
Strategic Ambiguity and Discursive Power in The Contemporary Political Media Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis

Mafaz Hatem Ouda

*The General Directorate of Education in Misan Province,
Ministry of Education, Iraq*

doi: <https://doi.org/10.37745/bjel.2013/vol14n32741>

Published September 27, 2026

Citation: Ouda M.H. (2026) Strategic Ambiguity and Discursive Power in The Contemporary Political Media Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis, *British Journal of English Linguistics*, 14(3),27-41

Abstract : *The Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach is used in this study to examine the connection between strategic ambiguity and discursive power in the political discourse of the contemporary media. Ambiguity has become a key language and ideology in contemporary political communication, a method used by political actors and media institutions to create persuasive stories, mediate ideational conflict and consolidate institutional power. This study seeks to investigate the role of strategically ambiguous language in political media discourse and its role in creating/producing discursive power. This study is of a qualitative nature, following Fairclough's three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis, which is further strengthened by the socio-cognitive perspective of van Dijk and discourse-historical perspective of Wodak. The texts are selected political media texts such as political speeches, televised interviews, news report, press conferences and social media's political statements. The analysis is concerned with the identification of linguistic elements linked to strategic ambiguity like vagueness, euphemism, modality, metaphorical framing, implication and lexical indeterminacy. The results show that strategic ambiguity is a conscious communication tactic to allow political figures interpretive latitude, deflect direct blame and reach ideologically different audiences at once. The study also shows the active participation media in consolidating the ambiguity of political narratives, either by framing or selective representation, which is used to consolidate the ideology and public opinion management. Ambiguous political discourse was identified as a discursive and symbolic power that works not only as a rhetorical imprecision, but as an advanced rhetorical device. Furthermore, the analysis shows that today's digital environments amplify the persuasive power of ambiguity by speeding up the flow of disembodied and politically charged messages that are both loaded with emotion and uncertain. This means that ambiguity fosters ideological polarization, multiplicity of interpretation and the normalization of hegemonic political narratives in today's society. The study ends with the finding that strategic ambiguity is one of the core elements of the political media discourse of today and is an effective discursive power. It additionally shows how the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) method can be useful for*

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development UK
revealing ideological patterns and power dynamics in political communication. The research is useful for discourse studies, political linguistics, and media analysis since it helps to better understand the role of language as a tool of ideological manipulation and socio-political control in current media environments.

Keywords: strategic ambiguity, discursive power, political media discourse, critical discourse analysis, ideology, political communication, media discourse, linguistic manipulation.

INTRODUCTION

The political media discourse today is becoming more and more complex, ideological and the use of language is more and more used strategically. Today, with the proliferation of information, polarizing political climates, and digitally mediated communication, political actors often resort to ambiguous language as a tool of rhetorical negotiation and moveability in order to influence public interpretation, to enact a process of compromise, and to keep shifting positions. Strategic ambiguity is not only a communicative shortfall from the side of the sender, or an unwitting vagueness, but also a purposeful discursive tool for the construction, maintenance and legitimation of power relationships in political and media institutions. The relationship between language and power is one of the main concerns of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as it is in the other works of this group of scholars, including that of Norman Fairclough, Teun A. van Dijk and Ruth Wodak, who emphasize the ideological role that discourse plays in creating social realities and reinforcing hegemonic structures. In this theoretical context, political media language becomes an ideal space to study ideologically how linguistic choices work to consolidate a dominant ideology, subject it to the public's imagination, and present the sociopolitical narrative. In this context strategic ambiguity serves as a rhetorical tool which enables the political elites and the media to obfuscate their intentions, evade responsibility and satisfy a broad audience of varying ideological demands. Furthermore, the media landscape of today adds to the importance of ambiguity because of the intertwining of traditional and digital communication channels. Today political statements are not only institutionalised in speeches or press conferences, they also flow through the media in televised debates, social media platforms, news commentaries and algorithm-driven media networks that highlight the multiplicity of interpretations. In this way, the ambiguous political discourse becomes more persuasive as it allows actors to remain discursively flexible and reduce political risk. This ambiguity can be expressed through the linguistic ambiguity of lexical indeterminacy, metaphorical framing, euphemisms, presupposition, implication, and ideological silence, for instance, which all play a role in the production of discursive power. The present study uses a critical discourse analysis perspective to examine the connection between strategic ambiguity and discursive power in the political media discourse of the present day. It aims to analyze the role of ambiguity in political communication and the processes of the normalisation and dissemination of ambiguous political discourses in the media. Additionally, the linguistic and rhetorical strategies in which political actors create persuasive ambiguity and the different ways

