

MEDIA FRAMING OF THE 2026 UNITED STATES-IRAN CEASEFIRE IN IRNA, BBC AND CNN REPORTS

Jordanka GALEVA

Assoc. prof., Faculty of Law, Goce Delcev University, Stip

email: jordanka.galeva@ugd.edu.mk

<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-4243-9614>

Abstract

This paper presents a comparative analysis of the media coverage by the official Iranian state news agency- the Islamic Republic News Agency (IRNA), the American cable news network (CNN) and the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC). The analysis examines reports published on 8 April 2026 on the website of these media outlets following the announcement of the ceasefire between United States (U.S.) and Iran. By applying the Robert Entmans's framing theory, the study investigates how each media outlet the defines the problem, attribute the responsibility, makes moral evaluations and proposes solutions. The aim of the paper is to examine how these different media organizations frame the same event, as this framing may shape public perceptions of the ceasefire and the crisis surrounding the Strait of Hormuz.

Keywords: *Hormuz crisis, U.S-Iran conflict, framing theory, IRNA, BBC, CNN*

Introduction

The conflict between the United States and Iran, which began on 28 February 2026 rapidly escalated into one of the most significance geopolitical crisis in the Middle East in recent years. The confrontation involved military strikes, threats to close the Strait of Hormuz, attacks on strategic infrastructure and growing tensions among the United States, Iran and Israel. The conflict also raised significant concerns about global energy security because the Strait of Hormuz is one of the world's most strategically important maritime chokepoints, through which approximately 20% of global oil supply passes (IEA, 2026).

On 8 April 2026, a temporary two-weeks ceasefire was announced following mediation efforts by Pakistan. The agreement was linked to negotiations on maritime security, sanctions and the reopening of the Strait of Hormuz to international shipping. As a major international event, the ceasefire received extensive media coverage from international news organizations. Examining how different media outlets framed the same event is important because media framing influences which aspects of a conflict are made salient and how audiences interpret political responsibility and possible solutions. The study therefore compares the framing of the ceasefire, by the Iranian Islamic Republic News Agency - IRNA, the American news network - CNN and the British Broadcasting Corporation - BBC using Robert Entman's framing theory (Entman, 1993).

Methodology

This study adopts media framing analysis as the most appropriate methodological approach for examining how narratives are constructed, how governments seek to shape domestic and international public opinion, and how media discourse contributes to the legitimization of political and military actions during international conflicts.

The research employs qualitative media framing analysis to examine how IRNA, CNN and BBC, framed the U.S. - Iran conflict in their coverage of the announcement of ceasefire between United States and IRAN. Drawing of Robert Entman's framing theory this study examines how each media outlet defines the problem, attributes responsibility, makes moral evaluations and proposes solutions. According Entman, framing involves selection and salience. He defines framing as selecting some aspects of a perceived reality and making them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and treatment recommendation for the item described.

In his book *Projections of power: Framing news, public opinion and U.S. foreign policy* (Entman, Projections of power: Framing news, public opinion and U.S. foreign policy, 2003), Entman distinguishes between two classes of framing: substantive and procedural frames. Procedural frames have a narrower focus and evaluate the legitimacy of political actors based on their techniques, success and representativeness. Substantive frames, by contrast, perform at least two of the following basic functions, when covering political events, issues and actors: defining effects or conditions as problematic; Identifying causes; conveying a moral judgment; endorsing remedies or improvements.

Accordingly, the analysis is guided by the following four analytical questions:

1. Define Problems: How is the issue defined and why is it considered important?
2. Diagnose Causes: Who or what presented as responsible for the conflict?

3. Make Moral Judgments: How are the actions and behaviour of the actors evaluated?
4. Suggest Remedies: What solutions or courses of action are proposed?

The empirical analysis in this paper includes six news reports published on 8 April 2026. Four reports were published by IRNA, one by CNN authored by Yeung Jessie and one of BBC authored by Kelly Ng, Daniel De Simone and Khashayar Joneidi. The articles were retrieved from the respective media websites using the keywords “Hormuz”. They were selected because they all report on the announcement of the ceasefire and therefore provide a suitable basis for comparing how different media organizations framed the same international event. The headlines of the analyzed reports are listed below:

- I. *Trump retreats, agrees to two-week Pakistan-proposed ceasefire* (IRNA, 2026);
- II. *Araqchi: Iran will halt fire if attacks stop* (IRNA, 2026);
- III. *Iran’s SNSC declares victory, urges national unity until outcome finalized* (IRNA, 2026);
- IV. *IRGC warns ‘finger on trigger’ if enemies make any mistake* (IRNA, 2026);
- V. *The US and Iran have agreed a ceasefire, with talks to bridge the gulf between them. Here’s what to know* (Yeung, 2026)
- VI. *What we know about the two-week ceasefire between the US and Iran* (Ng, De Simone, & Joneidi, 2026)

1. Analysis of IRNA reports

The Islamic Republic News Agency, established in 1934, is the official state news agency of the Islamic Republic of Iran. It serves as the government’s principal news organization and is one of the primary sources of official information on Iranian government policies, domestic affairs and foreign relations. It is internationally recognized as a major media outlet and is frequently cited by both domestic and international media, particularly in relation to government statements and national policies (IRNA, 2026).

Since the beginning of the Strait of Hormuz crisis, following the joint U.S. and Israeli attacks on Iran, IRNA has published extensive daily coverage of political, military, and diplomatic developments. For the purpose of this study, the analysis focuses on articles published on 8 April 2026, the day the temporary two-week ceasefire between United States and Iran was announced. The selected news reports were retrieved from the official IRNA website using the keyword “Hormuz”.

