Fact-Checkers as a Professional Community of Experts. The Research Project – From Idea to Implementation

Karina Stasiuk-Krajewska

ⓘD 0000-0001-8261-7335

SWPS University, Warsaw, Poland

Abstract: The following article presents an elaborate methodological concept that, in perspective, can serve as a model for analyzing professional communities (such as journalists) understood primarily as symbolic and discursive communities. This concept was partially tested by the author during her research on the community of fact-checkers (FC) in Poland. This study used in-depth interviews. The article presents the research design and its implementation, as well as the preliminary generalized results of the study. Special attention is paid to the usefulness of the IDI method in the context of professional community research, and to the difficulties that may be associated with the use of this method.

Keywords: fact-checking, discursive community, professionalisation, disinformation, methodological model, IDI

INTRODUCTION

Fact-checking, which the online Cambridge Dictionary (2024) defines as "the process of checking that all the facts in a piece of writing, a news article, a speech, etc. are correct" is considered one of the important activities in the context of combating disinformation. According to the DUKE Reporter's Lab, there were 424 active fact-checking organizations worldwide in 2022, just over half of which were non-profit organizations (Stencel, Ryan and Luther, 2023). Their activities have resulted in hundreds of analyses and reports published on the websites of these organizations, as well as growing public recognition of fact-checkers as a professional group, or, as experts in verifying information. Their activities are also extensively subsidized by the European Commission and other institutions, reflecting the important role attributed to them. Some fact-checking organizations also cooperate with private entities.

Considering the above data and from the point of view of the presented research issues, it should be emphasized that fact-checkers can be considered a specific expert group, relatively close to journalism, although certainly not identical. In this environment, certain activities, and tendencies can be observed, which make it possible to treat fact-checkers as a separate professional community (community of experts), referring in its activities to a relatively consistent identity and self-description, including ethical values. It is worth noting that fact-checkers maintain relatively extensive relations with each other at the international level (mainly thanks to cooperation in international projects). Interestingly, international relations tend to be more intense than those at the national level. The reason being the growing polarization of media systems, which has an impact on the community of fact-checkers.

An institution that sets professional standards on a transnational scale is the International Fact-Checking Network (IFCN), which is based at the Poynter Institute (Poynter, 2024). The IFCN publishes data and reports on the functioning of the FC community in most European countries and also on a global scale. The network also conducts training sessions and workshops to develop professional competence. But most significantly, in the context of the FC community, the IFCN promotes a code of ethics to which all the members must adhere and implement, for which the Network provides advice. Currently, 107 verified fact-checking organizations are active institutional members of the IFCN. It is worth noting that a condition for maintaining membership in the network is that the organization regularly undergoes an evaluation of the professional standards it applies (based on IFCN's code of ethics).

The aim of the article is to present the research design and its implementation of the study on fact-checkers as a professional community, as well as the preliminary generalized results. Special attention is paid to the usefulness of the in-depth interview (IDI) method in the context of professional community research, and to the difficulties to which this method may be associated.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The evolution in the field of fact-checking is an example of one of the important trends of modern societies, which is the progressive specialization and, directly related to it, the increasing role of experts (Giddens, 2001). Progressive specialization of knowledge produces groups of experts that in turn undergo processes of professionalization, becoming professions operating in specific social fields, for example, the field of science or art (Bourdieu, 2007). Progressive specialization can also be considered an effect of the structure of the discursive field (episteme) of modernity (Foucault, 1997 Laclau & Mouffe, 2007), within which

truth and the specialized knowledge related to it become central values (semantics). This type of semantics is central especially to the discourse of science as certain knowledge about the world but is also an important nodal point (Laclau & Mouffe, 2007) of other discourses, including the discourse of journalism (Stasiuk-Krajewska, 2018).