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development UK

audiences can be figured, manipulated, or ideologized by such discursive strategies are examined. This study examines the ways in which selected examples of contemporary political media language and discourse are articulated with the use of a critical lens, in order to make a contribution to current scholarly discussions on the relationship between language, ideology, and power in mediated political communication. It aims to show that strategic ambiguity is not just a stylistic or rhetorical device but a powerful discursive force which influences public opinion, political legitimacy, and ideological hegemony in the current society.

Research Problem

Language has become a medium of communication as well as a tool of ideological persuasion and socio-political constraint in today's political media. Media and political actors often resort to strategic ambiguity to craft messages that are broad enough to allow for multiple interpretations and that do not directly take political responsibility or risk confrontation. Although the term 'strategic ambiguity' has become common in political language in contemporary media, the practice of strategic ambiguity as a tool of discursive power in political communication has not yet been adequately examined. Moreover, most previous work on political discourse has focused on the process of persuading, on propaganda, on the process of framing and on the representation of ideology, while the use of ambiguity as a discursive technique has been comparatively under-researched, in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in particular. This comes into play in highly politicised contexts where hybrid language is being used, where opinion can easily change, where ideology can be reinforced, and where interpretation of statements can be skewed. Thus, the aim of the present study is to explore the critical issues of strategic ambiguity in the political media discourse today regarding the way in which it is manifested linguistically and ideologically, and the part it plays in the production and maintenance of discursive power.

Research Questions

1. This study is aimed at answering the following research questions:
2. How is strategic ambiguity linguistically built in the political media in the contemporary society?
3. How do political actors and media shape the politicisation and ambiguity of communication?
4. How does strategic ambiguity help to build and implement discursive power?
5. How does the fuzzy politics affect the representation of ideology and the interpretation of audiences?
6. To what extent can Critical Discourse Analysis detect the underlying power relations in the political media discourse that has a level of ambiguity?

Research Objectives

The present study aims to:

1. Be able to recognise the linguistic and rhetorical forms of strategic ambiguity in contemporary political media discourse.

2. Explore the discursive practices and processes of using ambiguity by political actors and media outlets.
3. Discuss the connection between strategic ambiguity and discursive power based on the Critical Discourse Analysis.
4. Discuss the ideologies behind the not-so-clear political communication, its effects on public perceptions, and its role in the sociopolitical narrative.
5. Make visible Political media discourse that reinforces power structures and hegemonic ideology in a strategically ambiguous way.

Significance of the Study

This study is very important both theoretically and practically. In theory, it helps to deepen the understanding of the relationship between strategic ambiguity and discursive power in contemporary political media discourse, which is a new field of the research of Critical Discourse Analysis. It takes political communication studies beyond the narrow focus on ambiguity as a rhetorical device to consider it an ideology and a power-based discursive strategy. In practice the research will help to raise critical consciousness about the impact of political communication and media text on the perception of the public with the use of implicit, indirect and strategically vague language. When it comes to questioning the role of ambiguity in political communication, polarization, and media influence, this approach is especially critical in today's day and age of digital communication and political polarization. Furthermore, the present study can be helpful for discourse analysts, linguists, media scholars, political communication researchers, and students who study language and ideology, media and language, and language and power. It can also help students to think more critically about how to analyze political messages in today's day and age of media and to expose the underlying ideologies of political language.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The discourse studies have always been concerned with the relationship between language, ideology, and power, especially Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Political media discourse is one of the most influential types of public communication that has generated much scholarly attention due to its ability to create social realities, to build ideological discourses and to reproduce power relations. In this context strategic ambiguity has become an important communicative phenomenon in which the political actors and media firms wield discursive power and manage the meaning, the tensions of ideologies. In this context, strategic ambiguity has become an important communicative phenomenon in which political actors and media institutions have discursive power and manage the meaning, the tension of ideologies.

