The Representation of Muslims in CNN Talk Shows: A Critical Discourse Analysis[1]

Jabr Saad Abdel Wahab Ahmad
Ph.D. Researcher, Helwan University
Corresponding email: jabr_saad@yahoo.com

ARTICLE DATA	ABSTRACT
	The current paper, that investigates representing Muslims in Western TV talk shows (particularly CNN) from 2014-2018, is a real challenge to tackle these controversial issues at the time of associating Muslims with most dangerous crimes all over the world. In the present study, van Leeuwen's framework of the representation of social actors (2008), ideological square of van Dijk (2004) and discursive strategies of Wodak (2009), powerful tools of enquiry within CDA, are adopted and adapted to analyzing data gleaned from CNN talk shows; Fareed Zakaria's GPS episode 'why they hate us'. It has found that Muslims who are negatively associated with crimes around the world are the most killed and injured group in such terror attacks that are unjustably associated with them because of their religion, Islam, and at the same time because of their inferiority.

1. Introduction

Media play an influential role in sharing and exchanging information about many important topics in the life of humans. Discourse analysis often examines how particular phenomena (people, concepts: events, etc.) are represented through language use. For example, prejudiced language is characterized by positive self-representation and negative „other" representation (Reisigl and Wodak 2001), which can be achieved through stereotyping.

Tolson claims that talk shows are "crucial to the landscape of popular television" (Tolson, 2001, p.3). As Reza (2011) observed, representations and 'pictures in our heads' are primarily reflected in 'pseudo reality' from media coverage. Media practitioners in any capacity play a vital role in creating such mental pictures by converting social reality into mediated reality. Therefore, the media hold a dominant position in conveying, explaining and articulating specific discourses that help represent (and misrepresent) minority groups (Cottle, 2006).

In the same vein, van Dijk (2000) states that media discourse are the main source of people"s knowledge, attitudes and ideologies. Over the past decades, the Western stereotypical images of Arabs and Muslims in America and Western countries have been persistent and the main difference between the past and the present lies mainly in the means, reasons, degree and content of these stereotypical images. For instance, in the past, Arabs and Muslims were largely described as "erotic," "primitive," "ignorant," "slave traders," and other insulting terms. Nowadays, they are stereotyped as terrorists, fundamentalists, extremists and anti-west. The incident of September 11, 2001, changed the course of history. It was a catastrophic event, like the assassination of President Kennedy or the attack on Pearl Harbor (Glant, 2012). van Dijk (1991), Poole and Richardson (2006) and (Yenigun, 2004) the negative image of Islam in a post 11\9 world when they said that Islam and Muslims are often represented as problematic or as

---

[1] This paper is extracted from the first author's unpublished Ph.D. thesis that is being conducted.

a threat. van Dijk (2003) asserts this image when he talks about the close and complete association of Muslims with violence and terrorism. Cottle argues that the media hold a powerful position in conveying, explaining and articulating specific discourses that help represent (and misrepresent) minority groups (see Cottle, 2006). It suggests that this misrepresentation can be linked to the development of "racism", namely Islamophobia that has its roots in cultural representations of the "other" (Saeed, 2007). What we know of society depends on how things are represented to us through media and that knowledge in turn informs what we do and what policies we are prepared to accept (Miller, 2002).

2. Aims of the paper

This paper is an attempt to reveal hidden ideology about Muslims in some Western shows on CNN through highlighting some linguistic features associated with the portrayal of Muslims. It investigates the nature of the relationship between Muslims and terrorism as claimed by the participants of the talk shows through identifying and marking the concepts characterizing labeling of Muslims in the selected media after certain terrorist attacks. Another important object is to illustrate the role of the media in getting knowledge about the world around us and how it affects the ideologies and attitudes of people all over the globe to the extent of providing the public with misinformation which in turn leads to the (mis)representation of others being Muslims or minorities. Thus, it has sought answers to the following questions:

3. Questions of the study

1- How the actors or institutions associated with Islam are represented in the gleaned data? What actions are attributed to these entities?

2- What is the relationship between the roles allocated to Muslims and their representation?

3- What are the linguistic tools that mark the discourse about Muslims in the talk shows of these four channels about Muslims?

4. Theoretical background

Numerous scholars across disciplines have investigated media representation of Muslims from their perspectives and across varying geo- political contexts, which include: North America (Ibrahim, 2010; Kumar, 2010; Shaheen, 2009), Europe (Ehrkamp, 2010; Poole, 2002), Asia (Ahmed, 2010, 2012; Green, 2013), Latin America (Ahlin and Carler, 2011) and Oceanian countries (Ewart, 2012; Kabir, 2011; Patil, 2015). Most of these studies didn't tackle the stereotypes of Muslims in TV talk shows as an interesting genre and analyzing the data based on the representational strategies as well.

4. 1- Why media discourse

Representing social actors aim to clarify how people as social actors are depicted in the social communication. This depiction may hide certain identities and ideologies that are to be revealed in the analysis and interpretation sections.

4.2 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Critical discourse analysis (CDA), a branch of discourse analysis investigates social phenomena which are necessarily complex and thus require a multidisciplinary and multi-methodological approach, focused particularly on issues of inequality, sometimes keeping in mind the question "who benefits?" when carrying out analysis. Fairclough stated that "ideologies can't be simply read directly from the text unless we carefully consider patterns and variations in the social distribution, consumption, and interpretation of the text" (1992, p.28).