Paradoxically, progressive specialization leads to fragmentation and a certain type of structural "unverifiability" of knowledge about the world. The reason is that the essential (and indeed the only) criterion of its verifiability remains the opinion of a specialist-expert, i.e. a representative of a profession that has symbolic power in a particular field, and therefore the power to decide what is and is not true. People trust medical knowledge not because they are able to fully verify its veracity (for it is too specialized, and therefore requires extensive expertise), but because it is presented to them by expert specialists—professional physicians. The situation is similar, albeit probably to a varying degree and scale, with knowledge concerning, for example, law, economics, or international relations. Also, although in those contexts the matter is much more complicated with knowledge of current events relevant to the world, which is provided to us by "professional journalists."[1]

Thus, access to truth (and knowledge), semantics constitutive of the self-description of modernity, is provided to non-experts by experts, who are therefore representatives of professions and holders of specialized knowledge. This conclusion leads to an indication of the particularly important role in modern societies of professional groups, which are the special guardians and disposers of "true knowledge about the world," and thus of the discursive order of modernity.

But is a professional group defined? Who is a professional and what is a profession? The answer to these questions is neither easy nor clear-cut, especially in the case of experts engaged in professional public communication (not only journalists or Public Relations specialists but also fact-checkers).

Two paradigms for defining a profession exist. The first is the taxonomic approach, the essence of which is to identify specific institutional determinants of the functioning of a profession. These determinants mostly include the possession of specialized education (preparation), which allows the acquisition of specific skills; the existence of professional associations and codes of professional ethics, as well as adherence to the norms arising from these codes; and finally – relative autonomy in the implementation of professional roles (Carpentier, 2005). Thus, the taxonomic paradigm of the profession, while providing some relatively concretized determinants, leaves quite a lot of room for interpretation. This

---

[1]   The „truth about the world" presented in media messages is essentially a mixture of information and interpretation. The process starts with interpretating which information should be considered relevant, as highlighted by the agenda setting theory well-established in media studies (McCombs, Shaw & Weaver, 2014).

is especially in the context of the level of autonomy enjoyed by expert representatives, but also specialized skill and the level of adherence to professional ethics. It is worth mentioning that this approach presents a perspective that isexternal to the representatives of a particular profession, considering as decisive those determinants that are not necessarily related to their identity.

The second paradigm is a completely different approach that, when defining a profession, uses categories, which refer to the identity or self-description of its representatives. This trend primarily includes the framing of the profession as a community of symbolic practices (Carlson, 2016; Carlson & Lewis, ed., 2015; Meltzer & Martik, 2017; Wenger, 1998). This community shares certain common ideas; common knowledge (which delimits the boundaries of a profession and lends it specific symbolic power, according to the concept of power/knowledge: Foucault, 1980) and ideology; a sense of belonging; values; typical activities or sources; and finally – mutual relations. The main tool for creating a professional community conceived as a symbolic community is language, and at a more complex level – discourse (a shared interpretation of the world) (Kong, 2014). In this view, an element constitutive of any profession is the "ideology of professionalism," which is a set of values (semantics) creating a system of beliefs or characteristics considered specific for a community that can be defined as a professional (expert) community. The typical semantic chain of such an ideology primarily includes values such as public service, objectivity, autonomy, commitment, and a specific "sense of ethics" (Deuze, 2004).

Relatively close to the view of a profession as a symbolic community is to interpret it as a discursive community (Swales, 1990). In both cases, the focus is on the semantics and processes of interpreting the world and producing symbolic identity that occur in the communities. However, in the case of a discursive community, more emphasis is placed on the bottom-up processes of discourse (and professional identity) production, while in analyzing a profession as a symbolic community, one is more concerned with an individual's processes of adaptation to existing symbolic structures. Unsurprisingly, in this approach, the discursive practices (as Foucault understands them) of most interest are those characteristic and constitutive for a profession (and therefore they define its boundaries). These practices include the typical specialized vocabulary, the dominant genres of speech or text in specific discursive communities; stabilized mechanisms of intra-group communication (e.g., in the context of building consensus around particular values); stabilized mechanisms of communication with the external environment; ways of sharing knowledge, communication rituals, etc.

RESEARCH MODEL – PRELIMINARY ASSUMPTIONS

The dichotomy of approaches to professions presented above (taxonomic versus symbolic-discursive approach) can lead to interesting conclusions in the context of research on professional groups (professions). Because the juxtaposition of these two approaches makes it possible to create an extensive, but relatively coherent and fairly comprehensive catalogue of the determinants of professions. In other words, a catalogue of artifacts (usually of a symbolic nature) that should be analyzed to reconstruct the social framework of a profession.

