Reiterating Anti-Muslim Rhetoric: Interview Practices of Fox News' *Hannity*

MOHAMED YACOUB[1]

ABSTRACT

Analyzing interviews with Muslim guests on Fox News' Hannity reveals biased practices that trigger anti-Muslim sentiment and rhetoric. Muslim guests are asked leading questions, cornered (asked off topic questions and forced to respond), accused with hedge-less statements, faced with the technique of "polls say," and labelled as "you" versus "us." The result of such anti-Muslim sentiment is audience who have not been given the chance to listen, but a chance to hate. This paper, thus, calls for transformation in action so that we pushback against this sentiment and rhetoric.

Keywords: Muslim, Hannity, Hedging, Fox News, United States

Anti-Muslim Rhetoric has existed in the United States for a long time; however, it surged in the aftermath of 9/11, and it resurged with the appearance of Donald Trump on the political theatre as a presidential candidate and then as the 45th president of the United States. This anti-Muslim sentiment has been characterized as Islamophobic, which Sayyid (2014) defined as a chain of ideologies that aim at undermining the presence and activeness of the Muslim population; it is, hence, not just prejudice or ignorance, but there has been an investment in this sentiment (Sayyid, 2014). Anti-Muslim sentiment has been attempted definitions and explanations. In an attempt to theorize the anti-Arab Muslim sentiment, Oswald (2005) proposed three theoretical dimensions that illustrate how Americans perceive Arabs and Muslims. Although Oswald study pertains to anti-Arab sentiment, it is a blurry line to distinguish Arab from Muslim or vice-a-versa since an Arab is usually perceived as a Muslim. The first categorization that Oswald found was that the participants (*N*=201) perceived Arabs as a source of threat—when an Arab is seen, a source of threat exists. The second categorization is that participants considered Arabs as the other: they are not us and we are not them. The third categorization was what Oswald considered an individual difference—i.e., those who believe in "such a world" belief. Those found believers of "just a world" tolerated anti-Arab sentiment since they (Arabs) get what they 'deserve' (Oswald 2005: 1781). What do Arabs/Muslims, then, deserve in the eyes of anti-Muslim sentiment advocates? Sayyid (2014) categorized five anti-Muslim, Islamophobic acts that reflect the belief of such 'just a world' people: 1. Attack on persons perceived to be Muslims; 2. Attack on property considered to be linked to Muslims: mosques, cemeteries, business premises; 3. Acts of intimidation. These actions would be organized since they would involve a number of persons acting in concert to intimidate a population that is perceived to be Muslim or friendly to Muslims; 4. Acts of unfavorable treatment. In some institutional settings, those perceived to be Muslims receive less favorable treatment than their peers in comparative positions within the same organizations. Such behavior may take the form of harassment, bullying, pointed jokes; 5. Incidents in which there is a sustained and systematic elaboration of comments in the public domain that disparage Muslims and/or Islam. This disparagement could be more or less subtle.

[1]**Mohamed Yacoub**, Ph. D. Assistant Teaching Professor- Writing & Rhetoric, Department of English, Florida International University, Modesto A. Maidique Campus | ZEB14 | Miami, FL 33199 USA. Email myacoub@fiu.edu

Edgell, Gerteis & Hartmann, (2006) reported that high percentage of Americans believe that Muslims "do not at all agree with [their] vision of American society." This is supported by the reports of FBI Annual Hate Crime Report of 2015 which reported a 67% increase in hate crimes against Muslims in 2015 compared to 2014, Pew Research Center (2017) that found that Islam is the least welcome and the least rated religion among the US population, Southern Poverty Law Center (2017) that reported an increase of 197% of hate groups against Muslims from 2015 to 2016, and CAIR (Council of American-Islamic Relations) that reported receiving cases of harassment, vandalism, bullying, denial of service or access, issues with employment or promotion, and inappropriate questioning or contact. I argue that such acts are initiated and fueled by such anti-Muslim rhetoric as that in Fox New's *Hannity*, and this necessitates the need of studying such practices and working on diminishing them.

