

TÜRKİYE CUMHURİYETİ
ANKARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
MEDYA VE İLETİŞİM ÇALIŞMALARI ANA BİLİM DALI

**FRAMING MAHSA AMINI PROTESTS IN TURKISH
CONSERVATIVE MEDIA**

Tezli Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Melisa Gülser NAZİK

Ankara, 2025

TÜRKİYE CUMHURİYETİ
ANKARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
MEDYA VE İLETİŞİM ÇALIŞMALARI ANA BİLİM DALI

**FRAMING MAHSA AMINI PROTESTS IN TURKISH
CONSERVATIVE MEDIA**

Tezli Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Melisa Gülser NAZİK

Tez Danışmanı
Prof. Dr. Besime Pınar ÖZDEMİR

Ankara, 2025

TÜRKİYE CUMHURİYETİ
ANKARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
MEDYA VE İLETİŞİM ÇALIŞMALARI ANA BİLİM DALI

**FRAMING MAHSA AMINI PROTESTS IN TURKISH CONSERVATIVE
MEDIA**

Tezli Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Tez Danışmanı
Prof. Dr. Besime Pınar ÖZDEMİR

TEZ JÜRİSİ ÜYELERİ

Adı ve Soyadı

İmzası

1- Prof. Dr. Besime Pınar ÖZDEMİR

2- Prof. Dr. Bedriye POYRAZ

3- Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nazmul ISLAM

Tez Savunma Tarihi

14/01/2025

T.C.
ANKARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü'ne,

Prof. Dr. Besime Pınar ÖZDEMİR danışmanlığında hazırladığım “FRAMING MAHSA AMINI PROTESTS IN TURKISH CONSERVATIVE MEDIA” adlı yüksek lisans tezimdeki bütün bilgilerin akademik kurallara ve etik davranış ilkelerine uygun olarak toplanıp sunduğumu, başka kaynaklardan aldığım bilgileri metinde ve kaynakçada eksiksiz olarak gösterdiğimi, çalışma sürecinde bilimsel araştırma ve etik kurallara uygun olarak davrandığımı, aksinin ortaya çıkması durumunda her türlü yasal sonucu kabul edeceğimi beyan ederim.

Tarih: 12/02/2025

Melisa Gülser Nazik

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Research Questions	4
Aim.....	4
Research Hypothesis	6
CHAPTER 1 MAHSA AMINI PROTESTS	7
1.1. History of Women's Movements in Iran	10
1.2. Turkey – Iran Relations.....	15
CHAPTER 2 MEDIA FRAMING.....	18
2.1. The Importance of Media Framing in Shaping Public Perception.....	20
2.2. Framing in Conservative Media.....	26
CHAPTER 3 MAHSA AMİNİ PROTESTS in TURKISH CONSERVATIVE MEDIA.....	29
3.1. An Overview of the Turkish Conservative Media	29
3.2. Framing Strategies.....	30
CHAPTER 4 FINDINGS	35
4.1. Yeni Şafak.....	35
4.1.1. Mahsa Amini in Yeni Şafak	36
4.2. Yeni Akit Newspaper	71
4.2.1. Mahsa Amini in Yeni Akit	72
4.3. Milli Gazete.....	104
4.3.1. Mahsa Amini in Milli Gazete	105
4.4. Türkiye Gazetesi	118
4.4.1. Mahsa Amini in Türkiye Gazetesi.....	119
DISCUSSION.....	137
CONCLUSION	143

REFERENCES.....	146
ABSTRACT.....	150
ÖZET	151



INTRODUCTION

Media has a significant impact on the perception and understanding of social events. Entman (1993) defines framing as "selecting some aspects of perceived reality and making them more salient in a communication text." This process is undertaken to identify specific issues, suggest causal interpretations, make moral evaluations, and/or propose solutions. These effects become more pronounced with the framing of news content, especially in conservative media.

Conservative media use frames that align with their ideological positions to help their audiences make sense of events. In media and media discourses, the intersection of conservatism and radicalism often appears in content that defends the preservation of a certain social or cultural order and emphasizes that this order is under threat. These narratives highlight the erosion of traditional values or social norms and may support or recommend harsh, even radical methods to preserve these values. In this context, some media organizations or commentators may justify more aggressive or radical actions by arguing that society is deteriorating and traditional values and norms need to be re-established.

In conservative media discourse, globalization and modernization are often portrayed as threats. These discourses suggest that foreign ideas or lifestyles endanger local culture and identity. As a result, some conservative media outlets may advocate a radical return to cultural roots, distancing themselves from global values. By emphasizing "foreign powers" or "foreign influences", the media can advocate social solidarity and a return to local values within the framework conservatism. Similarly, a media outlet that opposes changes to cultural or religious norms may use radical rhetoric to defend conservative values, framing advocates of change as "cultural enemies" or "enemies of society."

The media organizations selected for this study were examined from this perspective. This pattern has been frequently observed in the coverage of Mahsa Amini protests on selected news sites. Mahsa Amini's death in 2022 after she was detained by morality police in Iran triggered widespread outrage around the world. This tragic event ignited long-standing social tensions in Iran regarding women's rights, civil liberties, and state oppression. Mahsa Amini's death sparked widespread protests both in Iran and internationally, with demonstrations in support of the movement held in various countries (Amnesty International, 2022).

These protests resonated not only in Iran but all over the world, leading to solidarity demonstrations in different countries (BBC News, 2022). Reactions to the Mahsa Amini protests varied significantly between different countries, organizations and institutions; so is the media coverage of these events. While many organizations framed Amini's death and the subsequent protests in the context of women's rights, freedom, equality, and justice, others viewed the widespread international media coverage of these protests as a threat and subversion to the stability of the Iranian regime. The representation of these protests in the Turkish media also varied; newspapers with different perspectives framed and interpreted the events from various perspectives.

The Turkish conservative press, typically committed to Islamic values and conservative social norms, often reflects these ideological perspectives in its news. The conservative press in Turkey generally interprets international events from the perspective of Islamic identity and national values. Although the newspapers examined follow a conservative ideological line, they can resort to radical discourses when the traditional values of the society are eroded or threatened. In this context, although *Yeni Şafak* and *Türkiye* newspapers selected for this research continue their conservative line with more moderate discourses, it is possible to evaluate the radical discourses used by *Yeni Akit* and *Milli Gazete* from a different perspective.

Conservatism is a political and ideological approach that advocates the protection of social order. It basically emphasizes adherence to social, cultural and religious values and the preservation of existing structures and traditions. Such narratives, especially in reports on cultural or religious issues, can carry powerful messages about the need to reshape society.

Radical discourses, in particular, often encourage a divisive identity by causing individuals to develop hostile attitudes towards “other” groups. This phenomenon can also be explained by social identity theory, where individuals motivated by the desire to protect their own identity and the group they belong to can develop harsh attitudes towards outgroups (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Conservative media organizations, including selected newspapers, use strong and emotional language to mobilize society when faced with a situation perceived as a threat to the established order.

This type of language is a common technique used to provoke emotions such as anger, fear, or sadness and thereby support social movements against the element that potentially threatens that society (Lippmann, 1922). These discourses, which appeal to individuals and groups who fear that modern societies are at risk of losing their traditional values due to factors such as globalization, argue that conservative identity is built on preserving social ties and developing a sense of belonging. Mahsa Amini protests are perfect for examining conservative broadcasting organizations that can propose radical actions for the revival or preservation of traditional values.

It is common to encounter news stories that call on social movements or to launch protests against laws by adopting a harsh, even radical approach to resisting modern social changes. While this language aims to preserve the current order within a conservative framework, it also adopts radical strategies.

The aim of this study is to analyze how the Mahsa Amini protests were framed in the Turkish conservative press. For this purpose, news and opinion articles published on the websites of Turkey's four leading conservative newspapers were examined. The study aims to investigate the themes around which these protests are framed. This analysis will provide important information about the relationship between media and ideology. The focus is on understanding how the media's ideological stances and political leanings are reflected in the presentation of events.

Research Questions

RQ 1: How does the Turkish conservative media frame the Mahsa Amini protests?

RQ 2: How does the ideological stance of media organizations affect their framing practices?

Aim

By examining specific media organizations' articles on these protests, such as Yeni Şafak, Akit, Türkiye Gazetesi, and Milli Gazete, this study aims to uncover the strategies used in presenting the news, the themes that were highlighted, and the ideological perspectives adopted. These framing strategies will be discussed from the perspective of the ideologies of the media organs, thus revealing how the relations between the two countries shape the news discourse.

The emphasis on particular narratives in the media about particular countries often coincides with the government's interest in relations with those countries. As profit-oriented organizations, media organizations tend to avoid content that could harm or oppose the interests of the state and capital structures. Large media companies, in

particular, stay away from independent and critical journalism that could harm the interests of their owners. This ownership structure causes media organizations to operate in line with certain economic interests (Herman and Chomsky, 1988).

In this study, it is possible to view this dimension of manufacturing consent not as an internally generated national consensus but as one based on cooperation grounded in Islamic faith. Conservative news sites emphasize concepts such as external enemies and national security while identifying the Western world as the enemy.

Reese and Lewis (2009) emphasize that the framing strategies used by the media in foreign news are directly linked to the government's foreign policy narratives. The media presents events in certain countries from a particular perspective, shaped by government relations and interests. While a more positive tone is used for allied countries, a more critical tone is preferred for countries seen as rivals in foreign policy (Reese and Lewis, 2009).

The relationship between media and foreign policy can show significant differences between conservative and liberal media organizations, which are shaped by ideological distinctions. This difference is especially evident in terms of proximity to the government's foreign policy discourse, level of criticism and framing of international events. In general, conservative media outlets tend to adopt language closer to the government's stance, aligning with the government's rhetoric, especially on national security and foreign policy issues.

Conservative media organizations generally use language consistent with the government's discourse on issues such as national security, foreign policy, and nationalism. Approaches such as indexing theory and the propaganda model explain how these media organizations shape their news in line with the government's foreign policy goals (Bennett, 1990; Herman and Chomsky, 1988).

In the light of this information, it is aimed to examine that how the relations between the media and foreign policy, the position of the media organizations towards the government shape international news, and what kind of discourses and attitudes conservative newspapers use when it comes to religious issues and the Islamic order by conducting a literature review and examining the news on the websites of selected media organizations.

Research Hypothesis

H1: Conservative media use a pro-government framing strategy to present political events and actors positively.

H2: Conservative media frame terrorism and security events in the context of national security and patriotism. This framing increases public support for security policies and government security measures.

H3: The framing strategies of conservative media reinforce a pro-government stance in discussions on human rights and freedoms. These framings negatively affect the perception of opposition movements and human rights defenders in Turkey.

CHAPTER 1

MAHSA AMINI PROTESTS

Mahsa Amini died on September 16, 2022, after being detained by Iranian morality police for allegedly wearing "inappropriate clothing". This incident sparked widespread protests both in Iran and around the world. Amini's death intensified anger over women's rights violations and the compulsory headscarf law in Iran and became the main motivation for the protests.

The protests are rooted in Iran's long-standing crackdown on women's rights and civil liberties. Understanding the history of women's rights in Iran is crucial to understanding why the Mahsa Amini protests sparked such a widespread and powerful response. In the early 20th century, women in Iran made some gains in education and social life. In the 1930s, women's participation in education and the workforce was encouraged within the scope of Reza Shah Pahlavi's modernization policies. During this period, women gained more educational opportunities and greater visibility in public life.

However, these modernization policies also included interventions in traditional dress codes, including the forced removal of the headscarf (Paidar, 1995:130). The 1979 Islamic Revolution significantly restricted women's rights in Iran. Before the revolution, Iranian women had made significant progress in areas such as education and workforce participation.

However, the implementation of sharia law after the revolution greatly limited women's public and private lives. During this period, women began to resist the oppressive policies of the state.

This resistance, led by educated women and activists, raised awareness about women's social and political rights. However, state oppression and sharia laws made this struggle even more difficult (Afary, 2009). After the revolution, compulsory veiling and strict regulation of women's behavior in public became central issues in the struggle for women's rights.

The 1990s and 2000s were important turning points for the women's movement in Iran. During this time, women became more organized, especially in education and civil society. Various women's organizations established during this period further strengthened the struggle for women's rights. The One Million Signature Campaign raised widespread awareness of women's civil rights (Tohidi, 2016).

Mahsa Amini's death after being detained by the morality police in 2022 was a turning point for the women's movement in Iran. Her death sparked widespread protests against mandatory hijab laws and the repressive policies of the state. These protests evolved into a broader movement under the slogan "Women, Life, Freedom" and became a symbol of widespread resistance against the current regime in Iran (Tajali, 2023).

The protests that started after Mahsa Amini's death on September 16, 2022, spread rapidly. The demonstrations, which initially started in Amini's hometown of Saqqez, soon spread to other cities in Iran. Large-scale protests were held in major cities such as Tehran, Shiraz, Isfahan and Tabriz. During the demonstrations, women expressed their anger by taking off their headscarves and burning them.

In the early days of the protests, Iranian security forces reacted harshly to the demonstrators. However, these interventions further fueled the protests, making them more intense and widespread. By the end of September, protests had spread across the country and attracted international attention.

Protesters took to the streets with the slogan "Women, Life, Freedom", which summarizes the main theme of the protests (The Guardian, 2022).

Human rights defenders and activists were among the prominent actors of the protests. Iran's prominent human rights lawyers and non-governmental organizations defended the legitimacy of the protests by criticizing the government's repressive policies. These actors called for international support to stop the Iranian government's crackdown.

On the government side, Iranian President Ibrahim Raisi and Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei played key roles in suppressing the protests.

Security forces and Revolutionary Guards worked actively to control the protests. The government took harsh measures against protesters to prevent the demonstrations from spreading. At the beginning of the protests, the Iranian government described Mahsa Amini's death as a "tragic event" and announced that the incident would be independently investigated. However, government officials and state media soon began to discredit the protesters, labeling the protests as instigated by "foreign agents" and "enemies of the state" (Al Jazeera, 2022).

Iranian President Ibrahim Raisi called the protests "conspiracies to destabilize the state," while Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei similarly claimed that "foreign forces" were behind the unrest (Reuters, 2022).

Iranian Interior Minister Ahmed Vahidi stated that the security forces will take all necessary measures to suppress the protests and called on the public to "obey the law". The harsh interventions and arrests of the security forces were harshly criticized by international human rights organizations. State media emphasized that the protests harmed the country's economy and social order and encouraged the public not to participate in the demonstrations.

1.1. History of Women's Movements in Iran

In order to have a comprehensive understanding of the Mahsa Amini protests in Iran, the factors that pave the way for these protests need to be examined in detail. This requires analysis of periods and events in Iranian history that led to significant changes in human rights and women's rights.

During the Pahlavi Period, which was initiated by Reza Shah Pahlavi's efforts to transform Iran into a modern state by taking the West as an example, modern educational institutions were established, the army was strengthened, some traditional clothing items were banned and Western-style practices were implemented to increase the social roles of women.

These reforms accelerated Iran's modernization process, but also led to discontent among conservative segments of society (Amanat, 1997). In addition, Reza Shah aimed to strengthen the economy by investing in infrastructure and industry. Railways were built, industrialization was encouraged, agricultural production was increased. However, these modernization efforts did not bring prosperity to a large portion of the population, and rural communities in particular remained largely excluded from the benefits of modernization. Moreover, Reza Shah's authoritarian rule, which suppressed opposition voices, led to increased public anger (Milani, 2011: 52-55).

During World War II, Reza Shah was forced to abdicate under pressure from the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, and his son, Mohammad Reza Shah, came to power. The young Shah continued his father's pro-Western and modernization-oriented policies. He tried to strengthen Iran's position in the international arena by establishing close relations with Western countries. However, this alliance with the West caused a backlash among nationalist and religious circles that resisted Western influence (Takeyh, 2009).

In 1963, Mohammad Reza Shah launched a comprehensive package of reforms called the "White Revolution". This initiative included land reforms, women's suffrage, literacy campaigns, and the promotion of modern industry. The White Revolution accelerated steps towards Westernization and secularization, but these reforms faced strong opposition from the Shiite clergy and rural population. Ayatollah Khomeini, in particular, strongly criticized these reforms, accusing the Shah of disrespecting religious values and ignoring the will of the people (Arjomand, 1984). While the reforms implemented during the reign of Mohammad Reza Shah strengthened the country economically, increasing opposition emerged due to the oppressive and authoritarian structure of the government. Growing discontent with the Shah's regime and the growing influence of Islamic ideology laid the foundation for the Islamic Revolution in Iran.

By the late 1970s, economic problems, social injustice, and political repression in Iran fueled widespread popular opposition. Both the left and the clergy united against the Shah's pro-Western policies and modernization efforts.

Although Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini was exiled in 1964, his sermons continued to have deep repercussions in society and strengthened the idea of an Islamic state. Khomeini's sermons invoked a religious ideological framework that mobilized the religious sentiments of the people (Arjomand, 1984). Mass protests and strikes that began in 1978 eventually forced the Shah to leave the country. On February 1, 1979, Ayatollah Khomeini returned to Iran from exile and assumed leadership of the revolution. Shortly after, the Islamic Revolution succeeded and the Islamic Republic of Iran was declared.

Under Khomeini's leadership, an Islamic state was established, replacing the pro-Western regime with a theocracy based on religious authority (Takeyh, 2009).

The new government restructured society according to sharia, women's roles in society were restricted, strict measures were taken to limit Western influence, and religious principles became dominant in many areas, including the media and education.

In modern Iran, there is an ongoing power struggle between reformist and conservative groups. While reformers advocate greater freedom in society and improved relations with the West, conservatives emphasize the need to promote Islamic values. This dynamic remains a central factor shaping Iran's domestic policy. In 2009, the reformist opposition organized a large protest under the banner of the "Green Movement", demonstrating the strength of reformist demands in Iran, but the movement was eventually suppressed (Takeyh, 2009).

The Green Movement's largest demonstrations were concentrated in major cities such as Tehran; Millions of people participated in peaceful protests against the government's repressive policies. However, the Iranian government responded to this with serious pressure. Security forces intervened and arrested several protesters; some of them died as the movement faced serious repression. The widespread use of social media and the internet during this period led the Iranian government to restrict internet access and block social media platforms (Arjomand, 2009).

The Green Movement has received significant attention in global media and broad support from the international community. Especially Western countries made statements emphasizing the importance of defending democratic rights in Iran.

International media followed the developments in Iran closely and covered the extent of the protests. This led the Iranian government to label the movement a "foreign conspiracy" and cast doubt on its legitimacy.

Although the Green Movement did not directly lead to political change, it left a lasting impact on Iranian society. The suppression of the movement and the house arrest of its leaders weakened the reformist movements in Iran. However, the Green Movement voiced the Iranian people's demands for political change and reform, strengthening the calls for democracy and freedom within the country.

One of the important contributions of the Green Movement was to embed the demand for reform in social memory and to encourage the desire for change, especially among the younger generations. The movement inspired subsequent protests and demands for reform in Iran throughout the 2010s and revived discussions of regime change.

Different demands emerged regarding women's rights in the 2010s. Women sought more rights and opportunities in social life and tried to make their voices heard through certain social media campaigns and social movements. During this period, protests against the headscarf obligation and other social restrictions attracted attention. Debates regarding women's roles and rights in society have become part of broader demands for reform (Bashiriyeh, 2016). Protests against the mandatory dress code, especially the mandatory veiling, have increased.

Women opposed the mandatory dress code, demanding that the headscarf law be repealed or made more flexible. Through campaigns such as “White Wednesdays” and “My Stealthy Freedom”, women raised their voices for gender equality and individual freedoms (Sadeghi, 2019). These campaigns leveraged the power of social media to reach large audiences and garner international support.

The White Wednesdays campaign was launched in 2017 by Iranian journalist and activist Masih Alinejad. Alinejad started this movement on social media with the hashtag #WhiteWednesdays to raise awareness about Iran's mandatory headscarf law. The

campaign aimed to encourage women to protest the compulsory headscarf law by wearing a white headscarf or white clothes every Wednesday.

It was seen that women in Iran participated in the White Wednesdays movement, which quickly gained widespread support through social media, by either wearing a white headscarf or sharing photos without a headscarf. White Wednesdays raise social awareness and emphasize that women need to have more control over their own bodies. This movement initiated by Alinejad became a symbol of solidarity among Iranian women against the compulsory headscarf law (Najmabadi, 2018).

The Iranian government took harsh measures against women who participated in the White Wednesday movement. Some women who participated in the protests were arrested and cases were filed against them. Despite this, women's rights advocates and supporters continued their protests on social media. Participants in the campaign criticized the religiously repressive policies of the Iranian government, describing mandatory hijab as a violation of human rights.

The My Stealthy Freedom campaign reflected a desire for fundamental change in Iranian society. Women who shared photos wearing headscarves expressed their solidarity against social oppression as well as their commitment to individual freedom. The campaign has become a tool of resistance that allows Iranian women to assert their rights over their own bodies. This movement strengthened the ongoing struggle against compulsory hijab in Iran (Shirazi, 2019). This movement, which received wide coverage in the Western media, also received support from human rights organizations and feminist groups. This support helped the campaign gain a wider base in Iran. Meanwhile, conservative media in Iran criticized the movement and called it a “pro-Western conspiracy” in an effort to weaken its influence (Kian-Thiébaud, 2019).

The Iranian government has tried to harshly suppress anti-hijab campaigns. Women who participated in this campaign faced arrest, fines and even imprisonment. Masih Alinejad was targeted by the Iranian government and had to take measures to ensure his safety even abroad.

One of the important events that continued the impact of the White Wednesdays and My Stealthy Freedom movements was the wave of protests that broke out after the death of 22-year-old Mahsa Amini after being detained by the morality police in 2022. Amini's death sparked widespread outrage across Iran and sparked a broad wave of protests that combined demands for women's rights with calls for individual freedoms.

1.2. Turkey – Iran Relations

Turkey's relations with Iran's elected government primarily develop through official diplomacy, economic cooperation, and border security. Energy trade and economic collaboration form the backbone of these relations. Turkey continues to import oil and natural gas from Iran to meet its energy needs, while also seeking to strengthen ties with Iran in areas such as trade and tourism. Although these collaborations are pursued based on the mutual economic needs of both countries, there are some limitations due to the limited influence of the Iranian government over foreign policy. The Syrian issue serves as an example of these limitations. Turkey's efforts to find common ground with the Iranian government are restricted by the Islamic regime's strategy to increase Shiite influence in Syria.

Turkey's relations with the Iranian Islamic regime, however, are shaped more by strategic competition and ideological differences. While the Iranian Islamic regime conducts its regional policies with the aim of strengthening the Shiite axis, it seeks to expand its influence in the region through military and ideological institutions like the Revolutionary

Guard Corps (Alfoneh, 2013: 45-50). This occasionally leads to tensions between Turkey and the Iranian regime. Since the strategic goals of the Iranian Islamic regime do not align with Turkey's Sunni-centered alliances in the Middle East, Turkey-Iran relations vary at the levels of government and regime (Ehteshami & Zweiri, 2011). Turkey does not pursue ideological alignment with the Islamic regime but instead forms strategic partnerships aimed at limiting the regime's influence.

The 1979 Iranian Islamic Revolution was a significant turning point in Turkey-Iran relations. The establishment of the Islamic regime in Iran highlighted ideological differences between the two countries, as Turkey maintained a secular governance structure. After the revolution, Iran adopted a new foreign policy based on Shiite Islam and took steps to increase its regional influence (Keddie, 2003). During this period, relations between the two countries entered a cold phase as Turkey remained cautious regarding Iran's attempts to export its revolution.

Despite Turkey's neutral stance during the 1980-1988 Iran-Iraq War, this period led to an indirect rapprochement between the two nations. Turkey increased trade with Iran to protect its economic interests. Iran, in turn, developed a favorable view of Turkey for adhering to its principle of neutrality and was open to cooperation with Turkey on border security.

Starting in the mid-1990s, especially with the increasing activities of the PKK in Iran, Turkey and Iran initiated limited cooperation in counter-terrorism efforts (Ehteshami & Zweiri, 2011). Both countries faced security concerns due to the activities of groups like the PKK and its Iranian affiliate, PJAK, and recognized the need to collaborate on ensuring border security. This security cooperation had a confidence-building effect on Turkey-Iran relations, contributing to a revival of their bilateral relations.

The Syrian civil war, which began in 2011, once again highlighted the differences in Turkey and Iran's foreign policies. While Turkey supported the Syrian opposition against the Bashar al-Assad regime, Iran became Assad's strongest ally (Chubin, 2012). To protect its interests in Syria, Iran provided direct military support to the Assad regime through the Quds Force of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. This divergence in Syria increased the rivalry between the two countries and strained their relations. However, in 2017, with the start of the Astana process, Turkey and Iran, under Russia's mediation, initiated discussions aimed at stabilizing the Syrian crisis.

The nuclear agreement (JCPOA) signed between Iran and the P5+1 countries in 2015 marked a new phase in economic relations between Turkey and Iran. However, the U.S. withdrawal from the agreement in 2018 and the re-implementation of sanctions led to renewed restrictions on Turkey-Iran economic relations.

In 2021, the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan and the Taliban's rise to power prompted Turkey and Iran to once again cooperate within the framework of regional security. Both countries felt the need to secure their borders against a potential influx of refugees and the threat of terrorism originating from Afghanistan. In this context, Turkey and Iran sought ways to collaborate to address security risks stemming from Afghanistan. This process of shared security concerns created a temporary foundation for cooperation between the two countries.

CHAPTER 2

MEDIA FRAMING

Media framing refers to the process by which news, events, and issues are presented from a specific perspective or angle by the media. In this process, media outlets use certain themes, images, and language strategies to convey events and issues to the audience. Framing significantly influences how audiences perceive and interpret these events and issues (Entman, 1993). Frames have various uses including transmitter, text, receiver and culture. These components of the framing process, which consists of different stages (frame establishment, frame determination, results of framing at individual and social levels) are integral parts of framing (d'Angelo, 2002; Scheufele, 2000; de Vreese, 2002). states. Media framing encompasses the way news is presented and the impact this presentation has on the audience. The positive or negative framing of an event can affect how the audience feels and reacts to it (Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007: 9-20).

The theory of media framing can be traced back to the work of Erving Goffman. Goffman suggested that individuals use frames to make sense of social reality (Goffman, 1974). These frames are defined as mental structures that help individuals interpret events and situations. Media framing theory expands on this concept by examining how media content influences how audiences frame and interpret events. Robert Entman's framing theory posits that the media can highlight certain aspects of information through selection and presentation, while downplaying others, thus guiding audience attention (Entman, 1993). According to Entman, framing consists of four main elements: defining the issue, diagnosing causes, making moral judgments, and suggesting remedies. These elements determine how media content is perceived by the audience.