The following section presents and analyzes the four selected IRNA texts.

(I.) Trump retreats, agrees to two-week Pakistan-proposed ceasefire.

“US President Donald Trump has once again backed down from his threats and announced that he would agree to a two-week pause in his war of aggression with Iran. Trump had previously threatened to target Iranian power plants, bridges and other civilian infrastructure, which to many legal experts would amount to a war crime. Trump wrote on his Truth Social account that he had decided to stop attacks on Iran “based on conversations with Prime Minister Shehbaz Sharif and Field Marshal Asim Munir, of Pakistan.” He also said that Iran has agreed to “the COMPLETE, IMMEDIATE, and SAFE OPENING of the Strait of Hormuz,” adding that this “will be a double sided CEASEFIRE!” Claiming that the US has reached its military objectives, he noted that Washington has received “a 10 point proposal from Iran, and believe it is a workable basis on which to negotiate.”

The United States and Israel started a war on Iran on February 28 by assassinating Ayatollah Seyyed Ali Khamenei, the Leader of the Islamic Revolution, and targeting a school in the city of Minab, southern Iran, in which about 170 students and school staff lost their lives. At the time, indirect negotiations between Iran and the United States were underway with the mediation of some regional countries. By attacking civilian infrastructure and the people of Iran, the United States and Israel have violated international law, especially international humanitarian law; these attacks constitute a war crime and have also targeted officials of the Islamic Republic of Iran with their overt state terrorism in violation of all international laws. In defense and within the framework of its right to legitimate defense, the Islamic Republic of Iran has been targeting military and security positions of Israel in various cities of occupied Palestine, as well as bases and deployment centers of US forces in the region, with missile, drone, and air strikes”.

Using Robert Entman’s framing model, the following analysis addresses the four analytical questions of the model.

1. Define problems: Unlawful aggression by the United States and Israel against Iran, involving attacks on civilians, civilian infrastructure, and state officials.
2. Diagnose causes: Responsibility for the escalation is attributed to the United States and Israel, whose actions are presented as violations of international law and acts of state terrorism.
3. Make moral judgments: Trump is characterized as having “backed down” after military and political failure, while references to “many legal experts” and “war crime” reinforce the moral and legal condemnation of U.S. actions. The United States and Israel are morally condemned as violators of international law and perpetrators of war crimes, while Iran is portrayed as acting legitimately and lawfully in self-defense.

4. Suggest remedies: Iran's military response is presented as the appropriate and legally justified course of action under the right of self-defense. The ceasefire and renewed negotiations are presented as appropriate outcomes following the failure of military action. The text suggests that diplomatic engagement, based on Iran's proposal (10 points) and the cessation of U.S. attacks, represents the proper path forward.

(II.) Araghchi: Iran will halt fire if attacks stop

"Tehran, IRNA – Foreign Minister Seyyed Abbas Araghchi says if attacks against Iran are halted, Iranian Armed Forces will also cease their defensive operations. He made the remarks in a post on his X account on Thursday. "On behalf of the Islamic Republic of Iran, I express gratitude and appreciation for my dear brothers HE Prime Minister of Pakistan Sharif and HE Field Marshal Munir for their tireless efforts to end the war in the region," Araghchi wrote. "In response to the brotherly request of PM Sharif in his tweet, and considering the request by the U.S. for negotiations based on its 15-point proposal as well as announcement by POTUS about acceptance of the general framework of Iran's 10-point proposal as a basis for negotiations, I hereby declare on behalf of Iran's Supreme National Security Council: If attacks against Iran are halted, our Powerful Armed Forces will cease their defensive operations. For a period of two weeks, safe passage through the Strait of Hormuz will be possible via coordination with Iran's Armed Forces and with due consideration of technical limitations."

The United States and Israel started a war on Iran on February 28 by assassinating Ayatollah Seyyed Ali Khamenei, the Leader of the Islamic Revolution, and targeting a school in the city of Minab, southern Iran, in which about 170 students and school staff lost their lives. At the time, indirect negotiations between Iran and the United States were underway with the mediation of some regional countries. By attacking civilian infrastructure and the people of Iran, the United States and Israel have violated international law, especially international humanitarian law; these attacks constitute a war crime and have also targeted officials of the Islamic Republic of Iran with their overt state terrorism in violation of all international laws.

In defense and within the framework of its right to legitimate defense, the Islamic Republic of Iran has been targeting military and security positions of Israel in various cities of occupied Palestine, as well as bases and deployment centers of US forces in the region, with missile, drone, and air strikes".

Applying Robert M. Entman's framing model, the following analysis answers the four framing questions.

1. Define problems: The report defines the conflict as an illegal war initiated by the United States and Israel against Iran. The central problem is portrayed as external military aggression, violations of international law and attacks on Iranian leaders and civilians, rather than a broader regional conflict.
2. Diagnose causes: Responsibility is attributed entirely to the United States and Israel, who are described as initiating the war through assassinations and attacks on civilian infrastructure while diplomatic negotiations were ongoing. Iran's military actions are framed as a direct consequence of this aggression and as an exercise of its right to self-defense.
3. Make moral judgments: Iran is portrayed as a law-abiding and responsible state acting within the framework of international law and legitimate self-defense. Conversely, the United States and Israel are characterized as violators of international humanitarian law, perpetrators of war crimes, and practitioners of state terrorism. Pakistan is presented positively as a constructive mediator contributing to peace efforts.
4. Suggest remedies: The report advocates conditional de-escalation through diplomacy. Iran expresses willingness to suspend military operations if attacks cease, supports negotiations based on the proposed frameworks, and temporarily guarantees safe passage through the Strait of Hormuz, thereby presenting diplomacy as possible only if external aggression ends.

