

# Linguistic Landscapes: How Urban Environments Shape Language Variation

<sup>1</sup> Gerda Urbaite

Accepted: 04.10.2025

Published: 04.14.2024

<https://doi.org/10.69760/portuni.010203>

## Abstract:

This article explores how urban environments influence language variation through the lens of linguistic landscapes—the visual display of languages in public spaces such as signs, advertisements, and official notices. Drawing on established theoretical research, it examines how linguistic landscapes reflect the multilingual and multicultural nature of modern cities and function as symbolic markers of identity, power, and inclusion. The study discusses the ways in which language use in urban signage is shaped by social dynamics, including migration, globalization, and local language policies. It also considers how minority and heritage languages are represented or marginalized in these landscapes, and how public visibility affects perceptions of linguistic vitality and legitimacy. The article argues that linguistic landscapes are not merely passive reflections of linguistic diversity but active spaces of meaning-making, social negotiation, and identity construction. By analyzing these visual texts, sociolinguists gain valuable insights into the complex relationship between language, space, and society in contemporary urban settings.

**Keywords:** linguistic landscape, language variation, urban multilingualism, identity, language policy

## INTRODUCTION

Urban environments are dynamic and linguistically rich spaces where multiple languages often coexist, interact, and evolve. These environments offer fertile ground for examining language variation and multilingualism in action. One of the most visible and accessible indicators of linguistic presence in urban spaces is the linguistic landscape—the display of languages on public and commercial signs in a given territory. This field of study, though relatively recent, has gained significant attention for its ability to illustrate the intersection of language, space, identity, and power (Landry & Bourhis, 1997; Gorter, 2006).

As global migration, tourism, and digital connectivity increase, cities have become contact zones for diverse linguistic communities. This growing diversity not only affects the spoken and written language practices of urban populations but also reshapes the visual language of cityscapes. Urban signage—from shop names and billboards to graffiti and government notices—offers insight into how languages are used, negotiated, and sometimes contested in public spaces (Shohamy & Gorter, 2008).

---

<sup>1</sup> Urbaite, G. Author, Euro-Global Journal of Linguistics and Language Education, Lithuania. Email: [urbaite0013@gmail.com](mailto:urbaite0013@gmail.com). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-5471-6210>.

This article explores the theoretical foundations of linguistic landscape studies with a focus on how urban environments shape language variation. It aims to investigate the sociolinguistic functions of linguistic landscapes and how they contribute to the visibility, vitality, and social meaning of language use in multicultural cities. Through a synthesis of established research, including the foundational work of Backhaus (2006), Ben-Rafael et al. (2006), and Coupland (2007), the article examines language variation as both a structural phenomenon and a symbolic act embedded in urban life.

The rise of linguistic landscape studies has coincided with broader developments in sociolinguistics and discourse analysis. Language variation is no longer seen merely as a function of region or class; it is now understood as deeply embedded in identity formation and spatial practices (Chambers, 2004; Leeman & Modan, 2009). As such, linguistic landscapes serve not just as passive reflections of multilingual realities but also as active agents in the construction and negotiation of social identities.

By focusing on cities as the focal point of linguistic convergence and tension, this article addresses the following questions:

- In what ways do urban environments influence the forms and patterns of language variation?
- How do linguistic landscapes reflect and shape social hierarchies, cultural identities, and language ideologies?
- What theoretical insights can be drawn from the intersection of urban studies and sociolinguistics?

To answer these questions, the article is organized into several sections. The next section presents a theoretical background on the concepts of linguistic landscape and language variation. This is followed by an examination of how urban dynamics influence multilingual practices, and how signs in public space function as markers of identity, power, and policy. The final sections discuss implications for sociolinguistic theory and propose future directions for research.

In sum, this article offers a conceptual investigation into the role of the urban linguistic landscape as a site of meaning-making, social negotiation, and language variation. By drawing on key theoretical perspectives and established empirical work, it aims to deepen our understanding of language as it is visually and socially embedded in the modern city.