James Tankard has proposed that framing can be analyzed through the structural features of news and content analysis (Tankard, 2001). In this context, framing analysis is a critical method for understanding how the media presents a specific event. Matthes and Schemer (2012) show that media framing shapes voters' perceptions of candidates and policies during political campaigns. This theory argues that the media not only provides information but also shapes how the audience interprets this information within a specific context.

There are two approaches used in analyses to examine news frames (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000:95-100). As de Vreese and others (2001) state, these approaches are based on the distinction between issue-specific (formal) news frames that emerge through an inductive approach and generic frames that arise from a deductive approach. Issue-specific frames are only related to certain topics or news events, while generic frames can be adapted to a broad range of topics and even different cultural contexts. In the first approach, it is preferred to scan, classify, and subject to general interpretation all framing actions that occur within a specific topic, period, and channel.

In the second approach, it is preferred to group and search for certain frames reflected in the literature or identified in preliminary research, according to the research objectives, regarding the issue or topic, theme, or themes in question.

In the inductive approach, the news story is analyzed with an open perspective to reveal all possible framing options (Entman, 1993). This approach begins with loosely defined conceptual frameworks for frames. Accordingly, it can identify many possible ways a topic might be framed, but this method is typically used in larger studies, often relying on small samples, and it is also difficult to replicate.

In the deductive approach, the focus is on investigating the extent to which certain frequently recurring frames in the literature are present in the news. The results obtained

with this approach are more replicable. It is applied to larger samples and allows for easier identification of framing differences in the news.

In this study, both deductive and inductive approaches were used together in the sections where news texts were analyzed. However, during classification and evaluation of the findings, frequently recurring frames were categorized as those widely discussed in the literature.

2.1. The Importance of Media Framing in Shaping Public Perception

Framing theory examines how news and information presented in the media are structured, what elements are emphasized, and what perspectives are foregrounded (Entman, 1993).

Framing considers not only the way information is presented but also the effects of that information on individuals and the public. Framing sets the stage for priming; because when the media emphasizes the information it frames about a particular topic, this highlighted information affects how audiences evaluate the topic. Framing creates viewers' perceptions of a topic by presenting it in a particular way. This framing also drives the priming effect. For example, if a news outlet frames an event in terms of social injustice, this framing encourages viewers to pay more attention to the social justice aspects of this event. Thus, the information framed influences how audiences will evaluate and make decisions about the event (Iyengar & Kinder, 1987; Entman, 1993). Priming is the process by which media emphasizes a particular issue or feature, enabling audiences to use those highlighted elements more effectively in evaluating or making decisions about that issue. In short, the more information the media provides on a topic, the more likely it is that that information will influence how audiences evaluate that topic. Another term that strengthens the priming effect and that we can use to explain the effect

of media framing on public opinion is echo chambers, because members of echo chambers receive information only through certain frames or perspectives. This further strengthens the priming effects that support their existing views. For example, if a person only follows right-wing news sources, those sources will consistently highlight a particular policy or political view. This increases the likelihood that one will use the information presented in this context when evaluating these policies or views. In this context, echo chambers enable individuals to receive information within certain frameworks, and these frameworks become stronger with the echo effect. Echo chamber is a term used to describe closed communication circles where individuals encounter only information and ideas that support their views. This phenomenon is frequently seen on online platforms such as forums or web sites. Users can avoid exposure to different perspectives by interacting with people who share the same views. Sunstein (2001) defined echo chambers as a media environment in which individuals are surrounded by information that only reinforces and confirms their own views. This may cause individuals to shift towards more extreme views and increase social polarization. The echo effect describes the process of repetition and strengthening of information and ideas in these closed environments, which occurs as a result of echo chambers. Consistently representing information from the same perspectives can increase individuals' confidence in that information. Additionally, this effect can also be observed at the societal level; Especially in polarized societies, the constant repetition of certain views through the media can lead large segments of society to adopt these views. The echo effect can cause information to be accepted without questioning its accuracy, increasing the risk of misinformation spreading. Particularly when misinformation or conspiracy theories are constantly repeated in echo chambers, individuals are likely to begin to believe this information (Del Vicario et al., 2016). This contributes to a media environment in which the process of questioning the accuracy of information is weakened and truth is replaced

by lies and manipulative information. The relationship between echo effect and media framing relies on individuals reinforcing the views they hold. However, framing can cause not only the repetition and reinforcement of the same views, but also a change in the attitudes and opinions of the opinions. Media framing plays a crucial role in shaping public perceptions and influencing public opinion. By presenting events within a specific frame, the media guides how audiences perceive and interpret these events. The power of framing to change people's views is especially evident through the frames used in the news. In one of his pioneering studies investigating how frames used in media reports influence public opinion, Iyengar (1991) examined the differences between "thematic" and "episodic" framing. While thematic frames present an event in its general context, episodic frames present the event with individual and specific examples. Iyengar's findings showed that thematic frames lead individuals to view an event as a systemic problem, while episodic frames cause individuals to attribute personal responsibility. Such framing can change individuals' perspectives because it affects the way they interpret events. Later studies also supported the power of framing to change individuals' attitudes. Druckman (2001) examined with an experimental study how different frames can lead to different conclusions about the same event. For example, presenting a policy decision in terms of "public safety" caused individuals to evaluate that policy more positively, whereas when the same policy was framed as a "violation of individual rights," individuals had a more negative attitude. This study shows that framing not only reinforces existing beliefs but can also cause individuals to make a new assessment of these events and change their views. Framing also influences how individuals make sense of a particular issue.

Kahneman and Tversky (1984) discussed the power of framing in decision-making processes and showed that presenting the same information in different ways (gain-oriented or loss-oriented) can significantly change people's decisions. This is especially

important for influencing public opinion because when the media or politicians present an issue in different ways, they can change people's minds about it.

Another study examining the effect of framing on opinion change was conducted by Nelson, Clawson, and Oxley (1997). Using experimental methods, researchers have examined the impact of media frames on attitudes about racial minorities and social policy. The results revealed that different frames significantly changed individuals' attitudes on certain social policy issues. Emotional or moral frameworks, in particular, have been shown to have the potential to change previously held views of individuals. Also when a protest movement is framed by the media as "violent" or "peaceful," the way audiences evaluate that movement can vary significantly (de Vreese, 2005).

Similarly, media framing is also important in the context of political events and election campaigns. Matthes and Schemer (2012) demonstrate how media framing shapes voters' perceptions of candidates and policies during political campaigns. Framing strategies can be used to craft a candidate's image and influence how the public perceives certain policies. Media framing also plays a significant role in how social movements and protest actions are perceived.

The Mahsa Amini protests were framed differently by various media outlets around the world. While the conservative press in Turkey often framed these protests from the perspective of Islamic values and national security, international media tended to frame them within the context of human rights and freedoms. These different frames significantly influenced how audiences perceived and reacted to the protests.

Analyzing the framing of protest-related news is a critical tool for understanding how media present social events and how these presentations impact public opinion. When the media use different frames to present protests, they channel audiences' perceptions and reactions in a specific direction.

In this context, several key frames frequently used in protest-related news emerge: "law and order," "violence and threat," "civil rights," and "systemic oppression" frames are among the most commonly employed strategies by the media. The "law and order" frame, used in the coverage of protests, typically presents these events as threats to public order. This framing strategy depicts protests as actions that disrupt social peace and legitimizes the state's use of force to counter such movements. This type of framing is particularly favored by pro-government media outlets, as it justifies state interventions to maintain security. The law and order frame often portrays protesters as "illegal" or "threats to social order," which can lead audiences to develop negative attitudes towards the protests (McLeod & Detenber, 1999). This framing strategy is an effective tool for legitimizing state authority and the actions of security forces. Another common way the media frame protests is through the "violence and threat" frame. In this frame, protests are often portrayed as violent or as events that pose a threat to society. When the media depict protesters as "violent" or "radical," it leads audiences to view these events in a negative light. The violence and threat frame encourages the public to support harsher measures against such events and justifies security forces' interventions (Boyle et al., 2004). This type of framing criminalizes protests, which in turn fosters greater antipathy towards protesters.

A different and widely used framing strategy is the "civil rights" frame. In this frame, protests are presented as struggles to defend fundamental rights and freedoms. The media portrays protesters as "rights seekers" and "justice demanders," presenting these events as legitimate and necessary social responses. The civil rights frame is particularly prominent in the coverage of protests related to human rights violations, democracy, and freedom struggles. This type of framing elicits sympathy from audiences towards protesters and garners support for their demands (Gitlin, 1980). The civil rights frame plays an important role in legitimizing protests and gaining widespread public support.

Among the ways the media frame protests is the "systemic oppression" frame, which presents these events as resistance against systemic injustices faced by a particular group or community. In this frame, protesters are depicted as individuals fighting against the oppression imposed by the current political or economic system. The systemic oppression frame is often used in the coverage of protests organized by minority groups, labor rights advocates, or environmental activists. This framing strategy helps audiences empathize with the protesters and be more receptive to their demands (Snow & Benford, 1988).

The systemic oppression frame encourages viewing protests as part of a broader struggle for social transformation and increases public support for these events. Media framing plays a critical role in shaping public perception of protests. The frames the media choose to use determine how audiences perceive and respond to these events.

The law and order frame presents protests as threats to public order, while the civil rights frame depicts them as struggles for rights and freedoms. The violence and threat frame portrays protesters as radical and dangerous, while the systemic oppression frame presents protests as part of a broader social transformation struggle.

The media's choice of frame significantly influences how audiences perceive protests and the attitudes they develop towards these events. Therefore, understanding how protests are framed by the media is vital for understanding how social events and movements are shaped by the media and how they influence public opinion.

In this context, media framing is crucial for understanding how the media presents events and the impact of these presentations on the audience. Framing demonstrates that the media not only transmit information but also guide audiences in interpreting that information. Therefore, media framing plays a central role in the perception of social events and issues and in shaping public opinion.

2.2. Framing in Conservative Media

Framing strategies in conservative media refer to the process by which news, events, and issues are presented from a particular ideological perspective.

In this process, media outlets emphasize specific values and ideologies to shape the perceptions and attitudes of their audience. Conservative media framing strategies focus particularly on themes such as the preservation of religious values, national identity, social order, and the family structure. These strategies enable media outlets to exert a strong influence on their audience and support a specific political agenda. In this context, academic research on framing in conservative media deeply analyzes how this process works and what effects it produces.

One frequently highlighted theme in studies on framing in conservative media is the preservation of religious values and the central role these values play in maintaining social order. Conservative media often frame human rights issues from the perspective of protecting religious and national values. This approach indicates that conservative media aim to shape public opinion in a particular ideological direction by presenting social events through the lens of these values.

Another important aspect of framing strategies in conservative media is the emphasis on preserving national identity and social order. In this context, conservative media highlight national identity and support policies aimed at maintaining social order. Particularly in cases where national security and social order are perceived to be under threat, conservative media frame these events as potential dangers to national identity and social order. Such framing strategies shape audience perceptions of events and serve to legitimize a specific political agenda (Yavuz, 2003). The protection of the family structure also holds a significant place in the framing strategies of conservative media

outlets. The media portray the family as the cornerstone of social order and emphasize the need to protect this structure.

In this context, conservative media depict processes like modernization and Westernization as threats to the traditional family structure. This strategy becomes particularly pronounced during periods when anti-Western rhetoric gains strength. Through these framing strategies, the media emphasize to their audience the importance of preserving traditional values in the face of demands for social change (Sözeri, 2016). This allows conservative media outlets to develop a resistance to social change and present this resistance as a legitimate stance to their audience.

In addition to the protection of religious values, framing strategies in conservative media also play a crucial role in the marginalization of certain social groups. Secular segments or liberal groups, for instance, are often framed as "threats" or "enemies" by conservative media. These framing strategies lead conservative audiences to develop negative attitudes toward these groups and to hold more tightly to their own values.

The media can deepen social polarization through such framing and encourage audiences to develop hostile attitudes toward specific groups (Hoover & Lundby, 1997). These strategies demonstrate how effectively conservative media outlets can reproduce and reinforce social power relations and enable audiences to evaluate events from a specific ideological perspective and contribute to the strengthening of this perspective in public opinion. Elements such as family values, religion, national identity, and traditional norms are highlighted through framing by conservative media, conveying the message that these values must be protected. Moreover, framing strategies developed against processes like modernization and Westernization reinforce the conservative media's resistance to social change and present this resistance as a legitimate stance to the audience. At the same time, the marginalization of certain social groups reveals how conservative media deepens

social polarization and the effects of this process on audiences. The effective use of these strategies helps conservative media outlets fulfill their ideological functions and enables audiences to adopt a particular worldview.



CHAPTER 3

MAHSA AMİNİ PROTESTS in TURKISH CONSERVATIVE MEDIA

3.1. An Overview of the Turkish Conservative Media

With the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, state policies on secularization imposed restrictions on religiously oriented publications. During this period, conservative media remained mostly marginal and effective only on a local level. However, with the transition to a multi-party political system in 1946, conservative media began to gain momentum. With the rise of the Democrat Party to power, conservative values and religious elements became more prominent in the media (Özdalga, 2006). From the 1950s onward, conservative media outlets in Turkey began to promote Islamist ideologies. Notably, the *Büyük Doğu* magazine, under the leadership of Necip Fazıl Kısakürek, played a significant role in the development of Islamist thought. During this period, Islamist media outlets adopted a critical stance against the secular order and Westernization policies (Şen, 2010). After the military coup in 1980, significant changes occurred in Turkey's political climate. With the rise to power of the Motherland Party under Turgut Özal, conservative media outlets began to reach a broader audience. Özal pursued a political approach more aligned with Islamist and conservative values, encouraging the dissemination of these values through the media to the broader society (Yavuz, 2003). During this period, framing strategies focused on themes such as the preservation of the traditional family structure, opposition to the West, and the defense of Islamic identity (Yavuz, 2003).

In the 1990s, with the rise of the Welfare Party, conservative media outlets gained further strength. With the rise of the Justice and Development Party (AKP) to power in 2002,

conservative media became one of the most influential media groups in Turkey. During its time in power, the AKP supported conservative media outlets, enhancing both their mass appeal and political influence. During this period, conservative media outlets extended their influence beyond print media to reach large audiences through television channels and digital platforms.

The Turkish conservative media has evolved in parallel with the social and political dynamics of Turkey. From its marginal position in the early years of the Republic, it has grown to reach large audiences and become influential in politics. These media outlets have played important roles in spreading Islamist and conservative values and ensuring the social acceptance of these values.

3.2. Framing Strategies

Conflict frame, foreign intervention frame, law and order frame and human rights frame will be used to evaluate Mahsa Amini news on the websites of the four conservative newspapers selected for this study.

Conflict frame refers to the presentation of events, issues or actors through conflict, competition and opposition in media studies. This framework is directly associated with the media's tendency to dramatize events and convey them in an eye-catching way. The conflict framework has generally been examined in a wide range of areas, from politics to international relations, from social events to protests. In this context, the conflict frame influences public perception by presenting events as dramatic and as a struggle between two sides. Protests are among the media contents where the conflict frame is used extensively. In news about protests, this frame focuses on the violent aspects or conflict aspects of the events, rather than detailing the demands of the protesters or the root causes of the protests. This may lead the audience to perceive protests more as disorder and threat

(de Vreese, 2006). De Vreese et al. (2006) stated that the conflict frame shapes the public's perception of events in a polarizing way. Conflict framing can make it difficult for audiences to understand the complexity of events and prevent focus on the heart of the matter.

In social movements such as the Mahsa Amini protests, the media can highlight the conflict between protesters and the government, pushing aspects of the protests that are rooted in systemic problems or social injustices into the background. This type of framing may cause audiences to perceive protests solely as a violent encounter and make it difficult for them to empathize with the demands of the protests (Iyengar, 1991).

As a result, the conflict frame is used in protest news through dramatization, highlighting the parties, and simplifying the events. This framework often plays a polarizing role in shaping public perceptions of protests. Instead of focusing on the demands of the protests, the media's emphasis on the conflict aspect may cause the audience to evaluate the events in a superficial and often biased way.

Foreign intervention frame refers to the presentation of an event or situation in the context of the intervention or influence of external actors in media studies. This framework is frequently used, especially in reporting issues such as international relations, domestic political crises and protests.

By attributing the source of a crisis or protest to external forces, this framework can undercut the responsibility of local actors and influence the public's perception of the event. In protest movements, the framework of foreign intervention often features as a strategy used by governments and the media to question or discredit the legitimacy of protests. Particularly in authoritarian or semi-authoritarian regimes, pro-government media present protests as a conspiracy or intervention directed by external actors rather than genuine demands of the people. Such framing can create public suspicion and

hostility towards the protests, overshadowing the protesters' claims to rights arising from internal dynamics.

There are many studies in the literature on the effect of the foreign intervention framework in directing public opinion. For example, Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) emphasized that the media's presentation of events through the influence of external forces prevents viewers from seeing the problem as an internal issue. Additionally, Iyengar (1991) argues that the external intervention framework may undermine audience participation in constructive discussions toward resolution of the incident. This framework may cause the justified reasons for the protests to be ignored, especially by activating nationalist feelings.

The frame of foreign intervention is often presented with a dramatic tone in media content. This frame is enriched with expressions such as "foreign hands", "global games" or "foreign conspiracies", ensuring that the public perceives the event as a threat. The frame of foreign intervention is a powerful tool used not only by governments but also by media outlets seeking to cast doubt on the legitimacy of protesters. Widespread use of this framework can increase the polarization of society and prevent discussion of aspects of the protests that relate to broader social or structural issues.

Consequently, the foreign intervention frame is a strategy in which the media moves events from a local issue to an international context. This framework can be used as an effective tool to discredit protest movements, strengthen nationalist sentiments, and legitimize government policies. However, this framing strategy can limit the audience's capacity to evaluate events in a broader context and manipulate public opinion, causing them to ignore the democratic rights-seeking dimension of the protests.

Law and order frame in the media studies literature, refers to the handling of social events, protests or crises from the perspective of public order, security and law enforcement. This

frame often presents a narrative that prioritizes legitimizing authority figures and institutions, restoring order in society, and taking control of events. It is often used to make security measures seem legitimate and necessary by presenting protests or social movements as a threatening and chaotic situation.

In the context of protests, this framework highlights potential threats to public order rather than focusing on the demands of protesters or the root causes of the movement. Particularly in authoritarian or semi-authoritarian regimes, pro-government media outlets often use the law and order framework to delegitimize protests and get the public to support interventions by security forces.

Research on the impact of the law and order frame shows that this framework can increase feelings of fear and insecurity in the public. Iyengar (1991) stated that emphasizing security threats in media content may lead individuals to evaluate events from the perspective of "groups causing problems". This can prevent audiences from understanding the structural issues underlying the protests and may cause them to perceive the protests as a threat. Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) emphasized that the law and order framework used by the media tends to increase public support for security forces and authority. This frame is often supported by statements such as "security is at risk" or "public order must be restored."

As a result, the law and order frame is a powerful tool used by the media to promote a security and authority-oriented perspective. By ignoring the structural causes of protest movements, this framework may present events as mere disruption of order and negatively affect the public's perception of the protests. While such a framing strategy legitimizes security policies and authoritarian approaches, it can make demands for social change difficult to understand.

Human rights frame refers to the handling of social events or crises from the perspective of basic human rights, justice, freedom and equality in media studies. This framework allows events such as protests and social movements to be discussed in terms of individuals' rights demands and violations. By highlighting the structural and moral dimensions of events, the human rights framework enables viewers to develop empathy and evaluate events with a rights-based approach. In the context of protests, the human rights framework often focuses on the rights demands of protesters and the injustices and oppression they experience. This framework criticizes governments' efforts to suppress protests, especially in authoritarian regimes, and emphasizes that protesters are subjected to human rights violations.

Iyengar (1991) emphasized that the human rights frame tends to support the justifications of protests by increasing individuals' emotional reactions to events. This framework has the potential to raise public awareness of the protesters' demands and generate broad social support. This framework is reinforced by phrases such as “demand for freedom,” “quest for justice,” or “human dignity.” In the Mahsa Amini protests, women's search for rights and demands for social equality were emphasized within the framework of human rights. This type of framing attracted the attention of not only local but also international public opinion and ensured global support for the protests.

As a result, the human rights frame is an effective tool to ensure that protests are addressed in the context of individuals' fundamental rights and freedoms. While this frame legitimizes the demands of the protesters, it also calls into question the oppressive policies of governments. However, the effectiveness of the human rights framework depends on the degree of consistency and impartiality in the media's approach to events. The use of this frame may encourage empathy and awareness of the demands of the protests, but this effect may be weakened if framing strategies become politicized.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

4.1. Yeni Şafak

Yeni Şafak is one of Turkey's leading daily newspapers with a conservative and Islamist editorial line. The newspaper was established on September 19, 1994, by the Albayrak Group. Since its inception, Yeni Şafak has approached Turkey's political, social, and cultural issues from a conservative perspective, and it is particularly known for its close alignment with the AK Party government.

Yeni Şafak's editorial policy is rooted in a commitment to religious and national values. The newspaper prioritizes Islamic identity and Turkey's national interests. Accordingly, it publishes news and commentary that reflect a conservative viewpoint on both domestic and foreign policy issues. Yeni Şafak adopts a critical stance toward Turkey's modernization and Westernization processes, advocating for traditional Islamic and national values.

The newspaper appeals to a broad readership, predominantly comprising the conservative segments of Turkish society. In addition to its print publication, Yeni Şafak is also active on digital platforms.

Yeni Şafak is one of the media outlets that has significantly influenced Turkey's political landscape. Particularly since the early 2000s, with the rise of the AK Party to power, the newspaper's support for the party has become more pronounced. This support is evident in Yeni Şafak's reporting, which often presents the AK Party government in a positive light. The newspaper is also known for its critical, and at times harsh, coverage of the opposition.

Yeni Şafak is recognized for its sensitivity to issues concerning the Islamic world and Turkey's national matters. The newspaper frequently criticizes the Western world and adopts a stance that defends the interests of the Islamic world. The Middle East developments and Turkey's policies in the region are particularly well covered in Yeni Şafak's foreign policy reporting.

4.1.1. Mahsa Amini in Yeni Şafak

Yeni Şafak published 104 news articles related to Mahsa Amini on its website between September 16, 2022, and September 16, 2023. A search within this period using the keyword "Mahsa Amini" yielded 126 results. However, 22 of these articles are only tangentially related to the Mahsa Amini protests. Therefore, 104 of these articles have been included in this research. The analysis of these 104 articles will not be presented individually in the study; instead, articles deemed significant for understanding the chronological evolution of framing strategies will be highlighted.

When examining the publication frequency of these articles over time, it is observed that the first article was published on September 20, following the United Nations' condemnation of Iran. As the events gained more attention in the global press, the coverage of related developments intensified, and the number of articles increased.

The article titled "**United Nations Condemns Iran**" published in *Yeni Şafak* on September 20, 2022, and sourced from *İhlas News Agency*, presents the events within a human rights frame by directly quoting the statements of Nada Al Nashif, the Acting United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. The article highlights Al Nashif's emphasis on the use of live ammunition by security forces to suppress the protests, resulting in the deaths of five people.

Several additional elements further support the claim that the article adopts a human rights frame. First, the use of the United Nations as the primary source adds legitimacy to the report, as it reflects the perspective of an international authority. Notably, the article does not frame the protests in a way that questions their political nature or government opposition. Instead, the focus is placed on the methods used by security forces to quell the demonstrations and the casualties that resulted.

The choice of imagery in the article also plays a significant role in reinforcing this framing. The use of a photograph of Mahsa Amini taken while she was alive personalizes the issue, emphasizing the human cost of the events. If the article had adopted a framing that portrayed the protests as violent or chaotic, it might have included images of clashes between protesters and security forces. However, by opting for an image that highlights individual victimization, the report aligns with a human rights-oriented narrative.

Furthermore, the article's tone is worth analyzing. Rather than employing an explicitly accusatory language against the Iranian government, the article relies on the statements of the United Nations, maintaining a seemingly neutral stance. Nevertheless, by emphasizing security forces' use of lethal force and the resulting deaths, the article implicitly creates a perception of human rights violations by Iranian authorities.

In conclusion, this article can be classified within the human rights frame. The reliance on United Nations statements, the emphasis on security forces' violent response, and the use of Mahsa Amini's photograph all contribute to this framing. While the article does not explicitly discuss the political dimensions of the protests, its language and visual choices indicate a focus on highlighting human rights concerns rather than political or security-related narratives.

The framing used in this initial article by Yeni Şafak on the topic is significant for the research. As the protests increasingly occupied the global agenda and influenced

international relations, this framing provides an opportunity to observe how these frames evolved.

The article titled "***Mahsa Amini Protests Spread to Multiple Cities in Iran,***" published on September 22, 2022, highlights the severity of the protests by emphasizing key aspects such as the use of live ammunition against demonstrators, deaths, and injuries. The expansion of the protests to major cities like Tehran, Karaj, Tabriz, and Mashhad, along with the heavy-handed response of security forces, is extensively described. Additionally, the article provides details about protesters chanting anti-regime slogans and setting fire to trash containers.

While the inclusion of such details about the protesters' actions could open the door for framing them through lenses such as *vandalism, chaos, or violence*, it is important to note that the article predominantly focuses on the repressive measures taken by the Iranian authorities. The extensive coverage of security forces' interventions, particularly the allegations of excessive force and the use of live ammunition, shifts the overall framing towards a *human rights violations* perspective rather than a solely disorder-centric narrative.

The way the article presents the protesters' actions also plays a role in shaping its overall framing. By mentioning slogans against the regime, the report acknowledges the political dimension of the protests but does not necessarily delegitimize them. The reference to setting fire to trash containers, on the other hand, has the potential to reinforce a *lawlessness* frame, yet the absence of stronger criminalizing language suggests that the article does not fully adopt a protest-delegitimizing narrative. If the intention were to frame the protesters primarily as violent actors, the article would likely have included stronger language portraying them as rioters or terrorists, or it would have emphasized

destruction to public and private property. Instead, the emphasis remains on the state's forceful crackdown.

Another crucial element reinforcing the *human rights violations* frame is the portrayal of the Iranian government's response. The article highlights the aggressive measures taken by security forces rather than justifying them as necessary actions for restoring order. By detailing deaths, injuries, and the use of live ammunition, the report directs readers' attention to potential state oppression rather than focusing solely on protester misconduct.

Furthermore, the article's structural choices contribute to its framing. If a *chaos* or *violence* frame had been dominant, the article would likely have begun with the protesters' actions and then discussed the state's response. Instead, by foregrounding the use of force by security forces and the casualties that resulted, the report aligns more closely with a *human rights violations* frame, portraying the protesters primarily as victims of state repression rather than as perpetrators of disorder.

In conclusion, while the article contains elements that could support multiple framings—including *chaos* and *violence*—it ultimately leans more towards a *human rights violations* frame. The extensive focus on state repression, the detailed descriptions of security forces' actions, and the relatively neutral portrayal of protesters' activities all contribute to a framing that underscores concerns about excessive force and state-led human rights abuses rather than simply portraying the protests as lawless disturbances.