A limited catalogue in the terms of taxonomic definitions could be:

- Specialized: skills; specialized education; career paths;
- Existence of professional associations;
- Existence of codes of ethics and other documents regulating ethical standards relevant to the profession;
- Commitment to ethical standards (as declared in the statements of representatives of the profession);
- Relative sense of autonomy and independence (as declared in the statements of representatives of the profession).

In terms of definitions that emphasize the category of community and discourse, the characteristics of journalism are presented[2] in Table 1.

Table 1: Journalism as a discursive community

Characteristics	Journalism
A common range of knowledge about the world	Concerning current events
Shared ways of interpreting the world	e.g. as the scene of a struggle for political influence
Values	Truth, independence, social responsibility, etc.
Ideologies, narratives, mythologies, including foundational ones	e.g., media as the fourth estate
Typical activities	Primarily preparing and publishing journalistic materials, but also participating in debates, social media activity, etc.
Interactions and roles	Reporter, editorial secretary, homepage editor, etc.
Sources of knowledge about the world	Documents, informants, other media, etc.
Dominant type of activity[*]	In the area of information gathering and commenting on social reality
Mechanisms of socialization	Studies, practice, etc.

---

[2] It is very important to emphasize that the examples from the field of journalism are only random approximations that are not based on in-depth analysis, but rather on the reconstruction of the discourse of journalism as a profession. Their function is to be just a clarification of the categories used, not an exhaustive description of professional journalism.

Characteristics	Journalism
Rules and norms of social coexistence that apply to members	e.g., mutual respect, trust
Shared beliefs	e.g., about the special role of independent journalism in democracy or the restriction of journalistic freedoms by political authorities
Features and functions attributed to the profession	Activism, high communication competence, control of political power, informing the public
Building identity by pointing out differences from other professions	e.g. Public Relations specialists
Processes of reproduction of meanings and ideologies	Debates, trade magazines, introduction to the principles of institution, etc.
The occurrence of a generalized ideology of professionalism	Public service, objectivity, autonomy, commitment, and a specific "sense of ethics"
Ways of acquiring knowledge	Analyzing documents, reading the content of other media, talking to experts, OSINT**, etc.
The nature of the unique world knowledge produced	Up-to-date, socially relevant, and useful to the audience
Typical vocabulary, metaphors	Information, fact, checking, journalistic investigation, etc.
Other discursive constructions, such as syntax, rhetorical figures, expressive and deontic meaning, presuppositions, implicatures, keywords, word-stigmas, names, ad-hoc expressions, etc. ***	e.g. citation of the sources
Typical genres	News, feature, etc.
Communication rituals	e.g., presentation of industry awards
Communication behaviors	e.g. establishing consensus or assuming authority during media debates or on social media of individual professionals, commenting on the behavior of other experts
Stories	e. g., stories of persecution of journalists or media
Symbols used, including graphic symbols	e.g., microphone, camera
Authorities and "black sheep" (identified in community discussions as role models or examples of unacceptable behavior)	Examples of professional and non-professional journalists
Institutions and institutional practices	Broadcasters, associations, regulators, councils, etc.

Key

* Here, "type of activity" is understood not as activities that are undertaken by experts, but as the types of activities that are considered by them to be constitutive of the profession. Of course, the categories "typical activities" and "predominant activity type" partly overlap, but they are not identical

** open source intelligence

*** Warnke and Spitzmüller, 2009

The preliminary reconstruction of the diverse elements presented above, which must be explored and analyzed to reconstruct the functioning of a given symbolic (discursive) professional community, perfectly illustrates the complexity of the

issue. It also points to some important paradigms, methods, and tools to capture the multidimensional nature of professionalization.

