

Gersonskaya V.,

MEd, senior lecturer, Foreign Languages Department, Kazakh American Free University

Ogneva D.

Bachelor's student, Foreign Languages Department, Kazakh American Free University<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15298393>**Abstract**

The article describes some recent developments in political journalism, namely, shift to interpretive journalism, characterized by strategic framing, increased focus on conflict and negativity, and a blending of factual content with analytical commentary. The linguistic dimension of Tucker Carlson's rhetorical style, focusing on the persuasive techniques and recurring themes in his televised speeches from 2021 to 2023 is examined. An in-deep analysis of Carlson's verbal strategies reveals a consistent thematic framework centered on societal decline, threats to traditional values, and elite-driven narratives, achieved with such rhetorical devices as repetition, contrast, rhetorical questions, hyperbole, irony, and historical analogies which contribute to eliciting emotional engagement of the audience, particularly through appeals to fear, outrage, and mistrust.

Keywords: political journalism, interpretive journalism, rhetorical techniques, polarization, communication strategies, non-cooperative strategy, Tucker Carlson, political discourse.

Political journalism is considered one of the most significant spheres of the media, which has a significant impact on the functioning of democracy. It includes the collection, coverage, and analysis of news related to public administration, political processes, and legislation. The main goal of political journalism is to provide to citizens reliable information about recent events, monitor the activities of the authorities, and create a platform for political discussion, and exchanging different points of view. Nevertheless, the question of its effectiveness remains unresolved, since both internal and external factors affect the media [1].

Political journalism is influenced by many factors that can be considered at various levels. At the systematic level, the political, economic and legal environment in which the media function is constitutive. The organizational level includes the internal structure of newsrooms, editorial standards and the economic model of media. Concurrently, individual factors such as journalists' professional values and working style also play a key role. Furthermore, political journalism is closely related to the political context, where the interests and strategies of different groups can significantly involve the content of news stories [2].

About the content, researchers have identified several key trends that characterize political journalism in western democracies. Firstly, there has been a tendency to portray politics as a strategic game that focuses on the tactics and maneuver of politicians rather than on discussing the substance of issues. Secondly, there has been a rise in interpretive journalism, with analytical articles and opinion pieces gradually replacing neutral news reporting. A further distinctive feature of political journalism is its emphasis on conflicts, scandals and negative aspects of political life. This aspect of journalism is often characterized by drama and provocativeness, but studies demonstrate that structural and situational factors have a greater impact on the content of the news agenda than the overt political prejudice of journalists. The issue of media prejudice is a relevant one in this context, however, and it is important to note

that research shows that prejudice impacts news reporting more significantly than other forms of prejudice [3].

The field of political journalism has experienced major transformations in recent decades because of digital media expansion and changing news audience behavior and declining public trust in established media outlets [4]. The modern journalism industry is transforming its fundamental principles which include objectivity, factuality and neutrality. News standards that originated from balanced reporting with reliable sources and clear opinion/news separation face changes because of new information dissemination trends. This interpretive style, evident in analytical articles, extensive reports and even conventional news stories, involves supplementation of factual information with interpretive elements [1]. Fact-checking plays a pivotal role in this process, serving not only to combat misinformation but also becoming an integral component of the analytical approach.

Contrary to traditional journalism, characterized by impartiality, the interpretive style is marked by a more pronounced journalistic voice, the inclusion of value judgements and an expanded contextualization of events. This transition has been shown to have a multifaceted impact on the political sphere. On the one hand, it could reinforce negative views of politics by portraying it as a calculated endeavor that prioritizes the political maneuvers over the issues at hand. However, mass media have the power to shape public opinion and guide public conversation by shedding light on specific aspects of political processes. With growing information flow and the propagation of misinformation, interpretive journalism offers journalists an opportunity to maintain their independence from political elites and to analyze events in greater depth, thereby assisting audiences in more effectively navigating complex political processes [1].