(III.) Iran's SNSC declares victory, urges national unity until outcome finalized

"Tehran, IRNA– Iran's Supreme National Security Council (SNSC) has declared that the Islamic Republic has achieved a major victory following weeks of conflict, but stressed that national unity and resilience remain essential until the final details of the outcome are secured. In a statement released Wednesday, the SNSC congratulated the Iranian people, saying the enemy had suffered an undeniable, historic, and crushing defeat in an unjust and illegal war against Iran. The statement said the outcome was achieved through the leadership of Ayatollah Seyyed Mojtaba Hosseini Khamenei, the sacrifices of Iranian forces on the battlefield, and the widespread public support shown since the beginning of the aggression.

According to the council, the US was compelled to accept Iran's proposed 10-point framework, which includes commitments to refrain from further aggression, recognize Iran's control over the Strait of Hormuz, accept Iran's nuclear enrichment activities, lift primary and secondary sanctions, end related resolutions by international bodies, compensate Iran for damages, withdraw US combat forces from the region, and halt hostilities across all fronts, including actions against allied resistance groups. The statement said Iran and its allies in Lebanon, Iraq, Yemen, and the Palestinian territories had delivered significant blows to their adversaries during 40 days of fighting,

damaging military infrastructure and imposing heavy losses. It added that when the conflict began, Iran's adversaries expected to quickly achieve military dominance and destabilize the country politically and socially. However, the council said Iran's missile and drone capabilities and coordinated regional response shifted the balance of the conflict. The SNSC said Iranian forces and allied groups launched one of the most complex hybrid warfare operations in recent history against the United States and the Israeli regime, targeting military assets and infrastructure across the region. Despite a major victory, the council emphasized that unity among the Iranian people remains essential until negotiations and final arrangements fully secure the outcome.

The US and Israeli regimes imposed the war on Iran on February 28, 2026, while the Islamic Republic was engaged in indirect negotiations with American envoys over the nuclear issue”.

Applying Robert M. Entman's framing model, the following analysis answers the four framing questions.

1. Define problems: The report defines the conflict as an “unjust and illegal war” imposed by the United States and Israel against Iran. The central issue is not military confrontation itself but foreign aggression against Iranian sovereignty.
2. Diagnose causes: Responsibility is attributed entirely to the United States and Israel, described as the aggressors. Iran is portrayed as reacting defensively while also successfully resisting the attack. Iranian leadership, military capabilities, regional allies, and public unity are identified as the factors that produced victory.
3. Make moral judgments: Iran is presented as the legitimate, resilient, and victorious actor, while the United States and Israel are portrayed as aggressors who suffered a “historic” and “crushing defeat”. Iranian leadership is praised, military sacrifices are honored, and public unity is celebrated, reinforcing the government's legitimacy.
4. Suggest remedies: The report calls for continued national unity and resilience until negotiations are finalized. It also implicitly advocates maintaining Iran's military deterrence, regional alliances, and strategic negotiating position while expecting the United States to fulfill the stated conditions.

(IV.) IRGC warns ‘finger on trigger’ if enemies make any mistake

“Commander of the Aerospace Force of the Islamic Revolution Guard Corps (IRGC) Brigadier General Seyyed Majid Mousavi.

Tehran, IRNA – The commander of the Aerospace Force of the Islamic Revolution Guard Corps (IRGC) has warned that their finger remains “on the trigger” if the enemy makes any mistake.

In a social media post on Wednesday, Brigadier General Seyyed Majid Mousavi said, “Even today, they [enemies] have seen and experienced that our fingers are on the trigger. If the enemy makes even the slightest mistake, they will face a full-scale response.” He added, “Two weeks of vigilance lie ahead—for the field, diplomacy, and the streets. The watchful eyes of the field, along with unity in the streets, will consolidate the achievements”.

The US and the Israeli regime launched a large-scale unprovoked military campaign against Iran following the assassination of then Leader of the Islamic Revolution Ayatollah Seyyed Ali Khamenei, along with several senior military commanders and civilians, on February 28. In retaliation, Iranian Armed Forces launched attacks on American and Israeli positions in the region, demonstrating their capability to strike back effectively. Despite initial expectations by the attackers of a swift victory, the Iranian response proved significantly more potent, inflicting heavy damage on US and Israeli military resources while rallying the nation’s unity and resistance. While the US president had issued an ultimatum, Pakistani mediation facilitated an agreement for a two-week ceasefire during which negotiations would take place in Islamabad. Iran has proposed a ten-point plan as the foundation for discussions, seeking terms such as the withdrawal of US forces from the region, lifting sanctions, and establishing control over the Strait of Hormuz. The Supreme National Security Council of Iran emphasized on April 8 that the war led to a historic victory for Iran, compelling the US to accept negotiation terms, including a plan for guaranteed non-aggression and the cessation of hostilities”.

Applying Robert M. Entman’s framing model, the following analysis answers the four framing questions.

1. Define problems: The report defines the primary problem as the continuing threat posed by the United States and Israel, despite a ceasefire. The conflict is portrayed as unresolved, requiring constant military readiness and public vigilance.
2. Diagnose causes: Responsibility for the conflict is attributed entirely to the United States and Israel, who are described as initiating an “unprovoked military campaign” following the assassination of Iran’s leader. Iran is presented as acting solely in retaliation and self-defense.
3. Make moral judgments: Iran is portrayed as a responsible but resolute defender of its sovereignty. The United States and Israel are depicted as aggressors whose actions justified Iran’s military response. Iranian military preparedness, diplomacy, and national unity are presented as morally legitimate and necessary.