4.3 Tenets of CDA

Many theorists in CDS present the general principles of CDS in their own terms (van Dijk, 1993b; Wodak, 1996; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 271-280; Meyer, 2001). van Dijk (2001) discusses the main tenets of CDS of Fairclough & Wodak's (1997) as follows (1) CDS addresses social problems, (2) power relations are discursive, (3) discourse constitutes society and culture, (4) it does ideological work, (5) it is historical,

the link between text and society is mediated (7) discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory, and (8) discourse is a form of social action.

The first principle states that CDS addresses social and political problems such as racist discourse, anti-Semitist discourse and inequality practices. The objects under investigation do not have to be related to negative or exceptionally serious social or political experiences or events (Wodak & Meyer, 2009).The second tenet is that power relations are discursive in which CDA explains how social relations of power are exercised and negotiated in and through discourse (Fairclaugh & Wodak, 1997).

The next principle is that discourse constitutes society and culture in which every instance of language use makes its own contribution to reproducing and transforming society and culture, including relations of power (Fairclaugh & Wodak, 1997). The fourth principle is that discourse does ideological work. Ideologies are often produced through discourse. To understand how ideologies are produced, it isn't enoughto analyze texts; the discursive practice (how texts are interpreted and received and what social effects they have) must also be considered (Fairclaugh & Wodak, 1997).

Another important tenet is that discourse is historical and therefore discourses can only be understood with reference to their historical context. In accordance with this, CDA refers to extra-linguistic factors such as culture, society and ideology in historical terms (Fairclaugh & Wodak, 1997; Wodak, 2001a). The next principle is that the link between text and society is mediated. CDA, thus, is concerned with making connections between socio-cultural processes and structures on the one hand, and prosperities of texts on the other (Fairclaugh & Wodak, 1997; Meyer 2001; Scollon, 2001).

The following tenet is that CDA is interpretative and explanatory. It is not only interpretative, but also explanatory in intent (Fairclaugh & Wodak, 1997; Wodak, 1996; 2001b). These interpretations and explanations are dynamic and open, and may be affected by new readings and new contextual information. The last tenet states that discourse is a form of social action.

4.4 Aims of CDA

Much work in CDA aims primarily at instigating current social problems, seeking to show the resistance against inequality. A crucial objective is that "CDA contributes to addressing the social 'wrongs' of the day (such as injustice, discrimination, marginalization and exclusion), by analyzing their sources and causes, resistance to them and possibilities of overcoming them" (Fairclaugh, 2009 p. 163).

CDA analysts should highlight the usage of such social inequalities and the tools used to maintain that power (Fairclaugh, 1995a). One of the tasks of CDA is to see how such language use confirms, reproduces or challenges the existing power relations of individuals and institutions alike. Another objective of CDA is to expose misrepresentation of and discrimination against powerless, be they minorities, people of the Third World and political enemies, and expose the manipulative strategies adopted by dominant groups to maintain social inequalities and injustices (van Dijk, 2006). Wodak and Meyer state "CDA seeks to produce and convey critical knowledge that enables human beings to emancipate themselves from forms of domination through self-reflection" (2009 p.7).

4.5 Some major approaches of CDA

There are several approaches to CDA. Fairclough and Wodak (1997) acknowledge up to eight different theoretical approaches within the field of CDA. They can be distinguished from one another by the various linguistic theories they apply. However, one theory in particular is recurrent where in most studies there is reference to Hallidayan linguistics indicating that an understanding of SFG is essential for a proper understanding of CDA (Wodak, 2001a). The main concern of SFG depends more on the function of language in the social structure (Hart, 2010).

As a research enterprise, CDA is diverse and interdisciplinary, comprising a number of methodological approaches directed towards a variety of data (Weiss and Wodak, 2003).The methodology of CDA can therefore only be presented

with reference to particular approaches and with regard to their specific theoretical backgrounds (Titscher et al. 2000). Approaches of CDA are varied with common terms and features. CDA is used as an umbrella term of an approach that examines social problems of the day. Despite the diverse theoretical and philosophical orientations of CDA approaches, they all are concerned with analyzing how social and political inequalities as well as power relations are reproduced.

4.5.1 The Socio-Cognitive Approach (SCA)

van Dijk, a pioneering figure in the realm of CDA, labels his approach as the socio-cognitive model. In several studies from the late eighties and early nineties, he outlines a framework for analyzing news discourse that has been highly influential to CDA through highlighting the link between discourse, cognition and society.

The SCA assumes that there is a dialectic relationship between language and other elements of social life. It is a two-way relationship, in which language is influenced by society; on the other hand, society is shaped by language. In the Socio-cognitive approach, discourse is any kind of texts, written or spoken, and any genre, conversations, speeches or recipes. Van Dijk defines cognition as "the system of mental representations and processes of group members" (van Dijk, 2006a, p.125). He believes that those who control most dimensions of discourse (preparation, setting, participants, topics, style, rhetoric, interaction, etc) have the most power. He did remarkable works regarding racism in the news, representation minorities and defining the notion of 'Us and 'Them' or in-groups and out-groups, Self-glorification of our achievements and degenerating or dispraising actions of others are the key features of the ideological square.

In Van Dijk's own words, "CDA is a type of discourse analysis research that primarily studies the social power abuse, dominance and inequality which are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context" (Van Dijk, 1998a, p.196). According to van Dijk "CDA is a kind of discourse analytical research that focuses on how the abuse of social power, dominance and inequality are executed, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social political realm" (2001a, p.102).