Cultural Analysis of Discourse/ Discursive Power

The scholarship of the critical approach to discourse analysis, which was developed primarily by scholars like Norman Fairclough, Teun A. van Dijk, and Ruth Wodak, who saw discourse as a social practice that is tightly connected to structures of dominance and inequality, helped pave the way for the critical approach. Fairclough (1989, 1995) says that discourse is not only a reflection of the society but a factor that constitutes the social relations and the ideology of society. Language serves an ideology, says Fairclough, and this happens when some understandings and power structures are accepted as common sense – a process known as naturalization.

Likewise, in the cognitive approach, discourse is seen as a cognitive phenomenon, and van Dijk (1998, 2008) points out the importance of using language to shape public knowledge, belief and attitudes as part of an elite's agenda. He believes that discursive power is exercised when public discussion is dominated and mental models of social reality are formed. Wodak and Meyer (2009) also build on CDA, adding historical, political and sociocultural aspects to interpretation of discourse, stating that there are no languages outside of institutional and ideological power.

Lexical selection, framing, presupposition, implication, metaphor and silence are some of the ways in which discursive power can be realized within political media discourse. Such discursive strategies help political institutions and news media create hegemonic discourses, while silencing other understandings. Thus, CDA offers a suitable analytical tool with which to examine the role of strategic ambiguity in the context of today's political communication.

The Politics of strategic ambiguity

The roots of strategic ambiguity are traced back mostly to communication and organizational studies, with Eisenberg (1984) defining ambiguity as a communicative strategy that allows for multiple interpretations without losing the organization's unity and flexibility. Strategic ambiguity is planned and practical, as opposed to accidental vagueness. It gives the individual the opportunity to speak to a variety of audiences, to be politically flexible, and to avoid facing people directly or taking accountability.

Ambiguity has multiple communicative functions in political discourse. Political actors use ambiguous or indefinite language for several purposes: to not offend any specific group of voters, to avoid revealing controversial plans, and to permit political manoeuvrability. Political language often involves symbolic construction instead of clear factual statements, allowing politicians to stir up the emotions without making any clear promises (Edelman, 1977). Chilton (2004) makes a similar argument that ambiguity is essential to political communication for enabling a “negotiation of ideology” and “strategic positioning” in “contested sociopolitical contexts.”

The findings of recent research in political communication studies indicate that ambiguity is gaining more and more space in the digitally mediated political sphere of communication. Social media, television debates and online news sources propel the spread of disillusioned political messages with many layers of meaning. In such situations, ambiguous discourse becomes

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development UK
persuasive because the listener(s) are actively involved in the process of meaning construction, and may project their own biases and ideologies onto political messaging.

Media Discourse and Ideological Representation

The media have an important role in disseminating and normalizing political discourse. Fairclough (1995) stated that media discourse is an intermediate between political institutions and the public consciousness that mediates the process of ideological representation by selective framing. Media are not mere carriers of information; they make their own social reality through their language and their signs.

Van Dijk (1995) also claims that media discourse plays a role in the reproduction of ideology by highlighting some aspects and giving others weight. Media discourse not only creates dominant perceptions of political events and social issues, but also does so through repetition, framing, and lexical selection. Media ambiguity is ideologically important in that it enables institutions to sustain a sense of neutrality and to reinforce the hegemonic position in a less obvious manner.

Studies on political media discourse have also revealed the use of ambiguity as a persuasive tool in political crises and during election and international conflicts. Euphemisms, slurs and innuendo are commonly used by politicians and journalists to soften issues and to not get into a direct confrontation with a particular ideology. These forms of discourse can detract from accountability and shape how an audience will interpret political messages, especially if there's not enough context for them to be critical.

Ambiguity and Ideology and Audience Interpretation

The relationship between ambiguity and audience reception has been discussed by several scholars. According to Hall's (1980) encoding/decoding model the audience does not just take in discourse but actively read it according to their sociocultural and ideological backgrounds. The process is made easy by strategic ambiguity, which allows for multiple interpretations of the political message in a single statement to the media.

In post-structural discourse is always unstable and open to interpretation. But CDA academics say this instability is not politically neutral, and should be used strategically by powerful institutions. Ambiguous discourse allows political actors to have plausible deniability and retain ideological influence. This is especially important in today's political media landscape of misinformation, polarization and competing truths.