Silverstone (1999) argued that media plays a crucial role in identifying and creating images for certain communities. The process of identification in itself is not the problem; the problem arises when the image created for such communities are not representative. Fox News, as Jeffrey Jones (2012) put it, is performing an ideology that "provides a steady and consistent diet of such overtly ideological symbolic material to sufficiently sustain viewer interest and commitments as a community". Meeting the satisfaction and 'commitment' of the viewers is a continuum—this satisfaction and commitment were also created by such ideologies. Kathleen Jamieson and Joseph Cappella (2008) argued that Fox News creates certain images and then reinforces these images to their agreeing viewers. This helps them maintain their right-wing ideologies and keep them coherent. Fox News, as John Sonnett, Kirk Johnson, and Mark Dolan (2015) demonstrated, prefers the White race and reinforces the stereotypes of other ethnicities. Fox News also prefers the "bad news" over the "good news" since "good news" is believed to be of less interest to the viewers (Aday 2010; Downie & Kaiser 2002), and, of course, their news pertaining to Muslims are "bad." Aday (2010), thence, draws our attention to the fact that we have to be careful to the ideologies on which media operates "as subjective gatekeepers selecting negative stories over positive ones, or engage in valence framing of events, as compared with the independent effects of events themselves". Trump's executive order of vetting immigrants or temporary ban on certain Muslim countries is an event. Airtime devoted to the event, type of commentary on it, who to interview, and what to ask frame the event for the viewers (Aday 2010). Van Dijk (1991) pointed out that language strategies and structures used in presenting such news denote the ideology of the media outlet.

Methods

Hannity is a five-day-a-week news show (weekdays 10-11PM/ET). The data of this study were obtained from the official website of Fox News. More specifically from the URL extension that pertains to *Hannity*'s on air news show. The page provides transcripts to videos. The page provides search filtration option where one can search by a certain keyword and/or by a certain date. No dates were specified so that a plethora of results would come out. However, certain keywords were used to search the website. These words were: *Muslim, Islam, Sharia, Sharia Law, Saudi, radical*, and *ban*. These words returned tens of results. The process of choosing videos was then random as long as the video was not prior to 2014. There were not any selection criteria other than that the video be about Muslims and takes the shape of an interview with a guest, whether Muslim or non-Muslim. The length of the video varied—some videos were as short as four minutes and some videos were as long as 45 minutes. I watched the whole randomly selected videos and then whenever I noticed a use of a biased language practice, I would copy and paste the transcript related to that specific sentence. After jotting down a number of sentences, I started coding them, grouping them into practices, and I labeled each practice with a name. The analysis did not include the utterances of the guests—it did only when needed, but included only the utterance of Hannity himself. Analyzing the speech of the guests can

take the focus of this paper to other routes, while these other routes can make other studies themselves.

Author's Subjectivity

It cannot be avoided to admit the role of subjectivity and positionality in this paper. I am Muslim and have been living in the United States since 2012. I have personally been affected by the anti-Muslim sentiment that has been taking place in the US for many years now. I consider my positionality to be a critical eye and a strength since being a member of that minority that is being labeled as under suspicion (Ali 2014). I can feel what is fair and what is not as we see it as Muslims. As a Muslim person, I am being bothered by the almost new collocations: Muslim terrorist, Islamic terrorism, radical Islam, etc. I get offended when I see mosques being vandalized, Muslims being discriminated against, media accusing us of terrorism, people asking us to go back home, posts that dehumanize our values or religion, etc., and I am interested to investigate the causes of such acts, of which, I believe, *Hannity* and similar shows are one. Also, my Islamic knowledge and background can contribute in judging statements that I cannot judge otherwise. When Hannity, for instance, presented a group of Muslims in the United States being interviewed about whether they believed Sharia Law should supersede the US Constitution or not, without my knowledge of what Sharia Law is and what might those interviewees have been thinking of versus what the audience might have been thinking of when both hear the phrase "Sharia Law," I could not come to the analysis I provided below in the results section. However, other than that, I tried to neutralize my positionality and use objective words in other places.