4. Suggest remedies: The report recommends continued military readiness, national unity, and diplomatic engagement. Citizens are encouraged to remain vigilant while negotiations continue, with the implicit message that peace depends on enemy restraint and Iranian strength.

1.2. **Comparative analysis of four articles according to Entman's framing model**

Using Robert M. Entman framing, all four articles perform the same four framing functions, but each emphasizes a different aspect of the overall narrative.

1. Define problems: Every article defines the conflict as an externally imposed war initiated by the United States and Israel. Iran is never portrayed as an initiator but consistently as the victim of aggression.
2. Diagnose causes: Responsibility is attributed exclusively to the United States and Israel. None of the articles presents alternative explanations or acknowledges shared responsibility.
3. Make moral judgments: All four articles establish a clear moral dichotomy: Iran is portrayed as legitimate, defensive, resilient, and responsible. The United States and Israel are portrayed as aggressors violating international law. Iranian military actions are consistently described as defensive and justified.
4. Suggest remedies: Although expressed differently, every article recommends essentially the same solution: maintain Iranian strength, preserve national unity, continue diplomacy, negotiate only from a position of military strength and hostilities only if the United States and Israel cease aggression.

As mentioned before, the differences lie primarily in what aspect of the same narrative is emphasized, not in how the conflict itself is interpreted.

The first report places greater emphasis on international law than the other three. It repeatedly refers to war crimes, state terrorism, humanitarian law, and legitimate self-defense. It also introduces an additional political element by portraying Trump as having “backed down”, thereby reinforcing the narrative of Iranian strategic success. The key message is: international law and diplomacy validate Iran's position.

The second report focuses on legitimizing the outcome of the war. Military success is presented as proof of the government's effectiveness and national unity. The key message is: Iran has already won.

The third report shifts from celebrating victory to preserving it through deterrence. The famous phrase “finger on the trigger” reinforces readiness rather than triumph. The key message is: Iran remains ready to respond.

The fourth report introduces diplomacy while maintaining the defensive narrative. Military action is portrayed as conditional and reversible if aggression ends. The key message is: Iran wants peace but only on acceptable terms.

From an Entman perspective, the four reports do not represent different frames but rather different manifestations of the same overarching strategic frame. They consistently define the problem, assign responsibility, make moral evaluations and recommend solutions in ways that support the Iranian government's official narrative.

2. Analysis of CNN report

Cable News Network (CNN) is an American multinational news media organization founded on June 1, 1980. It is one of the world's leading news networks and reaches millions of viewers and online users globally. According to CNN it is "the most honored brand in cable news", reaching more individuals on television and online than any other cable news organization in the United States CNN describe its mission as follow: "We are journalists, designers and technologists, united by a mission to inform, engage and empower the world. We are truth-seekers and storytellers. We bear witness to history as it unfolds and explain not just what happened, but why, and what it means to you. Our products and platforms take you to the farthest corners of the world, and they bring the world to you, delivering content and services that enrich your lives, your families and your communities" (CNN, 2026).

The following section presents and analyzes the fifth (V) article included in this study, written by Jessie Yeung and published by CNN.

(V.) The US and Iran have agreed a ceasefire, with talks to bridge the gulf between them. Here's what to know

"After a month and a half of spiraling conflict in the Middle East, the United States and Iran agreed to a two-week ceasefire on Tuesday – less than two hours before US President Donald Trump's deadline, after which he had promised to wipe out a "whole civilization." That threat, which critics warned could be a war crime if carried out, appears to have been staved off for now at the 11th hour. But there remains a gulf between the two countries, who each portrayed the temporary truce as a victory for their nations. The ceasefire is a starting point for further negotiations, and it remains to be seen what final terms may be included in a proposal to definitively end a war that has upended the Middle East and caused a historic global oil disruption. Here's what we know.

What have the US and Israel said?

Trump announced the ceasefire in a Truth Social post, saying it was made on the condition that Iran agree to reopen the critical Strait of Hormuz, through which a fifth of the world's oil flows. The ceasefire had been mediated by Pakistan's prime minister and its military chief, he said. Iran had put forth a 10-point proposal, which the US views as "a workable basis on which to negotiate," Trump added. The next two weeks will allow a final agreement to

be drawn up, he said. As the ceasefire took effect on Wednesday, US Vice President JD Vance described it as a "fragile truce" that had taught him a lot about Iran. In an interview with AFP news agency Tuesday, Trump described the deal as "total and complete victory." But he would not say whether he would fulfill his prior threats to destroy Iran's civilian infrastructure if Tehran reneged on the agreement, only saying: "You're going to have to see." And in a later Truth Social post just past midnight, he said the US would be "helping with the traffic buildup in the Strait of Hormuz," adding: "Big money will be made". US sources told CNN that the Trump administration is preparing for potential in-person negotiations, likely in Islamabad – where Pakistan's prime minister has invited both sides to send delegations.

Israel is part of the ceasefire and will also suspend bombing against Iran, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's office said. But it also claimed Lebanon is not part of the ceasefire – contradicting Pakistan's prime minister, who said it was. Trump made no mention of Lebanon in his statement.

What has Iran said?

Iran's Foreign Minister, Abbas Araghchi, said that if attacks against Iran stop, Iranian operations will cease as well. The country's military will coordinate safe passage through the Strait of Hormuz during the ceasefire, he added in a post on X. Iran's semi-official Tasnim News Agency reported that Iran and Oman plan to charge transit fees for vessels passing through the strait during the ceasefire, with the funds earmarked for reconstruction. CNN has asked Oman's foreign ministry for comment. Iran's Supreme National Security Council, the country's top security body, had a more fiery statement – saying it had forced the US to accept its 10-point plan as a basis for talks and described the ceasefire as an "enduring defeat" for Washington. It also referenced possible talks in Islamabad – warning that "should the slightest error be committed by the enemy, it shall be met with full force."