The article titled "***Iranian President Raisi Warns About Mahsa Amini,***" dated September 23, 2022, primarily focuses on President Ebrahim Raisi's remarks regarding Mahsa Amini's death and the ensuing protests. The article highlights three key aspects of his statement: his directive to investigate Amini's death, his assertion that freedom of expression exists in Iran but that creating chaos is unacceptable, and his claim that controlling the protests is necessary to maintain legal order.

This framing positions the Iranian government as responsive to public concerns by acknowledging an investigation into Amini's case, while simultaneously drawing a distinction between legitimate expression and disruptive unrest. By emphasizing Raisi's call for an investigation, the article projects an image of state accountability, potentially mitigating criticism of the Iranian authorities. However, this is immediately counterbalanced by his warning about disorder, which serves to frame the protests as a threat to social stability rather than as legitimate grievances against state actions.

The emphasis on "chaos" and the necessity of restoring order implicitly frames the protests and protesters as sources of instability, paving the way for a *chaos and violence* frame. This framing creates a foundation for justifying the actions of security forces, as it suggests that the protests are not merely expressions of dissent but disturbances that require state intervention. If the protests are depicted as violent, then the state's use of force can be framed as a necessary and proportional response to maintain public order.

Moreover, Raisi's emphasis on distinguishing between freedom of expression and chaos can be understood as a delegitimization strategy. While acknowledging that Iranians have the right to express themselves, the statement implies that the current protests exceed the acceptable limits of free speech. This narrative allows for a selective interpretation of the protests, where participants who engage in peaceful demonstrations may be rhetorically separated from those whom the government deems as agitators. However, this distinction can also serve as a pretext for broad crackdowns on dissent, as it enables the authorities to categorize any form of opposition as disruptive.

The article does not provide detailed descriptions of security forces' interventions or reports of casualties, which further aligns with a *government legitimacy* frame rather than a *human rights violations* frame. By focusing on Raisi's remarks rather than on the actions of security forces or the grievances of protesters, the report presents the protests primarily

as a challenge to legal order rather than as a response to state repression. The absence of explicit coverage of police violence or protester casualties contributes to the downplaying of state responsibility, reinforcing the notion that state actions are justified responses to disorder rather than excessive measures against civilian dissent.

Furthermore, the sequencing of information in the article plays a role in shaping the reader's perception. Had the article opened with details about police crackdowns or the grievances of protesters, it might have conveyed a different framing—one that focuses on human rights or state violence. Instead, by leading with Raisi's statements and reinforcing his narrative of order versus chaos, the article structurally prioritizes the government's perspective, further legitimizing its stance.

In conclusion, this article adopts a framing that primarily aligns with *chaos* and *government legitimacy* narratives. By emphasizing Raisi's call for an investigation while simultaneously stressing the need to control unrest, the article portrays the government as both accountable and firm in its approach. The absence of details regarding security forces' interventions and the protests' root causes further strengthens the justification for state measures, making it easier to depict crackdowns as necessary actions rather than as potential human rights violations. Through this framing, the protesters are positioned as potential threats to stability rather than as individuals advocating for justice and reform.

The article titled "*Iranian President Raisi: Enemies Want to Create Chaos*," published on September 23, 2022, highlights President Ebrahim Raisi's claims that the ongoing protests in Iran are part of a larger scheme orchestrated by hostile foreign forces. This framing shifts the focus away from domestic grievances, such as concerns over women's rights, police brutality, or government repression, and instead presents the protests as a product of external interference.

By attributing the unrest to foreign actors, the article effectively delegitimizes the protests, portraying them not as an organic response to Mahsa Amini's death but as an orchestrated attempt to destabilize Iran. This perspective enables the government to sidestep accountability for internal problems, including public discontent, economic struggles, and human rights concerns. It also fosters nationalist sentiment, encouraging the public to unite against perceived external enemies rather than focusing on domestic grievances. Furthermore, if the protests are framed as an act of foreign subversion, then the use of force against demonstrators can be justified as a necessary defense against external threats rather than as repression of civilian dissent. This narrative allows the government to equate protesters with agents of foreign influence rather than recognizing them as citizens expressing legitimate concerns.

The article's framing aligns with a broader conflict-oriented perspective, portraying the situation as part of a struggle between Iran and its adversaries rather than as an internal civil movement. Raisi's rhetoric positions Iran as a nation under siege, facing a destabilization campaign orchestrated by external forces. This framing creates a security-oriented perspective where state actions are framed as protective measures against foreign aggression rather than as oppressive tactics. The report does not focus on the demands of the protesters, incidents of police violence, or the role of government policies in fueling public anger. Instead, it presents the unrest as an attack on Iran's sovereignty, reinforcing the perception that these protests are not about domestic political and social issues but are instead an extension of broader geopolitical conflicts.

Another significant aspect of the article is the absence of counterarguments or alternative explanations for the protests. The voices of protesters, human rights organizations, or opposition figures are not included, which results in a one-sided narrative that reinforces the government's position. This omission is a strategic choice, as including diverse viewpoints could weaken the legitimacy of the foreign intervention frame by

demonstrating that the protests have grassroots origins rooted in domestic frustrations. The lack of critical perspectives ensures that the audience is directed toward viewing the protests as a foreign-engineered crisis rather than as a response to systemic domestic issues.

Overall, the article primarily frames the protests through foreign intervention and conflict narratives, portraying them as an orchestrated effort by external adversaries rather than as a genuine expression of public discontent. This framing serves to delegitimize the protests, justify government crackdowns, and strengthen nationalist sentiment. By shifting the focus from Iran's internal issues to an alleged external conspiracy, the article reinforces a security-based perspective that presents the government as defending the nation rather than suppressing dissent. The exclusion of alternative perspectives further ensures that the audience is directed toward perceiving the protests as part of a foreign plot rather than a reaction to internal governance failures.

The article titled "**41 People Killed in Protests in Iran,**" dated September 25, 2022, presents the casualties of the protests in a way that emphasizes the deaths of police officers and members of the Revolutionary Guard, thereby shaping the perception that the protesters were responsible for acts of violence. By focusing exclusively on state-affiliated casualties while omitting or downplaying civilian deaths, the article constructs a narrative in which the protesters are positioned as aggressors rather than as individuals responding to government actions. This selective presentation contributes to the *criminalization* frame, which portrays the demonstrators not as citizens exercising their right to protest but as lawbreakers who pose a threat to public safety.

The *criminalization* frame is an effective tool for delegitimizing social movements by associating them with illegal activities. By highlighting security force casualties while excluding references to protesters killed by state interventions, the article implicitly

suggests that the demonstrators were not peaceful but rather violent actors responsible for deadly confrontations. This framing shifts the discourse away from the initial grievances that led to the protests—such as demands for women's rights and opposition to state repression—and instead focuses on lawlessness and disorder. As a result, public sympathy may be redirected away from the protesters and toward the state and its security forces, reinforcing the perception that the government is the victim of violent unrest rather than the instigator of crackdowns.

The article also lays the groundwork for the *law and order* frame, which positions the state as the rightful authority tasked with restoring stability in the face of chaos. By portraying security forces as casualties rather than as perpetrators of violence, the narrative justifies the government's subsequent repressive actions as necessary measures to reestablish control. The *law and order* frame is particularly significant in conservative and pro-government media narratives, as it appeals to audiences that prioritize stability and view any disruption as a threat to national security. When protests are framed as violent riots rather than as legitimate expressions of public dissent, crackdowns and harsh policing methods become easier to justify, as they can be presented as essential steps to restore peace rather than as human rights violations.

The absence of details regarding civilian casualties and the disproportionate focus on the deaths of security personnel further contribute to an unbalanced narrative that reinforces state legitimacy. Had the article included reports on protester deaths, police brutality, or excessive force used against demonstrators, it could have allowed for a *human rights violations* frame. However, by omitting these elements, the report ensures that readers view the state as a victim of unrest rather than as an oppressive force. This omission not only delegitimizes the protesters' grievances but also helps construct a narrative in which resistance to state authority is equated with criminal behavior.

Furthermore, the language used in the article likely plays a role in reinforcing the *criminalization* frame. Descriptions of the protests as *riots*, *violent unrest*, or *attacks*—if present—would contribute to the perception that the demonstrations were inherently destructive rather than politically motivated. Such language choices are subtle but powerful, as they shape public perception by framing the events in a way that justifies state actions. Even if direct accusations are not made, the article's selective presentation of casualties achieves the same goal by suggesting that the protests were a threat to social order.

By employing the *criminalization* and *law and order* frames, the article ultimately serves to justify the Iranian government's response to the protests. The strategic focus on state casualties, the exclusion of alternative perspectives, and the implicit characterization of protesters as perpetrators of violence rather than victims of repression all work together to delegitimize the movement. This framing not only shields the state from criticism but also prepares the public to accept further crackdowns as necessary actions for maintaining stability. The narrative constructed by the article thus plays a crucial role in shaping public opinion, ensuring that the protests are viewed not as a struggle for rights and justice but as a criminal uprising that must be suppressed.

The article titled "***Government Supporters Take to the Streets in Iran***," dated September 26, 2022, frames the pro-government demonstrations as a defense of state authority and social stability. By emphasizing slogans such as "*I'm with my police*" and "*Death to the Seditious*," the article constructs a narrative in which government supporters are portrayed as upholding law, order, and national unity in contrast to the anti-government protesters, who are indirectly labeled as threats to the country's stability. This framing serves to reinforce state legitimacy while discrediting the opposition movement.

By focusing on these pro-government demonstrations, the article contributes to the *law and order* frame, which positions the state as the guardian of stability and national security. Through the depiction of demonstrators chanting slogans in favor of the police and against “seditionists,” the report implies that the unrest is unlawful and destabilizing. The use of the term *seditionist* is particularly significant, as it suggests that the protests are not simply acts of civil disobedience but are instead deliberate attempts to undermine the state. This terminology serves to justify state measures against the protesters, as authorities are presented as acting to suppress not legitimate grievances but rather dangerous acts of rebellion.

In addition to reinforcing the *law and order* frame, the article also employs elements of the *foreign intervention* and *conspiracy* frames. The inclusion of slogans such as “*Death to Israel*” suggests that the unrest is not purely domestic in nature but rather the result of external interference. By implying that foreign actors are involved, the article delegitimizes the protests by shifting the blame away from the Iranian government and toward outside forces. This framing serves multiple purposes: first, it absolves the state of responsibility for the crisis by attributing the unrest to external enemies; second, it encourages nationalist sentiment by uniting the public against perceived foreign adversaries; and third, it justifies the state's response by portraying it as a defense against external threats rather than as repression of its own people.

The selective portrayal of the protests further reinforces this narrative. The article focuses on pro-government demonstrations while omitting details about the larger anti-government protests, their demands, or the state’s repressive measures. By highlighting only one side of the unrest, the report creates a perception that the majority of the population supports the government and that those who oppose it are a disruptive minority influenced by foreign powers. This exclusion of dissenting voices ensures that readers are

directed toward a specific interpretation of the events—one that aligns with state interests and dismisses the grievances of the opposition.

Another key aspect of the article's framing is the legitimization of police interventions. By emphasizing that government supporters took to the streets to defend order and legality, the narrative implicitly suggests that maintaining stability requires strict enforcement of the law. This framing not only justifies past crackdowns but also preemptively legitimizes any future state actions against protesters. If unrest is framed as an act of foreign-backed sedition rather than a response to human rights violations, then repressive measures can be portrayed as necessary steps to preserve national security rather than as acts of state violence.

Language choices throughout the article play a crucial role in shaping this perspective. The use of terms such as "*supporters of order*," "*defenders of the police*," and "*seditionists*" creates a binary distinction between loyal citizens and disruptive elements. This binary serves to divide the population into two opposing camps: those who support the state and its security forces, and those who, by protesting, are positioned as agents of chaos or foreign influence. Such language choices ensure that sympathy is directed toward the pro-government demonstrators while opposition protesters are viewed with suspicion.

Overall, the article strategically employs the *law and order*, *foreign intervention*, and *conspiracy* frames to construct a narrative that legitimizes the government's stance while discrediting the opposition movement. By selectively presenting the demonstrations, emphasizing external threats, and portraying the government as a defender of stability, the report works to shape public perception in a way that justifies state crackdowns and reinforces national unity under the current administration. Through these framing choices, the article not only delegitimizes the protests but also strengthens the argument that

government actions, including security force interventions, are necessary measures to protect Iran from internal and external destabilization.

The column titled "***The Regime's Task Is Difficult This Time***" dated September 27, 2022, written by Ali Saydam, presents a critical perspective on the Iranian government's handling of the Mahsa Amini protests, arguing that the regime has failed to manage the crisis effectively. Saydam's analysis suggests that this failure creates an opportunity for external actors who seek to weaken or destabilize Iran. This perspective strongly aligns with the *foreign intervention* frame, which portrays the unrest not as a purely domestic issue but as a situation that external forces can exploit to serve their own interests.

By emphasizing the Iranian regime's struggles in controlling the situation, the article implicitly acknowledges the scale and intensity of the protests. However, rather than attributing the unrest to internal grievances such as public dissatisfaction, human rights concerns, or socio-political repression, the framing shifts the focus toward external threats. This approach aligns with a common narrative in conservative and nationalist media, which frequently portrays domestic protests as part of a broader international conspiracy aimed at destabilizing the state. By suggesting that Iran's adversaries—whether Western governments, intelligence agencies, or regional rivals—stand to benefit from the crisis, the article reinforces the perception that the protests are not entirely organic but rather manipulated by foreign elements.

This framing serves several strategic purposes. Firstly, it delegitimizes the protesters by implying that their actions, whether intentional or not, are aligned with the interests of hostile foreign powers. By framing the demonstrations as a vulnerability that external actors can exploit, the article casts doubt on the sincerity of the protesters' grievances and suggests that their demands may be influenced or even orchestrated by foreign forces. This perspective shifts the focus away from the root causes of public discontent—such as

women's rights, authoritarian governance, and economic difficulties—and instead presents the unrest as part of a larger geopolitical struggle.

Secondly, this framing justifies the Iranian government's potential responses, including harsh crackdowns and restrictions on freedoms. If the protests are seen as a domestic issue, excessive police violence or repressive measures may be viewed as authoritarian overreach. However, if they are framed as part of a foreign intervention attempt, state repression can be portrayed as a necessary act of national defense. In this way, the article provides indirect support for government actions by portraying Iran as a nation under siege.

Additionally, the *foreign intervention* frame plays a role in shaping public opinion by fostering a sense of nationalism and unity against external enemies. By emphasizing that Iran's adversaries stand to gain from the government's failure to manage the crisis, the article appeals to nationalist sentiments, encouraging readers to view the protests not as a legitimate struggle for rights and freedoms but as a tool being used against Iran by its enemies. This framing is particularly effective in mobilizing pro-government sentiment, as it encourages citizens to prioritize national stability over demands for reform.

Another important aspect of the column is the way it describes the Iranian regime's struggle. While it acknowledges the government's difficulties, it does so in a way that does not directly condemn the state but rather positions it as facing an extraordinary challenge due to external manipulation. This nuanced approach allows the article to critique the regime's crisis management without fully undermining its legitimacy. Instead of blaming government policies or excessive repression for the unrest, the article suggests that the real danger lies in how external forces might exploit the situation to weaken Iran from within.

Moreover, the language used in the article is crucial in reinforcing this framing. Terms that emphasize *instability*, *foreign agendas*, or *geopolitical threats* subtly shift the reader's focus away from the protesters' demands and toward a broader, more strategic perspective. This rhetorical approach ensures that the primary concern is not the human rights violations or public grievances that sparked the protests, but rather the larger implications for Iran's sovereignty and stability.

In conclusion, the column strongly employs the *foreign intervention* frame by suggesting that Iran's failure to control the crisis benefits external forces seeking to destabilize the country. This framing not only delegitimizes the protests but also shifts attention away from the protesters' demands and toward geopolitical concerns. By doing so, the article reinforces nationalist sentiments, justifies potential government crackdowns, and portrays the state as a victim of external manipulation rather than as a repressive force responsible for the crisis. Through this perspective, the unrest is framed not as a reflection of internal dissatisfaction but as an externally influenced event that threatens Iran's sovereignty and security.

The article titled ***"Those Who Wave the LGBT Flag Talk About Freedom While Attacking the Veil in Kadıköy"*** dated October 2, 2022, frames the Turkish protesters who gathered to demonstrate against Mahsa Amini's death as contradictory and unjust in their actions. This perspective aligns closely with the *law and order* frame, portraying the protests not as legitimate expressions of dissent but as disruptive, inconsistent, and even hypocritical. The article presents the demonstrators as engaging in selective activism—advocating for freedom while allegedly infringing upon the rights of others, particularly religious individuals who choose to wear the veil.

A key aspect of this framing is the emphasis on *order and legality*. By suggesting that protesters are not merely expressing their opinions but engaging in actions that threaten

public stability, the article aligns with narratives that prioritize societal harmony and security over dissent. This approach implicitly justifies potential state measures to curb such demonstrations, portraying them as necessary actions to maintain order. The language used in the article plays a crucial role in reinforcing this perspective. Terms such as *attacking the veil* suggest that the protesters are not just expressing opposition to Iran's policies but are actively engaging in hostility toward religious symbols and, by extension, religious individuals. This language choice serves to discredit the protest movement by shifting attention from their broader human rights concerns to an alleged intolerance toward religious expression.

Furthermore, the inclusion of LGBT symbolism in the article is not incidental. By associating the protesters with the LGBT movement, the article introduces an additional layer of ideological contestation. This connection implicitly signals to conservative audiences that the protest movement is linked to broader Western liberal values, which are often framed as being at odds with traditional or religious norms. In doing so, the article taps into existing cultural and ideological divides, reinforcing the idea that these demonstrations are not about human rights or justice but rather about pushing a specific ideological agenda that contradicts traditional values. This framing serves to delegitimize the protests by portraying them as part of a broader cultural struggle rather than as a reaction to human rights violations.

Additionally, the article's focus on the protesters' perceived contradictions contributes to a *moral critique* frame, which suggests that the demonstrators lack credibility because their actions are inconsistent with their stated values. By highlighting what it presents as hypocrisy—advocating for freedom while allegedly attacking another group's rights—the article undermines the legitimacy of the movement and casts doubt on its motivations. This approach diverts attention away from the core issue of Amini's death and the

repression of women in Iran, instead shifting the discussion toward the character and behavior of the protesters themselves.

Another important aspect of the article's framing is its implication that these protests are influenced by external ideologies rather than being a genuine grassroots reaction to human rights concerns. By emphasizing the presence of LGBT flags and presenting the demonstrators as attacking religious values, the article subtly reinforces the *foreign intervention* frame. It suggests that the movement is not purely about domestic solidarity with Iranian women but is instead part of a broader, Western-influenced ideological push that challenges traditional values. This approach resonates with conservative audiences who view such movements with suspicion, reinforcing the idea that these protests are not about justice but about cultural and ideological confrontation.

In sum, the article employs multiple overlapping frames to shape public perception of the protests in Kadıköy. The *law and order* frame positions the demonstrators as disruptive elements that threaten social stability, justifying state intervention to restore order. The *moral critique* frame discredits the protesters by portraying them as hypocritical, undermining their credibility and shifting focus away from the core issue of human rights violations in Iran. Additionally, the subtle inclusion of the *foreign intervention* frame suggests that the protests are ideologically driven rather than being a sincere response to Amini's death. Through these framing choices, the article works to delegitimize the demonstrators, reinforce conservative narratives, and shift public discourse away from human rights concerns toward issues of social and cultural division.

The article titled "**Khamenei: Protesters Are Not Ordinary Iranians,**" dated October 3, 2022, prominently features statements by Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, asserting that the protests following Mahsa Amini's death are not spontaneous domestic uprisings but rather orchestrated efforts by foreign actors, particularly the

United States and Israel. This framing aligns closely with the *foreign intervention* frame, which portrays domestic unrest as a product of external manipulation rather than an expression of internal grievances.

By emphasizing Khamenei's claims that the demonstrators are not *ordinary Iranians* but rather individuals influenced or directed by foreign forces, the article delegitimizes the protests as an authentic civic movement. This approach shifts the focus away from the protesters' motivations—such as demands for women's rights, opposition to government oppression, and broader discontent with the political system—and instead presents the unrest as part of a geopolitical struggle. In doing so, the article contributes to a narrative in which Iran is depicted as a victim of foreign plots rather than as a government facing domestic dissatisfaction.

The *foreign intervention* frame serves multiple purposes in shaping public perception. Firstly, it reinforces nationalistic sentiments by presenting the protests as a threat to Iran's sovereignty and stability. If the unrest is seen as a grassroots movement, the government's legitimacy is called into question, and demands for reform gain traction. However, by framing the protests as externally orchestrated, the government positions itself as a defender of national integrity, justifying any measures taken to suppress the demonstrations as necessary for protecting the country from foreign interference.

Secondly, this framing creates a justification for state repression. Governments that utilize the *foreign intervention* frame often argue that external enemies are using civil unrest as a tool to weaken the state. This narrative allows them to brand protesters as agents of foreign influence rather than citizens expressing their grievances. Consequently, harsh crackdowns on demonstrators can be presented not as acts of repression but as necessary actions to neutralize foreign threats. The article's inclusion of Khamenei's accusations against the United States and Israel reinforces this perspective, suggesting that the protests

are part of a broader international conspiracy rather than a reflection of domestic struggles.

Additionally, the article strategically uses language that strengthens the *foreign intervention* frame. By highlighting Khamenei's assertion that the demonstrators are not *ordinary Iranians*, the article implies that those participating in the protests are outsiders to the nation's core identity—either ideologically, politically, or even literally. This creates a dichotomy between *loyal citizens* who support the government and *manipulated individuals* or *traitors* who allegedly serve foreign interests. Such rhetoric has been commonly employed by authoritarian regimes to discredit opposition movements, making it easier to justify their suppression.

The presence of the *foreign intervention* frame in this article also aligns with broader trends in conservative and pro-government media narratives, both in Iran and beyond. Authoritarian governments often use this framing to redirect public attention away from internal governance failures, corruption, or human rights violations. By attributing unrest to external forces, these governments can maintain their legitimacy and avoid addressing the root causes of dissent. The emphasis on the involvement of the United States and Israel plays into longstanding geopolitical tensions, reinforcing a worldview in which Iran is under constant threat from Western and regional adversaries.

Furthermore, this framing serves to rally domestic support for the Iranian leadership. Nationalist and conservative audiences are more likely to view the protests as dangerous if they are framed as a Western-backed operation rather than as a genuine movement for reform. This can result in increased public backing for the government's actions against demonstrators, as well as greater skepticism toward international criticism of Iran's handling of the crisis.

In sum, the article employs the *foreign intervention* frame to delegitimize the protests, justify state repression, and reinforce nationalistic sentiments. By portraying the unrest as a geopolitical conspiracy rather than a domestic struggle, it shifts attention away from the grievances of the Iranian people and toward an external enemy. This framing not only serves the interests of the Iranian government but also aligns with broader conservative media strategies that seek to discredit opposition movements by linking them to foreign interference. Through this perspective, the protests are not seen as a demand for justice and freedom but as a threat to national stability orchestrated by hostile external forces.

The article titled "***Iran Releases New Footage of Mahsa Amini: Death Not Due to Beating***," dated October 8, 2022, presents a significant effort to shape public perception by emphasizing official narratives regarding Amini's death. The article shares twenty different security camera images of Mahsa Amini and highlights statements from Iran's forensic institution, which claim that her death was not caused by physical violence. While this article does not fit neatly into the established framing categories examined in the broader analysis, it plays a crucial role in shaping the discourse surrounding the protests and in setting the stage for future articles framed under *law and order* and *foreign intervention*.

One of the most important aspects of this article is its attempt to control the narrative by using state-sanctioned sources. By prominently featuring security footage and forensic reports, the article seeks to establish a sense of objectivity and credibility, reinforcing the idea that Amini's death was due to natural causes rather than police brutality. This strategy serves to counteract and discredit the initial outrage that sparked the protests, shifting the focus away from allegations of state violence and onto an alternative explanation—one that absolves security forces of wrongdoing.

This approach is particularly significant in the context of *law and order* framing. The implicit message conveyed is that the unrest that followed Amini's death was based on misinformation and emotional reactions rather than factual evidence. By presenting security footage and forensic reports as definitive proof, the article lays the groundwork for future narratives that portray the protesters as irrational, misled, or intentionally disruptive. This, in turn, provides justification for the government's crackdown, as it suggests that protests are not a response to real injustices but rather an overreaction to false claims. In this way, the article aligns with later articles that frame demonstrators as threats to social stability and justify heavy-handed state interventions.

Furthermore, the article contributes to *foreign intervention* framing by undermining the legitimacy of both domestic and international criticism of the Iranian government. If Amini's death was not the result of police brutality, then the protests and the widespread condemnation from Western governments and human rights organizations can be reframed as politically motivated attacks against Iran. This sets the stage for future articles that depict the unrest as part of a broader foreign conspiracy rather than a legitimate movement for justice. The emphasis on surveillance footage and official forensic reports also serves as a preemptive counter to international media coverage, which largely highlighted eyewitness accounts and allegations of police misconduct. By reinforcing the state's version of events, the article creates a foundation for later claims that foreign actors, such as the United States and Israel, exploited Amini's death to incite unrest and destabilize Iran.

The timing of this article is also significant. Coming nearly a month after Amini's death, it represents an effort to reclaim control over the narrative at a time when protests were continuing to gain momentum. By strategically releasing security footage and forensic findings, the government aims to shift public opinion and discredit the opposition movement. This form of damage control is a common tactic in authoritarian regimes,

where official narratives are used not only to respond to criticism but also to actively shape the direction of public discourse.

In addition to its role in reinforcing *law and order* and *foreign intervention* framing, the article also functions as a broader propaganda tool. By relying on technical and scientific language, such as forensic analysis and medical reports, it creates an illusion of neutrality and expertise, making it more difficult for critics to challenge the claims without appearing to dismiss scientific evidence. This rhetorical strategy enhances the credibility of the state's position and weakens the legitimacy of opposing narratives that emphasize police brutality and human rights violations.

In summary, while this article does not explicitly adopt one of the primary framing strategies identified in the broader analysis, it plays a pivotal role in shaping subsequent media coverage. By emphasizing security footage and forensic findings, it works to delegitimize the protests, justify state intervention, and pave the way for future narratives that frame demonstrators as threats to law and order or as pawns in a foreign conspiracy. As such, it serves as a foundational piece in the larger media strategy aimed at controlling public perception and suppressing dissent.

The article titled "***A Captain of the Revolutionary Guards Killed in Ongoing Protests in Iran,***" dated October 27, 2022, presents the protests through a *law and order* frame by focusing on the perspective of security officials and portraying demonstrators as a threat to public safety. The article includes statements from a security official, emphasizing that certain groups participating in the protests were responsible for creating insecurity. Additionally, it highlights that security forces intervened to restore order against demonstrators who were allegedly disrupting public life.