Furthermore, populist and nationalist discourse analysis reveal that ambiguity often manifests itself in terms of emotionally charged but semantically undefinitive language. The meaning of concepts like 'freedom,' 'security,' 'national interest,' or 'democracy' is often deliberately left open. This linguistic versatility makes it more effective to persuade the audience, since they can import their own ideological assumptions into these terms.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study uses the qualitative research design with a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach because the study aimed to examine the relationship between strategic ambiguity and discursive power in the discourse of the political media. The qualitative method is deemed suitable since the study aims to uncover the underlying and unspoken issues of ideologies, linguistic strategies, and power dynamics in political communication.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a theory and method of analyzing language as a social practice that is used to assert political and ideological control. The study is based mainly on Fairclough's three-dimensional model of discourse analysis and supported by van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach and Wodak's discourse-historical approach. These frameworks work together to enable the analysis of the structures, practices, and sociopolitical contexts of texts in a multidimensional manner.

Data Collection

In this study, the data are selected political media texts which are sourced from contemporary media. These texts include:

- Political speeches
- Televised political interviews
- News reports, media commentaries
- Press conferences

Social media politician statements

Online political discussions and debates

The texts chosen are deliberately sampled because they are relevant to the phenomenon of strategic ambiguity in political communication. Purposive sampling is used because the study involves a specific type of instances of discourse that may involve ambiguity to shape an ideology and public interpretation.

The data comes from media and political communication sources which are well known internationally to provide authenticity and contextual relevance. The study aims at capturing the current political discourse created in the context of recent political events and debates, which shows the changing nature of the modern media communication.

Analytical Framework

The study is based on the three dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis developed by Fairclough (1995) which consists of the following levels:

Textual Analysis

At this level, the linguistic and rhetorical aspects of political discourses are analyzed. The analysis concentrates on the following:

- Lexical choice
- Modality
- Vagueness and indeterminacy
- Euphemism
- Metaphor
- Presupposition
- Implication
- Nominalization
- Intertextuality

Special focus is placed on linguistic structures that make for strategic ambiguity and ideological flexibility.

Discursive Practice Analysis

This stage explores the process of the production, distribution and interpretation of political media texts in media institutions and in sociopolitical contexts. It analyzes the interaction between parties, journalists and media organizations and audiences in creating and producing an ambiguous discourse.

Social Practice Analysis

On the macro sociocultural level, the analysis investigates how, and to what extent, strategic ambiguity is a reflection and reproduction of the power relations of ideology in the society. In this step, linguistic practices are connected to political hegemony, institutional power, media influence and public awareness.

Data Analysis Procedures

The analysis is carried out in a systematic process of stages:

1. Selection of media texts relating to politics that have potentially ambiguous discourse.
2. Identification of linguistic signs of strategic ambiguity in the selected texts.
3. Classification of rhetorical and ideological use of discursive strategies.
4. Understanding of role of ambiguity in the use of discursive power and ideology influence.
5. Incorporation of analysis at a political and media context level.
6. The study is interpretive and critical analytical that will bring out the underlying meaning and ideological assumptions of the political discourse.

Reliability and Validity

The analysis is based on tried and tested frameworks from the field of CDA and the extensive theoretical literature from discourse studies and political communication, in order to improve the reliability and validity of the study. Several discourse examples are selected from various political media sources and then analyzed to obtain the results, which can be used to maintain the consistency of the analysis and reduce the interpretative bias.

Moreover, triangulation is also accomplished by the use of different theoretical approaches such as Fairclough's socio-cultural approach, van Dijk's socio-cognitive model, and Wodak's discourse-historical approach. This theoretical integration enriches the interpretative insight and trustworthiness of analysis.

RESULTS

The study of political media usage in recent years shows that strategic ambiguity is a major discursive device that political actors and political media use to build, negotiate and establish power relations. The results show that ambiguity is not just a random product of political communication but is also used on purpose to create ideological, persuasive, and institutional goals. Using Critical Discourse Analysis, some common patterns of language and discourse were found in the political media texts selected for analysis.