Initially, one should certainly look at the texts produced within the professional community. Content analysis will be helpful here to identify the basic values, norms, stories, myths, etc., that are actualized in the documents created by the community (for example, in ethical codes, self-definitions, or program positions). This will be an analysis from the ethnographic level, that is, an analysis of the "surface of the text" (Fiske, 2010). Among the most relevant documents of this kind for the fact-checking community is the already-mentioned code of the International Fact-Checking Network. On the front page of its portal, the organization declares: "We believe truth and transparency can help people be better informed and equipped to navigate harmful misinformation" (Poynter, 2024). The IFCN's Code includes five principles:

1) Commitment to Non-partisanship and Fairness (referring in essence to the objectivity of fact-checkers, who should apply the same principles to all sides of political or worldview disputes);
2) Commitment to Standards and Transparency of Sources (committing fact-checkers to prepare texts in such a way that the reader can trace their work, to check the reliability of the information and the source for themselves);
3) Commitment to Transparency of Funding and Organization (a principle mandating disclosure of funding sources and connections of fact-checking organizations);
4) Commitment to Standards and Transparency of Methodology (mandating precise presentation and explanation of the methodology used);
5) Commitment to an Open and Honest Correction Policy (noting a commitment to correcting errors and mistakes and admitting any errors).

In analyzing the texts, however, it is necessary to go further than simply reconstructing the semantics present on their surface – in the direction of text deconstruction and discursive analysis. It is worth pointing out the dominant metaphors and narratives that actualize themselves in the texts, subject positions, etc. (Warnke & Spitzmüller, 2009), ideologies (here in a broader sense, as discourses that constitute interpretations of the world, such as democratic values that are the basis for the proper functioning of society). In this context, it is worth examining the various discursive practices that are carried out within the community. It is also important not to forget the graphic elements that constitute and at the same time reveal the discourses (ideas, values, ideologies, semantics) to which the community refers (Jewitt, 2014). In this context, a particularly relevant (distinctive and specific) discursive practice is the typical

text model (which can be described in principle as a genre³), which is the "fact-check" (the report, also popular, seems less interesting because it is less specific). In this case, those (mainly structural) elements of this type of text that constitute it as a (quasi-)genre, separate, for example, from journalistic information, should be considered important.

The seven most important structural elements of the fact-check genre are as Stasiuk-Krajewska (2024) describes:

(i) a photo depicting disinformation content (accompanying either or both the headline and lead; repeated in the proper text)
(ii) a précis, integrated into the graphic, labeling the disinformation as a hoax
(iii) the headline
(iv) Date (and time) of publication and reference to the social media of the portal
(v) The lead (simple or complex)
(vi) Relevant text (supported with illustrations, but separated by intertitles)
(vii) References to sources (integrated into the text or as a separate section)

The aspects that differentiate the fact-check genre from a potentially related genre of media news, are not simply the special importance attached to graphic elements or the exceptional care taken to refer the reader directly to sources. There is also, striking in its regularity, the lack of the name of the author of the text.

There is evident correlation between discursive practice and the values (semantics) referred to by the professional group of fact-checkers in their self-description (revealed, for example, in the cited code of good practice). The formal features of the fact-check genre explicitly refer to the discursive opposition of truth and falsehood, decisively taking the side of the former. They prove their credibility by referring to scientific findings, and thus they build the position of fact-checkers as experts – experts who are objective, independent and impartial. As such, they have the authority to decide what is true and what is not. This kind of authority can be potentially disturbing, hence the important role of any communicative elements designed to show the process of arriving at this truth – to preclude the possibility of the suspicion that this truth is of any discretionary nature. The discursive truth of fact-checking, like the discursive truth of journalism, is constructed as having the character of objective knowledge about the world, as a "report of facts".

In the context of research on the professional community, it is also important to point out the interrelationships between the actors (including institutional ones) operating within the analyzed community. In this context, reference should be made primarily to the actor-network theory (Arbiszewski, 2012) and

---

³ The caution in the above statement stems from the difficulty of defining the category of genre.

its possible applications in the process of collecting, processing, and analyzing data in the form of network analysis (Kawa, 2014).

It is worth noting that the methodological concepts indicated above generally refer to qualitative methods. This is no accident. Such an assumption arises not only from the research objectives and problems but primarily from the limitations of the research material. The analyzed community is relatively small (in Poland, based on the criteria that will be discussed below, it is possible to identify about 50 fact-checkers), but there are too few texts for it to make sense to analyze them, for example, with the methods of corpus linguistics (Pawlikowska, 2012).