Van Dijk (1999) proposes a distinctly different toolkit from those used by the East Anglia Group and Fairclough for the critical analysis of these debates. This toolkit includes various features: phonological (e.g. stress, pitch), syntactic (e.g. active/passive, transitivity, and nominalization), rhetorical (e.g. metaphors, contrast, irony, hyperbole) and pragmatic (e.g. speech acts, among others.

One of the most potent forces at work in Van Dijk's discourse is the ideological square that consists of four moves that make the "ideological square": emphasizing positive information about Us and negative about Them and de-emphasizing positive information about Them and negative about (Van Dijk, 1998b).

Van Dijk's (2004) framework consists of two main discursive strategies of 'positive self-representation' (semantic macro-strategy of in-group favouritism) and 'negative other-representation' (semantic macro-strategy of derogation of out-group) which are materialized through some other discursive moves such as presupposition, metaphor, Us-Them, and self-glorification. Local semantic analysis is the study of the many forms of indirect meanings such as implications, presuppositions, and allusions that aim to de-emphasize 'Our' bad things and 'Their' good things.

4.5.2 The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA)

Wodak, a leading figure in the field of CDA, has published widely in the areas of racism and anti-Semitism, gender studies, political discourse, organizational discourse and the construction of Austrian and European identities. With Reisigl, she developed Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) to critical discourse analysis, which involves using triangulation and emphasizes combining textual analysis with the analysis of historical and political context (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001).

Her analytical framework makes use of argumentation theory, SFL and ethnography. DHA has been influenced by Halliday‟s CL and SFG, critical theory, Argumentation theory, German „politico-linguistics‟ and forms of critical discourse analysis carried out by Fairclough (1989, 1995a). The most prominent notion regarding Wodak is the discourse

historical method, which is the result of her researches in racism and anti- Semitism as long as her other various researches in different places and on various social issues.

In order to reduce the risk of biased politicizing, the discourse historical approach uses Triangulation, combining different methods and data together, placing emphasis on finding out as much about context as possible. Wodak and her associates have attempted to describe those cases where language and other semiotic practices are used by those in power to maintain domination (Resigil and Wodak, 2009).

Discursive strategies of Wodak:

1- Nomination or reference is a strategy that looks at how social actors, objects, phenomena and events are named and referred to linguistically.

2- Prediction examines which characteristics and features are attributed to the actors, objects and phenomena.

3- Argumentation justifies claims of truth and often relies on topoi, which are part of argument schemes and can connect the premise of an argument to its conclusion.

4- Perspectivization positions the point of view of the speaker or writer.

5- Intensification or mitigation is a discursive strategy that modifies the force and status of utterances.

4.5.3 Representing social actors (van Leeuwen, 2008)

van Leeuwen's framework of the representation of social actors (2008), as one powerful enquiry within CDA is adopted to analyze the gleaned data from CNN programs. The analysis of labeling examines what lexical choices are used to refer to the Muslims and the effect of these choices in terms of the theme of exclusion. van Leeuwen (2008) introduces a socio-semantic inventory of the ways in which social actors can be represented. He offers a new detailed model, morpho-syntactic inventory, for representing social actors as follows:

Exclusion

There are two ways of excluding social actors: partial and full. The full exclusion of social actors is called suppression and the partial exclusion of social actors is called backgrounding. For van Leeuwen, exclusion is an important aspect of CDA. The first subcategory means that the social actors and their activities are excluded.

Suppression

In the case of supression, the social actors are excluded and not mentioned anywhere in the text. So the text includes only the action without its actor. As in Race Oddessey text analyzed by van Leeuwen (2008), "This Concern, the report noted, was reflected in sureys which showed that the level of support for stopping iimigration altogether at a post-war high." In this example, one can't infer who did the survey, which company or institution. This is because the social actor is deleted. Suppression can be realized through agentless passive voice, nonfinite clauses, nominalization, process nouns and adjectives.

Backgrounding

It refers to the partial representation of social actor where the actor isn't mentioned in relation to the given action but is mentioned elsewhere in the text that makes it easy to the reader to infer who they are. In other words, the social actors are deemphasized for a particular purpose. Backgrounding that refers to mentioning the excluded social actors later in another part of the clause, sentence or the text, can result from simple ellipses in nonfinite clauses with –ing and –ed participles and in nonfinite clauses with to.

Inclusion (Role allocation)

When social actors are visible in respect to the action they are articulated at different positions in respect to the action. Therefore, when analyzing a text, it is very important to determine who is the „agent"/ „actor" and what is the „goal" and whether the grammatical role given in the text is congruent to that of the social action. This manipluation of positions is

meant to serve a particular purpose by giving more emphasis to one participant rather than the other (van Leeuwen, 2008). There are two types of inclusion: activation and passivation.

Activation and Passivation

Another important aspect of the representation of actors is what roles are allocated to them, i.e. who the actors and the goals of the given action are. Representation 'can endow social actors with either active or passive roles' (van Leeuwen 1996, p.43) Activation can be realized through e.g. circumstantialization, premodification, postmodification, possessivation. Within passivation, subjected or beneficialized actors can be further distinguished.

When the social actor is activated, it is given the role of the grammatical (agent) and the doer who is responsible for the social practice in the talk show. On the other hand, when the participant is described as passivated, it is given the grammatical role of (goal) or "recipient" of the social practice in the text.