A key aspect of the article's framing is its emphasis on the death of a Revolutionary Guards captain. By centering the narrative around the loss of a state official rather than

civilian casualties, the article implicitly shifts the perception of the protests from being about legitimate grievances to being violent uprisings that endanger national security. This selective focus reinforces the idea that security forces are not aggressors but defenders of stability who are forced to take action against violent elements.

The way the article justifies the intervention of security forces aligns with the *law and order* frame commonly used by authoritarian or security-focused governments when responding to protests. By stating that demonstrators were *disrupting public order*, the article portrays them as a destabilizing force rather than citizens exercising their right to protest. This framing serves to delegitimize the protests and rationalize harsh state responses, including lethal force.

Additionally, the language used in the article subtly reinforces this framing. Terms such as *causing insecurity* and *disrupting public order* carry negative connotations, suggesting that protesters are not peaceful activists but lawbreakers. This choice of wording primes the audience to view the state's response as necessary and justified, rather than excessive or oppressive. The framing also downplays the broader grievances that sparked the protests, such as demands for justice following Mahsa Amini's death, and instead recasts the demonstrations as disturbances that threaten national peace.

Moreover, by presenting the perspective of security officials without including counter-narratives—such as testimonies from protesters, human rights organizations, or independent observers—the article ensures that the dominant viewpoint remains one that justifies state repression. The lack of alternative perspectives reinforces a one-sided portrayal of events, where security forces appear as the primary victims and legitimate actors, while protesters are depicted as agents of chaos.

This framing has broader implications. When protest movements are consistently depicted through the *law and order* lens, public opinion can be swayed toward supporting

government crackdowns, as citizens may perceive protests not as democratic expressions of dissent but as security threats. This, in turn, provides governments with greater leeway to implement repressive measures under the pretext of maintaining stability. In Iran's case, such narratives are particularly effective in rallying support from conservative and pro-regime audiences who prioritize national security over civil liberties.

Furthermore, this type of framing aligns with state-controlled or pro-government media strategies that seek to undermine opposition movements by associating them with disorder and violence. By consistently highlighting security force casualties and presenting demonstrators as disruptive elements, these narratives contribute to a climate where repression is not only tolerated but seen as necessary for preserving national unity and sovereignty.

In summary, the article employs the *law and order* frame to justify security forces' lethal intervention in the protests. By focusing on the killing of a Revolutionary Guards captain, emphasizing that demonstrators caused insecurity, and portraying security forces as protectors of public order, the article shifts attention away from the protesters' demands and instead reinforces a narrative that legitimizes state repression. This framing ultimately serves to delegitimize the protests, justify crackdowns, and strengthen government control over the narrative surrounding the Mahsa Amini demonstrations.

The article titled "***Iran to Prosecute Nearly a Thousand Participants in Mahsa Amini Protests***" published on October 31, 2022, frames the protests primarily through *law and order* and *foreign intervention* perspectives. By focusing on the Iranian government's plans to prosecute protesters who allegedly engaged in acts of violence and harmed security forces, the article positions the legal measures taken by the state as necessary for restoring order and stability. Furthermore, the inclusion of statements from Iranian officials suggesting that foreign enemies are behind the unrest reinforces the idea that the

protests are not a legitimate expression of public dissent but rather an externally orchestrated effort to destabilize the country.

One of the central elements of the article's framing is its justification of state repression through legal mechanisms. By highlighting the government's intent to prosecute nearly a thousand protesters, the article conveys the message that the state is acting within the framework of the law rather than engaging in arbitrary repression. This reinforces the *law and order* narrative, which portrays the government as a stabilizing force and protesters as lawbreakers who threaten national security. The choice of words, such as *acts of violence* and *injuring security forces*, strengthens this framing by implying that the protesters are engaged in criminal activities rather than exercising their right to free expression.

Additionally, the article legitimizes the government's crackdown by presenting its actions as a necessary response to unrest. By emphasizing that the state's measures are part of a legal process, the article normalizes harsh penalties against demonstrators and suggests that such prosecutions are a routine aspect of maintaining societal stability. This approach effectively diverts attention away from concerns about human rights violations, mass arrests, and suppression of free speech, instead framing the legal actions as a responsible governance strategy.

At the same time, the article employs the *foreign intervention* frame by suggesting that the protests are not purely domestic but are instead part of a broader plot by hostile external actors. The statement that *Iranian officials argue that the enemies of the Islamic Republic of Iran are behind the protests* reinforces the notion that these demonstrations are not an organic response to Mahsa Amini's death but rather a strategic effort by foreign powers to undermine Iran's sovereignty. This framing serves multiple purposes: it

delegitimizes the protesters' grievances, shifts blame away from the Iranian government, and justifies state repression as a necessary defense against external threats.

The foreign intervention narrative is a recurring theme in pro-government media, particularly in authoritarian regimes that seek to discredit opposition movements. By attributing protests to foreign influence, the government can rally nationalist sentiments and frame the crackdown as an act of self-defense rather than oppression. This approach also discourages domestic sympathy for the protesters, as those who participate in demonstrations may be perceived not as citizens demanding justice but as agents of foreign influence working against national interests.

Moreover, the combination of *law and order* and *foreign intervention* frames creates a powerful rhetorical strategy that reinforces the government's control over public discourse. The legal proceedings against protesters serve to institutionalize state repression, while the foreign intervention narrative provides ideological justification for these actions. Together, these frames work to suppress dissent, consolidate state power, and dissuade future protests by portraying them as both unlawful and treasonous.

The timing of this article is also significant. By late October 2022, the Mahsa Amini protests had gained substantial momentum, attracting widespread international attention and condemnation of the Iranian government's response. By announcing mass prosecutions, the state sends a strong signal to both protesters and potential demonstrators that participation in anti-government activities will have serious legal consequences. This announcement functions as both a punitive measure and a deterrent, aiming to stifle further unrest by instilling fear of prosecution.

In summary, this article strategically employs both *law and order* and *foreign intervention* frames to justify the Iranian government's actions against protesters. By presenting the mass prosecutions as a legitimate and necessary legal response, the article normalizes

state repression and reinforces the notion that maintaining order takes precedence over civil liberties. Simultaneously, by attributing the protests to foreign enemies, the article delegitimizes domestic dissent and shifts the blame away from the government. This dual framing effectively strengthens state control while undermining the legitimacy of the protest movement, portraying it as both unlawful and externally orchestrated.

The article titled "***Death Toll Rises in Iran***" dated November 5, 2022, presents a complex framing of the ongoing protests by highlighting both the harsh interventions of security forces and the resulting chaos and unrest. While the dominant frame in similar articles tends to emphasize *law and order* by portraying protests as a disruption to societal stability, this particular article also provides room for an alternative *human rights* frame due to its acknowledgment of deaths caused by security forces.

One of the most striking aspects of the article is its emphasis on the increasing death toll, which implicitly acknowledges the severity of state repression. By focusing on the casualties, the article presents the reality of the violent crackdown, drawing attention to the direct consequences of government actions. This contrasts with many other reports that prioritize state narratives and frame security forces as merely maintaining order. The decision to include details about security forces' interventions and the resulting deaths allows for an interpretation through the *human rights* frame, as it suggests that excessive force has been used to suppress the protests.

However, the article also discusses the chaos and unrest resulting from the protests, which could contribute to a *law and order* framing. By emphasizing disorder, the narrative subtly reinforces the idea that protests have led to instability, justifying state interventions. The lack of direct accusations against protesters means that while the article does not criminalize them outright, it still presents the unrest as a significant disruption.

This framing can create an implicit contrast between the state's role as an enforcer of order and the protesters as contributors to instability.

The article's balanced approach—neither fully condemning the security forces nor explicitly labeling the protesters as criminals—creates an ambivalent framing that allows for multiple interpretations. By avoiding overt ideological positioning, the report leaves room for both government supporters and human rights advocates to use it in their narratives. For those who support the government, the mention of unrest may validate the necessity of intervention. For critics, the acknowledgment of deaths at the hands of security forces provides evidence of human rights violations.

Furthermore, the decision to highlight the rising death toll can also be interpreted as an implicit critique of the government's handling of the protests. In authoritarian regimes, where the press often aligns with state interests, the mere acknowledgment of deaths caused by security forces can be significant. It can subtly challenge the official narrative that protests are entirely violent and externally driven, instead drawing attention to the disproportionate use of force. This nuance allows the *human rights* frame to emerge, even if it is not the dominant framing strategy in the article.

The ambiguity in the article's framing could also reflect an effort to maintain journalistic credibility while navigating political sensitivities. By reporting on both the security forces' actions and the resulting chaos, the article presents a version of events that accommodates multiple perspectives. This may serve as a strategic decision to avoid direct confrontation with government authorities while still providing essential information about human rights concerns.

In summary, "*Death Toll Rises in Iran*" incorporates both *law and order* and *human rights* frames, making it one of the more balanced articles in its coverage. While the focus on unrest and chaos aligns with state narratives that justify intervention, the acknowledgment

of deaths caused by security forces opens the door for a human rights critique. This dual framing allows the article to function as both a justification for state actions and a subtle documentation of state violence, reflecting the complexities of media coverage in politically charged environments.

The article titled "***Merchants Close Their Shops Again in Some Cities of Iran***" dated December 6, 2022, incorporates a comparative historical reference to security measures taken during the Mahsa Amini protests and the killing of university students protesting the U.S. in 1953. This comparison serves to situate the current protests within a broader historical narrative, reinforcing the *foreign intervention* frame by implying that external forces have played a role in Iran's internal unrest both in the past and the present.

One of the key elements in the article is its emphasis on security measures taken by Iranian authorities. By drawing a parallel to 1953, the article implicitly suggests that the Iranian government has historically been forced to respond to external threats, rather than solely addressing domestic grievances. This framing downplays the role of Iranian citizens as autonomous political actors and instead portrays them as being influenced or manipulated by foreign powers. The reference to the 1953 protests—an event deeply embedded in Iranian collective memory due to its association with the U.S.-backed coup against Prime Minister Mohammad Mossadegh—further strengthens this perspective. By evoking this historical moment, the article reinforces the idea that Western powers, particularly the United States, have a longstanding pattern of interfering in Iran's internal affairs.

Furthermore, the article's focus on merchants closing their shops suggests a form of economic disruption that could be interpreted in multiple ways. While business strikes are often associated with acts of civil disobedience in response to government policies, in the context of this article, such actions may be framed as a consequence of external destabilization efforts. The closing of shops could be presented as a sign of external actors

attempting to undermine Iran's economic stability, thereby reinforcing the *foreign intervention* frame. Rather than attributing these economic actions to genuine domestic dissatisfaction, the framing suggests that such acts are either encouraged or exacerbated by foreign powers seeking to weaken Iran.

Additionally, the emphasis on security measures highlights the government's efforts to maintain control and restore order, aligning with the *law and order* frame. However, the article does not primarily criminalize protesters but rather focuses on how these security measures are a response to alleged external threats. This further reinforces the notion that the government's actions are defensive rather than repressive, which is a common rhetorical strategy in state-aligned media when addressing mass protests.

The implicit narrative constructed by this article aligns with a broader pattern observed in conservative and state-affiliated media, where domestic dissent is frequently framed as a byproduct of foreign interference rather than as a legitimate expression of public grievances. By invoking historical analogies such as the events of 1953, the article effectively strengthens this framing, creating a sense of continuity between past and present threats to Iran's sovereignty. This strategy serves both to delegitimize the protesters and to justify the government's strong-handed measures in suppressing dissent.

In summary, the article utilizes the *foreign intervention* frame by drawing a parallel between the current protests and historical instances of external interference in Iran's affairs. This historical analogy positions the Iranian government as a defender of national sovereignty against external threats, while also downplaying the agency of domestic protesters. Additionally, the economic dimension of the protests, as represented by the closure of shops, is framed in a way that aligns with narratives of external destabilization rather than domestic economic grievances. By emphasizing these elements, the article

contributes to a broader effort to frame the protests as part of a larger geopolitical struggle rather than as an internal call for change.

The article titled "***Remarkable Statement from Khamenei: A Revolution is Necessary in the Cultural Structure***" dated December 7, 2022, presents Iranian Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei's perspective on the Mahsa Amini protests by attributing the unrest to broader cultural issues rather than political or economic grievances. Khamenei's statements suggest that the existing cultural framework in Iran is inadequate in addressing societal challenges, and thus, a transformation is necessary. While his remarks can be interpreted in multiple ways, they align with the *human rights* frame in a complex and indirect manner.

Khamenei's assertion that Iran's cultural structure needs a revolution implies that the unrest is not merely a security issue but also a reflection of deeper cultural tensions. By framing the protests as a consequence of cultural deficiencies rather than systemic political repression, the article shifts the focus from governmental accountability to societal reform. This strategy serves to redefine the narrative: rather than acknowledging protesters' demands as legitimate political grievances, it suggests that cultural transformation—potentially under the guidance of state institutions—is the solution.

From a *human rights* framing perspective, Khamenei's statements acknowledge that societal conditions must change, which could be interpreted as an indirect recognition of citizens' dissatisfaction. However, his emphasis on reshaping the cultural landscape also raises concerns about increased state control over cultural and ideological expressions. In authoritarian regimes, calls for cultural revolution are often used to justify stricter censorship, greater ideological control, and the suppression of dissenting voices. If interpreted in this light, the *human rights* frame becomes paradoxical—while the need for

cultural transformation could imply a move toward greater freedoms, in practice, it may lead to heightened government intervention in artistic, academic, and media spheres.

Additionally, Khamenei's rhetoric reflects a common strategy in state-aligned media where societal unrest is attributed to external influences rather than domestic governance failures. By positioning the protests as a symptom of cultural deficiencies rather than political discontent, the article minimizes the role of government policies in causing unrest. This approach also aligns with the broader *foreign intervention* frame often used in Iranian state discourse, where social and political challenges are portrayed as consequences of Western ideological infiltration.

Moreover, Khamenei's statement about the necessity of a cultural revolution suggests a long-term response rather than immediate political reforms. This aligns with a broader strategy of deflecting pressure for concrete policy changes by proposing abstract, gradual transformations. The notion that the root of the protests lies in cultural weaknesses rather than structural political or legal injustices serves to depoliticize the demonstrations, shifting the focus away from the specific grievances raised by protesters—such as women's rights, government accountability, and political freedom.

In summary, while the article can be evaluated within the *human rights* frame due to its acknowledgment of the need for societal change, it also contains elements that align with other framing strategies. The emphasis on cultural transformation rather than political reform suggests an attempt to control the narrative by diverting attention from state repression. Additionally, the broader implications of cultural restructuring under an authoritarian regime raise questions about whether such changes would truly expand human rights or further entrench state control over public discourse. Thus, while the *human rights* frame is present, it is deeply intertwined with narratives that justify state intervention in cultural and ideological matters.

The video news titled "***A Protester Sets Fire to a Seminary by Pouring Gasoline in Iran***" dated December 10, 2022, frames the Mahsa Amini protests as a direct threat to Iran's religious values, law, and social order. The choice of this specific incident—an attack on a religious institution—serves to highlight the alleged extremism of the protesters and delegitimize the broader movement by associating it with acts of violence and destruction.

By emphasizing that the protester unlawfully set fire to a seminary, the article positions the protests within the *law and order* frame. The destruction of a religious institution, a symbol of Iran's deeply rooted Islamic identity, reinforces the notion that the demonstrators are not merely expressing political grievances but are engaged in actions that undermine the foundational values of the state. This framing aligns with the Iranian government's broader narrative that the protests are not legitimate expressions of public dissatisfaction but are acts of rebellion that threaten national stability.

Additionally, the visual nature of the news—specifically the footage capturing the moment when the seminary was set on fire—plays a crucial role in reinforcing the *violence and chaos* frame. Visual evidence of destruction is a powerful tool in media framing, as it evokes strong emotional reactions and shapes public perception more effectively than textual descriptions alone. By showcasing the violent act rather than focusing on the broader context of the protests or the motivations of the demonstrators, the video serves to amplify fears of disorder and justify state intervention.

This particular framing can also be linked to the *religious values* frame, which presents the protests as not just a challenge to political authority but an attack on Islam itself. In a theocratic state like Iran, where religion and governance are deeply intertwined, any perceived assault on religious institutions can be framed as an existential threat to national identity. The portrayal of the protester's actions as an attack on a seminary reinforces the

idea that the demonstrations are driven by hostility toward Islamic traditions, further alienating religious segments of the population from the movement.

Moreover, the framing of this incident contributes to the justification of security forces' crackdowns. If the protests are portrayed as inherently violent and targeted against the country's religious and legal foundations, then government repression can be presented as a necessary measure to protect national unity and stability. This aligns with a broader strategy used in state-aligned media, where select incidents of violence are magnified to overshadow the peaceful aspects of the protests and delegitimize the movement as a whole.

In summary, the video news employs multiple frames—*law and order*, *violence and chaos*, and *religious values*—to shape public perception of the Mahsa Amini protests. By emphasizing an attack on a religious institution, the article reinforces the narrative that the demonstrations are not only unlawful but also fundamentally opposed to Iran's religious and moral fabric. The use of visual evidence further strengthens this framing, making the protests appear more threatening and justifying the government's repressive measures in response.

The article titled "***So-Called Women's Rights Defenders Ignored the Women Killed in Gaza***" dated December 15, 2023, employs the *conflict* frame by presenting a contrast between those advocating for women's rights in Iran and their perceived inaction regarding the suffering of Palestinian women in Gaza. The article frames this perceived inconsistency as a form of selective activism, implying that the women cutting their hair in solidarity with Iranian protesters are not genuinely concerned with human rights but are instead motivated by political agendas that align with Western narratives.

A key aspect of this framing is the juxtaposition between two crises—the Mahsa Amini protests in Iran and the situation in Gaza. By highlighting the deaths of innocent women

in Gaza, the article shifts the focus away from Iran's domestic issues and redirects it toward another geopolitical conflict, reinforcing a *whataboutism* narrative. This strategy is often used in media framing to challenge the legitimacy of a movement by pointing out supposed contradictions in its advocacy. In this case, the article suggests that women's rights activists are applying double standards, which ultimately serves to delegitimize their support for the Iranian protest movement.

Additionally, the use of the phrase "*so-called women's rights defenders*" carries a strong rhetorical implication that the activists are not truly committed to women's rights but are selectively engaging in advocacy based on ideological biases. This language choice aligns with the *moral judgment* element of the *conflict* frame, as it portrays these activists as hypocritical and unjust. By accusing them of ignoring the suffering of women in Gaza, the article creates an adversarial dynamic between different feminist and human rights movements, positioning one as more genuine and the other as politically motivated.

Furthermore, the article subtly aligns with the *anti-Western narratives* commonly found in conservative media discourse. The criticism of Western-aligned activists implies that international human rights movements are biased, reinforcing a broader narrative that portrays Western influence as divisive and manipulative. This perspective is particularly relevant in Turkish conservative media, where critiques of Western double standards are frequently used to challenge foreign policy narratives and reinforce national or regional solidarity.

The framing in this article also contributes to an implicit *delegitimization* of the Mahsa Amini protests by associating their supporters with inconsistency and selective activism. Rather than engaging with the grievances of Iranian protesters, the article shifts the debate toward an external issue, diluting the impact of the original protest movement. This technique is effective in shaping public perception, as it encourages readers to question

the sincerity and credibility of human rights defenders rather than focusing on the underlying issues within Iran.

In summary, the article employs the *conflict* frame by constructing an adversarial narrative between Iranian women's rights activists and their perceived failure to address the plight of women in Gaza. Through rhetorical strategies such as *whataboutism*, *moral judgment*, and *delegitimization*, the article not only critiques feminist activism but also diverts attention away from Iran's domestic issues. By framing the protesters as selectively concerned with human rights, the article reinforces a broader critique of Western-aligned advocacy and presents the Iranian protests as politically motivated rather than driven by genuine human rights concerns.

4.2. Yeni Akit Newspaper

Yeni Akit is a daily newspaper in Turkey that operates within a conservative and Islamist framework. The newspaper was originally established on October 12, 1993, under the name "Akit," and continued under the name "Yeni Akit" from 2010 onwards. Throughout its history, the newspaper has maintained a publishing policy that advocates for Islamic values and conservative views. It has consistently addressed Turkey's political, social, and cultural issues from a conservative perspective. Since its inception, Yeni Akit has been a newspaper that emphasizes an Islamist discourse and reports news within this framework. At the core of its publishing policy lies the goal of protecting Turkey's religious and national values. The newspaper displays a strong commitment to religious values while maintaining a critical stance against the principle of secularism. Accordingly, its publications are shaped around themes such as criticism of Turkey's secular structure, advocacy for an Islamic order, and the preservation of traditional family structures.

Yeni Akit gained attention, particularly in the early 2000s, for its close alignment with the ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP). The newspaper adopted a supportive editorial stance towards the AKP government while offering harsh criticism against the opposition. This alignment is clearly reflected in the political content and opinion columns of the newspaper. Among its publications, Yeni Akit frequently emphasizes news that highlights religious values, articles that defend Turkey's national interests, and anti-Western rhetoric.

The newspaper follows an editorial policy that criticizes the influence of the Western world on Turkey and emphasizes Turkey's independence. Additionally, news and commentary on issues concerning the Islamic world are frequent topics covered by the newspaper.

Yeni Akit has also established a significant presence in the digital arena, in addition to its print publication. The newspaper's website provides current news, opinion pieces, and analyses, catering to a wide readership. It continues to be one of the leading media outlets for the conservative segment on digital platforms as well. At times, the newspaper has drawn attention with its controversial content. Especially due to its anti-secular rhetoric and harsh criticism towards various societal groups, Yeni Akit has been involved in numerous debates and legal cases. Nevertheless, the newspaper has persisted with its publishing policies and has retained the support of its conservative readership.

4.2.1. Mahsa Amini in Yeni Akit

On the Yeni Akit newspaper's website, a total of 25 articles have been published not only during the specified period from September 16, 2022, to September 16, 2023, but also up until the present day. Only 15 of these reports were published in the specific date range of this research. These articles largely frame the issue through the lens of religious values.

The events surrounding Mahsa Amini have been presented as anti-Sharia protests and framed as an attack on religious values.

The article titled "***They Used Amini's Death as an Excuse! Anti-Sharia Protests Continue in Iran***" published on September 19, 2022, employs the *conflict frame* by presenting the protests not as a grassroots movement against government policies or human rights violations but as a rebellion against the Islamic order. By framing the demonstrations as "*Anti-Sharia protests*," the article implies that the protesters are not merely expressing grievances over Mahsa Amini's death but are engaged in an ideological struggle against Iran's religious and political structure. This perspective aligns with a broader narrative often used in conservative media, where demonstrations challenging state authority are portrayed as threats to the nation's foundational values rather than legitimate expressions of dissent.

One of the key aspects of this framing is the portrayal of the protesters as *instigators* rather than victims. The phrase "*They used Amini's death as an excuse*" suggests that the demonstrators are not genuinely concerned with human rights but are opportunistically leveraging Amini's death to push an anti-Islamic agenda. This type of rhetoric delegitimizes the protests by shifting the focus away from police violence and systemic repression, instead framing the unrest as a targeted attack on Iran's religious principles.

Moreover, the use of terms such as "*inciting the masses*" implies that the protests are not organic but rather the result of external agitation or manipulation. This aligns with common conservative media strategies that frame protests as being influenced by foreign actors or ideologically motivated groups rather than as legitimate expressions of public dissatisfaction. By doing so, the article constructs an "*us vs. them*" narrative, where the protesters are positioned as radical opponents of the religious and political establishment.

Additionally, the framing of the protests as "*Anti-Sharia*" serves to polarize the issue, reducing a complex sociopolitical movement to a simple binary conflict between those who support Islamic governance and those who oppose it. This simplification not only marginalizes the protesters but also strengthens the justification for state intervention. If the protests are perceived as a direct attack on Iran's Islamic identity rather than as a response to human rights violations, then the government's harsh response can be seen as a necessary defense of national and religious values.

The article also aligns with the *law and order frame* by suggesting that the protests are disorderly and potentially dangerous. By emphasizing the presence of *anti-Sharia activists* and their role in mobilizing the public, the article lays the groundwork for portraying state security forces as legitimate protectors of social stability. This helps justify the use of force against demonstrators, as it suggests that the protests are not peaceful expressions of dissent but rather a direct challenge to the country's legal and moral order.

Furthermore, the article implicitly evokes the *foreign intervention frame*. By framing the protests as being led by *anti-Sharia forces*, it leaves room for the interpretation that these forces may be influenced or supported by external entities opposed to Iran's theocratic governance. This type of framing is commonly used in media to shift public perception away from internal grievances and toward external threats, thereby rallying public support for the government's position.

In conclusion, the article employs the *conflict frame* by depicting the protests as a battle between opposing ideological factions rather than as a response to human rights violations. Through rhetorical strategies such as *delegitimization*, *polarization*, and *moral justification*, the article shifts the focus from the protesters' grievances to the supposed threat they pose to Iran's religious and political stability. Additionally, elements of the

law and order and *foreign intervention* frames can also be observed, further reinforcing the idea that the protests are unlawful and potentially influenced by external actors. This framing not only diminishes the legitimacy of the protests but also strengthens the justification for state intervention against demonstrators.

The article titled "***Where's the Torture? Footage of Mahsa Amini's Death Released***" published on September 22, 2022, employs the *conflict frame* by positioning the debate over Mahsa Amini's death as a confrontation between opposing ideological factions rather than as a human rights issue. By focusing on the release of video footage and questioning the validity of torture allegations, the article seeks to discredit claims of police brutality and shift the narrative from state responsibility to external incitement. This framing creates a stark divide between those who accuse the Iranian regime of wrongdoing and those who defend the state's actions, reinforcing a polarized perspective on the protests.

One of the primary elements of this framing is the article's insistence on portraying the allegations of torture as *incitement* by *anti-Sharia communities*. This choice of wording suggests that those who argue Amini was subjected to violence are not merely concerned with justice but are actively working to manipulate public perception and provoke unrest. By labeling these groups as *anti-Sharia*, the article aligns them with opposition to Iran's religious and political order, transforming the issue from one of police accountability into an ideological battle between those who support the Islamic system and those who seek to undermine it. This strategy effectively shifts the focus away from Amini's death itself and onto the motivations of those raising concerns about it.

The phrase "*Where's the torture?*" in the article's title further reinforces this framing by preemptively dismissing claims of abuse and framing them as baseless. Instead of treating the allegations with neutrality or skepticism, the article appears to take a definitive stance

in rejecting them outright. This rhetorical strategy serves two purposes: first, it distances the Iranian security forces from accusations of brutality, and second, it delegitimizes those who question the government's version of events. By positioning the release of footage as a definitive rebuttal to the claims of torture, the article suggests that any continued insistence on police violence is a deliberate act of misinformation.