What are the terms of the ceasefire? Araghchi said in his statement that while Washington had accepted the "general framework" of Iran's 10-point proposal as a "basis for negotiations," Iran was in turn considering a 15-point proposal from the US. The full details of the 15-point US plan have not been published but it is believed to include: Iran committing to no nuclear weapons, handing over its highly enriched uranium, limits on Tehran's defense capabilities, an end to regional proxy groups and the reopening of the Strait of Hormuz. Other points on the table include an acknowledgment of Israel's right to exist, the two regional sources said. Iran had previously rejected the 15-point plan, with one official describing the demands as "largely excessive, unrealistic and unreasonable" on Monday – despite Trump claiming in late March that Tehran had agreed to "most of" the points.

While the White House has not detailed what Iran's 10-point proposal consists of, Iran's Supreme National Security Council laid out key parts of the plan.

CNN obtained the statement from Iranian officials. It was also reported on by multiple Iranian state media outlets. It included regulating passage through the Strait of Hormuz; terminating attacks on Iran and its regional proxy forces; the withdrawal of US forces from the region; compensation to Iran; the lifting of international sanctions and unfreezing of assets; and a binding UN resolution to secure any ultimate peace deal. Some versions of the security council's statement that were widely distributed by Iranian state media in both Farsi and in English also include a claim by Iran of a right to nuclear enrichment. Iran's embassy in India also posted a breakdown of the 10 points on its verified X account that included "acceptance of enrichment." CNN has reached out to US officials and Iran's foreign's ministry for further comment. In his interview with AFP, Trump said Iran's uranium would be "perfectly taken care of or I wouldn't have settled."

Using Robert Entman's framing model, the following analysis examines the article through the four framing functions

1. Define problems: The report defines the problem as a major geopolitical crisis between the United States and Iran that escalated into a prolonged regional conflict, threatening Middle Eastern stability and causing global economic disruption. The ceasefire is presented not as a resolution, but as a temporary pause in a conflict characterized by deep political disagreements and unresolved security issues.
2. Diagnose causes: Responsibility is framed as shared and complex rather than assigned exclusively to one actor. The report presents the conflict as resulting from escalating tensions between the United States, Iran, and Israel, with disagreements over Iran's nuclear program, regional influence, military capabilities, and security concerns contributing to the crisis.
3. Make moral judgments: The report adopts a relatively balanced but critical tone. It presents both sides as claiming victory while emphasizing uncertainty and risks. Trump's threats against Iran's civilian infrastructure are presented as controversial and potentially violating international law, while Iran's military rhetoric and claims of victory are presented as examples of competing political narratives. Neither side is portrayed as entirely legitimate or illegitimate.
4. Suggest remedies: The report frames diplomatic negotiations as the necessary path forward. The ceasefire is presented as an opportunity to bridge differences, develop a final agreement, reopen the Strait of Hormuz, address nuclear concerns, and prevent renewed escalation.

Summarizing the four Entman's four functions, the article defines the problem as an unstable ceasefire following a major regional conflict. It explains the causes through competing strategic interests rather than attributing responsibility to a single actor. It evaluates the situation in terms of uncertainty, risk, and diplomatic necessity and presents negotiation as the only sustainable solution.

3. Analysis of BBC report

The British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) is a British public service broadcaster, established in 1922, serves as the primary national public broadcasting company of the United Kingdom (BBC, 2026). The BBC operates under a public service remit that emphasizes informing, educating and entertaining audiences. With global presence through its international news services, including BBC World Service, the BBC is one of the most influential international news organizations. For the purpose of this study, BBC coverage is analyzed as an example of international public service media reporting on the U.S. - Iran ceasefire and the broader crisis surrounding the Strait of Hormuz.

The following section analyzes the sixth article (VI), written by Kelly Ng - Singapore, Khashayar Joneidi - BBC Persian, Washington and Daniel De Simone - Jerusalem and published by BBC.

(VI.) What we know about the two-week ceasefire between the US and Iran

Iran and the US have agreed to a conditional two-week ceasefire, during which shipping traffic will be allowed through the Strait of Hormuz. This comes more than a month after the US and Israel launched coordinated attacks on Iran, and hours after US President Donald Trump threatened "a whole civilisation will die tonight" if Iran did not reopen the Strait. Pakistan's Prime Minister Shehbaz Sharif, who has been mediating negotiations, said early on Wednesday that the ceasefire was effective immediately. Here's what we know so far about the deal.

What have the US and Iran said?

Trump said he had agreed to "suspend the bombing and attack of Iran for a period of two weeks" if Tehran agrees to reopen the Strait of Hormuz, a vital shipping route for oil and other exports from the Gulf. In a post on Truth Social, Trump said he agreed to the provisional ceasefire because "we have already met and exceeded all military objectives". This comes after he earlier warned the US could take Iran out "in one night" and that a "whole civilisation will die tonight, never to be brought back again" - threats that drew condemnation from UN Secretary General António Guterres and Pope Leo XIV. Later on Wednesday, Trump said that the US will be working closely with Iran and "talking tariff and sanctions relief". On his Truth Social platform he added in a separate post that "a country supplying military weapons to Iran will be immediately tariffed, on any and all goods sold to the United States of America, 50%, effective immediately. There will be no exclusions or exemptions." US Defence Secretary Pete Hegseth said the US military would be making sure Iran complies with the ceasefire and comes to the table for a deal. Troops will

"stay put, stay ready, stay vigilant" and be "ready to re-start at a moment's notice", he added.