Genericization and specification

These categories distinguish whether social actors are represented as classes or as specific, identifiable individuals. Genericization may be realized by the plural without article, singular noun with the definite article and mass nouns as follows respectively.

Assimilation

Assimilation includes social actors that are referred to as groups, as opposed to individualization, where social actors are referred to as individuals. Assimilation includes aggregation, which quantifies the groups of participants and treats them as statistics, and collectivization, which does not.

Aggregation

Aggregation is associated with statistics without giving the specific figures to be objective and also to be persuasive and effective. It is realized by the presence of definite or indefinite quantifiers which either function as the enumerative or as the head of the nominal group. In this example, the Egyptian government attempts to assure people that a huge figure of terrorists had been killed. This representation has two functions; to assure and persuade the Egyptians on the one hand and to make them support the war against terrorism on the second hand. It may weaken the capacity of the terrorists.

Personalization and impersonalization

Personalized social actors are represented as human beings, whereas impersonalized are represented by other means, such as abstract nouns, or by concrete nouns whose meaning do not include the semantic feature „human". Two types of impersonalization are distinguished - abstraction and objectivation. Impersonalization can "lend impersonal authority or force to an activity of quality of a social actor; and it can add positive or negative connotations to an activity or utterance of a social actor"(van Leeuwen 1996, p.60).

Nomination and categorization

Nomination is related to the already mentioned distinction between representation by name (nomination) or by category labels (categorization). Nomination is typically realized by proper names and can be further divided into formal, semi-formal and informal. The social actors can be nominated through use of their names that may include additional honorific titles such as professor. Categorization then concerns the functions and identities the social actor shares with others.

Indetermination and differentiation

Indeterminated social actors are unspecified or anonymous, whereas determination specifies the identity of the actors. Differentiation occurs when an individual actor is explicitly excluded or differentiated from a group. As for the use of indetermination, it occurs when social actors are unspecified. Therefore, some words mark this category such as some, someone, many and some people.

As for differentiation, social actors are to be explicitly differentiated as individuals or a group of social actors from a similar actor or group, creating the difference between the self and other.

4.5.5 CNN

The CNN is one of most formidable international sources of packaged TV news delivered to viewers worldwide with a global perspective. According to Reynolds and Barnett (2003) in the first 12 hours of CNN's coverage after the incident of 9/11, the word war was used to describe the attacks 234 times. CNN was the most-watched TV channel immediately after the terrorist attacks on 9/11. The mass media in America have played a significant role in influencing the whole world to morally support the US in protesting against terrorism.

There is misinformation about the image of Muslims in the Western media coverage after the terrorist attacks on 9/11. The result of such misinformation and projection of stereotyped images is that the opinion of non-Muslims about Islam and Muslims has become negative. After an eventful one decade passed since the incident of 9/11, it is now significant to investigate that how the Western media is portraying Islam and Muslims. Being the leading news channels in the world, it is also important to examine how CNN is framing Islam and Muslims through the discussions of talk shows.

4.6 Previous studies

Most of the recent and academic written endeavors identifying correlating themes between Islam and the West are to be found in studies of Albakry (2006), Lemmouh (2008), Shaheen (2009), Ahlin & Carler (2011), Poorebrahim & Zarei (2013), Hussain (2014) and Reynolds (2015).

Albakry conducts a study (2006) on the representation of Islam and Muslims in the editorials of American and German newspapers, namely, the Times, the Post, the Monitor, die Zeit, die SDZ and die Welt. In his study, Albakry finds that the editorials in these newspapers fall into the trap of misinterpreting Islam with its own peculiar culture (2006).

In her thesis Eltantawy (2007) affirms the negative representation of Islam and Muslims in the Western media to the selection of certain materials that serve biased orientations. She argues that the Western media exaggerates exceptional problems in the Muslim societies in a way that make them to be perceived as the only features that dominate the region. For instance, the Western media continuously focus on issues like female genital mutilation, honour crimes and forced marriages.

There is a study based on recurring lexical and syntactic features that contribute to a stereotyped image of out-groups (Muslims) in newspapers. The focus of the study is on articles relating to Muslims in The New York Times in 1990, 1995 and 2000. The analysis is based on the analytic paradigm of Critical Linguistics (CL) and Corpus Semantics (CS). The results show that the linguistic features analyzed point to a systematic „othering" and stereotyping of Muslims as compared to other participants. The study concludes that the grammatical features examined reveal a stereotyped image of Muslims in which Muslims are presented negatively in the NYT newspapers (Lemmouh, 2008).

Ahlin & Carler (2011) use quantitative and qualitative text analyses to investigate media coverage of representing Islam and Muslims in Argentina newspapers; El Clarin, La Nacion and Pagina 12. In the analysis of the written online database from 2000-2010, there is a classification of cultural others, religious others and political others. The results show the levels of priming and framing in relation to earlier research. They state that "their findings suggest, however, that this is not the case in Argentina; on the contrary, Argentinean media lack the frames which make Muslims "others".

Using a synthesis of Edward Said's notion of "Orientalism" and van Dijk's notion of "ideological square", Poorebrahim & Zarei (2013) try to critically unravel the way Islam is represented in western discourse through establishing the relationship between language and ideology, the forms it takes and its potential effect. To that end, headlines from widely circulated print media of the west including the Independent, the New York Times, the Herald Tribune, and The Times from January 1, 2008 to December 30, 2012 were selected and Islam and Muslim reproductions were studied therein.