The strategic ambiguity as a deliberate discursive strategy

The results show that political actors use vague expressions to have communicative flexibility and to evade political responsibility. Uncertainty was often given in the form of ambiguous lexical expressions, vague references, uncertain modals and politically indeterminate terms. Words like “national interests,” “security concerns,” “democratic values” and “public welfare” were picked up again and again, but never defined, so that the speaker could give several meanings to these concepts in one speech.

The analysis also showed that ambiguous discourse allowed politicians to speak to a variety of groups without having to take a stance on specific political issues. This linguistic flexibility was apparent in the case of politically sensitive topics, election debates and media interviews during which it might be possible to provoke political controversy or public criticism through direct statements.

Language characteristics of strategic ambiguity

The following linguistic mechanisms were found in the analysed texts that led to strategic ambiguity: These include:

- Vagueness and indeterminacy
- Euphemistic expressions
- Presupposition
- Implicit meaning and implication

- Metaphorical framing
- Nominalization
- Modality and hedging
- Lexical abstraction

Of these, the modality and hedging were particularly noticeable. The use of modal verbs like "may," "might," and "could" by political speakers to avoid committing to anything and to allow for interpretive flexibility. In the same way, euphemistic language was used to mask for the public mind politically sensitive activities and to minimize adverse public response.

There was also metaphorical framing, which was an important part in building ideological narratives. Political events and conflicts were frequently depicted metaphorically in emotionally persuasive verbiage that led the audience in its interpretation without making a clear ideological statement.

The concept of strategic ambiguity and discursive power

The findings show that the strategic ambiguity is a good predictor of discursive power. Ambiguous discourse enabled political actors and media institutions to produce symbolic control over meaning production by making meaning uncertain in the process of shaping the meaning of political events. The analysis revealed that discursive power does not just work through overt ideological language of the text but also through what is not said, implied, or deliberately hidden. Frequently, political actors resorted to ambiguity to ensure plausible deniability in negotiations with ideologic conflicts and to limit responsibility for the controversial political stance they took.

Moreover, media institutions participated in the reinforcement of discursive power, reproducing and circulating ambiguous political narratives. Media discourse tended to exacerbate rather than clarify political meaning through framing, selective quotation and context omission. As such, audiences were situated in discursive contexts of uncertainty and negotiation of interpretation, as well as ideology.

The ideological Functions of Ambiguous Political Discourse

The results indicate that strategic ambiguity has several ideological roles in the current political media discourse. Firstly, ambiguity enables the normalisation of hegemonic political narratives by making ideologically charged ideas appear neutral, or generally accepted. Second, it avoids confronting ideas, which in turn helps to avoid the ideological confrontation.

It also shows that in times of sociopolitical flux, political institutions can retain their powers through the use of ambiguity. Political actors use indeterminate discourse to suit the changing public response and to maintain institutional legitimacy.

Further, ambiguous discourse causes ideological polarization by audiences' interpretation of statements depending on their pre-existing ideologies. The possible interpretation of the multiplicity adds to the fragmentation of political reality and enhances the vulnerability to manipulation and misinformation by the media.

The discursive positioning of media and audiences

The study concluded that the current discourse of media is active in the construction of the audience interpretation by selecting the political information strategically. Rhetorical expressions that appealed to the audience, and prompted them to align with a specific ideology, were commonly and repeatedly mentioned in the news reports and in televised political debates.

The phenomenon was amplified by the social media political discourse, which quickened the spread of political statements that lacked context and were broken up. Ambiguity now gained a new persuasive force in digitally mediated environments as the need for critical interpretation was often lost in the rush of media consumption.

The findings also indicate that audiences do not simply receive political discourses; they interpret them, but their interpretation is influenced and limited by dominant media discourses and discourses in terms of ideology. So, discursive power is enacted in both the construction and the circulation of media.

DISCUSSION

The present study shows that strategic ambiguity is a basic discursive mechanism for constructing and exercising discursive power in the current political media discourse. The analysis has established that ambiguity is not simply a linguistic feature that goes hand in hand with uncertainty or imprecision, but rather a conscious, intentional political move which allows political agents and media producers to influence the public interpretation of the text, to ensure political flexibility and institutional power.

The findings lend strong support to Fairclough's (1989, 1995) notion of discourse as a socially-constitutive activity, as he saw it, in relation to power and ideology. Lexical vagueness, euphemism, implication, and indeterminacy were found in the political discourse of the analysed texts, and they were used in a systematic way, which in turn contributed to the normalisation of hegemonic political discourse. The results found in the analysis above suggest that language in political media is not just a medium for delivering information, but is used to create an ideology and establish a dominant sociopolitical system.