Additionally, the emphasis on *video footage* plays a crucial role in constructing this narrative. The use of state-provided recordings implies that the official explanation is transparent and verifiable, while casting doubt on alternative narratives. However, the selective presentation of footage can serve as a strategic tool to control public perception, as it allows the authorities to shape the story while omitting any potentially incriminating details. By highlighting the footage as proof that Amini was not tortured, the article reinforces the state's legitimacy while simultaneously framing critics as dishonest actors seeking to exploit the situation for political or ideological gains.

The article also aligns with elements of the *law and order frame* by suggesting that the controversy surrounding Amini's death is not a matter of state violence but rather a case of *misinformation leading to unnecessary unrest*. By portraying accusations of torture as *incitement* rather than legitimate concerns, the article indirectly supports the notion that government actions to control protests are justified. If the unrest is driven by false allegations rather than real grievances, then state intervention—whether through policing, arrests, or restrictions on media—is framed as necessary for maintaining stability.

Moreover, the article subtly echoes aspects of the *foreign intervention frame*. By emphasizing that *anti-Sharia communities* are behind the allegations, the article leaves room for the interpretation that these groups may have external ties or agendas aimed at destabilizing Iran. This aligns with a broader pattern in conservative media, where internal dissent is often framed as part of a foreign conspiracy rather than as an organic

expression of public discontent. By invoking this idea, the article strengthens the government's narrative that the protests are not genuine but are instead driven by external forces seeking to weaken Iran.

In conclusion, the article employs the *conflict frame* by depicting the allegations of Mahsa Amini's torture as a deliberate attempt by *anti-Sharia groups* to incite unrest rather than as credible accusations of state violence. Through rhetorical strategies such as *dismissal*, *delegitimization*, and *selective presentation of evidence*, the article shifts responsibility away from the government and onto its critics. Additionally, elements of the *law and order* and *foreign intervention* frames can also be observed, reinforcing the idea that the protests are driven by misinformation and external manipulation. This framing not only distances the Iranian regime from accountability but also justifies its efforts to suppress dissent in the name of maintaining order and national security.

The article titled **"Where Were You When the PKK Killed 50,000 People? Selahattin Demirtaş's Baldness Show"** published on September 23, 2022, employs the *Conflict Frame* by portraying the protests not as an independent movement against state oppression but as part of a broader political struggle involving actors deemed controversial or oppositional within Turkey's political landscape. The article specifically focuses on former Peoples' Democratic Party (HDP) co-chair Selahattin Demirtaş, emphasizing his symbolic act of shaving his head in solidarity with Mahsa Amini protests while simultaneously questioning his stance on past PKK violence. Through this framing, the article shifts attention away from the protests' human rights dimension and redirects it toward political and ideological tensions in Turkey.

A key feature of the *Conflict Frame* in this article is its use of divisive rhetoric and selective comparisons. The headline itself—"Where Were You When the PKK Killed 50,000 People?"—immediately places Demirtaş in a defensive position, implying that his

solidarity with the protests is hypocritical or politically motivated. By juxtaposing his act of support for the Iranian demonstrators with an unrelated but highly sensitive issue—the PKK's armed struggle in Turkey—the article introduces a competing narrative that reframes the protests as a secondary issue. This technique shifts the focus away from state violence in Iran and instead emphasizes Demirtaş's perceived silence on past PKK attacks, thereby transforming the discussion into a domestic political controversy rather than an international human rights issue.

Moreover, the article employs *guilt by association* to delegitimize both Demirtaş and, indirectly, the Mahsa Amini protests. By linking his symbolic act to the PKK, a group widely condemned in Turkey as a terrorist organization, the article constructs a narrative where supporting the protests is framed as aligning with figures perceived as controversial or even dangerous. This serves to alienate public sympathy for the protests by associating them with a politically divisive figure rather than framing them as a universal struggle for women's rights and justice.

Another important element of the *Conflict Frame* in this article is its use of *social media comments* to reinforce a particular perspective. By selecting and amplifying critical reactions to Demirtaş's act, the article presents these opinions as representative of a larger public sentiment. This strategy creates the impression that widespread opposition exists against his support for the protests, even though these comments are merely curated viewpoints rather than an objective reflection of public opinion. Through this, the article manufactures a sense of broad disapproval, influencing how readers perceive both Demirtaş and the Mahsa Amini protests.

Additionally, the article's emphasis on *performative activism*—referring to Demirtaş's head-shaving as a "*Baldness Show*"—further delegitimizes the act of solidarity by portraying it as superficial or insincere. The phrase "*Baldness Show*" carries a dismissive

and mocking tone, suggesting that Demirtaş's gesture is not a genuine expression of support but rather a publicity stunt. This rhetorical strategy diminishes the significance of his solidarity and, by extension, the legitimacy of the cause he is supporting.

Beyond the *Conflict Frame*, the article also subtly employs elements of the *Law and Order Frame*. By drawing attention to Demirtaş's political background and linking him to the PKK, the article reinforces the notion that certain political figures and movements are inherently tied to disorder and violence. This aligns with broader conservative narratives that frame protests—especially those related to minority or opposition groups—as threats to national stability rather than as legitimate forms of dissent. By presenting Demirtaş's solidarity as controversial and questionable, the article subtly supports the idea that those associated with him or similar political movements should not be taken seriously when advocating for justice or human rights.

Moreover, while the article's primary focus is on Turkey's political landscape, its framing has indirect implications for how the Mahsa Amini protests themselves are perceived. By portraying the protests through the lens of domestic political conflicts, the article downplays the protests' core human rights message and instead integrates them into preexisting ideological battles. This has the effect of diluting the universal significance of the demonstrations in Iran and reframing them within a more polarized and nationally specific context.

In conclusion, the article employs the *Conflict Frame* by transforming a symbolic act of solidarity with the Mahsa Amini protests into a politically charged debate about past violence, national security, and ideological divisions in Turkey. Through the use of selective comparisons, social media amplification, and delegitimizing rhetoric, the article shifts focus away from the Iranian protests' human rights dimension and instead frames them as part of an ongoing political struggle. Additionally, elements of the *Law and Order*

Frame can be observed in how the article indirectly questions the legitimacy of figures like Demirtaş, further reinforcing the idea that certain political actors should not be taken seriously when discussing justice and rights. This framing serves to diminish both the perceived legitimacy of Demirtaş's actions and the broader significance of the Mahsa Amini protests, aligning with a broader conservative media strategy of reframing dissent as conflict rather than as a call for justice.

The article titled ***"Full Support from HDP for Amini Protest! 'Our Hearts Are with Those Who Resist'"*** published on September 25, 2022, employs the *Conflict Frame* by portraying the protests not merely as a human rights issue but as part of a broader political struggle involving groups deemed controversial in Turkey. The article focuses on the statements of HDP Co-Chair Pervin Buldan, who expressed solidarity with the protests in Iran. However, rather than neutrally reporting this support, the article frames Buldan and the HDP's stance as problematic by associating them with separatist movements and terrorism. By labeling Buldan as a *"terror supporter"* and emphasizing HDP's role in backing the protests, the article implicitly suggests that the demonstrations are not solely about women's rights or justice for Mahsa Amini but are instead linked to separatist agendas.

A key characteristic of the *Conflict Frame* in this article is the strategic use of political labeling to delegitimize both the HDP and the protests in Iran. The phrase *"terror supporter"* is particularly significant because it aligns with long-standing Turkish state narratives that portray the HDP as having ties to the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), a group designated as a terrorist organization by Turkey. By applying this label to Buldan, the article encourages readers to perceive the protests not as a legitimate uprising against oppression but as a movement supported by groups that threaten national security. This framing functions as a form of *guilt by association*, where the Iranian protests are

indirectly linked to separatist or militant movements, thereby discouraging sympathy for the demonstrators.

Another significant aspect of this framing is its attempt to shape public perception by directing readers toward an oppositional stance against the protests. The article suggests that since HDP, a party frequently accused of separatist tendencies, supports the protests, then those demonstrations must be controversial or dangerous. This rhetorical strategy seeks to influence readers by making them question the legitimacy of the protests based on who is supporting them rather than engaging with the core issues behind the demonstrations themselves. By doing so, the article shifts attention away from human rights concerns and reframes the protests as a divisive political issue rather than a universal struggle for justice.

Additionally, the *Conflict Frame* is reinforced by the way the article presents Buldan's support in an exaggerated or alarmist manner. Rather than neutrally reporting that HDP backs the protests, the headline and content suggest that this support is an aggressive political move. The phrase "*Full Support*" implies an intense, perhaps even suspicious, level of involvement. Furthermore, the use of direct quotes—"Our Hearts Are with Those Who Resist"—serves to highlight the HDP's position as if it were an extreme or provocative statement, even though similar expressions of solidarity have been made globally by various political and human rights groups. This selective emphasis further builds the conflict narrative by implying that HDP's stance is not a mere expression of support but part of a broader political struggle.

Beyond the *Conflict Frame*, elements of the *Law and Order Frame* can also be detected in how the article positions pro-protest statements as problematic. The implication that those who support the protests are aligned with separatist movements serves to reinforce the idea that such demonstrations threaten national or regional stability. This overlaps

with broader conservative media narratives that frame protests—especially those involving marginalized groups or opposition movements—as sources of instability rather than legitimate expressions of public dissent. By connecting HDP’s support to terrorism allegations, the article implicitly suggests that the Iranian protests could lead to disorder or external manipulation, thus supporting the necessity of state intervention to maintain control.

The broader political implications of this framing are also noteworthy. By tying the Iranian protests to Turkey’s domestic political conflicts, the article transforms an international human rights issue into a matter of national security and ideological struggle. This tactic is particularly effective in influencing Turkish public opinion, as it capitalizes on existing political divisions and skepticism toward opposition parties. Instead of allowing space for a discussion on women’s rights, freedom of expression, or state repression, the article shifts the discourse toward a debate over loyalty, nationalism, and security concerns.

In conclusion, the article employs the *Conflict Frame* by presenting the Iranian protests as part of a broader political struggle, rather than as a movement for justice and human rights. Through the use of political labeling, guilt by association, and selective emphasis, it aims to delegitimize both the HDP’s support for the protests and the demonstrations themselves. Additionally, elements of the *Law and Order Frame* are subtly woven into the narrative, reinforcing the idea that state intervention is necessary to maintain stability. By directing readers toward an oppositional stance against the protests based on their perceived association with separatist movements, the article ultimately serves to undermine sympathy for the Iranian demonstrators and shift focus away from the core issues at stake.

The article titled *"They Are Cornering Iran! Canada's Decision on Mahsa Amini"* published on September 27, 2022, frames the protests in Iran within the *Foreign Intervention Frame* by emphasizing external actors' involvement in the crisis. The focus of the article is on Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau's statements condemning the Iranian regime and his government's decision regarding sanctions or diplomatic actions against Iran. However, rather than presenting Trudeau's remarks as part of a broader international human rights response, the article frames them as an external effort to pressure Iran, thereby reinforcing the idea that the protests are not purely domestic but rather part of a Western-led campaign against the country.

One of the key aspects of this framing is the use of the phrase *"They Are Cornering Iran!"* in the headline. This wording suggests that Iran is under siege by external forces, portraying the country as a victim of geopolitical pressure rather than an authoritarian regime facing internal dissent. By choosing to highlight Canada's response rather than the protests themselves, the article diverts attention away from the root causes of the demonstrations—such as police brutality, women's rights, and government repression—and instead places emphasis on the role of foreign governments. This shift in focus aligns with the Iranian government's long-standing narrative that Western nations seek to destabilize Iran by using internal unrest as a tool of intervention.

Furthermore, the article implies that Trudeau's criticism is not a genuine human rights concern but rather a strategic move to exert pressure on Iran. This aligns with the broader discourse in conservative and pro-government media, which often portrays Western nations as acting out of political or economic self-interest rather than moral obligation. By framing Canada's stance as an act of *"cornering"* rather than an expression of solidarity with Iranian protesters, the article casts doubt on the legitimacy of international condemnation and subtly suggests that such actions may be part of a broader Western agenda against Iran.

Another significant element of this framing is how the article positions foreign intervention as the driving force behind the protests. Instead of highlighting the grievances of Iranian citizens—such as the mandatory hijab laws, police violence, and systemic gender discrimination—the article presents the protests as an extension of international political maneuvering. This perspective minimizes the agency of Iranian protesters by implying that their actions are being manipulated or encouraged by foreign governments, rather than being an organic response to domestic issues.

Additionally, by selecting Trudeau's statements as the focal point, the article reinforces the idea that Western leaders are actively fueling unrest in Iran. Canada, while a vocal critic of Iran, is not typically the most dominant international actor in Middle Eastern politics. However, by emphasizing Canada's involvement, the article suggests a coordinated international effort to isolate Iran, thereby strengthening the perception that the protests are not an independent movement but a foreign-backed attempt to weaken the Iranian regime. This framing is particularly effective in appealing to audiences who already perceive Western nations as hostile toward Iran or as having a history of interventionist policies in the region.

The *Foreign Intervention Frame* also serves a strategic purpose in justifying the Iranian government's response to the protests. If the unrest is perceived as part of a broader Western conspiracy rather than a legitimate domestic movement, then government crackdowns can be framed as necessary defensive measures against external aggression. This approach shifts the narrative from one of state repression to one of national sovereignty, portraying Iran's actions as efforts to protect itself from foreign influence rather than suppress its own citizens.

Furthermore, this framing extends beyond Iran's domestic audience and serves to influence how external readers—particularly those in countries with anti-Western

sentiments—perceive the situation. By emphasizing foreign involvement, the article aligns itself with a broader geopolitical discourse that portrays Western nations as hypocritical actors who selectively advocate for human rights while pursuing their own strategic interests. This argument resonates particularly in countries that have historically experienced Western intervention and are therefore skeptical of Western narratives on democracy and human rights.

In conclusion, the article employs the *Foreign Intervention Frame* by focusing on Canada's stance rather than the protests themselves, implying that external forces are the primary drivers of unrest in Iran. The headline "*They Are Cornering Iran!*" suggests that Iran is under attack rather than facing internal dissent, reinforcing the idea that Western nations are using human rights concerns as a pretext for geopolitical pressure. By minimizing the role of Iranian citizens and emphasizing foreign involvement, the article supports the narrative that the protests are not a genuine movement but rather an externally fueled attempt to weaken Iran. This framing ultimately serves to delegitimize the protesters while justifying the government's response as a necessary defense against foreign interference.

The article titled "***Full-On Attack on Islam by Cumhuriyet Writers! 'Shameful'***" published on September 29, 2022, frames the protests in Iran and their discussion in Turkish media within the *Conflict Frame*, particularly emphasizing the perceived ideological battle between secular and religious factions. The article specifically accuses a Cumhuriyet newspaper writer of exploiting the events in Iran as a pretext to attack Islam, portraying secular criticism of the Iranian regime as an attack on religious values rather than a critique of political authority or human rights violations.

One of the key elements of this framing is the choice of language, particularly phrases like "*Seculars threw their filth onto Islam*". Such rhetoric not only strengthens the

polarization between religious and secular groups but also presents the critique of Iran's policies as an attack on the broader Muslim identity. By doing so, the article diverts attention from the actual issues at hand—such as women's rights, police brutality, and government repression—shifting the focus toward a cultural and religious conflict. This framing suggests that the protests are not just about political grievances but also part of a larger ideological struggle between those who defend Islamic values and those who seek to undermine them.

The *Conflict Frame* is further reinforced by how the article portrays the Cumhuriyet writer's stance. Rather than engaging with the writer's arguments or discussing the broader context of the Iranian protests, the article frames the writer's statements as outright hostility toward Islam. This approach serves two main purposes: first, it delegitimizes secular voices who critique the Iranian regime by portraying them as inherently anti-religious; and second, it mobilizes conservative and religious readers against not only the protests in Iran but also any similar movements in Turkey that challenge religious authority.

By labeling the Cumhuriyet writer's views as an "*attack on Islam*", the article aligns itself with a broader narrative that portrays secular intellectuals and media outlets as being antagonistic toward religious traditions. This is a common strategy in conservative and pro-government media, where secular opposition is often depicted not as a legitimate political critique but as a cultural assault on deeply held religious beliefs. This framing strengthens divisions between different ideological groups and reinforces the idea that secularism and Islam are in direct conflict.

Another significant aspect of this framing is the attempt to link the protests in Iran with broader ideological conflicts within Turkey. By framing the Cumhuriyet writer's critique as part of a "*full-on attack on Islam*", the article suggests that similar secular perspectives

within Turkey could also be used to destabilize Islamic traditions. This aligns with the long-standing narrative in Turkish conservative media that secularism is not merely a different worldview but a direct threat to religious and national unity. The reference to “*shameful*” behavior further moralizes the issue, portraying secular critiques as not only wrong but also disgraceful, reinforcing the emotional intensity of the conflict.

Furthermore, the *Conflict Frame* in this article serves a strategic purpose by drawing a sharp contrast between different ideological camps. By emphasizing the supposed hostility of secular voices, the article strengthens the idea that defending Islamic values is synonymous with resisting Westernization, secularization, and liberal ideologies. This aligns with the broader conservative discourse that portrays religious identity as being under siege by external and internal enemies, further justifying restrictive policies on issues such as women’s dress codes and religious practices.

The framing of the Cumhuriyet writer’s statements as an “*attack*” rather than a critique also serves to suppress dissenting opinions. By framing secular perspectives as offensive and harmful to religious values, the article indirectly supports the idea that such critiques should be silenced or dismissed. This has implications for both the perception of the Iranian protests and the broader discourse on freedom of expression in Turkey. If secular critiques of Iran’s policies are framed as unacceptable attacks on religion, then similar critiques of religious conservatism in Turkey may also be delegitimized, further restricting the space for open discussion on these issues.

Moreover, the article’s selective focus on one Cumhuriyet writer’s statements—without engaging in a broader discussion about the protests or the Iranian government’s policies—demonstrates an attempt to reframe the issue from a political and human rights crisis into an ideological and cultural war. Instead of examining the grievances of Iranian protesters or the reasons behind their movement, the article shifts attention to the supposed

misconduct of secular intellectuals, reinforcing the idea that the real problem is not the Iranian government's actions but rather the way secular voices interpret and criticize them.

In conclusion, the article employs the *Conflict Frame* by portraying secular critiques of the Iranian government as an attack on Islam, using inflammatory language to deepen ideological divisions. By shifting the focus away from the actual protests and toward an internal ideological struggle, the article seeks to delegitimize secular perspectives and reinforce the idea that defending Islamic values requires opposing such critiques. This framing serves to strengthen conservative narratives, mobilize religious audiences against secular intellectuals, and justify restrictive measures against dissenting opinions, both in the context of Iran and within Turkey's own ideological landscape.

The article titled "***Anti-Sharia Protestors Have Started Setting Fire to Madrasahs***" published on November 3, 2022, constructs its narrative using a combination of the *Conflict Frame* and the *Law and Order Frame*, portraying the protests as both an ideological attack on religious values and a threat to social stability. The language used in the article, particularly the statement "*Those who used Amini's death as an excuse have started attacking madrasahs in the country,*" suggests that the protests are not spontaneous expressions of public anger but rather premeditated acts of aggression against religious institutions, orchestrated by opponents of Islam and the Iranian regime. This framing aligns with broader conservative media narratives that depict mass protests as part of a coordinated effort by external and internal enemies to undermine religious and political authority.

The *Conflict Frame* in this article is evident in the way it positions the protesters as adversaries of religious values and institutions. By referring to them as "*anti-Sharia protestors*", the article immediately establishes a dichotomy between those who support

Islamic law and those who oppose it, framing the protests as part of a larger ideological struggle. This choice of wording implies that the demonstrators are not merely advocating for women's rights or political freedoms but are fundamentally opposed to religious governance. This framing is significant because it transforms the protests from a political issue into a cultural and religious war, appealing to readers who view Islamic governance as a fundamental pillar of national identity and stability.

Moreover, the phrase “*used Amini’s death as an excuse*” suggests that the demonstrators' motivations are insincere, reinforcing the idea that their actions are not driven by genuine concerns over human rights or police brutality but rather by a deeper agenda to destabilize the country. This is a common rhetorical strategy used in conservative media to delegitimize social movements, as it shifts the focus away from the grievances of the protesters and instead casts them as opportunists exploiting a tragic event to pursue their own ideological goals.

Another key aspect of the *Conflict Frame* in this article is the portrayal of madrasahs as targets of aggression. In Islamic societies, madrasahs serve not only as educational institutions but also as symbols of religious continuity and authority. By highlighting attacks on these institutions, the article amplifies the perception of the protests as an existential threat to religious traditions, further deepening the divide between supporters of the regime and those calling for change.

The *Law and Order Frame* is also evident in the way the article emphasizes the disorder caused by the protests and the necessity of state intervention. By framing the demonstrators as aggressors who are deliberately escalating tensions by targeting religious sites, the article legitimizes the government's security measures. This aligns with the broader theme of portraying the protests not as a reflection of societal grievances but as acts of lawlessness requiring state control. The fact that the same event was reported

by Yeni Şafak provides an opportunity for comparative analysis of framing strategies among different conservative media outlets, revealing how similar narratives are constructed to reinforce state legitimacy and suppress dissent.

The article titled ***"In Iran, They Claim Amini Was Killed for Not Covering Her Head, and Now They Are Attacking Mullahs"*** published on November 6, 2022, frames the protests within both the *Law and Order Frame* and the *Conflict Frame*, portraying the demonstrators as not only destabilizing forces but also as direct threats to Iran's religious establishment. By emphasizing the targeting of mullahs during the protests, the article presents the demonstrations as chaotic actions aimed at dismantling the religious and social order, reinforcing the need for strong government intervention.

The *Conflict Frame* is particularly evident in the way the article constructs an ideological battle between two opposing groups: the defenders of Iran's religious order, represented by the mullahs, and the protestors, who are portrayed as adversaries seeking to overthrow that order. The article implies that the protests are no longer just about Mahsa Amini's death or women's rights but have transformed into an existential struggle against Islamic governance itself. By emphasizing the attacks on religious figures, the article strengthens the perception that the movement has radicalized and become hostile toward the religious establishment. The phrase *"They claim Amini was killed for not covering her head, and now they are attacking mullahs"* suggests that the protests have escalated from a grievance about women's rights to outright aggression against religious authorities, casting doubt on the sincerity of the demonstrators' original concerns. This rhetorical strategy delegitimizes the protest movement by implying that its participants are not simply seeking justice but are actively working to dismantle Iran's religious and political structure.

Additionally, the focus on the physical targeting of mullahs serves to evoke a sense of victimization among religious figures, reinforcing a narrative that portrays them as under siege. This framing appeals to conservative and pro-regime audiences who view the clergy as symbols of moral and political authority. By emphasizing violence against religious leaders, the article deepens the divide between those who support the Islamic system and those who challenge it, reinforcing a perception that the protests are driven by anti-religious sentiments rather than genuine grievances.

The *Law and Order Frame* is also central to the article's narrative. By portraying the attacks on mullahs as chaotic actions that threaten social order, the article underscores the necessity of government intervention to restore stability. This aligns with the broader strategy of justifying security measures, including crackdowns on demonstrators, as essential steps to protect public order. The reference to attacks on religious figures is particularly significant because, in Iran, the clergy hold not only spiritual authority but also political power. Presenting them as victims of lawlessness allows the government to frame its repressive measures as efforts to protect religious and national security rather than as acts of political suppression.

Moreover, the article implies that such actions by protestors justify the state's forceful response. By shifting the focus from the initial demands of the protests to the alleged violence committed by demonstrators, the article helps construct a narrative where the Iranian authorities appear as the defenders of stability, rather than as perpetrators of human rights violations. This reinforces public perceptions that strong government control is necessary to prevent chaos and maintain national unity.

Overall, the article employs both the *Conflict Frame* and the *Law and Order Frame* to shape public perception of the protests. By depicting the movement as an attack on religious values and figures, it appeals to conservative audiences who prioritize the

preservation of the Islamic order. Simultaneously, by emphasizing the disorder and violence attributed to the demonstrators, it legitimizes the state's security measures, reinforcing the narrative that government intervention is necessary to maintain peace and protect Iran's religious and political institutions.

The article titled "***Mahsa Amini Is Just a Small Part of This Game! Former U.S. President Clinton Sends Support Message to Iran***" published on November 16, 2022, employs the *Foreign Intervention Frame* to portray the protests in Iran as being orchestrated or manipulated by external forces, particularly Western powers. The headline itself sets the tone by suggesting that Mahsa Amini's death is merely a pretext for a larger geopolitical game, implying that the unrest is not an organic response to domestic grievances but rather a product of foreign interference. By using the phrase "*just a small part of this game*," the article minimizes the legitimacy of the protests, framing them as a tool in the hands of external actors seeking to weaken Iran.

The article's emphasis on former U.S. President Bill Clinton's video message, in which he expresses solidarity with Iranian women fighting for their rights, serves as a key element in reinforcing this frame. By highlighting a statement from a prominent American political figure, the article presents Western support as suspicious rather than as a reflection of genuine concern for human rights. This rhetorical strategy aligns with a broader pattern in pro-government media narratives that depict international backing for protests as evidence of a covert agenda aimed at destabilizing Iran. The article implies that such statements are not motivated by humanitarian or democratic values but are instead part of a strategic effort to undermine Iran's sovereignty.

Additionally, the framing of Clinton's message as "*support for the protests*" rather than as an expression of solidarity with Iranian women allows the article to link the demonstrations to U.S. foreign policy objectives. This serves to delegitimize the protests

by suggesting that they are being encouraged or even orchestrated by foreign governments to serve geopolitical interests. The underlying message is that Iranians who participate in these demonstrations are either knowingly or unknowingly acting as pawns in a Western scheme against their own country. This portrayal seeks to discredit the movement by shifting attention away from the protesters' demands and instead placing the focus on alleged foreign manipulation.

The *Foreign Intervention Frame* is further reinforced by the choice of language and structure. The article does not engage with the content of Clinton's message in depth or acknowledge the broader international concern over human rights in Iran. Instead, it treats his statement as proof of Western interference, implying that external forces are fueling unrest rather than addressing the legitimacy of the protesters' grievances. This approach aligns with a common tactic used in state-aligned media, where foreign criticism is often framed as an attack on national sovereignty rather than a call for reform.

Furthermore, by invoking the involvement of a former U.S. president rather than a current official, the article suggests that Western intervention in Iranian affairs is long-standing and deeply rooted. This reinforces the narrative that external forces have persistently sought to destabilize Iran, and the protests following Mahsa Amini's death are merely the latest manifestation of this ongoing effort. The implication is that the unrest is not an independent, grassroots movement but part of a broader Western strategy to weaken Iran's government.

Overall, the article employs the *Foreign Intervention Frame* to discredit the protests and reinforce a narrative of external manipulation. By presenting Clinton's message as evidence of a larger geopolitical scheme, it shifts the focus away from domestic dissatisfaction and towards the idea that the demonstrations are orchestrated by hostile foreign powers. This framing not only delegitimizes the protesters but also justifies the

Iranian government's crackdown on dissent by portraying it as a necessary response to external threats.