Throughout the lexical choices and presuppositions, it's found out that Muslims are associated with adjectives such as radical, extremist, terrorist, fundamentalist and violent. All these modifiers indicate a negative representation of Muslims. There is study examined TV coverage of terrorism from Al-Jazeera and Al- Arabiya using media framing analysis that was based on a framing approach to examine a number of framing devices based on past literature such as types of news frames, framing perspective, geographical location of terrorism coverage, sources used, perpetrators of terrorism, victims of terrorism, episodic versus thematic frame, and responsibility frames (Abdullah, 2014). It was found that the majority of terrorism victims are Muslims. In addition, the findings reveal that too much media focus was placed on disseminating and supporting official positions and decisions, and that humanitarian suffering from terrorism is seldom brought to the attention of the public.

Another study tackles British media representation of Islam and Muslims in the Manchester Evening News from a critical discourse perspective (Hussain, 2014). The researcher uses the MEN online of data collection to investigate the Manchester Evening News, the daily newspaper in Manchester. This study is based on a qualitative method to analyze the data. The findings pinpoint that Islam and Muslims are negatively framed and described in this newspaper.

Another significant study is Reynolds's thesis on media representation of Islam and Muslims in Southern Appalachia (2015) in which he uses content analysis to investigate reporting of two years of Islam in a country of more than 80% of the population are protestant Christian. The reports were selected from the Associated Press, New York Times, Washington press and Reuters.

The results of this thesis, show that Islam and Muslims are negatively depicted because they are associated with negative adjectives such as terrorists, killers, attackers, extremists and radicals describing them, reflects the nature of using media to defend Muslims.

There is a study that tackles a critical investigation of the Obama's political speeches on the Iranian nuclear problem 2008-2011 (Saad, 2016). This thesis examines five of Obama's speeches from a pragma-syntactic analysis. The analysis of SFG and pragmatic presuppositions shows that Iran and its program are misrepresented and marginalized.

5. Methodology

This section covers the data collection of the study. It demonstrates how the data are selected, their period and their significance for the analysis section. It also presents some linguistic features that are related to investigating media data linguistically. These linguistic tools are to be prominent in the data to the extent they lead to the construction of this genre associated with daily life situations.

5.1 Data collection

The current research is mainly based on investigating the language of talk shows in the West and particularly CNN. The TV talk shows, focused on the issues of Islam, Muslims, terrorism and immigration, are to be paid more attention to this study. They are to be analyzed linguistically to shed light on the prominent features of this type of discourse. About five programs are selected randomly to investigate representing Muslims in TV talk shows on CNN. All of these programs focus mainly on certain attacks and actions all over the world that are associated with Islam and Muslims.

The researcher selected CNN because of its large outreach to the millions of viewers in the whole world. As a TV genre, talk shows are certainly generating awareness and giving knowledge to the viewers and help them to build up their perception about the changing political, religious, social and cultural trends in the world (Sattar, 2013).

The rationale for selecting 'Fareed Zakaria GPS' is that these talk shows focus on international issues and engage the public with different perspectives. These talk shows bring people in-depth interviews with world leaders, international thinkers, newsmakers and analysts who enlighten the audience with their expert opinion. Fareed Zakaria GPS (Global Public Square) is 60 minutes in length program that takes a comprehensive look at foreign affairs and the decisions

affecting our lives. Every week it brings in-depth interviews with world leaders, newsmakers, and analysts breaking down the world's toughest issues. The show emphasizes on global issues and foreign affairs.

The current study is based on selecting five different talk shows from CNN from 2014-2017. In essence, these talk shows are focusing primary on discussing the issues of Islam, Muslims, immigration, terrorism and fundamentalism as controversial topics in the West. The image of others (Muslims) is to be investigated in the discourse of talk shows.

Five programs about five different issues on CNN are to be analyzed linguistically to make the readers concentrate on analyzing social actors as a network. The researcher selects the following talk shows: Donald Trump calling for a ban of all Muslims entering the U.S.A Dec 7, 2015, why they hate us; a TV show on CNN May 23, 2016 and June 20, 2016, horrifying truth about ISIS; terrorism behind the masks, 31 March 2017 and third terror attack in U.K in less than three months, June 5, 2017.

6. Analysis

Based on the comprehensive classification of Van Leeuwen (2008), the analysis section aims to demonstrate how the participants in the TV talk shows in the West represent Muslims; an image that is associated with terrorism and other negative abstract terms.

Representing Muslims on CNN (why they hate us)

From the title of the program on CNN, one can notice that Muslims are presented as 'they' who hate Americans in general. To facilitate the analysis process, the researcher suggests listing all examples associated with each category of classification and then to interpret, explain and comment on them to the extent that readers know how Muslims are represented in the Western media linguistically.

- Exclusion

Americans are asking, why **they** hate **us**?

Why do **Islamic terrorists** hate **Americans**?

Young children are being taught how to kill **us**.

It is an act of terror on our soil.

 We have training camps growing where **they** want to kill **us**.

The use of the 'us' and 'them' is prominent in this talk show on CNN. From the title of this program, why they hate us? A listener can recognize a comparison between two groups, they and us. The pronoun 'they' is associated with the verb 'hate' that indicates misrepresentation of the other. The pronoun 'us' always comes at the end of the sentences to tell the audience that the Americans, us, are the victims of the dangerous acts of Muslims. Placing the pronoun 'us' in the place of the object is to help the Americans get sympathy and above all this to present Muslims negatively through drawing the attention of the audience to their negative acts.