## **II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

### **2.1. Understanding the Linguistic Landscape**

The concept of the linguistic landscape (LL) emerged as a response to the need for a visual and spatial understanding of language use in public domains. Landry and Bourhis (1997) first introduced the term in its modern usage, describing it as the visibility and salience of languages on public and commercial signs in a given area. Since then, linguistic landscapes have evolved into a critical analytical lens for exploring multilingualism, language ideologies, and symbolic power structures in society (Gorter, 2006; Shohamy & Gorter, 2008).

The linguistic landscape is not just a passive reflection of the languages spoken in a place—it is a symbolic construction of that place (Ben-Rafael et al., 2006). Signs are not merely informative; they are performative, shaping perceptions of linguistic legitimacy and social belonging. Whether a sign is

written in a dominant national language or a marginalized minority tongue, its presence—or absence—communicates societal attitudes toward linguistic groups.

## **2.2. Language Variation and Sociolinguistics**

Language variation has long been a central theme in sociolinguistics, with scholars such as Chambers (2004) emphasizing that variation is intrinsic to the structure and function of all languages. Variation may occur across dimensions such as geography, social class, gender, and age, and it can be expressed through phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical differences. In urban environments, these dimensions often intersect, giving rise to complex, hybrid linguistic practices.

Linguistic variation is not random; it is structured and patterned according to social meanings. Coupland (2007) views style as a resource for constructing identity and emphasizes the ways in which speakers shift between styles in different contexts. This idea is echoed in linguistic landscapes, where language choices on signs can reflect shifting alliances, social aspirations, or resistance to dominant ideologies.

## **2.3. Multilingualism in Urban Settings**

Multilingualism, often seen as a communicative resource, takes on a more visible, spatial character in the urban linguistic landscape. Cenoz and Gorter (2006) have argued for the importance of including visual elements in the study of multilingualism, particularly in relation to minority languages. Urban multilingualism is not limited to individual language competence; it also includes the sociopolitical and economic forces that influence which languages are displayed, promoted, or suppressed in public space.

Cities are inherently multilingual, often hosting communities that speak several different languages side by side. Backhaus (2006), in his study of Tokyo, found that the co-occurrence of languages on signs reflected both practical needs (e.g., addressing tourists) and deeper cultural negotiations. The use of English in non-Anglophone cities, for example, often carries prestige or is associated with globalization and modernity, whereas local or indigenous languages may reflect community roots or resistance.

## **2.4. The Linguistic Landscape as a Tool for Analyzing Identity and Power**

Beyond the surface level of language presence, linguistic landscapes are deeply tied to questions of identity, agency, and power. The visibility of certain languages and the invisibility of others can indicate which groups are valued in society and which are marginalized (Leeman & Modan, 2009). Signs may serve the interests of local businesses, governmental bodies, or grassroots activists—each deploying language strategically for different purposes.

Moreover, the linguistic landscape is also a field of contestation. Shohamy et al. (2010) point out that LLs can be arenas where language policies are negotiated and resisted. This aligns with a more critical view of language as embedded within social structures, where the presence of a language in the landscape is often the outcome of ongoing political, cultural, and economic dynamics.

# **III. URBAN ENVIRONMENTS AND LANGUAGE VARIATION**

## **3.1. Cities as Linguistic Contact Zones**

Urban spaces are fertile grounds for linguistic innovation and variation. As centers of migration, commerce, education, and cultural exchange, cities bring together speakers from diverse linguistic and social backgrounds. The result is a linguistic ecology characterized by contact, competition, and cooperation among languages. In this context, language variation does not exist in isolation but emerges from social interaction shaped by demographic dynamics, institutional forces, and individual agency.

Foulkes and Docherty (2014) highlight that urban areas often give rise to distinctive varieties of language—so-called “urban dialects”—which may feature innovations in phonology, syntax, or lexicon. These innovations are driven by interaction among different linguistic communities, including native speakers, immigrants, tourists, and transient populations. The linguistic landscape serves as a record of these interactions, displaying the multiplicity of voices that animate the urban scene.