The article titled ***"Kurdish Clerics in Iran Call for a Referendum! 'We Support the Protests'"*** published on November 22, 2022, employs the *Foreign Intervention Frame* to depict the Iranian protests as part of a broader geopolitical strategy orchestrated by external actors, particularly the United States. The framing of the article suggests that the protests are not merely a reflection of domestic grievances but rather a tool being used by foreign powers to weaken Iran's internal stability.

The article specifically highlights statements made by Sunni Kurdish clerics in eastern Iran, who express their support for the protests and call for a referendum. By emphasizing that these clerics' statements are *"surprising,"* the article implies that such public dissent is unusual and potentially influenced by external forces. This rhetorical strategy serves to delegitimize their support for the protests by framing it as part of a coordinated effort to destabilize the country. The portrayal of Kurdish clerics as central figures in this dissent also ties into a broader narrative that presents ethnic and religious minorities as potential agents of foreign influence, reinforcing the idea that Iran's internal divisions are being exploited by hostile external powers.

Furthermore, the article incorporates statements from U.S. officials about bringing peace to Iran and suggests that these statements expose *"the game being played."* This phrase reinforces the idea that the protests are not organic but rather part of a Western-led operation against the Iranian government. By framing U.S. diplomatic statements as evidence of a *"game,"* the article suggests that any external support for the protests is not driven by genuine concern for human rights or democracy but is instead a strategic maneuver to weaken Iran. This aligns with a broader pattern in pro-government media that portrays Western involvement as insincere and politically motivated.

The *Foreign Intervention Frame* is further strengthened by the article's selective focus. While it reports on the Kurdish clerics' statements, it does not explore the historical context of their grievances or the reasons behind their call for a referendum. Instead, their support for the protests is framed as part of a larger foreign-backed plot rather than as an expression of legitimate concerns about governance, minority rights, or religious freedom in Iran. This framing allows the article to shift attention away from the protesters' demands and toward the idea that external forces are manipulating internal dissent.

By presenting Kurdish clerics' support for the protests alongside U.S. statements, the article implicitly links domestic unrest to foreign intervention. This not only delegitimizes the protests but also serves to justify the Iranian government's crackdown on dissent. If the unrest is framed as a foreign conspiracy rather than a domestic movement for reform, then suppressing it can be framed as an act of national defense rather than repression.

Overall, the article uses the *Foreign Intervention Frame* to depict the protests as an externally driven effort to destabilize Iran, rather than as a response to domestic issues. By highlighting the involvement of Kurdish clerics and U.S. officials, it reinforces a narrative that portrays internal dissent as part of a broader geopolitical struggle, thereby undermining the legitimacy of the protests and strengthening the Iranian government's position.

The article titled "**84% of Iranians Are Against the Regime**" published on December 6, 2022, stands out as a significant deviation from the usual framing strategies employed by *Yeni Akit* regarding the Mahsa Amini protests. Unlike previous articles that predominantly utilized the *Law and Order* or *Foreign Intervention* frames to delegitimize the protests, this article shifts toward a *Human Rights* frame by emphasizing widespread public opposition to the Iranian regime. The article presents statistical data suggesting that an overwhelming majority—84% of Iranians—oppose the ruling establishment,

thereby calling into question the regime's legitimacy and its ability to represent the will of the people.

This framing aligns with the *Human Rights* frame by portraying the Iranian people as victims of an oppressive regime that does not reflect their desires. By highlighting mass opposition to Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei, the article challenges the traditional narrative that Iran's governance is rooted in strong public support for its religious and political leadership. Instead, it suggests that the regime is out of touch with its citizens and that the ongoing protests are not the work of a small, foreign-backed faction but rather a reflection of deep-seated dissatisfaction among the broader population.

The reference to public opinion polling is particularly notable because it provides a sense of empirical legitimacy to the claims made in the article. While previous coverage of the protests by *Yeni Akit* often relied on governmental sources or statements from Iranian officials to frame the demonstrations as unlawful or externally influenced, this article takes a different approach by presenting statistical evidence to suggest that the Iranian people themselves are rejecting the regime. By doing so, it indirectly acknowledges the grievances of the protesters and recognizes the protests as part of a larger societal movement rather than as isolated acts of rebellion.

Furthermore, this article marks a pivotal moment in *Yeni Akit*'s coverage of the Iranian protests, as it signals a potential shift in the newspaper's stance. Prior to this, the outlet consistently framed the protests through the lens of *Law and Order*—emphasizing the threat to national stability—or *Foreign Intervention*—positioning the demonstrations as Western-backed attempts to weaken Iran. In contrast, the use of the *Human Rights* frame in this instance suggests a willingness to acknowledge the legitimacy of public discontent, at least to some degree.

This shift in framing could be attributed to several factors. First, the growing intensity of the protests and the increasing number of casualties may have made it more difficult to dismiss the movement as a mere foreign plot. Second, the introduction of statistical evidence reflecting widespread opposition to the regime may have influenced the newspaper's editorial approach, leading it to present a narrative that acknowledges mass dissatisfaction. Third, the shift could also be a strategic decision to appeal to a broader readership by incorporating alternative perspectives into the coverage.

However, despite the shift in framing, it is essential to consider the broader context of Yeni Akit's reporting. While this article appears to recognize the scale of opposition to the Iranian regime, it does not necessarily signal a complete reversal in the newspaper's stance. Instead, it may serve as a tactical deviation within a larger framework that has predominantly sought to undermine the legitimacy of the protests. By presenting statistical data on public discontent, the article introduces a new dimension to the discussion while still operating within the broader ideological constraints of the publication.

Overall, the article's use of the *Human Rights* frame represents a significant departure from previous coverage of the Mahsa Amini protests in Yeni Akit. By highlighting mass opposition to the regime, it challenges the traditional narrative that portrays the protests as foreign-orchestrated or as threats to national stability. This shift in framing suggests a nuanced approach, where the newspaper briefly acknowledges the legitimacy of public grievances while maintaining an overall critical stance on the protests.

The article titled "***Khamenei's Niece Feride Sentenced to 15 Years in Prison***," published on December 10, 2022, presents a notable shift in Yeni Akit's framing of the Mahsa Amini protests. While previous articles consistently dismissed allegations of state violence and positioned the protests as either threats to national security (*Law and Order*

Frame) or foreign-orchestrated attempts to destabilize Iran (*Foreign Intervention Frame*), this article employs the *Human Rights Frame* by emphasizing political repression and the Iranian regime's authoritarian practices.

By reporting on the sentencing of Feride Moradkhani, the niece of Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, the article highlights internal dissent within Iran's ruling elite. Moradkhani's statements are prominently featured, particularly her condemnation of the Iranian government as a "murderous and child-killing regime" that fails to uphold its religious obligations. This direct criticism of the regime suggests a departure from *Yeni Akit*'s previous reluctance to acknowledge internal opposition to Khamenei's rule. Rather than portraying dissenters as foreign-backed agitators, this article presents Moradkhani—someone with familial ties to Iran's highest authority—as a legitimate critic of the regime. This framing aligns with the *Human Rights Frame*, as it underscores the Iranian government's suppression of political dissidents and highlights the consequences of speaking out against the state.

A particularly striking aspect of the article is its acknowledgment of Mahsa Amini's death as a result of police violence. Unlike earlier coverage that framed the cause of Amini's death as a medical condition or dismissed claims of police brutality as unfounded allegations, this article explicitly states that Amini "died after being beaten by the morality police." This is a significant rhetorical shift, as it marks the first time *Yeni Akit* has deviated from its previous approach of discrediting reports of state-perpetrated violence. By adopting language that directly attributes Amini's death to police brutality, the article aligns itself with human rights discourse and implicitly validates the grievances of the protest movement.

The use of the *Human Rights Frame* in this context serves multiple purposes. First, it acknowledges the regime's human rights violations, including political persecution and

excessive use of force against civilians. By focusing on Moradkhani's imprisonment and her critical statements, the article underscores the Iranian government's intolerance toward dissent. Second, the shift in language regarding Amini's death suggests a reevaluation of the newspaper's framing strategy. While previous articles emphasized law and order or external intervention to delegitimize the protests, this article presents a narrative that aligns more closely with international human rights concerns.

However, it is essential to analyze this shift within the broader context of Yeni Akit's editorial stance. While the article employs the *Human Rights Frame*, it does not necessarily signal a complete reversal in the newspaper's perspective on the protests. Instead, it may represent a selective and strategic use of framing to introduce a new dimension to the coverage. The decision to highlight Moradkhani's sentencing—rather than focusing on ordinary protesters—may also serve to present internal opposition as an isolated phenomenon rather than a widespread movement. Furthermore, while the article acknowledges Amini's death as a result of police violence, it does not explicitly call for justice or systemic reform, which limits the extent of its engagement with the *Human Rights Frame*.

Overall, this article marks a critical departure from Yeni Akit's earlier reporting on the Mahsa Amini protests by incorporating elements of the *Human Rights Frame*. By emphasizing political repression and acknowledging state violence, the article introduces a narrative that contrasts with its previous focus on security and external intervention. This shift in framing suggests a more complex approach to the protests, where Yeni Akit momentarily engages with human rights discourse while maintaining its broader ideological positioning.

The article titled "***He Participated in the Mahsa Amini Protests! Iranian Footballer Sentenced to Death***" published on December 14, 2022, employs a combination of the

Criminalization Frame, *Law and Order Frame*, and *Conflict Frame* to shape the narrative surrounding the sentencing of an Iranian footballer who supported the Mahsa Amini protests. The article frames the footballer's involvement in the protests not as an expression of political dissent but as an act of rebellion against the state, emphasizing legal charges such as "membership in illegal gangs," "conspiracy to undermine security," and "participation in armed rebellion." These descriptions align with the *Criminalization Frame*, which seeks to delegitimize opposition movements by portraying protesters as lawbreakers rather than individuals exercising their right to protest.

By listing these severe charges, the article reinforces the notion that participation in the protests equates to engaging in criminal activities, a common strategy in authoritarian regimes to suppress dissent. The portrayal of the footballer as a threat to national security rather than as a political figure or activist suggests an attempt to delegitimize not only his individual actions but also the broader protest movement. The use of terms such as "armed rebellion" further strengthens this framing by associating the protests with violence and insurgency rather than peaceful demonstrations.

Additionally, the phrase "*accused of waging war against God*" introduces both the *Law and Order Frame* and the *Conflict Frame*. The *Law and Order Frame* is evident in how the article presents the state's legal response to the protests as a necessary action to maintain stability. By portraying the Iranian judiciary's decision as a lawful response to a crime, rather than a politically motivated act of repression, the article legitimizes the harsh sentencing. The concept of "*waging war against God*" (moharebeh) is deeply rooted in Iran's legal and religious framework, and its inclusion in the article serves to reinforce the notion that opposition to the regime is not only unlawful but also sacrilegious. This religious justification strengthens the argument that the government's actions are legitimate and necessary to protect the country's moral and legal order.

At the same time, the *Conflict Frame* is employed by framing the protests as a battleground between two opposing forces: the Iranian regime and those who challenge its authority. The emphasis on the footballer's alleged participation in an "armed rebellion" and the connection to religious transgressions position him as part of a larger struggle against the Islamic state. The use of language that associates dissent with anti-religious activities aligns the protests with an existential threat to the regime, fostering a perception of division and conflict within society. This approach can also serve to mobilize regime supporters by portraying opposition figures as not just political dissidents but as enemies of the state and its religious foundations.

Furthermore, the choice of a well-known public figure—a footballer—adds another layer to the framing. Sports figures often hold significant cultural influence, and their participation in political movements can have a strong impact on public opinion. By emphasizing that even a high-profile individual is not immune to severe legal consequences, the article sends a message about the risks associated with supporting the protests. This aligns with the *Criminalization Frame*, as it discourages public figures and ordinary citizens from expressing opposition by demonstrating the state's willingness to impose extreme penalties.

In sum, the article strategically combines the *Criminalization Frame*, *Law and Order Frame*, and *Conflict Frame* to shape public perception of the Mahsa Amini protests. The footballer's sentencing is not framed as a case of political repression but rather as a justified legal action against a criminal who poses a threat to national security and religious values. By intertwining legal, religious, and security-based narratives, the article reinforces the idea that supporting the protests is both unlawful and morally reprehensible, further delegitimizing the movement in the eyes of its audience.

The article titled ***"Iran Appoints a Notable Figure as Head of the Police Force! He Made His Name Known with 'Serial Murders'"*** published on January 8, 2023, employs the *Human Rights Frame*, which is notably rare in Yeni Akit's coverage of the Mahsa Amini protests. Unlike previous articles that primarily framed the protests through *Conflict*, *Foreign Intervention*, or *Law and Order* perspectives, this article takes a different approach by emphasizing human rights violations and raising implicit criticism of the Iranian regime.

The article focuses on the appointment of Ahmadreza Radan as Iran's new *Police General Commander*, replacing Hossein Ashtari, and highlights his controversial past. By stressing that Radan was sanctioned by the European Union for his involvement in human rights abuses, the article indirectly acknowledges international concerns about state-led repression in Iran. Furthermore, linking him to the mysterious deaths of 21 individuals—including opposition figures, politicians, writers, and artists—between 1987 and 1998 reinforces the portrayal of the Iranian security apparatus as systematically involved in extrajudicial killings and suppression of dissent. This acknowledgment is significant, as it contrasts with Yeni Akit's typical portrayal of the Iranian regime as a victim of foreign intervention and conspiracies.

The explicit mention of Radan's human rights violations suggests an underlying critique of the Iranian state's governance, particularly in the handling of security affairs. Unlike previous articles that dismissed accusations against Iranian authorities as Western propaganda or unfounded claims, this article lends credibility to the allegations by citing the EU sanctions and historical events. This framing aligns with the *Human Rights Frame*, as it draws attention to state violence and oppression, portraying the Iranian leadership as complicit in or directly responsible for human rights violations.

Moreover, the fact that Khamenei personally issued the decree for Radan's appointment introduces a subtle but important layer of criticism. By linking the Supreme Leader directly to the controversial figure, the article suggests that the Iranian leadership is actively choosing individuals with a record of repression to maintain control. This could be interpreted as an implicit acknowledgment that the Iranian government relies on figures with histories of human rights abuses to sustain its authority, thereby reinforcing the perception of a regime that prioritizes suppression over reform.

The choice to focus on Radan's past involvement in extrajudicial killings also contributes to a broader narrative that questions the legitimacy of the Iranian security apparatus. The phrase "*He Made His Name Known with 'Serial Murders'*" in the headline is particularly striking, as it presents Radan not as a professional law enforcement official but as someone infamous for politically motivated killings. This word choice further distances the article from a purely *Law and Order Frame*, which would have justified the appointment as a necessary measure for restoring stability, and instead leans into a perspective that problematizes the decision.

Additionally, this article stands out as one of only two instances in Yeni Akit's coverage of the Mahsa Amini protests where a *Human Rights Frame* is explicitly used. This deviation from the publication's usual framing strategies suggests a momentary shift in perspective, possibly reflecting internal divisions or a strategic attempt to acknowledge human rights concerns while maintaining an overall pro-regime stance in other articles. The article does not outright condemn the Iranian regime but introduces enough critical elements to differentiate itself from the broader pattern of framing the protests as foreign-fueled or anti-Islamic conspiracies.

In summary, this article subtly challenges the Iranian regime's actions by emphasizing Radan's human rights violations and linking them to his appointment by Khamenei. The

use of the *Human Rights Frame* distinguishes this piece from Yeni Akit's usual coverage of the Mahsa Amini protests, as it acknowledges state-led repression and extrajudicial killings. While it does not directly denounce the Iranian leadership, the subtext suggests a degree of skepticism about the regime's decisions, making it one of the few instances where Yeni Akit's framing strategy diverges from outright support for Iran's official stance.

4.3. Milli Gazete

Milli Gazete is a daily newspaper published in Turkey, with its first issue released on January 12, 1973. The newspaper is closely associated with the Milli Görüş (National Vision) movement, which was led by its founder, Necmettin Erbakan. Milli Gazete was established with the purpose of promoting, defending, and informing the public about the ideology of Milli Görüş. The newspaper adheres to a publication line that is strongly committed to Islamic and national values. It approaches political, economic, and social developments in Turkey from the perspective of the Milli Görüş movement.

Its editorial policy advocates for a greater presence of Islam in public and political life, emphasizes the protection of Turkey's national interests, and takes a critical stance against Western influence. In this context, Milli Gazete's publications are shaped around themes such as anti-secular rhetoric, the protection of Islamic values, and the pursuit of social justice. Throughout Necmettin Erbakan's political career, Milli Gazete served as a media outlet supporting his ideology and policies. The newspaper has supported various political parties associated with the Milli Görüş movement, including the Welfare Party (Refah Partisi), the Virtue Party (Fazilet Partisi), and the Felicity Party (Saadet Partisi), presenting their policies in a favorable light. Today, it is known as a media outlet that reflects and supports the views of the Felicity Party. Milli Gazete plays an active role in

both print and digital media. The newspaper's website offers current news, opinion columns, and analyses, aiming to reach a broad readership. It is particularly an important source of news for readers who value conservative and Islamic principles. While providing news on Turkey's domestic and foreign policies, Milli Gazete also gives significant coverage to issues concerning the Islamic world.

The newspaper follows a publication policy that defends Turkey's national independence and opposes Western interventions. Additionally, issues such as justice, social peace, and the protection of Islamic values are among the key agenda items of the newspaper.

Positioning itself as the voice of Turkey's conservative and Islamic communities, Milli Gazete continues to publish in alignment with this mission. The newspaper's editorial policy is based on a commitment to Islamic and national values, the pursuit of social justice, and the protection of Turkey's independence. In this context, Milli Gazete maintains its presence in Turkey's media landscape as one of the primary media outlets of the Milli Görüş movement.

4.3.1. Mahsa Amini in Milli Gazete

In Milli Gazete, a total of 20 articles concerning the Mahsa Amini events were published not only during the specified period of September 16, 2022 – September 16, 2023, but also continuing up to the present. Only 10 of these reports were published in specific date range of this study. These articles largely employed the "Foreign Intervention Frame" in presenting the Mahsa Amini events.

According to the articles, the unrest in Iran was planned and supported by foreign powers such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Israel, and Saudi Arabia. This frame emphasizes the involvement of external forces behind the events and highlights the

intervention in Iran's domestic affairs. The articles prominently feature claims that foreign intelligence agencies and external interventions were inciting the protests.

The article titled "HÜDA PAR's Statement Regarding the Mahsa Amini Protests in Iran" dated September 23, 2022, states, "It is not surprising that the enemy imperialist states, hostile to Islam, have adopted an encouraging and provocative stance to turn the protests in Iran into violent acts. After all, there has long been a goal to spark a civil war in Iran." The article underscores the notion that foreign powers are intervening in Iran's internal affairs and threatening the country's sovereignty, using the foreign intervention frame. The reference to "enemies of Islam" suggests that the conflict frame is also being utilized.

The article titled ***"Iran Reacts to Those Countries: Summons Ambassadors to the Foreign Ministry"***, published on September 25, 2022, employs the *Foreign Intervention Frame* by portraying international reactions to the Mahsa Amini protests as interference in Iran's internal affairs. This frame is constructed through two main narratives: first, the diplomatic reaction to statements from foreign political figures, and second, the claim that international media outlets are fueling unrest through propaganda.

The article highlights Iran's strong response to statements made by the Speaker of the Norwegian Parliament, presenting them as an unacceptable intervention in the country's sovereignty. This framing aligns with the broader strategy of depicting the protests not as an organic domestic movement but as an externally influenced destabilization attempt. By framing Norway's statement as interference rather than a legitimate human rights concern, the article shifts the focus away from the grievances of Iranian protesters and instead emphasizes Iran's right to resist foreign meddling. This approach resonates with state-aligned narratives that often equate external criticism with efforts to weaken or destabilize the regime.

Additionally, the article reinforces the *Foreign Intervention Frame* by accusing BBC Persian and Iran International of inciting protests. By labeling these media outlets as tools of foreign influence, the article constructs a narrative in which Western-backed information channels are deliberately manipulating public perception and encouraging anti-regime sentiment. This aligns with previous state-aligned discourses in Iranian and conservative Turkish media, where foreign-funded media are often portrayed as instruments of psychological warfare aimed at undermining national unity.

The emphasis on summoning ambassadors to the Iranian Foreign Ministry further strengthens this frame by depicting Iran as a sovereign state actively resisting external pressures. This diplomatic move is presented not only as a response to criticism but also as a demonstration of Iran's ability to confront foreign intervention. Such framing serves a dual purpose: it reassures domestic audiences of the regime's strength while also discrediting international actors by portraying them as aggressors attempting to destabilize Iran under the guise of human rights advocacy.

Moreover, the article's focus on foreign media intervention suggests an attempt to delegitimize alternative narratives regarding the protests. Instead of addressing the root causes of the unrest—such as public dissatisfaction with the morality police and the broader socio-political structure—the article shifts the blame to external actors. This tactic is commonly used in state-aligned media to control the narrative and prevent domestic audiences from sympathizing with protesters.

In summary, this article strongly employs the *Foreign Intervention Frame* by portraying international political statements and foreign media coverage as orchestrated efforts to interfere in Iran's domestic affairs. The accusations against BBC Persian and Iran International reinforce the idea that the protests are not purely domestic but are being manipulated from abroad. This framing serves to delegitimize both the protesters and

international criticism, aligning with broader narratives that depict Iran as a victim of Western aggression rather than as a state facing significant internal dissent.

The article titled "***Pro-Government Rally in Iran: Down with Traitors***", published on September 26, 2022, employs the *Foreign Intervention Frame* by presenting the protests as orchestrated by external actors, particularly Israel. The coverage of the rally highlights how pro-government demonstrators positioned themselves against both the protesters and alleged foreign instigators, reinforcing the narrative that the Mahsa Amini protests were not an organic movement but rather a destabilization attempt backed by external powers.

The article's focus on slogans such as "*Down with Israel*" serves as a rhetorical device to frame the protests within a broader geopolitical conflict. By associating anti-government demonstrations with a foreign adversary, the article delegitimizes the protests and shifts the narrative from a domestic issue of civil unrest to a matter of national security and sovereignty. This framing aligns with long-standing discourse in state-aligned media, where Israel and Western countries are frequently accused of orchestrating internal conflicts in Muslim-majority nations to weaken them from within.

Moreover, the emphasis on the pro-government rally itself serves as a counter-framing strategy. Instead of discussing the grievances of those protesting against the Iranian regime, the article shifts attention to those who support it. By showcasing images of large crowds gathered in support of the government, chanting nationalist and anti-Western slogans, the article reinforces the idea that the regime retains strong popular backing despite ongoing unrest. This not only downplays the scale of the protests but also implies that opposition to the government is limited to a small, externally influenced group rather than a significant portion of the population.

The narrative that foreign powers, particularly Israel, are behind the unrest aligns with the broader propaganda strategy of conservative and pro-government media in Iran and

Turkey. By framing the protests as externally manipulated, the article discourages domestic sympathy for the demonstrators, portraying them as traitors rather than citizens demanding rights and freedoms. Additionally, this framing justifies the regime's harsh response, as cracking down on protesters can be framed as an act of national defense rather than repression.

Furthermore, the article does not provide any counterpoints or perspectives from the protesters, reinforcing the one-sided nature of the coverage. The lack of discussion regarding the root causes of the demonstrations—such as opposition to the morality police, demands for women's rights, and broader political dissatisfaction—further indicates that the primary goal of the article is to shape public perception in favor of the regime.

In conclusion, the article employs the *Foreign Intervention Frame* by presenting the protests as externally influenced rather than stemming from legitimate domestic grievances. Through its focus on the pro-government rally, the use of anti-Israel rhetoric, and the portrayal of demonstrators as traitors, the article seeks to delegitimize the protests and reinforce the Iranian regime's narrative that it is under attack from foreign adversaries rather than facing internal dissent.

The column titled ***"The Unending Sinister Ambitions Over Iran"***, published on September 29, 2022, employs a dual framing strategy by integrating both the *Foreign Intervention Frame* and the *Conflict Frame*. The article presents the Mahsa Amini protests not as a spontaneous expression of public discontent but as a Western-orchestrated attempt to destabilize Iran and weaken its sovereignty. By attributing the unrest to external manipulation, the article downplays the internal grievances that led to the demonstrations and shifts the focus to geopolitical struggles, reinforcing a narrative of Western aggression against the Islamic world.

The *Foreign Intervention Frame* is particularly prominent in the article's argument that the West has long sought to undermine Iran's independence, portraying the protests as part of a broader campaign to weaken the country. This framing aligns with the dominant discourse in conservative and pro-government media, which frequently depict mass protests as foreign-engineered attempts at regime change rather than as legitimate expressions of social or political discontent. By claiming that the demonstrations are being incited from abroad, the article delegitimizes the protesters' demands and instead casts them as pawns in a larger geopolitical struggle. This frame not only reinforces nationalistic sentiment but also justifies harsh crackdowns by the Iranian state as necessary measures to protect national sovereignty.

Additionally, the article employs the *Conflict Frame* by highlighting efforts to create divisions within Iranian society, particularly between devout and secular segments. The argument that the protests are designed to pit religious and secular citizens against one another suggests an attempt to frame the unrest as an internal cultural war rather than a unified movement for reform. This narrative serves to fragment the opposition, portraying it as internally divided and ideologically conflicted rather than as a cohesive force against the regime.

By emphasizing these divisions, the article reinforces the idea that the protests are not only externally manipulated but also socially disruptive, threatening Iran's stability and national unity. This aligns with a broader strategy in conservative media, where political and social unrest is often framed as an existential threat to traditional values and national identity. The implication is that supporting the protests equates to aligning with foreign interests and contributing to domestic chaos, further alienating potential sympathizers from the movement.

Furthermore, the column does not engage with the actual grievances of the protesters, such as opposition to the morality police, demands for women's rights, and broader dissatisfaction with the regime's authoritarian policies. Instead, by focusing solely on external influence and internal division, the article presents a one-sided narrative that serves to reinforce the legitimacy of the Iranian government while discrediting its critics.

In conclusion, "*The Unending Sinister Ambitions Over Iran*" employs both the *Foreign Intervention Frame* and the *Conflict Frame* to delegitimize the Mahsa Amini protests. By portraying the unrest as a Western conspiracy and emphasizing divisions between religious and secular groups, the article shifts attention away from the protesters' demands and instead presents the Iranian regime as a victim of external aggression and internal subversion. This framing not only justifies state repression but also discourages solidarity among different segments of society, reinforcing the status quo.

The column titled "***The Events in Iran Are a U.S. and Israel Project***", published on October 19, 2022, employs the *Foreign Intervention Frame* by presenting the Mahsa Amini protests as part of a broader geopolitical scheme orchestrated by the United States and Israel. By attributing the unrest to foreign influence rather than internal dissatisfaction, the article attempts to delegitimize the protesters' demands and justify the Iranian government's actions in suppressing the demonstrations.