The participants make use of the nouns to give the same meaning. They wonder why **Islamic terrorists** hate **Americans**. In this example, they classify Muslims saying Islamic terrorists to identify that these terrorists are Muslims and they represent Islam. One can say that ordinary Muslim people are totally excluded in these examples to suit an ideological purpose that not all Muslims are terrorists. It includes all terrorists who in some cases are related to Islam. Therefore, the modifier Islamic indicates a negative representation because it is associated with terrorists that have negative connotations.

Other examples give the same connotation that Muslims are the source of hatred against Americans. Young children in the Muslim world are being taught to kill Americans as stated in the talk show. The participants state that '**young children are being taught how to kill us'**. This sentence makes clear that the traditions, customs and teachings of Muslims promote

this hatred against Americans from the birth of kids. It is a systematic process because people teach their students to kill Americans.

The speakers assume that older people teach young children in the Muslim world to kill Americans. Those children are being taught in schools, in mosques, in streets, at home and in all possible places to kill Americans. This sentence emphasizes the negative portrayal of Muslims in the minds of the audience. All examples of this classification are to represent Muslims negatively. In this example, the actor is not mentioned so it's an agentless clause. The actors are passivized to highlight the importance of their actions on children and therefore on their relations with the Americans. The speaker omits the actors but the action and beneficiaries are still obvious. The social actors are to be stated elsewhere in the talk shows. This example indicates even implicitly a new attitude misunderstood in the U.S.A that Muslims are teaching their young children from the very beginning of their life hatred, killing and terrifying others (Americans).

- Personalization and impersonalization

It drove **Omar Mateen** to slaughter dozens of Americans on a dance floor in Orlando.

Americans are asking, why they hate us?

Why do **Islamic terrorists** hate **Americans**?

If the goal of **ISIS propaganda** is to terrify America, it is worked.

Donald Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of **Muslims** entering the USA until our country's representatives can figure out what the hell is going on.

Trump's message has let some Americans to say, who cares why they hate us, we hate them.

It's the **Muslims** (who are bombing buildings and airplanes).

Americans are understandably angry and afraid.

When you ask the **scholars** deep into the subject like **Columbia Rashid Khalidi**, he makes an important distinction.

The speakers make use of this type of classifying social actors to determine who is responsible for saying and doing all these dangerous actions. For example, Omar Mateen, is personally responsible for slaughtering this huge number of people. He is accused of doing this because they think he is a Muslim. For Americans, Muslims are killers and criminals. This implies a negative representation of Muslims. This personalization that shows the audience that Ommar as a Muslim person killed this number of Americans on a dance floor illustrates that he didn't kill soldiers or pirates but he slaughtered ordinary people.

It is noticed that Trump personally and as a presidential nominee states that "**Donald Trump** is calling for a total and complete shutdown of **Muslims** entering the USA until our country's representatives can figure out what the hell is going on." This statement is a personal point of view of Trump towards Muslims. He promises his audience and supporters that he'll prevent Muslims from entering the USA. He' talking about Muslims and no other groups of people who are living in the USA. This is an obvious discrimination against All Muslims. Therefore, he implies hatred and hostility against Muslims even before taking the office.

Another example that asserts this negative image of Muslims is: It's the **Muslims** (who are bombing buildings and airplanes). The participants accuse Muslims personally and specifically of committing these dangerous crimes. They said that they are not Christians, they are not Jews, but they are Muslims who are bombing buildings are airplanes. Muslims are responsible for committing all crimes all over the world. Unlike Muslims who are associated with most negative actions, Americans and their representatives are portrayed positively to reveal hidden and implied ideology towards Muslims.

In most of these examples, it's found out that personalization is prominent. The speakers state directly Muslims, scholars and other words related to persons who do some negative activities. There is no reference to impersonalized words

because speakers aim to highlight the great roles played by these social actors upon the Americans, the recipients. This emphasizes the negative roles that are associated with Muslims.

- Genericization and specification

Why **do Islamic terrorists** hate **Americans**?

It's the **Muslims** (who's bombing buildings and airplanes).

Americans are understandably angry and afraid.

In the real world **the people in Afghanistan** hate the **Americans**.

If you take "**they**" as being **Muslims**, they don't hate us.

If you talk about "**they**" as being a narrow, a **very small group of radicals**, that's an entirely different question.

Choudary has been charged with supporting ISIS.

Choudary faces prison for his support of ISIS.

We got a better picture of the **man** accused of that murdering **13 people**.

But the USA intervened in Bosnia to protect **Muslims**.

In the fifth example, the speaker assumes that not all Muslims hate Americans. He advises his partners to categorize people and for him those who are radicals are the source of hatred. This kind of specification is important because most of the public in the USA talk about Muslims in general. To assert this meaning, he adds some details in the second example. Radical Muslims hate Americans as he stated in the second case. This is a new approach but it is the point of view of one speaker who rejects generalizations. Highlighting the generic group "Muslims" makes clear that Muslims in general are the source of threat to the Americans. To that end, Muslims are misrepresented.

In the other examples, the participants concentrate on Choudary, a man who is associated with the ISIS; that organization that commits all violent acts as the Americans think. The specification of this person and his connection with this organization without evidences imply social discrimination. They think he will be in the prison because of his support to this organization or group of people.