The present time is characterized by a marked tendency within the sphere of political journalism to prioritize the coverage of adverse events and conflicts. This phenomenon can be attributed to the strategic intent of appealing to audiences by presenting such reports as

being more profound and substantial [4]. Recent research findings indicate that news media are more likely to disseminate news if it features accounts of crisis situations or generates a sense of threat. This phenomenon aligns with broader trends in contemporary media consumption and dissemination [2]. The phenomenon is largely related to the peculiarities of human psychology, as people instinctively react to information about potential risks. It is important to distinguish between negativity and conflict in news stories, although these concepts are close. Negative coverage may include criticism of authorities, revelations of corruption and scandals, while conflict-centricity focuses on confrontations between political forces. According to Lengauer, Esser and Berganza (2012), there are several hallmarks of negative journalism. These include a pervasive critical tone directed towards political actors, an accentuated focus on conflicts, the leveling of accusations against individuals or political entities and a tendency towards pessimistic prognostication.

Proliferation of negative and conflict-oriented journalism has been identified as a major contributing factor to the spread of such reporting, with the process of commercialization of media recognized as a key element in this phenomenon. This phenomenon exerts a substantial influence on the nature of news coverage, compelling private media outlets to prioritize sensational and controversial stories. Commodification of media services has been identified as a significant factor in the propagation of deleterious trends. Private media outlets have been shown to exhibit a higher propensity to engage in the dissemination of sensational and contentious narratives, a tendency that is purportedly driven by a pursuit of heightened viewership ratings and an enlargement of their demographic reach. In countries characterized by intense market competition among media outlets, this phenomenon is especially evident [5]. This strategy of news coverage has been demonstrated to have a considerable impact on public opinion: a constant focus on crises and conflicts contributes to the development of a political outlook marked by cynicism and distrust of state institutions. While journalism based upon the principles of objectivity and impartiality fulfils a vital function within a democratic society, it can also contribute to the development of a polarized public and levels of public discontent [4].

Therefore, it may be concluded that negative news constitutes an integral element of political journalism; however, the prevalence of such reporting is determined by a variety of factors. Such factors may be categorized as including country-specific characteristics and media market strategy. The phenomenon remains a subject of active research, as its impact extends beyond the scope of individual events and affects public sentiment on a broader scale. From a theoretical standpoint, politics is regarded not solely as an object, but also as an active subject, utilizing diverse communication mechanisms to shape, maintain, and transform social reality. In this context, the function of political journalism is pivotal in serving as a conduit between politicians and their respective audiences, with journalists operating as intermediaries who dictate the manner in

which information is disseminated, whether in its entirety or in a redacted form, and in an affirmative or negative light [2].

The goals of the political organization dictate the choice of a communication strategy, which may be either cooperative or confrontational. The cooperative approach is all about ensuring effective interaction, where the primary goal is the generation of high-quality communication and the secondary goal is adaptation to the specific situation. The implementation of this strategy, if done well, will help in the achievement of both of these goals. On the other hand, non-cooperative strategies involve more forceful methods of engagement, which include strategies for open conflict, credibility destruction, and controlling the communication process. These approaches are applied in all types of political discourse, both monologic and dialogic forms of communication [6].

Research findings show that news programs, with a heightened and more adversarial tone, tend to overestimate audience interest [18,6]. Such programs are an "echo chamber," offering a daily news source for their audiences, which in turn seek validation of their perspectives from other news sources. In addition, the research indicates that social networks as a source of news create isolated information bubbles [18,12]. In addition, there is a general overestimation of the frequency of news consumption: For example, 45% of the participants report that they consume the news 5-7 times a week, whereas observational data reveal that this percentage is merely 20% [18,6]. Moreover, studies show that individuals who regularly consume content containing conspiracy theories or fake news tend to use social media as the main source of information [18,12]. The potential to tailor algorithms to suit particular user interests has been cited as a cause of this trend because it optimizes audience participation and gets a better reaction. So, the popularity of news shows that are characterized by combative rhetoric, such as "Tucker Carlson Tonight," may be attributable to several reasons. The above dynamics could include the echo chamber effect, the consumption of customized content through social media outlets, and an inflated self-assessment of news consumption patterns by audiences. These dynamics act to enhance polarization in society and the spread of false narratives in the news environment.