Results and Discussion

Joining Fox News Network in 1996, Sean Hannity has become one of the most eminent and poignant voices of the right-wing in the United States, through his daily show *Hannity,* which presents a combination of news, commentary, and, most importantly, guest interviews (Sean Hannity 2017). According to Fox News, *Hannity* is one of the most listened-to hosts in the United States with 13.5 Million Listenership (Sean Hannity 2017). Talker Magazine ranked *Hannity* second in its Top 100 Talk Host in America in 2016, and he was ranked number 72nd on Forbes' 2013 "Celebrity 100." Hannity is also a frequent winner of other awards such as NAB Marconi Radio Awards for Network Syndicated Personality and Radio & Records National Talk Show Host of the Year Award (Sean Hannity 2017). However, Hannity is a controversial individual whom Baym (2013) described as a "version of postmodern infotainment: a rawly partisan and entirely market-driven form of celebrity punditry marked by a deep-seated epistemological relativism, privileging opinion over reason, volume over logic, and [in Jones' (2009) wording] "believable fictions" over the empirically verified". In what follows, I present the interview practices that Hannity uses with Muslim guests or non-Muslim guests who are hosted to speak about Muslims. These practices clearly reflect the ideology that Baym described above:

Hedge-less Statements

Hedging from the pragmatic perspective refers to words or phrases that are used in writing or speech to reduce the assertion or the sharpness of the argument the writer or speaker is making (Markkanen & Schröder 1997; Yongqing Tengl 2015). The function of the hedges, thus, are to show the degree of certainty or doubt the authors have towards their own; hedges also leave a room for the readers or viewers to make their own judgements (Yongqing Tengl 2015). Hedges provide better communication and are more academic. In analyzing Hannity's statements, it is noted that he leans away from hedging his claims, in an indication that his arguments are not to be doubted. In an interview with Manal Al-Sharif (a Saudi women activist), Hannity said, "America is free. You do not have the freedom that American women have! (Anon 2015a). We notice that these statements are

not hedged. He could have said, America is more free than other countries, and you may not have the same freedom in some life respects as American women do. The difference between the first and the hypothetical latter styles is that the first denotes Hannity's sureness and certainty of who Saudi women are and how they live, which is not the case.

In another interview that included several guests one of whom is a Muslim, Hannity said, "we know the application of sharia renders or relegates women and minorities and other religious faiths to second class citizens! So that's just a fact when you look at the application of sharia in Muslim countries" (Anon 2015b). We can notice the degree of certainty that Hannity claims come from when he used phrases such as "we know," and "that's just a fact." He made his argument that application of Sharia is atrocious, and he supported his claim by the prosaic evidence of saying, "look at the Sharia application of Muslim countries." Does he mean the 50 countries in the world that have Muslims as the majority (Pew Research center)? Or was he thinking of specific country and made his own generalization to all other Muslim countries?

In his interview with Imam Kashif Abdul Karim from Muhammad Islamic Center in Greater Harford and Dr. Zuhdi Jasser from the American Islamic Forum for Democracy, Hannity said, "the Quran is being used to justify murder. It's being used to justify mothers and fathers strapping suicide vests on their own children and promising them 72 virgins in heaven. So obviously they're taking it from somewhere and they cite the Quran" (Anon 2016). Again, he used his hedge-less style to deliver a message of "we know, we are sure," instead of asking "is it true that the Quran is being used to ….?" The problem of this strategy is that it crowds the heads of audience of fact-like claims.

Sarcastic Hedging

In the above section, I defined the function of hedging as expressions used to mitigate the intensity of the claim and for the speaker to avoid being viewed as impeccable. However, when Hannity uses hedges with Muslim guests, it is obvious that he used it to ridicule the guest. It becomes more obvious when combined with Hannity's facial expressions and voice pitch. In the same interview with Manal Al-Sharif, Hannity said, "It sounds *to me* that you don't have the freedom that American women have and the choices – you can't even drive a car. That's the point! You can't drive a car! That is absurd *to me*! (Anon 2015a). *To me* is a hedge; however, its function is not to doubt the level of truth nor to limit the generalizability of the claim but a strategic communicative move to invoke the same response (not only to you but to us all!) from his audience.

Reiteration

Reiteration is a semantic strategy that Hannity employs to repeat and emphasize the claims he is making. Repetition has power; a power on the memory, on the attitudes, and on the acts. This power is manipulated and used by Hannity in a way that reiterates anti-Muslim sentiment and invokes anti-Muslim violent acts. In the introduction with Manal Al-Sharif interview, Hannity starts saying, "Tonight, we have news for these liberals. There is a real war being waged against women, but it's not in America and it's not by conservatives. Now, in this war, women are tortured. They're treated as second class citizens, unjustly imprisoned and they are even killed. Now, of course, I'm talking about the deplorable treatment of women in Islamic theocracies (Anon 2015a). Analyzing the words that Hannity used in this four-line quote, we can see: war, waged, against, tortured, second-class, unjustly, imprisoned, killed, and deplorable. Also, the usage of the progressive tense "being waged against" delivers a sense of danger—that as we speak These are reiterations, repetitions, exaggerations, and hollow, statistically unsupported claims that are enough to intoxicate minds that accept claims without questioning.