In the last sentence, one participant explains the America intervened in Bosnia to protect Muslims. The speaker tries to emphasize that America involves in Bosnia and other countries to protect Muslims. The man is unknown to exclude him and deemphasize this act. While talking about Muslims as killers, they are well defined and presented negatively to the audience. It is a kind of paradox because the USA accuses Muslims of committing all crimes all over the world and then it broke war in Bosnia to protect those killers and terrorists.

Nomination and categorization

When you ask the **scholars** deep into the subject like **Columbia Rashid Khalidi**, he makes an important distinction.

Donald Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the USA until our country's representatives can figure out what the hell is going on.

George Bush flushed those down the toilet. (because we're talking about terrorism).

As for the use of nomination, the interviewer draws on it to assert close and personal relations. He talks about scholars like Khalidi who has another point of view about Muslims. For this scholar not all Muslims are terrorists. He categorizes them and he thinks that radicals hate Americans. However, the term 'scholars' that refers to functionalization sounds more official. Scholars always have a different attitude due to their education, experience and deep thinking about certain issues. In the other examples, Bush, an ex-president of the USA and Trump, a presidential nominee are referred to them as a nomination. The speaker didn't say that Bush was the ex-president of America because Bush flushed those people down the toilets. This process is a negative act because too many people were killed and too many people were injured. He aims to get the audience focus on this negative and dangerous act personally and not institutionally.

While talking about Trump, the president of America, the speaker said Trump personally. Trump calls for preventing Muslims from entering the American land. He thinks that Muslims are killers, terrorists and violent promoters who aim to make America as hell. The use of nomination reduces the effect of Trump's negative presentation of Muslims. In these examples, the participants talk about both of Bush and Trump personally through the use of nominations.

- Indetermination and differentiation

It is impossible to understand, impossible to get into the mind of **a terrorist**.

In this example, the speaker doesn't identify who is this terrorist. Even if he intends to call him a Muslim man he dehumanizes him. Speakers sometimes use circulating expressions to avoid being frank and to affect their audience well. For the speakers it is difficult to address a terrorist cognitively. A terrorist, a social actor, can't be understood because his method of thinking is different and at the same time deemphasizes specific people. In this case the terrorist isn't defined, but in most cases in the talk show he is a Muslim. This kind of partial exclusion implies negative representation of Muslims. This example makes clear that a Muslim, a terrorist, is unconscious person who does most bad actions that hurt the Americans.

-Assimilation

It drove Omar Mateen to slaughter **dozens of Americans** on a dance floor in Orlando.

Why do so **many millions of Muslims** hate the USA?

We got a better picture of the **man** accused of that murdering **13 people**.

Donald Trump is calling for a **total and complete shutdown of Muslims** entering the USA until our country's representatives can figure out what the hell is going on.

15 years after 9\11, we are no longer surprised when they tell us they want to kill us.

Despite documented evidence of **tens of thousands of people** desperately fleeing ISIS, Choudary claims there are actually more arriving.

As for the use of aggregation, it is obvious that this show is full of this type of classification. For example, Omar Matten slaughtered dozens of Americans emphasizes that this Muslim man didn't kill a man, but he slaughtered more than twenty persons on a dance floor in Orlando. This is not an ordinary process of killing because of the huge figures of the killed men and the nature of the place where they were slaughtered as well. Highlighting this crime is a kind of negative presentation of Muslims and at the same time makes the speakers get the sympathy and support of people all over the world in their war against terrorism. It presents Omar, a Muslim person, negatively through making him the actor of a very severe action in the U.S.A. However, those dozens of people have passive roles in this process of killing. Therefore, the action of slaughtering is emphasized to assure that this process is a legitimate action.

The second example, why **so many millions of Muslims** hate the USA, supports this negative presentation. This question is directed not only to specific category of Muslims but also many millions of Muslims. These huge figures have the same approach towards the Americans. The speaker addresses these millions of Muslims why they as Muslims hate the Americans. This classification of Muslims enhances the negative representation of Muslims. This highlight of the huge number indicates explicitly negative representation of Muslims who are the only persons to hate Americans. They are included in this process while other people all over the world are excluded. Therefore, only Muslims are responsible for this negative approach towards the Americans.

7. Findings and discussion

After the linguistic analysis of the image of Muslims in CNN Why they hate us presented by Fareed Zakaria, it's found out that there is a correspondence between the title of the episode "why they hate us" and the depiction of Muslims. Fareed wonders why they (Muslims) hate us (Americans) and the replies of his guests support this portrayal. Muslims are associated with negative actions that are problematic to the Americans and the West in general. There is an agreement between this image and what has said by van Dijk (1991) and Poole and Richardson (2007).

The results of most previously investigated studies have shown that media in the USA associate Muslims with violence and terrorism in a post 11\9 incident. The roles allocated to Muslims indicate that they have done most if not all bad action and thus their negative actions are marked and highlighted and their good actions have never mentioned or even referred to them. According to the discursive strategies of Wodak, van Leewuen's model and van Dijk's ideological square, Muslims are presented in a negative spot since they support terrorism and violent attacks in the USA. To that end, this result may lead to other linguistics features; misinformation, misrepresentation and marginalization that in turn lead to much clash between Muslims and the West.

The analysis of CNN episodes about the representation of Muslims after some terror attacks in the USA and Europe showed that the Western media (particularly CNN) portrayed Muslims negatively. It has been found out that only Muslims are associated with terror attacks in the USA and Europe. This kind of representation arises some questions; who is responsible for it? Are Muslims represented in this way because of their religion? And to what extent such an image does affect the attitudes of the public? And who benefits from such portrayal of Muslims?