A clear illustration of non-cooperative strategies at play in the field of journalism is presented by the corpus of work by the American political commentator Tucker Carlson. The defining aspects of his work are marked by a skeptical questioning of official discourses and biting polemics, along with a strong tendency towards confrontational argumentation. These aspects render Carlson's work a relevant illustration of an aggressive communication style. Over time, Mr. Carlson has managed to gain a large following due to his presence on television programs and internet media platforms. This, in turn, has enabled him to wield a great deal of influence over public opinion. Peaking at 2020 with an average of 4.2 million viewers per week, his program Tucker Carlson Tonight on Fox News has been one of the highest-rated news programs on US cable television

[7]. After leaving Fox News in 2023, Carlson established his own media company called the Tucker Carlson Network. This helped him solidify his place in the media via independent digital avenues. His podcast quickly became the second most popular podcast on Spotify, with the debut episode on Twitter having garnered nearly 120 million views. Later episodes, however, witnessed a decline in the interest of viewers [11]. Carlson's personality is a personality that is not without controversy: the traits he is also renowned for are his forthrightness and his willingness to raise issues that are considered sensitive, as well as his willingness to confront the mainstream media. He is thus seen as an alternative voice in the media world [9]. Meanwhile, he has also been blamed by critics for being responsible for the dissemination of conspiracy theories, slanted reporting, and the exploitation of journalism as a tool for political manipulation [12].

Tucker Carlson is a unique media figure with millions of fans and haters worldwide. Known for his uncompromising and dynamic approach, demanding direct answers and keeping interviews energetic, effectively connecting with viewers and creating memorable moments, combining political analysis with personal views, focusing on topics of significant public resonance, he has long become one of the most influential political journalists [10]. His interviewing style and rhetoric, public persona and perception as well as the themes he discusses and people he interviews have provoked heated debate in mass media and attracted numerous researchers. Tucker Carlson's distinctive and contentious approach to journalism has elevated him to the status of a leading figure in the field.

His unconventional style has garnered significant attention, with numerous studies examining the content of his publications and the rhetoric he employs on his eponymous talk show, Tucker Carlson Tonight. Consequently, a number of studies have been conducted by media outlets such as NPR and Politico, examining the content of his publications and his rhetoric on the Tucker Carlson Tonight show. A research study conducted by journalists at The New York Times analyzed all 1,150 episodes of Tucker Carlson Tonight from 2016 to 2021 in order to identify consistent storylines and patterns of presentation [14]. The study revealed that Carlson's rhetoric was designed to evoke feelings of cognitive dissonance in viewers by contrasting the 'ruling class' ('them') and the Fox News audience ('you'). The analysis showed that Carlson's rhetoric was intended to instil fear and distrust in viewers towards elites and progressive movements. In April 2021, he overtly endorsed a conspiracy theory concerning 'replacing whites' through immigration, and an analysis revealed that the topic had been raised over 400 times since 2016. In general, the researchers stated that his assertions frequently entwined factual information with fictional elements [15]. The New York Times created a database that captured the key themes and rhetoric of Carlson's show, including data on the time spent on each topic, as well as guests and their agreement or disagreement with the host [14]. Over time, the programme became increasingly aggressive and straightforward, becoming an 'echo chamber' where Carlson's ideas were presented without criticism [16]. The jury

recognized the efficacy of Carlson's utilization of his own words in conjunction with visual components, a combination that rendered the article particularly appealing and persuasive. The investigation revealed the impact of the gradual introduction of ideas on the formation of public opinion, thereby demonstrating the influence of the media on public opinion. Notwithstanding the boycott by major advertisers, the show maintained its commercial success, largely due to its loyal audience.

Carlson's capacity to articulate contradictory assertions in disparate programmes while sustaining the confidence of his audience attests to his proficiency in rhetoric. He adroitly escalated tensions by depicting liberal journalists, Hollywood celebrities, Democrats and progressive youth as adversaries. Additionally, Carlson has overtly endorsed far-right politicians such as Viktor Orbán, Jair Bolsonaro and Andrzej Duda, as well as Donald Trump.