In another interview that included several guests one of whom is a Muslim, Hannity said, "The true application of sharia in countries is women can't drive, women have to dress a certain way, they can't be seen in public with men that are not their relatives. In some cases, women need four male eyewitnesses for rape. Gays and lesbians are killed. Those that leave the faith are viewed as apostate. They are killed for such religious liberty" (Anon 2015b). The same thing said above can be said here. Hannity misrepresents the image of Islam. He created the image and keeps distorting the image he created. This aligns with Kathleen Jamieson and Joseph Cappella (2008) who argued that Fox News creates images for minorities and then keeps reinforcing the same images in a way that service their right-wing ideologies and keep them coherent.

Leading Questions

Although Leech (2002: 667) argued that hosts should all avoid certain kinds of questions, and he named those questions to be: loaded questions, double-barreled questions, leading questions, and presuming questions; it seems that these same should-be-avoided-questions are what orient Hannity's style of asking questions. Examining the below questions can reveal this style:

> I want you to explain to our audience why you went about this effort [being a woman activist] and what happened when you were caught driving? (Manal al-Sharif 2015)

> You don't have the right to wear any clothes that you want as a woman in Saudi Arabia. Is that true? (Manal al-Sharif 2015)

> So you need man's permission to do it? But you also have the morality police. There's a group of police officers – for example, if you wanted to meet a young man in a park and have ice cream together, that can't happen, can it? (Manal al-Sharif 2015)

In the above questions, we see the three types of questions that Leech (2002) warned against. In the first example, Hannity asks a double-barreled question. He asked two separate questions that confused her and she ended up giving a very short answer. In the second example is a leading question—he puts her in a situation that does not give much space for answer. It is a yes-no question and what this question creates is a moment of hesitation. If she says yes, she reinforces the image Hannity is creating for Muslim women, and if she says no, she would not escape his trap. What happened is she neither said yes nor no; she said we have to wear *Abaya* (A black) in public. Hannity reiterated, "so, you must cover in public?" She said, "no, not anymore." Hannity created a state of confusion for her. She contradicted herself as clearly stated by her answers, but the reason may well be the style of questions Hannity asks. She seemed as if she is shielding herself and knowing that the host is trying to trap her. The third example above is a loaded question—he gives an example of an innocent situation that every one of his audience sees as normal and saying that this cannot happen in Saudi Arabia. He also asks about the morality police without introducing a definition of what it is or giving us any evidence of what it does. The viewers will definitely see the guest as a hesitant, a liar, or unable to answer. Searching for the same video on Youtube, it was found under this title: "CAT GOT YOUR TONGUE? Hannity silences Muslim, listen for the crickets!!!," and that is what Hannity may have wanted her to appear to his viewers if she does not confine her answers to what he originally wanted from her.

In the example with Abdul Karim and Jasser, Hannity asked, "I want you to respond to polls and the Quran calling to cut off hands and feet of those who fight Allah, or Christian and Jews are deluded and not to take them as friends, and all these other quotes that we're putting up there. Explain how people interpret that literally (Anon 2016). We can here see the same reiteration repeating constantly. The problem here is that this leading question presupposes that the Quran

really calls for all what he claims. Brining these words together in the same sentence "Allah, Quran, murder, killing, cutting off, etc." is a very problematic style. It calls for hatred and misrepresentation. It tries to coin new collocations in the minds of the viewers that whenever you hear the word Islam, it should be collocated with these negative words.

After doing the job with the Muslim guests, now comes the questions he asks to non-Muslim guests but about Muslims. In his interview with Nigel Farage (a British politician), Hannity asks his like-minded guest with a chauvinistic tone, "Is it really too much to ask that if you come from a country that practices Sharia whose values directly contradict those of the United States and our constitution or the values of western Europe and the United Kingdom, is it really too much to ask that we vet you and know that you're going to bring safety and security with you as you visit, have the honor of visiting our great countries? (Anon 2017). We can see that as Van Dijk (1991) called it "mitigation." It is a semantic style that mitigates and excuses any act that might seem as discriminatory or racist. Hannity here is not only asking a question for information he needs to know but to lead the guest to agree with him.