In most investigated examples Muslims; persons and agencies or organizations are accused of committing attacks that kill, injure innocents and at the same time make them feel terrified. Therefore, for the Westerns all reactions and approaches are applicable and acceptable to defend themselves and their innocent people. For the Americans, Muslims are killers and terrorists and these attributes are the same of those in the past with a difference in the terms used to depict Muslims.

8. Conclusion

By conducting van Leewuen's model representing social actors, van Dijk's ideological square and Wodak's discursive strategies on CNN talk shows, it is found out Muslims are negatively portrayed in these shows regarding the periods after terror attacks. Muslims, as outgroups, are depicted in a way that makes them marginalized, discriminated against them and at the same time their actions and verbiages are misconceptualized. However, the question here is why Muslims are depicted in this way, who benefits from this portrait and how Muslims can challenge such a depiction that has never reflected the real teachings of Islam and Muslims. These questions may arouse another question about the effective role of media on the public not only in the USA but also on the public in the Islamic world. The media is considered the main source of information of the majority of the public all over the globe. Therefore, those who have access to media may exert great influence of the minds of others and thence may change their ideologies and identities.

References

Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Harlow, U K: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995b). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

Glant, T. (2012). Terrorism and Anti-Americanism: 9/11 ten years after. *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies*, 18. pp. 507-521. Retrieved from http://ieas.unideb.hu/admin/file_4783.pdf.

Hussain, A. (2014). *A critical discourse analysis of the British media representation of Islam and Muslims in the Manchester Evening News*.

Lemmouh, Z. (2008). A critical linguistic analysis of the representation of Muslims in the New York Times. *Journal of Language and Communication Studies*. 40 (217-240).

Machin, D. & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction*. Sage publications: New Delhi and Washington DC.

Miller, D. (2002). Promotion and power. In A. Briggs & P. Cobley (Eds.), *Introduction to media* (2nd ed.) (pp. 41-52). London: Longman.

Nurullah, A. S. (2010). Portrayal of Muslims in the media: "24" and the „Othering" process. *International Journal of Human Sciences* [Online]. 7:1. Available: http://www.insanbilimleri.com/en

Papacharissi, Z. & Oliverira, M. (2008). News frames Terrorism: A comparative analysis of frames employed in terrorism coverage in US and U.K Newspapers. *Press/Politics*, 13(1), 52-74.

Poole, E. (2002). *Reporting Islam: Media representations of British Muslims*. London: I.B. Tauris Publishers.

Poole, E & John, R. (2006). *Muslims and the news media*. London: I. B. Tauris Publishers.

Poorebrahim, F & Zarei,G. R. (2013). How is Islam portrayed in Western media? A critical discourse analysis Perspective. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 1 (2), 45-62.

Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination, rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Reynolds, S. K. (2015). *Media representation of Islam and Muslims in Southern Appalachia*. Unpublished thesis EastTennessee State University.dc.etsu.edu/etd.

Reza, M. S. (2011). Representations of Islam and Muslims in press coverage. *World Journal of Islamic History and Civilization*, 1 (4). 234-241.

Richardson, J. E. (2004). *(Mis)Representing Islam: The racism and rhetoric of British 315 Broadsheet Newspapers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishers.

Richardson, J.E. (2007). *Analyzing Newspapers, an approach from critical discourse analysis*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Saeed, A. (2007). Media, racism and Islamophobia: The representation of Islam and Muslims in the media. *Sociology Compass*, 1(2), 443-462.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage books.

Sattar, T. (2013). A discourse analysis of political talk shows as a medium of structuring political opinion of people in Multan district (Pakistan). *British journal of Social Sciences*: 1(5. (1-16).

Tolson, A. (ed.) (2001). *Television talk shows: Discourse, performance, spectacle*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Titscher, S., M. Meyer, R. Wodak, & Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Tolson, A. (ed.) (2001). *Television talk shows: Discourse, performance, spectacle*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Associates.

Toolan, M. (Ed.). (2002). *Critical discourse analysis: Critical concepts in linguistics*. New York: Routledge.

van Dijk, T.A. (1991). *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge.

van Dijk, Teun A. (1993) Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse and Society* 4, 249-283.

van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage publications.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1999). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In: C. Shaffner & A. Wenden (Eds,). (pp. 17-133).

Van Dijk, T.A. (2000). Parliamentary debates; In R. Wodak and T. A. van Dijk (eds), Racism at the top. *Parliamentary discourses on ethnic issues in six Europian states*. (pp. 45-78). Klagenfurt Austria: Drava Verlag.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2003). Élite discourse and racism in Spain (conference paper), A new research agenda in (Critical) *Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity*.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). *Ideology and discourse: a multidisciplinary introduction*. London: Sage.

Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors, in C.R. Cadlas-Culthard and M. Coulthard (eds), *texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford: Oxford press.

Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (Eds.). (2003). *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of discourse*. London: Longman.

Wodak, R. (2001a). What CDA is about – a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak, M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-13). London: Sage.

Wodak, R. (2001b). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63–95). London: Sage.

Wodak, R. (2009). *Politics as usual: The discursive construction and representation of politics in action*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (1st ed). London: Sage.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: history, agenda, theory and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed) (pp. 1-33). London: Sage.

Yenigun, H. I. (2004). Muslims and the media after 9/11: A Muslim discourse in the American media? *American Journal of Social Sciences*, 21(3), 39-69