The influence exerted by Carlson on public opinion is defined not only by his oratory skills, but also by his ability to create vivid and memorable moments for the media. Even his final broadcast on Fox News was meticulously planned, involving the consumption of substandard pizza, a discussion on the 'heroic delivery man', and the promotion of a new documentary. Carlson's ability to evoke a wide range of emotions in viewers, from outrage to pride, was the result of a deliberate strategy [17].

Despite being harshly criticized for his controversial and theatrical manner, with frequent interruptions and moralising, divisive rhetoric, often pitting "ordinary people" against "globalists" or "elites," reliance on sarcasm and performative anger (which, as critics argue, misrepresent complex issues), he has unparalleled influence on mass audience maintaining their loyalty through assertiveness and emotional appeal. He is seen by many as a voice against mainstream liberal narratives, representing an "anti-elite" perspective, who tackles issues of public resonance with a bold perspective. This makes him project simplicity and relatability to everyday citizens despite a privileged background [17]. It can be seen from the above-mentioned, that Tucker Carlson is a confrontational personality; however, it must be mentioned that he possesses abilities as an excellent journalist. The rhetorical strategies employed by Tucker Carlson incite controversy and yield charges of combative rhetoric, but his style is definitely effective.

In contrast to previous studies, this research tackles the linguistic dimension, specifically the words and processes used by Tucker Carlson in his verbal speeches. The sources of the research are a collection of speeches made by Tucker Carlson from 2021 to 2023 [22-30]. Through the close examination of the materials, we were capable of determining not just rhetorical strategies used by the speaker but as well as prevailing themes that recur in successive speeches. One dominating theme among the materials is recognizing the perilous course of modern political, social, and worldwide trends. This perspective is characterized by the feeling that Western society is undergoing a period of grave instability, signaled by the erosion of customary values,

the restriction of freedom of speech and the enforcement of policies by political and economic elites that culminate in an environment of turmoil. The texts under scrutiny adopt a conservative and critical stance, centering on three primary issues: gender identity problems and their implications, increasing military conflicts (including threats of nuclear war), and the role of the media, politicians, and big business. Of particular concern is how the understanding of gender is being transformed. Tucker Carlson's orations view this as a questioning of biological facts and traditional values. Tucker Carlson's talks correlate with Christine Ellingsen's case, who is a self-proclaimed Norwegian feminist that has criticized drugs interfering with puberty among children. Through this, she sheds light on the potential consequences of such medical intervention, which include being sterilized and other irreversible outcomes [23]. One other point made in another statement is that children as young as 10 years old are being injected to stop puberty and then given hormones of the opposite sex that make them infertile. This statement, 'Billboard Chris: This is the "biggest child abuse scandal" in modern medicine', claims that all these are being projected as 'gender-supportive medicine'. The speech also claims that one of the biggest scandals of forced sexual transformation of kids is now taking place in the medical field. It contends that these procedures are referred to as 'gender-supportive medicine,' although in reality they inflict irreversible harm on children [24].

The second significant topic is military conflicts, specifically the situation surrounding Ukraine and the growing threat of nuclear war. In the article 'Tucker talks American and Ukrainian borders with Rep. Salazar', we find that the chances of war with Russia are on the rise as U.S. leaders are supporting a strong approach and are not ready to think about peaceful solutions to end the crisis. A majority of people see that a huge war with Russia is inevitable since most powerful individuals support it. The nuclear warming theory argues that humanity's biggest threat is not global warming but nuclear weapons. In his address titled 'Trump warns of modern-day weaponry: Our biggest problem is "nuclear warming"', the President points out that if the leading world powers continue to fuel wars without restraint, it may result in a catastrophe even greater than what we anticipate of global warming. The speech compares the issue of global warming to the threat of nuclear weapons and claims that global warming is assumed because of nuclear weapons. It argues that the most significant threat should be nuclear warming and not the much-debated topic of global warming [26].