Iran has agreed to allow vessels through the Hormuz Strait for two weeks, with their passage coordinated by the Iranian military. The country has also issued a 10-point plan, which includes, among other things, the complete cessation of war in Iran, Iraq, Lebanon and Yemen; "full commitment" to lifting sanctions on Iran; the release of Iranian funds and frozen assets held by the US; and a "full payment of compensation for reconstruction costs" to Iran.

It also says, "Iran fully commits to not seeking possession of any nuclear weapons". "Iran's victory in the field would also be consolidated in political negotiations," Tehran's Supreme National Security Council said in a statement. According to Sharif, the ceasefire will also take effect in Lebanon, where Israel has been fighting the Iranian-backed armed group Hezbollah. Israel has backed the deal but says it "does not include Lebanon", renewing strikes on Wednesday in the Tyre and Nabatieh areas in the south of the country. Trump's press secretary Karoline Leavitt later also said that Lebanon was not included in the deal. The Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) promised a "regret-inducing response" if strikes on Lebanon continue.

What has Israel said?

Sirens sounded in Israel shortly after Trump's announcement, with the Israel Defense Forces saying they were intercepting missiles launched from Iran. Several loud booms were heard in Jerusalem late on Tuesday night. A few hours after the ceasefire was confirmed, Netanyahu said: "Israel supports President Trump's decision to suspend strikes against Iran for two weeks subject to Iran immediately opening the straits and stopping all attacks on the US, Israel and countries in the region." The statement added that the "ceasefire does not include Lebanon", where Israel has ground troops. It is unclear how involved Netanyahu was in Trump's decision-making but at a news conference later on Wednesday, the Israeli leader said the ceasefire came into effect "in full coordination with Israel". He added: "We have more goals to complete - and we will achieve them either by an agreement or by renewing the fighting. We are prepared to return to fighting at any moment necessary. Our finger is on the trigger."

What is next?

Pakistan, which has been mediating the negotiations, has invited the delegations to meet in Islamabad on Friday "to further negotiate for a conclusive agreement to settle all disputes". Leavitt acknowledged ongoing discussions about in-person talks, but said "nothing is final until announced by the President or the White House". She later announced that the US Vice President JD Vance would attend the talks, along with the president's envoy Steve Witkoff and his son-in-law Jared Kushner. Whatever form they take, negotiations are going to be very difficult. Strikes appeared to be continuing

after the ceasefire, as Kuwait on Wednesday morning reported Iranian attacks which damaged power and desalination plants as well as oil facilities.

"Kuwait air defences have been engaging an intense wave of hostile Iranian attacks, dealing with 28 drones targeting the State of Kuwait," the country's military said in a statement on X. The US and Iran appear to have contradicting positions on what this ceasefire entails. And Iran and the US have held two rounds of talks in the past year. Both times saw military tensions escalate in the middle of negotiations. The leaders of France, Italy, Germany, Britain, Canada, Denmark, the Netherlands, Spain and the EU welcomed the ceasefire and in a joint statement urged a "swift and lasting end" to the war. "We call upon all sides to implement the ceasefire, including in Lebanon," they said".

Applying Robert M. Entman's framing model, the following analysis evaluates the article according to its four framing functions.

1. Define problems: The report defines the problem as a fragile and conditional ceasefire following a month-long military conflict between the United States, Israel, and Iran. The central issue is not only ending hostilities but managing unresolved disputes over the Strait of Hormuz, sanctions, Iran's nuclear program, regional armed groups, and conflicting interpretations of the ceasefire terms.
2. Diagnose causes: The report presents the causes of the crisis as multi-dimensional and contested. It identifies the coordinated U.S. and Israeli attacks on Iran as the trigger for the conflict, while also highlighting Iran's retaliatory actions, its regional alliances, and disputes over nuclear activities and sanctions. Responsibility is not assigned exclusively to one actor, instead, the conflict is framed as the result of escalating strategic tensions among multiple actors.
3. Make moral judgments: The report adopts a relatively neutral but critical framing. It highlights controversial statements by Trump, including threats that were condemned by international actors, while also reporting Iran's military responses and Israel's continued readiness to resume attacks. All sides are portrayed as pursuing their own strategic interests, but the article emphasizes the risks posed by military escalation and violations of the ceasefire.
4. Suggest remedies: The report frames diplomatic negotiations and implementation of the ceasefire as the necessary path forward. Pakistan-mediated talks, international support for a lasting agreement, compliance with ceasefire terms, and further negotiations are presented as the mechanisms for preventing renewed conflict.

Summarizing the Entman's four framing functions, the article defines the problem as a fragile ceasefire following a regional conflict, attributes the crisis to competing strategic interests among multiple actors, adopts a relatively neutral but

critical stance toward all parties, and presents diplomacy, ceasefire implementation, and continued negotiations as the necessary path to lasting peace.

4. Comparative analysis of IRNA, CNN and BBC reports

This section compares the three media outlets. Before analyzing the articles, it is useful to first examine how their headlines frame the event.

Applying Entman's framing approach to the headlines of reports reveals a consistent pattern in IRNA's coverage. The headlines predominantly frame Iran as a legitimate, defensive, and successful actor, while portraying the United States and Israel as aggressors or adversaries. IRNA titles emphasize: Iranian victory (SNSC declares victory), U.S. weakness (Trump retreats), Iran defensive legitimacy (Iran will halt fire if attacks stop), continued deterrence (finger on trigger).