Because of the characteristics of the analyzed symbolic community, the method of in-depth interviews (IDI) seems to deserve special attention. This is due not only to the already mentioned relatively small size of the community but also to the specificity of its representatives. The IDI method is worth considering when potential research participants are difficult to reach; when the researcher is anxious to obtain in-depth information from one person, and finally – when there are concerns that the presence of others may block statements (Maison, 2001). Representatives of the fact-checker community, as representatives of the profession, are undoubtedly experts in their field. This makes it possible to obtain in-depth, elaborate, and valuable answers to the questions asked. On the other hand, some of the themes relevant to the research may be somewhat unclear to the interviewees (e.g., questions about values), while other themes may prove difficult or uncomfortable (e.g., questions about relationships within the community). Hence, the IDI method enables the researcher to draw interesting and reliable conclusions with a relatively small group of respondents, while at the same time providing an opportunity to establish a communicative relationship with the interlocutor (e.g., addressing their concerns), seems particularly valuable.

OWN RESEARCH

In view of the above, it was decided to use the IDI method. The purpose of the research was to reconstruct the self-description (identity) of the fact-checker community in Poland, with a particular focus on the relationship of this self-description to that of of journalism. The analyses were conducted in the context of the assumptions of the theory of profession as a symbolic and discursive community.

In the context of the planned study, referring to the analyses of the discursive practices of the analyzed community briefly presented above, four research questions (RQs) were formulated, which were then the basis for designing the tool, the in-depth interview scenario.

- RQ1. What does the work of fact-checkers look like (daily routines, challenges, good practices, tools they use)? How do they practically carry out their professional tasks?
- RQ2. What are the personal stories and motivations of fact-checkers (how did they reach this point, what drives them, what frustrates them, what was the most difficult situation they encountered in the context of their work)?
- RQ3. How do fact-checkers define their profession (social role, tasks, key competencies, future of their profession, relationship to journalists, institutional location, public perceptions)?
- RQ4. How do fact-checkers define disinformation (threats, causes, mechanisms, counteraction)?

Based on the research problems formulated in this way, the following interview scenario was developed (supplemented in the presentation below with information on which of the questions were linked to a specific research problem).

1.

- Tell us what you do for a living, what type of institution you work in, and what specifically falls under the scope of your activities.
- Describe one day of your work/work activity. Do you work every day? According to some kind of schedule? Who/what regulates your professional activity?
- Where do you find topics for fact-checking?
- What method do you use (how do you proceed step by step)? How does the information verification process work?
- What happens to the results of your work; where and how are they published afterward? Is this method of publication satisfactory to you?
- What do you consider to be the greatest professional challenge for fact-checkers?
- What are the main principles that guide you in your work?
- Who or what is an authority for you?
- What are the main mistakes a fact-checker can make?
- What tips would you give to your younger colleagues?
- What are good practices in fact-checking (give a specific example)?

2.

- How did you get into this profession? Why did you get into it?
- In your daily work – what frustrates you the most?
- In your daily work – what drives you the most, what gives you satisfaction?
- What is your worst experience in relation to the work of a fact-checker?

- What do you consider your greatest personal success, your discovery, your best experience and why?

3.

- How do you define fact-checking?
- What do you think is the most important task of a fact-checker? Where does their role end (e.g., is it just fact-checking or also publishing, educating, etc.)?
- What values guide your work – what is most important to you in what you do, what goals do you set for yourself?
- What does fact-checking bring to society? What is its mission?
- What are society's expectations of fact-checking? Do you think they are adequate (achievable, in line with what the industry really does)?
- How do you think the work of fact-checker(s) is socially appreciated?
- When are you proud of your work?
- When do you feel disappointed about your work?
- Do you think fact-checking is already a profession?
- Do fact-checkers form some kind of community, are in contact with each other, know each other, maintain relationships, etc.? If so, in what way?
- In your opinion, what is the relationship between fact-checking and journalism? How are they similar, and how do they differ?
- How does the relationship stand between these communities at the moment, in your opinion? What should the ideal cooperation between journalists, media institutions, etc. and fact-checkers look like?
- What, in your opinion, should be the ideal situation for employing a fact-checker (e.g. an external expert for the medium, a person employed in the editorial office, or someone working in complete isolation from the journalistic community)?
- Do you think that generally – in Poland and around the world – fact-checkers are objective in their work?
- Do you think that in general – in Poland and around the world – fact-checkers are independent in their work?
- How do you imagine the future of fact-checking? Do you think it will gain importance, develop, or rather not? How will it evolve?
- What is, in your opinion, the main problem about your colleagues (your community)? What irritates you?
- What do you think is the strength of your community?