Cornering

I define cornering as an interview style that forces a guest to answer a specific question that is off topic or that the guest does not wish to answer to make the guest seem fragile and tenuous. When Manal Al-sharif disappointed Hannity and did not respond to his questions the way he wanted, he eventually said, "Listen, when you get to drive a car on your own and you get to make choices on your own, then we can talk. (Anon 2015a). Similar to this is Hannity's interview with Anjem Choudary. And regardless the controversiality of the guest, Hannity said, "You support Hamas, Hezbollah, ISIS, ISIL. You support al Qaeda. You once said about 9/11 – you were very clear that you were on team bin Laden, not team Obama. So you supported what happened on 9/11 and you said it was a good thing. So I know where you're coming from. I just want America to see you for who you are! You are the enemy of free people! (Anon 2014). Hannity here makes his ideology clear—you are not here to answer my questions, you are here so that America sees how I made you appear as a terrorist and as an enemy of us, the free people.

In a more obvious example, Hannity hosts Hassan Shibly, the executive director of CAIR Florida (Council of American-Islamic Relation), to talk about a family of a college student who left the USA to join ISIS. Shibly described ISIS as extremists, violent, and as a gang of monsters. All of a sudden, Hannity corners Shibly by asking him if Hamas is a terrorist organization, which is an off-topic question. Shibly wondered why Hannity changed the topic. Hannity kept repeating the question and Shibly kept saying that he is not here to Talk about Hamas and that Hannity can host experts about the topic. Hannity then said, "I'll ask any question I want. This is my show" (Anon 2015a). Viewing this same video on Youtube and other websites and reading the comments reveal how much hatred for Muslims this video created. Regardless of the semantic strategy of cornering, this is also a complete an unethical behavior from Hannity.

McCracken (1988) and (Leech, 2002) warned against putting words in guests' mouths since this strategy can risk losing rapport which Leech defined as putting guests at ease by showing them that you are listening and interested in what they are saying, and that they are hosted to give us information that we need to learn. Hannity does not put Muslim guests at ease. Hassan Shibly when he was cornered by Hannity said to him, "Every Muslim you bring, every Muslim you bring, you change the topic." Adding to not putting the guests at ease, Hannity says things guests neither said nor meant. Putting words into the guests' mouths without their consent whenever the guests say something that doesn't conforms to Hannity's ideology of showing Muslims as unassimilable, violent, and radical. When Manal Al-sharif disappointed Hannity with saying that Saudi Arabia is changing and women are having more freedom than before, he then said, "If you have the choice to wear whatever you want, drive whenever you want, leave your house whenever you want, love whoever

you want, whatever that – that is personal freedom" (Anon 2015a) She did not say she does not have the freedom to wear whatever she wants, leave her house whenever she wants or love whatever she wants but he puts the words in her mouth. As a viewer, I would have the impression that she said these things while she did not.

We/Us Vs. You/Them Contrast

This is the most obvious among all the strategies. As Van Dijk (1991) explained, the right-wing emphasizes the differences and makes distinctions between "us" and "them—" they are not "us" and we are not "them." There are too many-to-count examples of such nature. The following are just enough:

> I didn't hear in Donald Trump's statement that he was saying that American Muslims or American servicemen that are Muslim couldn't come back into the country. What I heard him say is those people that come from countries that live under sharia, which directly contradict our constitutional republic and the values we hold (Marco Rubio 2015)

> you don't have the freedom that women in America have, and I feel bad for you. (Manal al-Sharif 2015)

> Fundamentally, the Quran and Islam –I'm not talking about radical Islamists. The Quran and Islam are fundamentally at odds with the Constitution! Isn't that the truth? (Anon 2015b)

Safety Cause

It is noticeable in almost all Hannity's interviews and talks about Muslims that he uses "safety of Americans" as a reason for his style. It was most obvious in an interview with Marco Rubio (a Politician and former Speaker of the Florida House of Representatives) that took place December 8, 2015. Hannity kept asking him in different moments during the interview:

> Why would we *gamble with the lives of the American people* and allow them in?
> And if we can't vet them, would it be a good idea to put in place a pause until we can vet them and not *gamble with the lives of the American people*?
> If you don't have information, you're not willing to let them in and *gamble with the lives of the American people*.
> Would you go as far as to say that the president insisting on taking these refugees in spite of what I assume are intelligence assessments that you're reading, that he's *gambling with the lives of the American people*?
> I think the *lives and the safety of the American people need to come first*.