The CNN headline frames the event primarily as diplomatic process. The word wording "agreed a ceasefire" and "talks to bridge the gulf between them" emphasizes negotiation rather than victory or defeat. The headline neither attributes responsibility nor declares a winner, instead highlighting the need to resolve remaining differences through diplomacy.

The BBC headline adopts the most neutral and informational frame. Rather than emphasizing victory, defeat or negotiations, it simply introduces the ceasefire as a news event. The focus is on explaining the agreement rather than interpreting it. Compared with CNN, the BBC headline is even less evaluative and functions primarily as an informational frame, inviting readers to learn about the ceasefire rather than adopt a particular interpretation.

4.1. IRNA versus CNN reports

This section compares the framing of the U.S. - Iran ceasefire in IRNA and CNN reports by applying Entman's four framing functions.

1. Define problems: according to Iranian reports, U.S. and Israel committed aggression against Iran, while CNN article under the problem is defined as U.S. - Iran conflict created a regional crisis requiring diplomacy.
2. Diagnose causes: according to IRNA, responsibility lies mainly with U.S. and Israel, while CNN, causes are presented as interconnected disputes involving Iran, U.S. and Israel.
3. Make moral judgments: according to IRNA, Iran is legitimate defender while U.S. and Israel are aggressors. On the other hand, according to CNN, both sides use competing narratives and focus is on risks and political claims
4. Suggest remedies: according to IRNA it is important to maintain resistance, deterrence, and negotiate from strength, while CNN recommend to continue negotiations to transform ceasefire into lasting agreement.

The comparison demonstrates how the two media outlets construct different narratives of the same event, with IRNA emphasizing resistance and legitimacy,

while CNN focuses on diplomatic uncertainty and conflict management. The Iranian articles construct a clear victim–aggressor narrative, while CNN presents the conflict as a complex geopolitical confrontation involving competing interests and unresolved disputes.

4.2. IRNA versus BBC report

This section compares the framing of the U.S. - Iran ceasefire in IRNA and BBC reports by applying Entman’s four framing functions.

1. Define problems: According to Iranian reports the problem is defined as foreign aggression against Iran by the United States and Israel. The conflict is presented as an unjust war imposed on Iran, requiring resistance and national unity. On the other hand, BBC defines the problem as a fragile ceasefire after a major regional conflict, with unresolved disputes over nuclear issues, sanctions, the Strait of Hormuz, and regional security
2. Diagnose causes: in the IRNA reports responsibility is attributed mainly to the United States and Israel, whose actions are described as aggression, violations of international law and attacks against Iran. Iran’s military response is framed as defensive. In the BBC reports, causes are presented as multidimensional and contested, involving U.S.–Iran tensions, Israel’s security concerns, Iran’s nuclear program, regional alliances, and military escalation.
3. Make moral judgments: according to IRNA, Iran is portrayed as the legitimate defender and victor. The U.S. and Israel are morally condemned as aggressors. The Iranian leadership, armed forces, and population are praised for resistance and sacrifice. The BBC avoids a clear moral division. It presents competing claims from Iran, the United States and Israel, while emphasizing risks, threats, and uncertainty surrounding the ceasefire.
4. Suggest remedies: in the IRNA reports the solution is continued unity, military readiness, maintaining deterrence, and negotiations from a position of strength. Peace is possible only after recognition of Iran’s demands and security interests. In the BBC perspective the solution is diplomatic engagement, implementation of the ceasefire, and further negotiations mediated by international actors, particularly Pakistan.

The comparison demonstrates significant differences in the framing of the ceasefire by IRNA and BBC. IRNA constructs a victory and resistance frame, portraying Iran as a legitimate defender that successfully resisted foreign aggression and achieved strategic gains through military strength and national unity. In contrast, the BBC adopts a diplomatic uncertainty frame, presenting the ceasefire as a fragile and incomplete process shaped by competing interests and unresolved disputes. While IRNA emphasizes legitimacy, victory, and deterrence, the BBC focuses on negotiation, risk management, and the possibility of a lasting political settlement.

4.3. CNN versus BBC reports

This section compares the framing of the U.S. - Iran ceasefire in CNN and BBC reports by applying Entman's four framing functions.

1. Define problems: in the CNN frame the problem is defined as a fragile ceasefire that has not restored stability, particularly because uncertainty over the Strait of Hormuz continues to disrupt global shipping, energy markets and commercial activity. In the BBC frame, the problem is defined as a temporary ceasefire after a major regional war, with unresolved political disputes over nuclear issues, sanctions, regional security, and the terms of a final agreement.
2. Diagnose causes: According to CNN the causes are linked mainly to uncertainty after the conflict, lack of security guarantees, unclear procedures for reopening the Strait of Hormuz and concerns among shipping companies about renewed hostilities. According to BBC, the causes are presented as broader geopolitical tensions between Iran, the United States and Israel, including disputes over Iran's nuclear program, military capabilities, sanctions and regional influence.
3. Make moral judgments: CNN largely avoids moral judgments and evaluates the situation through the perspective of businesses, markets, and security risks. The main concern is whether conditions are safe enough for shipping and economic recovery. BBC also avoids a strong moral position but gives more attention to controversial political actions, such as Trump's threats, international criticism, and competing claims of victory by Iran, the U.S. and Israel.
4. Suggest remedies: in the CNN report the solution is framed as restoring confidence through security guarantees, clear navigation rules, and a stable ceasefire so that shipping and energy markets can recover. In the BBC narrative the solution is framed as continued diplomatic negotiations, mediation, and implementation of the ceasefire agreement to achieve a long-term political settlement.