4.

- How do you define the category of disinformation?
- In your opinion, what are the main reasons for its spread?
- What, in your opinion, are the main trends in disinformation today?
- What are the main threats posed by disinformation?
- How can disinformation be countered? What is the role of fact-checking in this context?

The survey was conducted using the in-depth interview (IDI) method. A total of 20 interviews were conducted with representatives of the fact-checking community in Poland. On average, an interview lasted about 60 minutes, with the shortest lasting 32 minutes and the longest lasting 94 minutes. Interviews were conducted both offline (40%) and online (60%). Interviews were conducted with representatives of all relevant fact-checking organizations in Poland, including in particular:

1. Konkret24 (5 interviewees)
2. FakeHunter (4 interviewees)
3. AFP (2 interviewees)
4. "Demagog" association (6 interviewees)
5. others (fakehunter.pl, Pravda Association, 3 interviewees)

A preliminary analysis of the material obtained seems to lead to the following general conclusions[4]:

1. The community of fact-checkers has a relatively stabilized professional consciousness, based on clearly defined procedures, genres, and skills that are necessary for the profession.
2. The fact-checker community can be considered a symbolic professional community in the sense that it defines itself very clearly in terms of values; however, it must be emphasized that these values are not original to the value system in journalistic ethics.
3. Of importance is that these values are operationalized in professional practice in the form of a coherent set of recommendations for professional conduct.
4. The fact-checker community has a strong sense of connection with journalism as a profession, but it is associated with a rather critical assessment of the current state of journalism and the media; the specific perception of the relationship between journalism and fact-checking depends on the employment model in which the fact-checker works.

---

[4] A full presentation and analysis of the research results is under development and will be presented soon.

5. In general, two models of employment of fact-checkers in Poland can be distinguished – within a media institution and within an association; the implementation of one or the other model has a significant impact on the professional awareness of individuals.

6. Fact-checkers have a sense of high ethical standards of their profession, and consider themselves objective and independent.

7. The community is concerned about the polarization that it observes (and assesses as negative) in the journalism industry.

From the point of view of the considerations presented here, it seems particularly important that the implementation of the survey confirmed the usefulness of the method applied and the tool designed in the context of the purpose of the survey and the research problems (questions). In implementing the survey, there were some difficulties (e.g., differing communicative competence of the interviewees, fear of expressing opinions, difficulties in distancing oneself from one's environment, misunderstandings in defining abstract concepts). However, the fact-checkers were very open to participation in the research and helpful in organizing it. This is an important indication of a more general nature – representatives of expert communities are eager to share their knowledge and have a sense of mission in promoting it. This is another argument in favor of the choice of method and tool. The results obtained, after their detailed analysis and interpretation, should be correlated with the results of other research in this area – in terms of surface and deep textual structures, actualized discourses, or mutual relations in the field.

Only such a holistic approach will make it possible to grasp the peculiarities of the fact-checker community as a professional community. This example does however explain the essential and characteristic elements of the formation and functioning of such communities in a more general sense, indeed as phenomena specific to modernist societies.

NOTICE

REFERENCES

Arbiszewski, K. (2012). *Poznanie, zbiorowość, polityka. Analiza teorii aktora-sieci Bruno Latoura. (Cognition, collectivity, politics. An analysis of Bruno Latour's actor-network theory)*. Universitas: Kraków.

Bourdieu, P. (2007). *Reguły sztuki. Geneza i struktura pola literackiego.* (*The Rules of Art. Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*). Universitas: Kraków

Cambridge Dictionary (2024) https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/fact-checking

Carlson, M. (2016). Metajournalistic Discourse and the Meanings of Journalism: Definitional Control, Boundary Work, and Legitimation. *Communication Theory*, vol. 26, no. 4, 349–368. https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12088

Carlson, M., & Lewis S. C., (Eds). (2015). *Boundaries of Journalism*. Routledge: London–New York 2015.