The one of the most important findings relates to the connection between ambiguity and political accountability. Political actors often used strategically vague language to evade commitments or controversial statements. This discovery is consistent with Eisenberg's (1984) theory of strategic

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development UK
ambiguity, which proposes that ambiguity enables communicators to remain flexible, yet satisfy multiple audiences at the same time. During times when ideology is at odds, elections are competitive, or there is a political crisis, this flexibility is especially important in the political media.

Furthermore, the study shows that ambiguity plays a significant role in the creation of discursive power in controlling interpretation. Van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach offers a way to understand how the political elite and media can affect the public understanding by influencing the ways in which this understanding is made sense of, rather than simply dictating an ideology. Political rhetoric is often confusing, making it hard to be sure of its meaning and encouraging viewers to accept a preconceived notion about the issues. In this way, discursive power takes place indirectly through implication, presupposition and selective framing, not in the form of overt coercion.

Media institutions proved to be a key reinforcer of strategic ambiguity. The results show that the political narratives in the media are often ambiguous, which is reproduced and amplified by the media in a selective quotation, omitting the context and making it emotionally persuasive. The finding corroborates past studies, which have called attention to the fact that the media is not a neutral medium of information delivery but an active player in the process of ideology production. In today's digital media context, this process is amplified by the rapid dissemination of political messages through disarticulated communication spaces where contextualization is de-emphasized or altogether absent.

Furthermore, the study finds that strategic ambiguity works ideologically, morphing politically charged notions into seemingly innocuous or consensual statements. Words like freedom, security, national interest and others were used over and over again as semantically open words that could be interpreted in various ideological ways. The result is in line with some post-structural and discourse theoretical perspectives which see political language as contestable and ideologically negotiable. The present study, however, takes this idea further, as it is shown how this ambiguity can be used to systematically enforce hegemonic power structures.

It also points to the connection between ambiguity and audience interpretation. Audiences have their own agency of interpretation, but the dominant media narratives and positioning of ideology also have an impact on how audiences interpret political discourse. In this regard, Hall's encoding/decoding model is of central importance: the results indicate that ambiguity allows for a variety of interpretations of political discourse, but also privileges some of them through media framing processes. Ambiguity therefore helps to polarize politics because audiences read semantically ambiguous discourse based on their pre-existing political orientations.

Moreover, the study indicates that the ambiguity of strategy is a growing trend in today's digital political communication. The social media environment and news context online fosters the dissemination of short, strong, and contextually detached political messages. In these

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development UK

communicative contexts, ambiguity gains a greater persuasive force because a quick consumption tends to disenchant the receptivity to critical reflection and contextual analysis. This can, in turn, lead to the spread of misinformation, political ideology manipulation and the normalisation of conflicting political narratives.

The results also validate the analytical potency of Critical Discourse Analysis in the detection of the underlying ideology in the political media discourse. Combining a textual, discursive and sociocultural analysis, CDA helps researchers to uncover links between linguistic choices and other systems of political domination and institutional power. The study thus helps to advance the current debate on studies on discourse, as it clarifies the importance of not considering ambiguity merely a rhetorical device, but rather as a complicated mechanism of discursive control and ideological government.

However, the study has a few limitations. The research did not quantitatively study the reception of the political text by the reader or examine the differences in the interpretation of the political in different cultures. Future research could be extended using Critical Discourse Analysis, audience studies, corpus linguistics or multimodal discourse analysis to gain a wider perspective of the discourse analysis of ambiguity in the different political and media texts.

Finally, the discussion is shown to be a strong discursive tool in today's political media discourse. Ambiguity allows political subjects and agents to shape public perception, manage ideological tensions, and maintain hegemonic power in relation to the language, ideology, and circulation of media. Finally, the study confirms the need to critically analyze political language to reveal the implicit process of producing social reality and power relations in modern society.