Although both CNN and BBC cover the same event, the U.S. - Iran ceasefire, their framing differs in emphasis. Both adopt a relatively multi-perspective and conflict-management approach, unlike the IRNA reports, which present a clear state-centered narrative. However, CNN focuses more on the economic and geopolitical consequences of the conflict, while BBC focuses more on the uncertainty of diplomacy and ceasefire implementation.

Conclusion

Using Robert Entman's framing theory, this study examined how IRNA, CNN and BBC framed the announcement of the 8 April 2006 ceasefire between United States and Iran and produced the following findings and conclusions. The headlines of the analyzed articles illustrate how different media organizations make

different aspects of the same event salient. IRNA frames the ceasefire as evidence of Iranian victory, legitimate self-defense and continued military strength. The headlines define the conflict through a lens of resistance and political success. CNN frames the ceasefire as the beginning of a diplomatic process, emphasizing negotiation and the challenge of overcoming political differences. BBC frames the ceasefire as a significant but temporary development requiring explanation, privileging factual description over political interpretation. Thus, while all six headlines refer to the same ceasefire, they guide audiences toward different understandings of its meaning: IRNA emphasizes victory and legitimacy, CNN emphasizes diplomacy and conflict management, and BBC emphasizes factual reporting and the evolving nature of the agreement.

Regarding the content of the reports, the application of Robert Entman framing model demonstrates that IRNA, CNN, and BBC construct fundamentally different interpretations of the same ceasefire by emphasizing different aspects of reality. Although all three media outlets report on the same event, they differ in how they define the problem, assign responsibility, evaluate the actors, and propose solutions.

IRNA consistently employs a state-centered strategic frame. Across its report and headlines, the conflict is defined as an unlawful war imposed by the United States and Israel against Iran. Responsibility is attributed almost exclusively to external aggression, while Iran is portrayed as a legitimate victim that successfully defended itself. The ceasefire is framed as the outcome of Iranian military strength and political resilience rather than compromise. Consequently, the dominant themes are victory, resistance, national unity, deterrence, and legitimate self-defense. Negotiations are presented as occurring because Iran negotiated from a position of strength.

In contrast, CNN adopts a conflict-management and geopolitical frame. Rather than emphasizing victory or defeat, CNN portrays the ceasefire as a temporary opportunity for diplomacy amid unresolved strategic disagreements. Across its coverage, particular attention is given to the implications for the Strait of Hormuz, global energy markets and international commerce, while also highlighting competing political narratives from Washington and Tehran. Responsibility for the conflict is presented as more complex than in IRNA's reporting, and the preferred solution is sustained diplomacy supported by practical security guarantees and confidence-building measures.

Similarly, BBC employs a diplomatic uncertainty frame, but with a stronger emphasis on explaining the ceasefire itself and the political challenges surrounding its implementation. The BBC avoids adopting either the Iranian or American interpretation of events, instead presenting multiple perspectives and emphasizing that the agreement remains fragile and conditional. The report highlights mediation efforts, competing interpretations of the ceasefire, and the difficulties of achieving a comprehensive settlement. Its focus is less on economic consequences than CNN's and less on strategic legitimacy than IRNA's.

From Entman's perspective, these differences demonstrate that media framing is not simply a matter of reporting facts but of selecting which aspects of reality are made most salient. While the underlying event remains the same, IRNA encourages audiences to interpret it as a strategic victory for Iran, CNN frames it as a geopolitical and economic challenge requiring careful management and BBC presents it as a fragile diplomatic development whose ultimate outcome remains uncertain. These contrasting frames illustrate how different media organizations shape public understanding by emphasizing different problems, causes, evaluations, and solutions.

Bibliography

- BBC. (2026, April 10). *BBC*. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.co.uk/aboutthebbc>
- CNN. (2026). *CNN*. Retrieved from <https://edition.cnn.com/about>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- Entman, R. M. (2003). *Projections of power: Framing news, public opinion and U.S. foreign policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- IAE. (2026, February). IAE Retrieved from <https://www.iea.org/about/oil-security-and-emergency-response/strait-of-hormuz>
- IRNA. (2026, April 08). Araqchi: Iran will halt fire if attacks stop. Retrieved from <https://en.irna.ir/news/86121890/Araqchi-Iran-will-cease-fire-if-attacks-stop>
- IRNA. (2026, April 08). Iran's SNSC declares victory, urges national unity until outcome. Retrieved from <https://en.irna.ir/news/86122029/Iran-s-SNSC-declares-victory-urges-national-unity-until-outcome>
- IRNA. (2026, April 08). IRGC warns 'finger on trigger' if enemies make any mistake. Retrieved from <https://en.irna.ir/news/86122605/IRGC-warns-finger-on-trigger-if-enemies-make-any-mistake>
- IRNA. (2026). *Islamic Republic News Agency*. Retrieved May 7, 2026, from <https://en.irna.ir/news/85965303/>
- IRNA. (2026, April 8). Trump retreats, agrees to two-week Pakistan-proposed ceasefire. Retrieved from <https://en.irna.ir/news/86121887/Trump-retreats-agrees-to-two-week-Pakistan-proposed-ceasefire>
- Ng, K., De Simone, D., & Joneidi, K. (2026, April 08). What we know about the two-week ceasefire between the US and Iran. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/ce84z6y3ke4o>
- Yeung, J. (2026, April 08). The US and Iran have agreed a ceasefire, with talks to bridge the gulf between them. Here's what to know. Retrieved from <https://edition.cnn.com/2026/04/08/middleeast/us-iran-ceasefire-explainer-war-intl-hnk>