Carpentier, N. (2005). Identity, contingency and rigidity. The (counter-)hegemonic constructions of the identity of the media professional. *Journalism* 6, 199–219. DOI:10.1177/1464884905051008

Deuze, M. (2004). Journalism studies beyond media: On ideology and identity. *Ecquid Novi African Journalism Studies, 25*, 275–293. DOI:10.1080/02560054.2004.9653298

Fiske, J. (2010). *Reading the popular*. Taylor & Francis Ltd.: London.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Archeologia wiedzy. (Archeology of Knowledge)*. PIW: Warszawa.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: selected interviews and other writings 1972 – 1977.* Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Giddens, Anthony. (2001). *Nowoczesność i tożsamość. „Ja" i społeczeństwo w epoce późnej nowoczesności.* (*Modernity and self-identity*). PWN: Warszawa.

Jewitt, C. (ed.). (2014). *The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis*. Taylor&Francis Ltd.: London.

Kawa, A. (2014). Analiza sieciowa jako metoda badawcza w naukach o zarządzaniu. (Network analysis as a research method in management science. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu 356*, 40–49.

Kong, K. (2014). *Professional Discourse*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Laclau, E,. & Mouffe, C. (2007). *Hegemonia i socjalistyczna strategia*. (*Hegemony and socialist strategy*). Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej we Wrocławiu: Wrocław.

Maison, D. (2001). *Zogniskowane wywiady grupowe.* (*Focus group interviews). Warszawa: PWN.*

McCombs, M., Shaw, D., & Weaver, D. (2014). New directions in agenda-setting theory and research. *Mass Communication and Society*, Vol. 17, no 6. https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2014.964871

Meltzer, K., & Martik, E. (2017). Journalists as Communities of Practice: Advancing a Theoretical Framework for Understanding Journalism. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, *41*(3), 207–226. https://doi.org/10.1177/0196859917706158

Pawlikowska, A. (2012). Zastosowanie metod językoznawstwa korpusowego i lingwistyki kwantytatywnej w analizie dyskursu. (Application of methods of corpus linguistics and quantitative linguistics in discourse analysis). *Oblicza Komunikacji*, 5, 111–125.

Poynter (2024) https://www.poynter.org/ifcn/articles-ifcn/

Stasiuk-Krajewska, K. (2018). *Media i dziennikarstwo. Struktury dyskursu i hegemonia.* (*Media and journalism. Discourse structures and hegemony*). Elipsa: Warszawa.

Stasiuk-Krajewska, K. (2021). Informacja jako gatunek medialny. (Information as a media genre). Życzyński, Norbert, Tworzydło, Dariusz, Gawroński, Sławomir (ed.). *Informacje prasowe. Czynniki determinujące skuteczne relacje z mediami.* (*Press releases. Factors determining effective media relations*). Wydawnictwo Politechniki Rzeszowskiej: Rzeszów.

Stasiuk-Krajewska, K (2024). „Fact-check" jako praktyka dyskursywna. Prób opisania nowego gatunku medialnego. ("Fact-check" as a discursive practice. Attempts to describe a new media genre). Rozbicka, Patrycja, Gołuch, Wiesław (ed.). *Co pan na to, panie P? (What do you think, Mr. P.* Wydawnictwo Uniwersytet Wrocławskiego: Wrocław

Stencel, M., Ryan, E. & Luther, J. (2023). *Misinformation spreads, but fact-checking has leveled off. 10th annual fact-checking census from the Reporters' Lab tracks an ongoing slowdown.* https://reporterslab. org/misinformation-spreads-but-fact-checking-has-leveled-off/.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Warnke, I. & Spitzmüller, J. (2009). Wielopoziomowa lingwistyczna analiza dyskursu – DIMEAN. (Multilevel linguistic discourse analysis – DIMEAN). *Tekst i dyskurs*, no 2, 143–44.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice. Learning, meaning and identity.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.