Also, in the interview with Abdul Karim and Jasser, Hannity started saying to the viewers, "the same Islamic extremists who are wreaking havoc across the world are now living among you, the American people" (Anon 2016). In another interview, Hannity asked Newton Gingrich (an American right-wing politician), "We have enough terror going on in Boston at the marathon and Chattanooga, at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, at Fort Hood and San Bernardino. We have our own problems already. Do we really want to invite other problems without a proper vetting system?" (Anon 2017). From the range of interview dates, we can conclude that Hannity's style has not changed, but he works to maintain the same way he interviews his guests. Safety always makes people sympathize and there is nothing wrong to care about people's safety but what is wrong is to care about *some* people's safety than others and to relate the terror to a certain group.

Presupposition

For the many examples that include this strategy, the following incident is more than enough due to its importance. On September 23, 2015, *Hannity* interviewed a group of Muslims at some Islamic center and asked this question: "Should Sharia Law supersede the constitution?" Most interviewees said, yes. Hannity took advantage of this answer to cry out his anti-Muslim fears. The very big problem with this video—regardless of the many hateful comments the video invoked—is that the concept of Shaira Law is different for both the interviewees and the viewers. For Hannity's viewers as he has been confirming to them, Shaira Law is women cannot drive, cutting off people's hands, hating Jewish and Christians, the list of the alleged list goes long. However, for the Muslim interviewees, Sharia Law is to pray, to observe the month of Ramadan, to do pilgrimage, etc. The interviewees were not asked to define Shria Law or what Sharia meant to them. Siddiqui (2011) argued that republican politicians use Shria Law as a threat to the United States and hence use this threat as an excuse for their anti-Muslim sentiment, and this was vivid in the example.

Polls Say

The last strategy is the strategy of "polls say." Hannity knows that he has to support his claims with some kind of evidence. However, the support he offers are polls! Just saying polls say without knowing the sample, the methodology, etc. is problematic and may very well not be representative (Timotei 2013). Hannity relies heavily on his polls as infinite evidence of truth. Examining the following examples reveal this claim.

> You had a significant number – and by the way, this backs up a poll that came out last year that even a majority of Muslims in America think that sharia should supersede the Constitution. (Anon 2015b)

> Let's go to more polls. We'll put it up on the screen, 29 percent of Muslim polled say violence against those who insult the Islamic faith is sometimes acceptable. That same poll says 51 percent of Muslims polled say Muslims in America should have the right and the choice of being governed by Sharia. (Abdul Karim & Jasser 2016).

Hannity's interview practices lead to hatred. People are not born with hatred; hatred is learned, and the more opportunities of hatred exist against certain communities, the more it is difficult to invest in listening for the sake of better understanding and communication. Krista Ratcliffe (1999 & 2005) asks: Why is it difficult to listen to each other? She then answers that our debates are almost always based on and aiming at the arguments: "I'm right" vs. "No, you're wrong." This leads to, in Kenneth Burks' (1950) words, a status of non-identification in cross-cultural communication or reiterates the status of disidentification. Either status drains blood from the veins of understanding. Understanding as Ratcliffe (1999: 205) defines it means "listening to discourse not for intent but with intent-with the intent to understand not just the claims, not just the cultural logics within which the claims function". Such intent is absent in Fox News's *Hannity* when the topic is pertaining to Muslims.