The third theme is about criticism of the media, large corporations, and politicians. The authors feel that these institutions manipulate society and suppress freedom of speech. In his article 'Diversity trainers weaponise critical race theory to systematically attack the unifying ideals of America', Chris Rufo claims that critical race theory has been introduced in US public institutions. It is being done, according to him, to polarize society along racial lines, which enhances current conflicts. Rufo believes that hired diversity trainers are slowly eroding the things that hold the nation together, dividing Americans against each other based on the color of their skin. The topic that we are discussing is

how the media can strengthen a particular belief by silencing other opinions, as well as the vast power of large corporations in dictating political agendas and derailing democratic processes. Others state that no corporation should be that powerful in relation to politics to overrule what the voters want [27]. The overall argument in these documents is that there is a lack of trust in the story that is being told by the politicians and the media. The overall assumption is that there is a crisis in Western society. The crisis is linked with changing ideas, the demolition of traditional institutions, and straying from the principles of free speech.

An analysis of Tucker Carlson's speeches demonstrates the active use of specific techniques in an attempt to become more convincing and emotionally appealing with his arguments. These techniques act synergistically to alter the manner in which the audience thinks, cast doubt over the official narratives, and stimulate the sense of urgency and frustration. One of the conventional ways of driving a point home is by repetition. This is seen from the repeated use of statements like *"for months, the public have been told."* or *"we have heard time and time again."* This creates an impression that there is an information campaign that has been well planned. This is seen in one section: *"For the last 14 months, you've heard two things about the war in Ukraine."* [25]. This technique of expressing the message illustrates that the audience has been provided with a universal message that can be misleading. By indicating how widespread and persistent these comments are, the speaker renders them less trustworthy and elicits disappointment and suspicion. The rhetorical device of contrast, the antithesis, is related to a frequent theme of repetition throughout the texts, in which two opposing forces are repeatedly set alongside one another: the powerful and the people, truth and lies, and reality and illusion [19]. As shown by the statement that *"He revealed the crimes, therefore he is the criminal"*, such a contrast between antithetical forces operates to reinforce a pervasive theme of regime dishonesty and oppression. This is a rhetorical technique that specifically accentuates the contradiction inherent in the situation, evoking a critique of the rationale for the decisions of those with power. Such an effect is also created through the utterance, *"Telling the truth is the only real sin,"* which suggests the notion that speaking the truth gets punished, thus supporting the prevalent theme of systematic dishonesty and oppression [28].

The employment of rhetorical questions has been shown to be an extremely effective way of appealing to the audience and guiding their thoughts [20]. Rather than presenting direct assertions, the texts pose inquiries such as *"Why would we fight Russia? Wouldn't making Russia our enemy drive Putin into the arms of China?"* or *"Who are these officials who lied to Reuters?"* [26; 29]. These interrogations subtly suggest that there are straightforward but unnoticed solutions, thereby prompting the audience to challenge dominant discourses. The use of these interrogatives by the speaker aims to provoke critical thought as well as lead the audience towards a particular conclusion. Hyperbole is a rhetorical device that heightens emotive appeal by exaggeration [20]. A pertinent illustration is provided by the following: *"They are treating him like*

Osama bin Laden. Maybe worse, actually."[28]. This increased comparison is done to enhance the feeling of perceived injustice in the case, evoking a gut response from the audience. In the same vein, the rhetoric of fear becomes effective by employing, for instance, the line *"The animals are dying, the water is glowing" when describing a nationwide environmental disaster* [29].

This type of language is employed to invoke anger and dramatize the crisis. Appealing to fear in speech is common when referring to geopolitical war [19]. The most obvious example of this is stating that *"this is a hot war between the two leading nuclear superpowers on Earth"*, which brings about the feeling of an imminent catastrophe [29]. By portraying the conflict as a serious danger, the speaker is making the audience increasingly anxious. Using fear in a speech is a very effective way of convincing people. One of these techniques is to show that the people are against the elite class, e.g., *"Us versus them."* They reaffirm this through such remarks as *"News agencies print what they are told to print by the intelligence agencies."* [29].