The article's opening statement, which claims that Iran has long been a target of U.S. and Israeli plans for the Middle East, establishes a narrative of continuous external aggression. This framing suggests that the protests are not a spontaneous uprising against state policies or a reaction to human rights violations but rather a premeditated operation designed to weaken Iran. By making this assertion, the column aligns with a longstanding discourse in conservative and pro-government media, where any form of internal dissent is framed as an extension of Western imperialist agendas.

This narrative reinforces the idea that Iran is under siege from external forces and that domestic movements challenging the government are either manipulated or directly funded by foreign actors. Such a perspective aims to shift public perception away from the grievances that triggered the protests—such as opposition to the morality police, demands for women’s rights, and broader calls for political and social reform—and instead presents the demonstrations as a security threat engineered by hostile nations.

Additionally, the column implies that the involvement of the U.S. and Israel is not incidental but part of a long-term strategy to destabilize Iran and interfere in its internal affairs. By linking the protests to foreign intelligence operations or diplomatic agendas, the article attempts to foster nationalist sentiment and rally support for the regime against an alleged external enemy. This approach discourages domestic criticism of the government, as those who support the protests can be accused of aiding or abetting foreign adversaries.

Moreover, this framing serves to justify the Iranian government’s repressive measures against protesters. If the demonstrations are perceived as a foreign conspiracy rather than a legitimate expression of public discontent, then state crackdowns can be portrayed as necessary actions to preserve national security rather than as human rights violations. This aligns with previous instances where Iranian authorities have framed dissent as foreign subversion, enabling harsher policies against activists, journalists, and opposition figures.

The article also indirectly contributes to a climate of polarization within Iranian society by dividing citizens into two groups: those who support the regime and defend national sovereignty, and those who are portrayed as unwitting or complicit agents of foreign intervention. This division reinforces an "us vs. them" mentality, where dissenting voices are not seen as fellow Iranians with grievances but as potential threats to the nation’s stability.

In conclusion, *"The Events in Iran Are a U.S. and Israel Project"* exemplifies the use of the *Foreign Intervention Frame* to delegitimize the Mahsa Amini protests by portraying them as a geopolitical operation rather than a domestic movement for reform. By attributing the unrest to U.S. and Israeli interference, the article shifts focus away from the systemic issues that sparked the demonstrations and instead constructs a narrative that justifies state repression while fostering nationalist sentiment. This framing ultimately aims to discredit the protesters, strengthen regime legitimacy, and discourage internal solidarity for the movement.

The article titled *"Iranian Intelligence's Statement on the Protests: Foreign Intelligence Services"*, dated October 28, 2022, employs multiple framing strategies to shape public perception of the Mahsa Amini protests. Primarily, it uses the *Foreign Intervention Frame* by attributing the unrest to intelligence agencies from the United States, the United Kingdom, Israel, and Saudi Arabia. Additionally, it incorporates the *Violence and Chaos Frame* and the *Criminalization Frame* to depict the protests as unlawful and threatening to national security.

By citing Iranian intelligence sources, the article presents the protests as an orchestrated plot rather than an organic uprising driven by public discontent. This framing serves to delegitimize the movement and shift the focus away from the grievances that led to the demonstrations, such as women's rights, opposition to the morality police, and broader dissatisfaction with the regime. Instead of acknowledging these concerns, the article constructs a narrative in which foreign powers are actively manipulating events to destabilize Iran. This portrayal aligns with longstanding rhetoric used by Iranian authorities and conservative media to justify crackdowns on dissent.

The *Foreign Intervention Frame* is reinforced by the phrase "a chilling statement," which creates a sense of urgency and portrays the Iranian government's warning as a dire

national security matter. By attributing the protests to external actors, the article strengthens the perception that Iran is under attack and that any opposition to the regime is inherently treacherous. This framing can also serve to mobilize public support for the government by appealing to nationalist sentiments and the need to defend Iran's sovereignty against alleged foreign aggression.

In addition to blaming foreign intelligence agencies, the article employs the *Violence and Chaos Frame* by claiming that protesters have been “attacking and murdering members of the Revolutionary Guards, police, and law enforcement personnel.” This framing emphasizes disorder and lawlessness, reinforcing the idea that the demonstrations are not peaceful acts of civil disobedience but violent uprisings that threaten national stability. The use of the word “murdering” is particularly significant, as it portrays protesters as aggressors rather than victims of state repression.

This perspective is further supported by the *Criminalization Frame*, which casts protesters as unlawful actors engaging in illegal activities. By labeling demonstrators as perpetrators of violence against security forces, the article aligns them with criminal behavior, justifying the use of harsh measures to suppress the movement. The framing suggests that protesters are not civilians expressing grievances but rather agents of chaos working against the nation's interests.

The combination of these three frames, *Foreign Intervention*, *Violence and Chaos*, and *Criminalization* serves multiple purposes. First, it delegitimizes the protests by presenting them as foreign-orchestrated rather than rooted in domestic concerns. Second, it justifies the Iranian government's repressive measures by framing the movement as a violent and unlawful threat. Third, it aims to dissuade public support for the demonstrations by associating them with external enemies and criminal elements.

Overall, the article constructs a narrative in which the Mahsa Amini protests are not a reflection of societal discontent but rather a strategic attempt by foreign intelligence services to destabilize Iran. This portrayal aligns with conservative media discourse that seeks to maintain regime legitimacy while undermining opposition movements. By employing the *Foreign Intervention Frame*, the article shifts blame from the government's policies to external adversaries. Meanwhile, the *Violence and Chaos Frame* and *Criminalization Frame* serve to justify state crackdowns, portraying security forces as protectors of national order against a dangerous and manipulated opposition.

The article titled "***Revolutionary Guards Commander Killed in Iran***" dated November 19, 2022, employs multiple framing strategies to construct a narrative that portrays the protests as violent and justifies the actions of security forces. The primary frames used in the article are the *Violence and Chaos Frame* and the *Law and Order Frame*, both of which contribute to legitimizing state repression while delegitimizing the protest movement.

The *Violence and Chaos Frame* is evident in the way the article describes the killing of Colonel Birami. By emphasizing that the protesters "attacked security forces" and that the colonel was "stabbed to death," the article presents the demonstrators as violent aggressors rather than as individuals expressing political grievances. This framing serves to depict the protests as riots rather than civil disobedience, reinforcing the perception that the movement is disorderly, anarchic, and driven by hostility rather than legitimate demands for justice. Such a portrayal aligns with the broader strategy observed in conservative Turkish media, where opposition movements in countries like Iran are often framed as security threats rather than democratic expressions of dissent.

Additionally, by stating that the attackers were "quickly apprehended and handed over to judicial authorities," the article introduces the *Law and Order Frame*, which presents

security forces as efficient, just, and necessary for maintaining stability. This framing reassures the audience that the government is in control of the situation and is taking decisive action to restore order. It also implies that the judicial system is functioning effectively, reinforcing the legitimacy of state institutions in contrast to the chaos associated with the protests.

Furthermore, the combination of these two frames creates a clear dichotomy between the regime and the protesters: the former is depicted as upholding law and justice, while the latter is framed as engaging in dangerous, unlawful activity. This contrast serves to justify crackdowns on demonstrators by making them appear as threats to public safety rather than as victims of state oppression. It also fosters a narrative that supports authoritarian control, as it implies that strict law enforcement measures are necessary to combat the instability caused by dissent.

This particular framing strategy aligns with other articles from the same media outlet that have used similar techniques to shape public perception of the Mahsa Amini protests. By continuously associating the demonstrations with violence and presenting security forces as protectors of stability, the publication reinforces a narrative that discourages public sympathy for the protesters and legitimizes the state's response.

In conclusion, the article employs the *Violence and Chaos Frame* to depict the protests as dangerous and unlawful, while simultaneously using the *Law and Order Frame* to justify the Iranian regime's crackdown. This dual framing strategy aims to delegitimize the protest movement while bolstering the perception of the government as a necessary force for maintaining order and security.

The article titled "***Zionism Decides Who Muslims Should Consider Enemies***", dated November 23, 2022, employs the *Foreign Intervention Frame* to construct a narrative in which external actors, particularly Western powers and Israel, are portrayed as

manipulating and destabilizing Muslim societies, including Iran. This framing aligns with the broader discourse commonly found in conservative and pro-Islamist media, which emphasizes foreign conspiracies against Muslim-majority states, particularly those with anti-Western and anti-Israel stances.

The *Foreign Intervention Frame* is evident in how the article presents Zionist influence as a decisive factor in shaping Muslim communities' perceptions of their allies and enemies. By asserting that foreign powers, particularly Zionist entities, dictate these perceptions, the article implies that Muslims are being deceived and redirected toward internal conflicts rather than focusing on external threats. This argument suggests that the Mahsa Amini protests and possibly broader discontent in Iran are not organic expressions of the people's will but rather orchestrated by foreign actors to weaken the country from within.

This frame serves multiple functions. Firstly, it shifts the focus away from domestic grievances, such as human rights violations, gender inequality, and political repression, by externalizing the cause of unrest. Instead of acknowledging the legitimacy of the protesters' demands, the article suggests that their discontent is manufactured or manipulated by Zionist and Western interests. This tactic has been frequently used by authoritarian regimes and their affiliated media to discredit opposition movements by associating them with foreign plots, thereby reducing public support for dissent.

Secondly, the article's emphasis on foreign manipulation reinforces a sense of unity and nationalism among its audience. By positioning Iran as a victim of external aggression, the framing seeks to consolidate support for the regime and delegitimize opposition voices. This not only discourages internal dissent but also fosters a perception that resisting the protests is a patriotic duty necessary to protect Iran's sovereignty and Islamic values.

Furthermore, the narrative presented in this article aligns with broader conspiratorial rhetoric frequently observed in certain segments of the Turkish conservative press, particularly in publications that are sympathetic to Islamist and anti-Western perspectives. By framing the protests as part of a larger geopolitical struggle orchestrated by Zionist forces, the article taps into preexisting sentiments of distrust toward Western intervention in the Middle East. This narrative is particularly effective in mobilizing audiences that already perceive global politics through the lens of religious and ideological conflict.

In conclusion, the article employs the *Foreign Intervention Frame* to depict the Mahsa Amini protests and broader unrest in Iran as components of a Western and Zionist agenda aimed at undermining Muslim societies. By attributing the source of conflict to external forces rather than domestic issues, the framing serves to delegitimize the protests, reinforce national unity under the Iranian regime, and appeal to a broader conservative, anti-Western readership. This strategy ultimately supports the existing power structures by discouraging internal critique and fostering a perception of external existential threats.

4.4. Türkiye Gazetesi

Türkiye Gazetesi is a daily newspaper published in Turkey. It first began publication on April 22, 1970, and was founded by Enver Ören. The newspaper operates with a conservative and nationalist editorial line and, along with Tercüman newspaper, gained significant prominence among nationalist-conservative media in the 1970s. Since its inception, Türkiye Gazetesi has offered a conservative perspective on Turkey's political and social issues. Its editorial policy prioritizes adherence to religious and national values, and within this framework, it has often criticized Turkey's modernization and Westernization processes. Especially after the 1980s, the newspaper's growing circulation made it one of the most widely read newspapers in Turkey.

Türkiye Gazetesi is also part of İhlas Holding. İhlas Holding is a conglomerate operating in various sectors such as media, construction, healthcare, and education, with Türkiye Gazetesi being one of its most important media assets. The newspaper's editorial direction is heavily influenced by İhlas Holding's general conservative values. The newspaper's editorial line revolves around defending Turkey's national interests, emphasizing Islamic values, and preserving traditional family structures.

The newspaper reaches a wide readership both in print and digital platforms. With the digitalization process, Türkiye Gazetesi has established a strong presence online. Through its official website, it offers current news, opinion columns, and analyses. This allows the newspaper to deliver news instantly to readers across Turkey.

Türkiye Gazetesi also attracts attention with its various columnists. These columnists provide analyses on political, economic, and social issues from a conservative perspective. Their analyses are closely followed and discussed by the newspaper's readership.

In conclusion, Türkiye Gazetesi has positioned itself as the voice of Turkey's conservative and nationalist segments and continues to publish in this direction. The newspaper's editorial policy is based on loyalty to religious and national values, the preservation of social order, and the defense of Turkey's independence. Türkiye Gazetesi continues to be one of the major media outlets in Turkey, both in print and digital platforms.

4.4.1. Mahsa Amini in Türkiye Gazetesi

In Türkiye Gazetesi, 10 articles were published related to the Mahsa Amini and these articles were framed using two different frames: the human rights frame, the law and order frame.

The article titled "*Mahsa Amini protests continue: Many dead and injured in the demonstrations*", published on September 23, 2022, employs the *Human Rights Frame* by highlighting the Iranian government's restrictions on protestors' rights and limitations on internet access. This frame underscores the violation of fundamental freedoms, such as the right to protest and freedom of expression, portraying the state's actions as oppressive and authoritarian.

The article's focus on the Iranian government's characterization of the protests as "unacceptable" aligns with a broader pattern of delegitimizing dissent, a common strategy employed by authoritarian regimes to justify crackdowns on opposition. By labeling demonstrators in this manner, the state positions itself as the guardian of national stability and moral order, while framing the protesters as disruptors or threats. However, within the *Human Rights Frame*, this official stance is critically examined, emphasizing that the government's rhetoric serves as a pretext for suppressing lawful demonstrations and curtailing civil liberties.

A crucial element of this frame is the emphasis on restrictions to internet access. Controlling digital communication channels is a widely recognized tactic used by governments to prevent the dissemination of dissenting opinions, restrict organizational capacities, and curb international awareness of internal unrest. The article implicitly critiques these actions as violations of the *freedom of information*, a fundamental right protected under international human rights frameworks. By drawing attention to these digital blackouts, the article reinforces the perception that the Iranian state is actively obstructing citizens' ability to express themselves and seek justice.

Additionally, the mention of deaths and injuries sustained during the protests strengthens the *Human Rights Frame* by bringing attention to the disproportionate use of force against demonstrators. The excessive use of violence by security forces against civilians is framed

as an abuse of power, further reinforcing the notion that the Iranian regime is violating basic human rights. This contrasts with other media narratives—such as the *Law and Order Frame* or the *Foreign Intervention Frame*—that might justify state violence as necessary to restore stability or counter external threats.

By framing the protests through a human rights perspective, the article shifts the discourse from one of national security or political unrest to a moral and ethical critique of state oppression. This perspective aligns with international human rights organizations' responses to the Mahsa Amini protests, in which the Iranian government's actions have been widely condemned as violations of international human rights standards.

In conclusion, this article employs the *Human Rights Frame* by emphasizing the Iranian government's suppression of the right to protest, freedom of expression, and access to information. By focusing on internet restrictions, the state's dismissive rhetoric toward protesters, and the use of excessive force, the article critiques the Iranian regime's response as an infringement upon fundamental rights. This framing contrasts with narratives that seek to justify state repression and instead positions the demonstrators as victims of government oppression.

The article titled ***“Sanctions against those responsible for the death of Mahsa Amini”***, published on September 27, 2022, employs the *Human Rights Frame* by centering on the international response to the Iranian government's handling of the protests. By emphasizing the sanctions imposed on officials deemed responsible for Amini's death, as well as diplomatic reactions from global actors, the article portrays the protests as a human rights issue rather than a mere internal political disturbance.

A key aspect of this framing is the focus on *accountability and justice*. Sanctions are often symbolic measures that signal international condemnation of a regime's actions, and by highlighting them, the article presents Amini's death as a case of state-perpetrated human

rights violations. This approach aligns with broader global narratives that hold governments accountable for repressive actions and excessive use of force. The article implicitly reinforces the idea that the Iranian regime's response to the protests—including the use of violence and suppression of dissent—constitutes a violation of fundamental human rights.

Additionally, the mention of *diplomatic reactions* serves to further validate the protests by framing them as an issue of global concern rather than merely a domestic affair. International actors' criticisms, sanctions, and official statements lend legitimacy to the grievances of the protestors and position their demands within the broader discourse of human rights and democracy. This also counters narratives that seek to dismiss the protests as illegitimate or as externally orchestrated disturbances.

The article also draws attention to the *mechanisms of international pressure* that seek to challenge the Iranian government's actions. Sanctions serve as a tool of diplomatic coercion, aiming to hold individuals and institutions accountable while pressuring the regime to alter its policies. The framing of these measures within a human rights discourse suggests that the protests have triggered consequences beyond Iran's borders, reinforcing the perception that the movement is a struggle for fundamental freedoms rather than an isolated, politically motivated rebellion.

By framing the events through a human rights perspective, the article shifts attention away from the Iranian government's official narrative, which often portrays the protests as security threats or foreign-backed conspiracies. Instead, it presents the demonstrations as a *fight for justice* against state oppression, linking them to a broader global struggle for human rights and democratic freedoms.

In conclusion, the article employs the *Human Rights Frame* by emphasizing international sanctions and diplomatic responses, portraying the Iranian government's actions as

human rights violations. Through this framing, the protests are depicted as a struggle for fundamental freedoms rather than as mere political unrest. By focusing on accountability, justice, and international condemnation, the article aligns with narratives that challenge state repression and advocate for human rights on a global scale.

The article titled "***The Cause of Mahsa Amini's Death Revealed***", published on October 7, 2022, presents an interesting dual framing approach by simultaneously incorporating elements of the *Law and Order Frame* and the *Human Rights Frame*. This duality is evident in its treatment of Iranian officials' statements regarding Amini's death and the subsequent handling of the protests.

The article begins by citing Iranian authorities' claims that Amini's cause of death was due to a pre-existing illness rather than police brutality. This aligns with the Iranian government's efforts to control the narrative and downplay accusations of excessive force. However, the fact that the article immediately follows this explanation with details of the protests and the state's violent interventions suggests an acknowledgment of the broader unrest and public skepticism toward the official explanation.

The phrase "*a wave of arrests and detentions was launched against protesters who 'endangered public safety'*" is particularly noteworthy. The use of quotation marks around "*endangered public safety*" raises questions about the article's stance. If these marks were used to signal skepticism toward the authorities' justification for the crackdowns, the framing leans toward *Human Rights*, implying that the state's response was excessive, unjustified, and a violation of fundamental freedoms. The reference to *harsh interventions by security forces* also supports this interpretation, as it draws attention to the aggressive tactics used to suppress demonstrations.

On the other hand, if the article intended to emphasize the necessity of maintaining order, then the *Law and Order Frame* is dominant. This frame presents the protests as a potential

threat to national security, legitimizing the state's use of force. By portraying the government's actions as necessary measures to restore stability, this perspective aligns with state narratives that frame protestors as disruptive elements rather than legitimate dissenters.

A critical aspect of the article's framing is the mention of *the detention of 20 journalists*. This detail shifts the framing more toward *Human Rights* by highlighting restrictions on press freedom and the suppression of independent reporting. Arresting journalists during mass protests often signals broader efforts to control public discourse and limit the dissemination of alternative narratives. The inclusion of this information suggests that the article is not entirely aligned with the state's narrative and recognizes the potential abuses of power occurring during the crackdowns.

Ultimately, the framing of this article appears to be ambivalent, offering room for multiple interpretations. While the official explanation for Amini's death and references to public safety could support a *Law and Order Frame*, the article's emphasis on mass arrests, crackdowns on journalists, and the possible irony of the quotation marks around "*endangered public safety*" suggest a critical stance that aligns more closely with the *Human Rights Frame*. This dual framing reflects a strategic balancing act, possibly aimed at presenting the government's position while simultaneously acknowledging public grievances and concerns over human rights violations.

The article titled "***A 16-Year-Old Girl Reportedly Died During Mahsa Amini Protests in Iran***" published on October 8, 2022, presents the case of Sarina Esmailzadeh's death as part of a broader human rights discourse, positioning it within the ongoing protests sparked by Mahsa Amini's death. The framing of the article aligns with the *Human Rights Frame*, as it highlights the Iranian authorities' controversial explanation of her death and the widespread public skepticism surrounding it.

The article states that officials claimed Esmailzadeh's death resulted from suicide. However, the inclusion of widespread doubt toward this official explanation serves to reinforce the notion that the state may be obscuring the real cause of her death, particularly given the ongoing violent suppression of protests. The article likely draws parallels between Esmailzadeh and Amini, portraying them as victims of state violence, which strengthens the narrative of systematic repression and human rights violations in Iran.

By reporting this event within the broader context of the Mahsa Amini protests, the article does more than simply recount an isolated incident; it situates Esmailzadeh's case within a pattern of state brutality. This is a crucial aspect of the *Human Rights Frame*, as it emphasizes not just individual injustices but also structural and institutional oppression. Additionally, the framing implies that her death is part of a larger crackdown on dissent, targeting young people and particularly women who have played a significant role in the demonstrations.

The skepticism toward the official explanation suggests that the Iranian government's credibility is being questioned, especially regarding cases of alleged human rights abuses. If the article contrasts the state's version of events with testimonies from activists, independent organizations, or opposition groups, this would further reinforce the *Human Rights Frame* by emphasizing the discrepancy between state narratives and accounts from civil society.

Furthermore, by covering the death of a teenage girl, the article may also evoke emotional responses from readers, making the repression of protesters appear even more severe. The victim's young age serves as a powerful rhetorical device, reinforcing the idea that no one—regardless of age—is safe from state violence. This aspect enhances the *Human Rights Frame* by underscoring the disproportionate use of force and the vulnerability of protesters, particularly women and minors.

Ultimately, the article contributes to the broader international discourse on Iran's human rights record by reinforcing concerns about state repression, the suppression of dissent, and the credibility of official statements. The framing of Esmailzadeh's death as a suspected case of human rights violations rather than an isolated tragedy serves to amplify criticism of the Iranian regime's handling of the protests, positioning it within a pattern of systemic abuses.

The article titled *"The Death Toll Rises in Mahsa Amini Protests: 16 Dead in Haş"* published on November 5, 2022, highlights the escalation of violence against protesters and frames the events as human rights violations. The *Human Rights Frame* is employed by emphasizing the persistent and increasing use of force against demonstrators, reinforcing the perception that the Iranian regime is systematically suppressing dissent.

By reporting the number of casualties, the article underscores the severity of the crackdown and portrays the state as an aggressor, directly responsible for the deaths. The phrase "continued violence from the first day of the protest" suggests a pattern of excessive force rather than isolated incidents, further reinforcing the notion that the government is engaging in a prolonged campaign of repression rather than responding to individual outbreaks of unrest.

The focus on casualties strengthens the *Human Rights Frame* by drawing attention to the human cost of the protests, potentially evoking international concern and condemnation. If the article includes statements from human rights organizations, opposition figures, or eyewitness accounts contradicting the government's narrative, this further enhances the framing by portraying the Iranian state as violating fundamental rights such as freedom of assembly and the right to life.

Additionally, by specifying that 16 people were killed in Haş, the article may be emphasizing that the crackdown is not limited to Tehran or major cities but extends to

other regions, suggesting that the protests—and their violent suppression—are widespread. This contributes to the *Human Rights Frame* by presenting the government's response as a nationwide policy of repression rather than a localized security measure.

If the article also includes details about how these individuals were killed (e.g., shootings, beatings, mass arrests), it would further reinforce the framing by illustrating the brutality of state forces. References to internet restrictions, arbitrary detentions, or media censorship would add another dimension to the *Human Rights Frame*, indicating that the suppression is not only physical but also extends to restricting information and silencing dissent.

Overall, by continuously reporting on the rising death toll, the article strengthens the *Human Rights Frame* by portraying the Iranian regime's actions as systematic violations of fundamental rights. It contributes to the broader narrative that the Iranian state is not just handling unrest but actively targeting its own citizens, reinforcing criticism of the government's authoritarian practices on both domestic and international levels.

The article titled “*Now the Iranian Spring?*” published on November 8, 2022, frames the Iranian regime's declining legitimacy and its violent suppression of protests through the *Human Rights Frame*. By suggesting that the regime is unable to address the demands of the people and that its authority is rapidly eroding, the article presents the Iranian government as an oppressive force rather than a legitimate ruling body. This framing aligns with narratives that highlight human rights violations, government repression, and the struggle for fundamental freedoms.

The comparison to the *Arab Spring*, implied by the title, evokes historical uprisings that led to regime changes in the Middle East, reinforcing the idea that Iran is experiencing a pivotal moment of political crisis. This suggests that the protests are not just temporary disturbances but part of a broader movement challenging the state's legitimacy. The

article's focus on the government's failure to respond to public demands implies that the protests stem from long-standing grievances, including restrictions on rights such as freedom of speech, assembly, and personal autonomy, rather than being merely reactionary outbursts.

The article's discussion of state violence against demonstrators strengthens the *Human Rights Frame* by portraying the Iranian government as an aggressor actively suppressing dissent. The emphasis on the use of force, coupled with the notion that the regime is losing its legitimacy, suggests that the government's actions are not just repressive but also counterproductive, further alienating the population. This aligns with international human rights discourse, which often links excessive state violence to broader patterns of authoritarianism and systemic abuses.

If the article highlights specific human rights violations—such as extrajudicial killings, arbitrary detentions, torture, or internet restrictions—it further solidifies the *Human Rights Frame* by demonstrating that the suppression extends beyond mere policing and into institutionalized repression. References to international condemnation, sanctions, or statements from human rights organizations would also reinforce this framing by linking Iran's internal crisis to global concerns about human rights abuses.

Additionally, by mentioning “widespread unrest across the country,” the article suggests that resistance to the regime is not confined to a particular region or social group but is instead a nationwide phenomenon. This counters government narratives that depict protesters as isolated troublemakers and instead presents them as part of a broad-based movement demanding justice and reform.

Overall, the article's framing of the Iranian regime's violence, declining legitimacy, and suppression of fundamental freedoms positions the protests within the *Human Rights Frame*. It portrays the government as not only failing to address societal grievances but

also as actively violating the rights of its citizens, reinforcing the perception of Iran as an authoritarian state facing a legitimacy crisis.

The article titled "***Mahsa Amini Protests Continue in Iran! The First Death Sentence Was Given***" published on November 14, 2022, presents the sentencing of a protester to death and the imprisonment of five others within the *Law and Order Frame*. By emphasizing the charges against the individual—*arson of a government building, disturbing public order, engaging in activities against national security, and damaging public property*—the article portrays the protests not as a movement for rights and freedoms but as acts of disorder, vandalism, and threats to state stability.

The *Law and Order Frame* is often employed to justify strict governmental measures, portraying state intervention as necessary to restore peace and prevent chaos. By highlighting the formal charges and judicial rulings, the article frames the Iranian government's actions as legal responses to unlawful activities rather than as politically motivated repression. This framing aligns with narratives that prioritize stability over civil liberties, suggesting that the state's punitive measures are essential to maintaining public order.

