=3s	ABC	15:55	12,767
13	"One America News Network"	2020, March 25	Man Eats Fish Tank Cleaner. MSM Blames Trump	youtube.com/ watch?v=1Oz 6cYuwFcg	(Not specified)	02:24	20,850
14	"One America News Network"	2020, April 7	Jonathon Turley critical of CNN correspondent Jim Acosta's behavior during press briefings	youtube.com/ watch?v=5OP b4_h1rwA	CNN	02:52	3,0237
15	"Rebel HQ"	2020, April 14	Lindsey Graham uses Fox News to awkwardly soothe Trump's ego	youtube.com/ watch?v=Ozf7 _brXGO8	Fox News	05:03	11,008

16	"Rebel HQ"	2020, April 17	Maniacal Fox host pushes war with China over Coronavirus	youtube.com/ watch?v=J89A kL8z5K8	Fox News	05:15	11,736
17	"Rebel HQ"	2020, April 22	Laura Ingraham: Leftists like quarantine because… Kavanaugh?	youtube.com/ watch?v=oPjy UR7IQZ4	Fox News	05:11	11,599
18	"Secular Talk"	2020, Apr 2	The View badgers & disrespects Bernie Sanders	youtube.com/ watch?v=GwMw ygLR5Uc&t=263s	The View	18:01	117,900
19	"Secular Talk"	2020, Apr 4	Mainstream media's handling of Covid-19 disliked by the public	youtube.com/ watch?v=XqZhpF Tz-p0&t=34s	(Not specified)	08:59	103,792
20	"Secular Talk"	2020, April 29	CNN loser all but begs Michelle Obama to be VP	youtube.com/ watch?v=gjQD CzVsc6g	CNN	08:13	72,231
21	"Secular Talk"	2020, May 6	Jake Tapper: Two terrible choices for president is good enough!	youtube.com/ watch?v=dCSc XMOhUGI	CNN	08:27	66,945
22	"Steven Crowder"	2020, Mar 28	How Covid-19 hands Trump 2020 | Louder with Crowder.	youtube.com/ watch?v=E94hu uAYXQM	ABC	16:47	462,601
23	"Steven Crowder"	2020, April 20	Trump's right, the media's wrong on Covid | Louder with Crowder	youtube.com/ watch?v=WQ k3fgF-0tI	CNN/ MSNBC	55:00	437,926
24	"Steven Crowder"	2020, April 24	Fact-checking the media's Trump/Lysol lies | Dan Crenshaw guests | #12 Good Morning MugClub	youtube.com/ watch?v=D0he Jh3YD3c	(Not specified)	01:25:17	470,830
25	"The Majority Report w/ Sam Seder"	2020, Apr 9	Brian Kilmeade Licks Boot Of Texas Congressman to Bash Bernie One Last Time	youtube.com/ watch?v=79K Rfk8KikE	Fox News	10:08	9,277
26	"The Majority Report w/ Sam Seder"	2020, April 22	The dumbest thing ever just made Fox & Friends question immigration ban	youtube.com/ watch?v=bV ThvnlfqNI	Fox News	02:45	22,189
27	"The Majority Report w/ Sam Seder"	2020, April 23	Jeanine Pirro unhinged	youtube.com/ watch?v=argW 7AWzLz4	Fox News	08:42	114,814
28	"The Majority Report w/ Sam Seder"	2020, May 9	Gutfeld forgets which Bush failure is which	youtube.com/ watch?v=mo7Q r8ql-7k&t=2s	Fox News	05:17	14,691
29	"The Humanist Report"	2020, April 9	Centrists, CNN waste zero time attacking & dancing on Bernie's political grave	youtube.com/ watch?v=t8If CuMwad0	CNN	11:47	41,042
30	"The Humanist Report"	2020, April 25	Fox's Stuart Varney Offended Ocasio-Cortez Would DARE Laugh at Oil Crash	youtube.com/ watch?v=xa4R JgUm__w&t=4s	Fox News	14:49	46,593

31	"The Humanist Report"	2020, April 25	CNN's Chris Cillizza says there's "not much" evidence media hated Bernie Sanders	youtube.com/ watch?v=2GbP qEaWXIM	CNN	11:50	27,194
32	"The Humanist Report"	2020, April 28	Disinfectant injections isn't the stupidest Trumpism from last week, believe it or not	youtube.com/ watch?v=bqU MBRi4fdc	Fox News	14:14	11,465
33	"The Progressive Voice"	2020, April 9	Tucker Carlson demolishes Joe Biden & the Democrats for voting for him!	youtube.com/ watch?v=q0B w7t6jQKw	Fox News	04:47	13,999
34	"The Progressive Voice"	2020, April 26	Breaking: CNN covers Tara Reade story in-depth, buries the coverage!	youtube.com/ watch?v=YpS QWABJF0g	CNN	13:35	14,265
35	"The Young Turks"	2020, April 12	Joe Biden's toughest foe	youtube.com/ watch?v=DCEd EQvEH9Y	(Not specified)	10:43	104,776
36	"Zeducation"	2020, April 6	Positive coronavirus news! Does Tiger King have Coronavirus? Hilarious MSNBC, CBS & Pelosi Fails	youtube.com/ watch?v=bCU ZMl4DSXw	MSNBC/ CBS	12:22	86,145