This implies that the mass media does not come into being as an independent institution but as a voice for the powerful and therefore plays a role in creating a gap between the masses and the elite, and consolidating the feeling of antagonism and suspicion against the latter. Additionally, the contention that *"the media are completely determined to suppress the truth"* works to reiterate the implication that the listeners are being actively deceived, and thus creates a sense of camaraderie amongst listeners who believe they have a common enemy [29]. Of note, the texts use irony and sarcasm, techniques which, as widely documented, work to ridicule oppositional argument whilst simultaneously debilitating its credibility. We can look, for example, at the sentence *"Our senile president has just given some kind of medal to a sitcom actress, purportedly for courage"*, which satirizes governmental action by bringing it down to its most ridiculous characteristic. In the same manner, the expression that *"Respect indigenous knowledge, don't drive our cars"* is used to illustrate how, in the author's view, the above arguments are not sincere [30].

The use of mockery in the form of the statement *"And the amazing thing is—it's kind of working"* is used to satirize environmental policies by implying their irrationality and counter-effectiveness [26]. Such a derisive tone not only amuses but also bolsters ideological identification by rendering opposition ridiculous. The use of absolute rhetoric has also been recognized as rhetorical tactics are characterized by the deliberate diminution of the field of debate by the introduction of diametrically opposed terms; for instance, the words *"This is the worst act of war I have ever seen us commit"* and *"This is the most dishonest war in history"* work to introduce the speaker's opinion as the sole valid opinion by diminishing the field of debate [29]. This style of rhetoric is especially useful in reducing complex matters and thereby rendering them more appealing to the listeners [20].

One of the prominent characteristics of the texts under scrutiny is that they utilize anecdotal proof and selective framing. The account often uses isolated incidents – for example, the derailed train in East Palestine,

Ohio – to demonstrate overall systemic breakdowns [30]. By sharing these occurrences and contrasting them with the expense of foreign aid, the speaker reaffirms the opinion that the government is more interested in foreigners' interests than the country's citizens are in their own health. Further, the texts demonstrate a strategic use of direct audience participation [20]. These kinds of utterances as *"Are we really meant to believe this?"* or *"What will they say now that we know the truth?"*, for example, have an interactive effect and thus bring about a feeling of personal involvement in the debate on the part of the audience [27]. This direct address helps to create a sense of joint discovery and also helps to bolster the idea that the audience is an enlightened minority that can see beyond deception. Because the texts repeatedly use historical analogies to offer parallels between current and past events (e.g. comparisons with the Cold War and past wars) they create a context backdrop to introduce geopolitical matters, thus making them more understandable and credible. Historical analogy is employed to make the case that the same mistakes of past foreign policy are being made in the present crisis, citing *"what occurred in 1960 with Fidel Castro and JFK"* [25].

It can be seen from the above analysis that Tucker Carlson is a confrontational personality; however, it must be mentioned that he possesses abilities as an excellent journalist. The rhetorical strategies employed by Tucker Carlson incite controversy and yield charges of combative rhetoric, but his style is definitely effective. As Carlson's career continues and encounters more challenges, it is only natural to anticipate that his style will change over time.

References:

1. Tufts University. Focus on political journalism. Tufts University Career Center Blog; 2024 Oct 7. Available from: <https://careers.tufts.edu/blog/2024/10/07/focus-on-political-journalism/>
2. Oxford Research Encyclopedia. Political journalism [Internet]. Oxford University Press; Available from: <https://oxfordre.com/communication/display/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228613-e-859>
3. Kuhn R, Nielsen RK, editors. Political journalism in transition: Western Europe in a comparative perspective. London: I.B. Tauris; 2014.
4. Klein E. Why we're polarized [Internet]. Vox; 2020 Jan 28. Available from: <https://www.vox.com/2020/1/28/21077888/why-were-polarized-media-book-ezra-news>
5. Lengauer G, Esser F, Berganza R. Negativity in political news: A review of concepts, operationalizations, and key findings. Journalism. 2012;13(2):179–202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884911427800>
6. Bukin AS. Cooperative and non-cooperative drivers in speech [Internet]. CyberLeninka; 2018. Available from: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kooperativnye-i-nekooperativnye-drivy-v-rechi>
7. Adweek. Fox News Q2 2020 ratings: Tucker Carlson averaged 4.3 million viewers in the 8 p.m.