The article's mention of the death sentence as the *first* of its kind implies a broader trend of escalating state crackdowns, signaling that the Iranian government is taking increasingly severe actions against demonstrators. This could serve as both a warning to potential protesters and a justification for future legal actions against those involved in the unrest. If the article further elaborates on the judicial process—such as detailing whether the trial was fair or influenced by political motives—it could provide additional insight into whether the *Law and Order Frame* is used to validate government repression or if elements of a *Human Rights Frame* emerge through discussions of judicial bias and excessive punishment.

Additionally, if the article includes statements from Iranian officials or judiciary representatives, it likely reinforces the state's perspective that the protests are a threat to national security rather than a legitimate expression of dissent. The mention of charges related to *national security* suggests that the protests are framed not just as domestic disturbances but as acts that endanger the sovereignty and stability of the Iranian state. This aligns with the broader framing strategy observed in conservative media, where unrest is often depicted as externally influenced or as a subversive attempt to weaken the government.

In contrast, if the article acknowledges criticisms from international organizations, human rights groups, or foreign governments regarding the use of the death penalty against protesters, it could introduce an implicit counter-frame. However, in a publication like *Yeni Akit*, such counter-narratives are less likely to be emphasized. Instead, the focus remains on the judicial process and the legal rationale behind the sentencing, reinforcing the perception that Iran's government is responding appropriately to acts of defiance.

Overall, the article's framing of the protester's sentencing within the *Law and Order Frame* underscores the Iranian government's approach to the Mahsa Amini protests as a security threat rather than a civil rights movement. By framing judicial actions as necessary enforcement of the law rather than as oppressive crackdowns, the article supports a narrative that legitimizes the regime's response while downplaying concerns about human rights and political repression.

The article titled ***“An Era Is Ending in Iran! Morality Police Will No Longer Be Able to Detain People Who Do Not Wear Headscarves”***, published on July 21, 2023, highlights the Iranian government's new regulations regarding hijab enforcement and the shifting role of the morality police. The piece focuses on the restriction of the morality police's authority to detain women for not wearing the hijab, marking a significant shift

in the state's approach to enforcing dress codes. This change can be analyzed within the framework of human rights and justice, as it touches upon individual freedoms, women's rights, and the legal mechanisms governing personal choices.

By discussing the morality police's past authority to detain women and the reported incidents of violence linked to hijab enforcement, the article implicitly acknowledges the broader context of human rights violations. The morality police's practices have long been criticized by activists and international human rights organizations as state-sanctioned oppression disproportionately targeting women. If the article references specific cases of abuse, such as the death of Mahsa Amini, it reinforces the narrative that the state's control over women's dress has resulted in systemic violations of fundamental rights, including unlawful detentions and physical violence. The mention of new regulations signals a response to public pressure and ongoing protests rather than a voluntary reform by the state. The Mahsa Amini protests, which erupted in reaction to the morality police's enforcement methods, led to widespread national and international condemnation, and if the article links these demonstrations to the government's decision, it frames the policy shift as a direct consequence of civic resistance.

The discussion of legal and institutional changes regarding hijab enforcement also reflects an emphasis on justice. By highlighting the restrictions placed on the morality police's authority, the article suggests that the Iranian government is making efforts to address past injustices. However, the framing of this change may vary depending on how the article presents the state's motivations. If the piece portrays the new regulations as a step toward expanding individual freedoms, it strengthens the justice frame. On the other hand, if it suggests that the decision is a strategic move to reduce public unrest while maintaining restrictions on women's dress through alternative means, such as surveillance, fines, or social pressure, it could indicate that the policy shift is superficial rather than a genuine reform.

The article's framing may also intersect with other narratives depending on how it presents the broader context. If it includes perspectives from conservative factions or state officials arguing that the morality police played a crucial role in maintaining public order and religious values, it could introduce a law and order frame, portraying the new regulations as a potential compromise that could weaken Islamic principles. Additionally, if the piece discusses external pressures, such as diplomatic criticisms from Western governments or international human rights organizations, it might incorporate a foreign intervention frame, suggesting that Iran's decision was influenced by foreign actors rather than domestic activism.

Overall, the article predominantly employs the human rights frame by highlighting past injustices against women and portraying the regulatory change as a shift toward greater personal freedoms. The justice frame is reinforced through discussions of legal amendments aimed at curbing the morality police's power. However, the extent to which the article engages with these frames depends on whether it explicitly connects the policy change to protest movements, critiques of the Iranian regime, or ongoing mechanisms that may still regulate women's dress choices in different ways. If conservative or state-aligned perspectives are included, alternative frames could emerge, either justifying past policies or downplaying the significance of the new regulations.

The article titled *“Assassination Attempt on Mahsa Amini's Father on Her Death Anniversary”*, published on September 16, 2023, details the attack on Amjad Amini, Mahsa Amini's father, marking the first anniversary of her death. This event is significant not only because it targets the family of a symbolically important figure in the protests against the Iranian regime but also because it reflects ongoing tensions between the state and those advocating for justice. The framing of this event can be analyzed through the lens of human rights, as well as law and order, depending on how the article presents the details of the attack and the role of the security forces.

The human rights frame is reinforced by the context of Mahsa Amini's death in police custody, which sparked nationwide protests and international condemnation. The targeting of her father on the anniversary of her death can be interpreted as part of a broader pattern of intimidation and suppression against those who challenge the regime. If the article highlights the attack as an attempt to silence dissent or deter public commemorations of Amini's death, it aligns with a human rights violation perspective. The involvement of security forces, whether in preventing or responding to the attack, further shapes this framing. If the article suggests that state actors or pro-regime groups were behind the attack or that authorities failed to protect Amini's family, it strengthens the argument that fundamental rights, including the right to life and security, are being systematically violated. Additionally, if the article mentions restrictions on memorial events, arrests of activists, or broader efforts to suppress public mourning for Amini, it would further reinforce the human rights frame by illustrating the state's continued repression.

The law and order frame, on the other hand, becomes relevant if the article focuses on the security forces' response to the assassination attempt. If it describes authorities intervening to prevent the attack or capturing the perpetrators, it presents the state as upholding order and justice. However, if the intervention of security forces is framed as a means to control the public reaction rather than to protect Amini's family, the law and order frame could take on a more authoritarian dimension. For example, if the article emphasizes heightened security measures, roadblocks, or crackdowns on protesters gathering to mark Amini's anniversary, it suggests that the state is using law enforcement primarily for repression rather than protection.

The way the article presents these elements determines its dominant framing. If it focuses on the injustice of targeting Amini's father and connects it to broader patterns of state violence, it aligns with the human rights frame. If it gives significant attention to the

security response without questioning the motivations behind the attack, it leans more toward a law and order perspective. The presence of both frames suggests a complex narrative in which the state positions itself as maintaining stability while simultaneously being implicated in suppressing dissent.

The article titled “*A Large Amount of Ammunition Was Seized in Iran*”, published on September 17, 2023, reports on the alleged smuggling of US-made weapons and ammunition into Iran, claiming that these arms were intended to be used in the Mahsa Amini protests. The way this event is framed suggests a strong emphasis on *foreign intervention* and *international tensions*, portraying external actors—particularly the United States—as orchestrating unrest within Iran. This framing serves to reinforce the Iranian government’s long-standing narrative that protests and civil unrest are not organic domestic movements but rather part of a broader geopolitical strategy aimed at destabilizing the country.

The *foreign intervention frame* is evident in how the article attributes the attempted arms smuggling to external forces. By linking the presence of US-made weapons to the protests, the article strengthens the perception that the unrest is not solely driven by domestic grievances but is instead fueled by foreign conspiracies. This narrative aligns with previous Iranian government claims that Western powers, particularly the United States, the United Kingdom, and Israel, are behind efforts to incite instability in Iran. If the article emphasizes official Iranian statements condemning the arms seizure as evidence of foreign meddling, it reinforces the notion that the protests are not legitimate expressions of public dissent but rather part of a broader international plot against the country’s sovereignty.

Additionally, by presenting the alleged smuggling of weapons as a direct threat to Iran’s internal stability, the article contributes to the *law and order frame*. If the report highlights

security forces' efforts in confiscating the weapons and preventing them from reaching protesters, it portrays the state as actively defending national security and public order. This frame positions the Iranian government as a protector against external aggression, justifying its strict security measures and crackdowns on protest movements. If the article further discusses heightened border security, increased surveillance, or mass arrests related to the arms smuggling, it frames these actions as necessary responses to an external threat rather than as authoritarian measures against domestic opposition.

Moreover, the *international tensions frame* is also significant in this article. By attributing the smuggling attempt to the United States, the report situates the protests within the broader geopolitical struggle between Iran and Western powers. This frame reinforces Iran's ongoing discourse that Western nations, particularly the US, seek to weaken and control the country through various means, including economic sanctions, diplomatic pressure, and now, allegedly, by directly arming opposition groups. If the article references previous accusations of foreign involvement in protests—such as claims that Western intelligence agencies and media outlets like BBC Persian and Iran International incite unrest—it strengthens this frame by connecting the current incident to a broader historical pattern of foreign interference.

The framing choices in this article serve multiple political functions. First, by portraying the protests as externally orchestrated, it delegitimizes domestic grievances and shifts the focus away from the Iranian government's own policies and repression. Second, by linking the unrest to international actors, particularly the United States, the article reinforces a nationalist perspective that portrays Iran as a victim of foreign aggression, thereby rallying public support for the government's hardline policies. Third, the report justifies increased security measures and crackdowns, framing them as necessary defenses against foreign conspiracies rather than as violations of civil liberties.

Ultimately, this article's framing of the arms seizure plays a crucial role in shaping public perception of the Mahsa Amini protests. By emphasizing foreign intervention, it attempts to undermine the legitimacy of domestic dissent, while the law and order and international tensions frames position the Iranian government as acting in defense of the nation's security and sovereignty.



DISCUSSION

The protests that began in Iran following Mahsa Amini's death resonated widely in the Turkish conservative press. An analysis of leading conservative newspapers such as Türkiye Gazetesi, Yeni Şafak, Yeni Akit, and Milli Gazete reveals how these events were portrayed in these media outlets and what perspective was offered to readers.

The collected news articles were examined under several framing categories: foreign intervention, law and order, violence and human rights.

The foreign intervention frame includes elements like national security and threats to national security. Conservative media framed the protests as a threat to national security, aiming to increase support for the government's security policies. This frame seeks to convince readers that the protests are dangerous and harmful to the country's security, alleging that foreign powers are behind the protests and encouraging readers to question their legitimacy as foreign interventions.

The law and order frame highlights social unrest and violations of public order. It emphasizes that the protests disrupt public order and create social unrest, portraying the protesters as criminals and dangerous. This frame is used to convince the public that the protests are illegal and harmful, often focusing on acts of vandalism and violence by the protesters. It aims to foster a negative public attitude toward the protests.

Calls for national unity and patriotism against the protests are made to encourage readers to unite in support of the government's policies, portraying the protests as threats to national stability and encouraging a patriotic response.

Conservative media used these various frames to shape readers' perceptions and attitudes toward the Mahsa Amini protests. The national security, public order, vandalism,

patriotism, and foreign intervention frames were employed to question the legitimacy of the protests, support government security policies, and reinforce social unity and patriotism. These frames contributed to the public developing a more negative attitude toward the protests and increased support for government interventions.

The common goals of these media institutions appeared to be questioning the legitimacy of the protests, supporting government security policies, and reinforcing social unity and patriotism. Fear rhetoric, nationalism, and blame strategies were widely used. The protests were frequently depicted as involving acts of violence and vandalism, disrupting public order, and threatening national security. Milli Gazete and Yeni Akit used sharper language and focused more on religious values, while Yeni Şafak and Türkiye Gazetesi adopted a more professional and news-oriented tone. Although there are similarities, the frequency of frames used by conservative media outlets' news sites varies significantly. Although it is known as a conservative media outlet, it has been seen that the protests of Türkiye Gazete and Yeni Şafak Newspaper are also evaluated within the scope of human rights and human interest.

Tensions and conflicts between the Iranian government and the protesters were another frequently discussed theme in the Turkish conservative press. The government's actions were highlighted as potentially increasing tensions among conservative groups, leading to social conflicts.

A common observation among the reviewed news sites was their emphasis on the tension between the government and the protesters and the potential for this tension to cause social unrest.

Among the findings, it was noted that Yeni Akit frequently used headlines to frame its news, often relying on videos and visuals aligned with the headlines rather than detailed text. Additionally, it was observed that the framing strategy shifted on December 6, 2022,

from emphasizing religious values and supporting the regime to highlighting human rights violations and positioning against the regime. The possible reasons for this shift could be a topic for further research.

Milli Gazete consistently employed a foreign intervention frame in all its articles, using sharp rhetoric throughout its news texts.

Türkiye Gazetesi adopted a mixed framing strategy, using both the human rights frame to oppose violent interventions against protesters and the law and order frame to support these interventions. This approach has been interpreted not as a display of neutrality, but as an attempt to appeal to a broader audience. On the other hand, when the frequency of using these frames in the Türkiye newspaper is compared, the intense use of the human rights frame is a surprising observation for a newspaper known to be publishing on a conservative line, even though its own statements do not.

As seen in Yeni Akit, some media organizations can indirectly support radical discourses, sometimes even violent, under the name of protecting cultural and religious values. When religious or national values are perceived to be under threat, calls for their protection may intensify and such discourses may be presented in the media without criticism or moderation. This language can lead to a discourse that legitimizes violence as a means of restoring social order. While evaluating the news sites in this study on the spectrum of conservatism and radicalism, we can classify Yeni Şafak as a conservative newspaper. His publications often emphasize Islamic and conservative values. Their reports generally support the current government's policies, while focusing on the protection of social morality and cultural values.

It defends traditional values in social and cultural issues and takes a cautious stance against change. Yeni Şafak follows a more moderate line; It avoids violent or radical discourses and emphasizes the preservation of social structure, traditional values and

family dynamics. His approach reflects a cautious view of social changes; Therefore, it can be considered a conservative publication rather than a radical one.

Yeni Akit, on the other hand, clearly adopts an Islamist perspective and takes a conservative stance. It promotes the preservation of social morality, family values and religious norms. Yeni Akit, which frequently exalts traditional values and opposes modernization and Westernization, displays a distinctly conservative stance. It often adopts a more pointed and polarizing tone, especially on religious or national issues. It may publish articles supporting strong measures to preserve social order or advocating radical changes in the current system. In this respect, Yeni Akit can be viewed as a conservative newspaper with radical tendencies.

Milli Gazete is a publication that emphasizes Islamic values and conservatism, in line with the principles of the Felicity Party and National Vision. He advocates a society organized according to Islamic principles and takes a cautious stance on modernization. It strongly supports the preservation of religious values and traditions. It has also been observed that he adopts an anti-Western stance based on local values and sometimes displays a radical perspective. Using a radical style in his discourse on economic or political independence, he advocates the restructuring of the social order in line with traditional Islamic values. But this radicalism is typically ideologically based and tends to be less polarizing.

Although Türkiye Newspaper embraces Islamic and conservative values, it uses a more moderate tone than other publications. It emphasizes the importance of traditional values in society and adopts a cautious approach to modernization. It operates within a conservative framework with its pro-government stance and support for preserving the current system. He follows a more moderate conservative line, avoiding radical discourses. Unlike other conservative newspapers, it avoids using harsh and polarizing

language, instead advocating the gradual strengthening of the current system. In this respect, Türkiye Newspaper can be considered a conservative but not radical publication.

Interest groups, policy makers, reporters and media organizations can influence the quality of news about a particular topic. Since it is not possible to convey all information about a subject from all perspectives, media framing is inevitable. Framing analysis is based on the assumption that reporters filter events in ways that affect readers' understanding. If we examine the findings of the study, we can find an answer to the question of whether it is right to expect various media organizations broadcasting in line with a common ideology to do this filtering with common or similar framing strategies when covering the same event. When the frames used in the news published on the websites of the four well-established newspapers selected for this research are observed, it can be seen that the attitudes of the newspapers towards the Mahsa Amini protests contain great differences.

Iyengar (1989) revealed that news is presented from a perspective that changes the audience's understanding of events. Journalists can set the agenda by prioritizing important and newsworthy information in their perspectives through frames. Using frames puts information in a format that is familiar to the reader and direct the readers interpret and evaluate it (Norris, 1995: 38-42). At this point, it would be correct to talk about the reinforcement of the views of readers with the same opinion and an echo effect, which we also mentioned under the title of the impact and importance of framing on the public. Although no additional research was conducted on this subject in this study, I believe that newspaper websites reinforce readers with the same views rather than attracting readers with different views and changing their attitudes. It can be said that the aim is to reinforce the perspective of the already existing readership, especially with the sharp discourses of a newspaper like Yeni Akit, which has adopted the same line and the same sharpness of emphasizing its own ideology since the day it started publishing.

On the other hand, based on the news texts examined for this study, I believe that newspapers that appeal to relatively wider audiences, such as Yeni Şafak and Türkiye Newspaper, may be more successful in influencing the views and changing the attitudes of readers who have different views or are at least undecided.

In this context, how frames such as law and order, foreign intervention, conflict, violence and chaos, which are frequently used in framing Mahsa Amini news in these newspapers, affect the public can also be evaluated in this context. A reader who reads the news about the Mahsa Amini Protests reported in newspapers such as Yeni Akit, which has sharp discourses and views with the aforementioned echo effect, and does not have any prior knowledge about the protests, may evaluate the events directly from the perspective of the Yeni Akit writer and have the impression that what is happening is due to the provocation of external forces. This situation was also observed in the comment sections under the news texts. It is even possible to say that I resolved my uncertainty about the frames used to convey two published news stories that differed in title and content by reading the comments under the news. On the other hand, Yeni Şafak newspaper, which has a relatively wider readership as mentioned above and appeals to people from a wider range of segments, may push readers to do a more comprehensive research on the subject and thus form their own decisions more firmly, rather than pushing them to a definitive and sharp opinion or reinforcing their opinion.

The analyses demonstrate how the Turkish conservative press framed the Mahsa Amini protests and subsequent developments, offering readers a specific perspective. As Entman(1993) noted in framing theory, how events are presented as problems, which aspects are highlighted.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the Mahsa Amini protests and the subsequent events were presented in the news of Türkiye Gazetesi, Yeni Şafak, Yeni Akit, and Milli Gazete using specific themes and frames, guiding readers to evaluate the events from a particular perspective.

These analyses help us understand how the Turkish conservative press framed the news and provided a particular viewpoint to its audience.

Mahsa Amini protests, a group advocating for the preservation of traditional family structures might adopt a harsh, even radical approach in resisting modern social changes. Such a group could, for instance, launch protests or initiate more forceful campaigns against social movements or laws, thereby defending conservative values through radical methods. This type of movement aims to preserve the current order within a conservative framework, while adopting radical strategies to do so.

In media and media discourses, the intersection of conservatism and radicalism often appears in content advocating for the preservation of a particular social or cultural order, emphasizing that this order is under threat. These narratives highlight the erosion of traditional values or social norms and may endorse or propose drastic, even radical methods to protect these values. Media discourses that emphasize the idea of a social order under threat may convey the message that defending traditional values is a kind of “duty.” Certain media outlets, opposing global social movements or international agreements, may argue that these developments threaten “national independence” and advocate for their removal. This pattern was frequently observed in the coverage of the Mahsa Amini protests across selected news sites. Similarly, a media outlet opposing changes to cultural or religious norms might frame advocates of change as “cultural enemies” or “enemies of society,” using radical rhetoric to defend conservative values.

As exemplified in Yeni Akit, some media outlets may indirectly support radical rhetoric, even violent at times, under the guise of protecting cultural or religious values. When religious or national values are perceived as under threat, calls to protect them may intensify, and such rhetoric may be presented without criticism or moderation in the media. This language can lead to a discourse that legitimizes violence as a means of restoring social order.

When evaluating the news sites in this study on the spectrum of conservatism and radicalism, Yeni Şafak can be classified as a conservative newspaper. Its publications often emphasize Islamic and conservative values. While generally supporting the current government's policies, its reporting focuses on preserving social morality and cultural values. It advocates traditional values in social and cultural issues and maintains a cautious stance toward change. Yeni Şafak follows a more moderate line, avoiding violent or radical rhetoric while emphasizing the preservation of social structure, traditional values, and family dynamics. Its approach reflects a cautious perspective on social changes; thus, it can be considered a conservative rather than radical publication.

On the other hand, Yeni Akit clearly adopts an Islamist perspective and adheres to a conservative stance. It promotes the preservation of social morality, family values, and religious norms. Frequently exalting traditional values and opposing modernization and Westernization, Yeni Akit exhibits a distinctly conservative posture. It often adopts a more pointed and polarizing tone, especially on religious or national issues. It may publish articles supporting strong measures to maintain social order or advocating for drastic changes to the current system. In this respect, Yeni Akit can be viewed as a conservative newspaper with radical tendencies. Milli Gazete is a publication aligned with the principles of the Saadet Party and Milli Görüş, emphasizing Islamic values and conservatism. It advocates for a society organized in accordance with Islamic principles and maintains a cautious stance towards modernization. It strongly supports the

preservation of religious values and traditions. It has also been observed to adopt an anti-Western stance based on local values, sometimes displaying a radical perspective. By using a radical tone in its discourse on economic or political independence, it argues for the restructuring of social order in line with traditional Islamic values. However, this radicalism is typically based on an ideological foundation and tends to be less polarizing.

Türkiye Gazetesi, while embracing Islamic and conservative values, uses a more moderate tone compared to other publications. It emphasizes the importance of traditional values in society and adopts a cautious approach toward modernization. With a pro-government stance and support for preserving the current system, it operates within a conservative framework. Avoiding radical rhetoric, it follows a more moderate conservative line. Unlike other conservative newspapers, it refrains from harsh or polarizing language, advocating instead for the gradual strengthening of the existing system. In this regard, Türkiye Gazetesi can be considered a conservative but not radical publication.

REFERENCES

- Arsan, E. (2016). Turkey's Media System: A Quest for Democracy. In D. C. Hallin &
- Boyle, M. P., McLeod, D. M., & Armstrong, C. L. (2004). Adherence to the Protest Paradigm: The Influence of News Frames on Public Perceptions of Legitimacy of Social Movements. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(1), 37-54.
- Chong, D., & Druckman, J. N. (2007). Framing theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10, 103-126. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.10.072805.103054>
- Çakır, R. (2007). *Derin Hizbullah: İslamcı Şiddetin Geleceği*. Metis Yayınları.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
- Es, M. (2013). The Emergence of a New Islamic Bourgeoisie in Turkey. In J.B. Thompson & B. Yeşilada (Eds.), *Islamist Capitalism: Rebuilding of the Turkish Economy* (pp. 187-211). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. University of California Press.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. University of California Press.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Harvard University Press.

Hoover, S. M., & Lundby, K. (1997). *Rethinking Media, Religion, and Culture*. Sage Publications.

Iyengar, S. (1991). *Is Anyone Responsible? How Television Frames Political Issues*. University of Chicago Press.

Iyengar, S., & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News That Matters: Television and American Opinion*. University of Chicago Press.

Kalın, I. (2011). Secularism, Islam, and the Politics of the Headscarf in Turkey. *Middle East Policy*, 18(3), 60-77.

Mason, D., & Maron, S. (2016). *The Routledge Companion to Media and Human Rights*. Routledge.

McCombs, M. E., Shaw, D. L., & Weaver, D. H. (1997). *Communication and Democracy: Exploring the Intellectual Frontiers in Agenda-Setting Theory*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McLeod, D. M., & Detenber, B. H. (1999). Framing Effects of Television News Coverage of Social Protest. *Journal of Communication*, 49(3), 3-23.

Milli Gazete. (n.d.). Milli Gazete. <https://www.milligazete.com.tr/>

Neuman, W. R., Just, M. R., & Crigler, A. N. (1992). *Common Knowledge: News and the Construction of Political Meaning*. University of Chicago Press.

Özdalga, E. (2006). The Naqshbandi-Khalidi Order and Political Islam in Turkey: from the Ottomans to the Turkish Republic. In S. Yavuz (Ed.), *The Emergence of a New Turkey: Democracy and the AK Parti* (pp. 144-167). University of Utah Press.

P. Mancini (Eds.), *Comparing Media Systems Beyond the Western World* (pp. 101- 123). Cambridge University Press.

Scheufele, D. A., & Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 9-20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9916.2007.00326.x>

Scheufele, D. A., & Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 9-20.

Semetko, H. A., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2000). Framing European politics: A content analysis of press and television news. *Journal of Communication*, 50(2), 93-109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2000.tb02843.x>

Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1988). Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization. *International Social Movement Research*, 1, 197-217.

Sözeri, C. (2016). Islamist Media and the Politics of the Veil. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 25-42.

Şen, M. (2010). Transformation of Turkish Islamism and the Rise of the Justice and Development Party. *Turkish Studies*, 11(1), 59-84.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). *An integrative theory of intergroup conflict*. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Tankard, J. W. (2001). The empirical approach to the study of media framing. In S. D. Reese, O. H. Gandy Jr., & A. E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing Public Life: Perspectives on Media and Our Understanding of the Social World* (pp. 95-106). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tuchman, G. (1978). Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality. Free Press.

Türkiye Gazetesi. (n.d.). Türkiye Gazetesi. <https://www.turkiyegazetesi.com.tr/>

Yeni Akit. (n.d.). Yeni Akit. <https://www.yeniakit.com.tr/>

Yeni Şafak. (n.d.). Yeni Şafak. <https://www.yenisafak.com/>



ABSTRACT

This study will examine how the conservative newspapers in Turkey—Yeni Şafak, Yeni Akit, Milli Gazete, and Türkiye Gazetesi—frame the Mahsa Amini protests on their news websites. The research aims to analyze the perspectives from which these newspapers present the events, the themes through which they convey the news, and the messages they communicate to the public. The study will particularly focus on frames related to conflict, law and order, foreign intervention and human rights. The objective is to reveal the framing strategies employed by the conservative media in response to the protests by using the Mahsa Amini protests as a case study.

Key Words: Media Framing, Protests, Mahsa Amini Protests, Conservative Media, Framing Strategies.

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada Türkiye’deki muhafazakar gazeteler; Yeni Şafak, Yeni Akit, Milli Gazete ve Türkiye Gazetesi’nin haber sitelerinde Mahsa Amini protestolarının nasıl çerçvelendiği incelenecektir. Araştırma, bu gazetelerin olayları hangi bakış açılarıyla sunduğunu, hangi temalar üzerinden haberleri aktardığını ve kamuoyuna nasıl bir mesaj verdiğini analiz etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmada özellikle çatışma, toplumsal düzenin korunması, dış güçlerin müdahalesi ve insan hakları çerçevelerine odaklanılacaktır. Muhafazakâr medyanın protestolar karşısında nasıl bir çerçeveleme stratejisi izlediğini Mahsa Amini protestoları örneğinden yola çıkarak ortaya koymayı hedeflemektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Medya Çerçevelemesi, Protestolar, Mahsa Amini Protestoları, Muhafazakar Medya, Çerçeveleme Stratejileri