To conclude, as we have seen from the above ten interview practices, Hannity has shown to be a host that (Baym 2013: 12) describes as one who "throws out nuggets of fact divorced from context," and uses that to "establish the assertions upon which every question is based". Baym (2013) continued saying that in his interview, Hannity describes any problem in "ideologically laced terms" such as when using ("robbing from our kids"), and frames his statements in platitudes, and repeats questions if not answered the way he wished (Baym 2013: 12). Hannity also refuses that his guests explain their logic because if they succeed, they can threaten his "multimillion-dollar personal brand," and "a media empire that includes revenue streams from radio, television, and books" (Baym 2013: 12). Hannity uses interviews not to solicit information but to use his guests (especially those who do not conform to his ideology) to be a tool that he builds his brand name on. Hannity follows

what Baym calls a zero-sum game; one has to win and one has to be defeated, and Hannity tries to play the winner every time he interviews someone (Baym 2013: 12). In the conclusion, I assert that the problem is not in Hannity himself or many similar programs and shows, the problem is in the language ideologies they use and the hatred their language can provoke. Thus, one successful way of diminishing any anti-minorities sentiment is to start with language and diminish any language ideology that aims at discrimination or bigotry.

References

Abdul Karim and Jasser. 2016. *Reiterating Anti-Muslim Rhetoric: Interview Practices of Fox News' Hannity*. Interview, 14th January.

Aday, S. 2010. Chasing the Bad News: An Analysis of 2005 Iraq and Afghanistan War Coverage on NBC and Fox News Channel. *Journal of Communication*. (1): 144-164.

Ali, A. I. 2014. A threat enfleshed: Muslim college students situate their identities amidst portrayals of Muslim violence and terror. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (QSE) 27*(10): 1243-1261.

Anon. 2014. *Reiterating Anti-Muslim Rhetoric: Interview Practices of Fox News' Hannity*. Interview, 27th August.

Anon. 2015a. *Reiterating Anti-Muslim Rhetoric: Interview Practices of Fox News' Hannity*. Interview, 23rd April.

Anon. 2015b. *Reiterating Anti-Muslim Rhetoric: Interview Practices of Fox News' Hannity*. Interview, 23rd September.

Anon. 2016. *Reiterating Anti-Muslim Rhetoric: Interview Practices of Fox News' Hannity*. 14th January.

Anon. 2017. *Reiterating Anti-Muslim Rhetoric: Interview Practices of Fox News' Hannity*. Interview, 22nd March.

Baym, G. 2013. Political media as discursive modes: a comparative analysis of interviews with Ron Paul from Meet the Press, Tonight, The Daily Show, and Hannity. *International Journal of Communication.* 7: 489–507.

Burke, K. 1950. *Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California.

Downie, Jr., L., & Kaiser, R. 2002. *The News about the News.* New York: Knopf.

Jamieson, K. & Joseph N. Cappella. 2008. *Echo Chamber: Rush Limbaugh and the Conservative Media Establishment.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Jones, J. P. 2009. Believable fictions: Redactional culture and the will to truthiness. In, B. Zelizer (Ed.), *The Changing Faces Of Journalism: Tabloidization, Technology And Truthiness* (pp. 127–143). New York, NY: Routledge.

Leech, B. L. 2002. Asking Questions: Techniques for semi-structured interviews. *PS: Political Science and Politics*. (4): 665.

Manal al-Sharif. 2015. *Reiterating Anti-Muslim Rhetoric: Interview Practices of Fox News' Hannity*. Interview, 23rd April

Markkanen, R., & Schröder, H. 1997. *Hedging and Discourse. Approaches to the Analysis of a Pragmatic Phenomenon in Academic Texts*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

McCracken, G. 1988. *The Long Interview*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Oswald, D. 2005. Understanding anti-Arab reactions post-9/11: The role of threats, social categories, and personal ideologies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology.* 35 (9): 1775-1799.

Ratcliffe, K. 1999. Rhetorical Listening: A Trope for Interpretive Invention and a 'Code of Cross-Cultural Conduct'. *College Composition and Communication*. 51 (2): 195-224.

Ratcliffe, K. 2005. *Rhetorical Listening: Identification, Gender, Whiteness*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, c2005.

Rubio, Marco. 2017. *Reiterating Anti-Muslim Rhetoric: Interview Practices of Fox News' Hannity*. Interview, 8th December.

Silverstone, R. 1999. *Why Study the Media?* London: Sage.

Sonnett, J., Johnson, K. A., & Dolan, M. K. 2015. Priming implicit racism in television news: visual and verbal limitations on diversity. *Sociological Forum. 30*(2): 328-347.

Timotei, V. 2013. How much can we trust public opinion polls? *Annals of the University of Oradea, Economic Science Series. 22*(1): 1835–1844.