hour, the largest audience in cable news history. Available from: <https://www.adweek.com/tvnewser/fox-news-q2-2020-ratings-tucker-carlson-averaged-4-3-million-viewers-in-the-8-p-m-hour-the-largest-audience-in-cable-news-history/>

8. Newsweek. Tucker Carlson's first Twitter show hits 120 million views. Available from: <https://www.newsweek.com/joe-rogan-tucker-carlson-spotify-chart-podcasts-1930612>

9. The New York Times. Tucker Carlson, a source of repeated controversies, is out at Fox News; 2023. Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/04/24/business/media/tucker-carlson-fox-news.html>

10. The Atlantic. Tucker Carlson's final moments on Fox were as dangerous as they were absurd; 2023. Available from: <https://www.theatlantic.com/culture/archive/2023/04/tucker-carlson-tonight-fox-news-last-episode-pizza/673845/>

11. The Guardian. Tucker Carlson launches subscription-based streaming service; 2023. Available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2023/dec/11/tucker-carlson-network-subscription-streaming-service>

12. The Guardian. Tucker Carlson's influence in conservative media. Available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/article/2024/sep/04/tucker-carlson-donald-trump-jd-vance>

13. Vox. Tucker Carlson controversy explained. Available from: <https://www.vox.com/2023/4/25/23697600/tucker-carlson-tonight-fox-news-dominion-lawsuit>

14. Online Journalism Awards. Inside the apocalyptic worldview of Tucker Carlson Tonight; 2022. Available from: <https://awards.journalists.org/entries/inside-the-apocalyptic-worldview-of-tucker-carlson-tonight/>

15. NPR. Tucker Carlson has been at the forefront of a racist conspiracy theory; 2022. Available from: <https://www.npr.org/transcripts/1098488908>

16. Politico. Tucker Carlson book canceled. Available from: <https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2024/06/14/tucker-carlson-book-canceled-00163285>

17. The New Yorker. The world according to Tucker Carlson. Available from: <https://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/the-world-according-to-tucker-carlson>

18. Barthel M, Mitchell A, Asare-Marfo D, Kennedy C, Worden K. Measuring news consumption in a

digital era: As news outlets morph and multiply, both surveys and passive data collection tools face challenges. Pew Research Center; 2020. Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep63515>

19. Khazagerov GG. Political rhetoric. Moscow: Niccolo Media; 2002.

20. Heinrichs J. Thank you for arguing: What Aristotle, Lincoln, and Homer Simpson can teach us about the art of persuasion. 3rd ed. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press; 2017.

21. Jones AM. Use of fear and threat-based messages to motivate preparedness: costs, consequences and other choices. Part two. J Bus Contin Emer Plan. 2013;6(3):256–68.

22. CNN. Tucker: What is the science behind this? Available from YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HBew0NGH9fo>

23. BlazeTV. Norwegian feminist faces jail time in Norway for 'stating the obvious'. Available from YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mop-MFfMlwvE>

24. Fox News. Billboard Chris: This is the 'biggest child abuse scandal' in modern medicine. Available from Fox News. <https://www.foxnews.com/video/6311077938112>

25. Fox News. Tucker talks American and Ukrainian borders with Rep. Salazar. Available from Fox News. <https://www.foxnews.com/video/6300914092001>

26. Fox News. Trump warns of modern-day weaponry: Our biggest problem is 'nuclear warming'. Available from Fox News. <https://www.foxnews.com/video/6324633135112>

27. Fox News. Diversity trainers weaponize critical race theory to systemically attack the unifying ideals of America. Available from Fox News. <https://www.foxnews.com/video/6186767845001>

28. BlazeTV. 4 times Tucker Carlson said what we were ALL THINKING at Blaze Media Summit. Available from YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mGKs482toZM>

29. Fox News. Tucker Carlson: Where does Zelensky get off 'demanding' money from US? Available from Fox News. <https://www.foxnews.com/video/6316176409112>

30. Fox News. Stephen Miller: We are about to witness the single greatest self-inflicted wound in history. Available from Fox News. <https://www.foxnews.com/video/6311074949112>