CONCLUSION

The study has critically analyzed the discursive power of strategic ambiguity in the political media discourse of the early 21st century using the approach of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The results show strategic ambiguity as a conscious and systematic rhetorical maneuver used by politicians and media outlets to influence the public's understanding, to hold on to ideological flexibility and to keep the political power in their hands. Ambiguity is not an expression of linguistic uncertainty or of accidental vagueness, but it is a powerful tool for the construction of ideology and the socio-political control.

The study found that the language of the present day political discourse is often characterized by vagueness, euphemism, modality, implication, metaphorical framing, and lexical indeterminacy, which allow it to build political narratives that are appropriate to the political context. These rhetorical devices make it possible for political leaders to deflect direct responsibility and also to resonate with a wide variety of and often ideologically polarized audiences. By these means,

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development UK
ambiguity helps to reproduce hegemonic power structures by influencing the production of meaning and constraining interpretable certainty.

The study also finalized the crucial position of media establishments in the enhancement and validation of strategically murky political conversation. The contemporary media, especially in digital communication spaces, can now rapidly disseminate partial and emotive political messages that allow several readings and support dominant narratives. Media discourse does not only function as a medium for political communication, but also as an agent in the process of discursive power building.

Moreover, the results validate the main tenets of Critical Discourse Analysis with regard to the language–ideology–power nexus. The study shows that political discourse is deeply enmeshed in wider sociocultural and institutional practices of negotiating and reproducing dominance and authority. Strategic ambiguity is thus a highly nuanced way of engaging in ideology in order to create public awareness, political perception and normalize specific social and political realities. A further valuable finding from this study is that ambiguity can be a key factor in the polarization of ideology in the current political climate. Ambiguous text can also enable audiences to interpret the political meaning of the text according to their own ideological assumptions, leading to a number of different interpretations of political reality and making them susceptible to manipulation, misinformation and discursive fragmentation. The persuasiveness of ambiguity is even stronger in digitally mediated settings, where users need to process information quickly and without adequate contextual analysis.

Critical Discourse Analysis is also shown to be a methodological tool that can discover the implicit ideology and power relations in political media discourse. CDA combines and builds on textual analysis, discursive approach, and sociocultural analysis, thus offering a holistic perspective on the role of political language as a symbolizing instrument of symbolic power and ideology.

This study has provided some valuable insights, however, there were some limitations. The research was conducted mainly on political media texts selected and did not empirically examine the audience reception and comparative cross-cultural political discourse. For future studies, multimodal discourse analysis and/or corpus-based analyses and/or audience-response studies would be useful to add to the understanding of how strategic ambiguity functions in different political and media contexts.

To conclude, this study suggests that strategic ambiguity has become a central aspect of the political media discourse of today and a potent discursive tool for political discourse in the modern era. Crafted linguistic indeterminacy and media mediation enable political actors and institutions to shape public perception, mediate inter-ideological conflicts, and maintain political hegemony. Therefore, it becomes a necessity to critically analyse the ambiguous political discourse to understand the intricate relationship of language, media, ideology and power in the present society.

REFERENCES

1. Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
2. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
3. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse*. Edward Arnold.
4. Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203561217>
5. Edelman, M. (1977). *Political language: Words that succeed and policies that fail*. Academic Press.
6. Eisenberg, E. M. (1984). Ambiguity as strategy in organizational communication. *Communication Monographs*, 51(3), 227–242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758409390197>
7. Hall, S. (1980). Encoding/decoding. In S. Hall, D. Hobson, A. Lowe, & P. Willis (Eds.), *Culture, media, language* (pp. 128–138). Hutchinson.
8. van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schäffner & A. Wenden (Eds.), *Language and peace* (pp. 17–33). Dartmouth Publishing.
9. van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359–383.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250>
10. van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan.
11. Wodak, R. (2009). *The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual*. Palgrave Macmillan.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230233682>
12. Wodak, R. (2015). *The politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean*. SAGE Publications.
13. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
14. *Critical Discourse Studies*. (n.d.). Taylor & Francis.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/journals/rcds20>
15. *SAGE handbook of political communication*. (2012). SAGE Publications.
<https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/the-sage-handbook-of-political-communication/book236023>
16. SAGE Journals. (n.d.). *Critical discourse studies*. <https://journals.sagepub.com/home/cds>
17. Taylor & Francis. (n.d.). *Critical discourse analysis research*.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/topic/allsubjects/SCOM/Critical-Discourse-Studies>