### **3.2. Language Use and Adaptation in Urban Life**

Language variation in cities is also closely tied to social adaptation. Individuals and communities often modify their linguistic practices to align with dominant social norms or to navigate specific urban contexts. This includes phenomena like code-switching, style-shifting, and register variation, which are often observable in signage and public communication.

Urban linguistic landscapes provide clear examples of such adaptation. Businesses may display signs in multiple languages to reach broader audiences or appeal to specific clientele. For instance, a restaurant in a multicultural district may use English for international customers, the national language for official legitimacy, and a local or ethnic language to signify authenticity and cultural identity (Leeman & Modan, 2009).

The coexistence of these languages on a single sign reflects layered identities and pragmatic choices. It also speaks to the sociolinguistic reality that urban residents often operate within multiple linguistic and cultural frames simultaneously—a phenomenon Duff (2015) connects to transnationalism and multilingual identity.

### **3.3. The Role of Linguistic Landscape in Reflecting Social Stratification**

The urban linguistic landscape often mirrors existing social hierarchies. Certain languages—typically national or global languages—are more likely to appear in official signs, advertisements, and high-visibility locations. Meanwhile, minority and indigenous languages may be confined to specific neighborhoods or used in informal, handwritten, or community-generated signage (Cenoz & Gorter, 2006).

This unequal visibility has symbolic consequences. The languages prominently featured in public space are implicitly granted social legitimacy and economic capital, while less visible languages may be perceived as marginal or subaltern. Landry and Bourhis (1997) referred to this phenomenon as *ethnolinguistic vitality*, suggesting that a language’s presence in the landscape contributes to how vibrant and resilient it is perceived to be by its speakers.

Thus, the linguistic landscape functions not only as a medium of communication but also as a mechanism of inclusion and exclusion. The city becomes a semiotic battlefield where linguistic groups claim space, negotiate identity, and assert their presence—or are pushed into invisibility.

## **IV. LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE AND SOCIAL IDENTITY**

### **4.1. Language as a Marker of Identity in Urban Space**

In urban environments, language is not only a tool for communication but also a profound marker of social identity. The linguistic landscape serves as a public canvas on which communities express cultural affiliations, historical roots, and group belonging. When languages appear in signs, they are not chosen arbitrarily—they are selected to project specific identities, attract particular audiences, or assert symbolic power.

Coupland (2007) emphasizes that linguistic style, whether spoken or written, is central to constructing and negotiating social identity. Similarly, the choice of language on a public sign—whether it's a boutique using French for sophistication, or a grocery store using an ethnic language to connect with a local diaspora—reflects an intentional act of identity signaling. These acts are deeply influenced by social context, including class, ethnicity, religion, and political ideology.

The urban linguistic landscape thus becomes a site of identity performance. In multilingual neighborhoods, the layering of different languages on a single street reflects the cultural mosaic of its inhabitants. This visibility fosters a sense of community, familiarity, and recognition among speakers of minority languages, while also showcasing the multicultural nature of the space to outsiders.

### **4.2. Minority Languages and Visibility in Public Space**

The presence of minority languages in the linguistic landscape plays a critical role in maintaining cultural continuity and resisting assimilation. Scholars such as Cenoz and Gorter (2006) and Marten et al. (2012) have shown that the visibility of minority languages in public spaces can strengthen community identity and promote linguistic pride.

However, this visibility is often uneven. In many cities, the linguistic landscape reflects broader social power dynamics: majority languages dominate official and commercial signage, while minority languages are restricted to informal, grassroots contexts. Even when minority languages appear in the landscape, they may do so in subordinated or decorative roles, lacking the functional or official status of dominant languages.

Nonetheless, symbolic inclusion can still be meaningful. When a government office includes a minority language on its signage, or when a community event is advertised in a heritage language, it can affirm the linguistic rights and cultural identity of a marginalized group. Shohamy et al. (2010) stress that such practices are political as well as cultural, shaping the narratives of belonging in the city.

### **4.3. Contested Identities and Linguistic Conflict**

In some cases, linguistic landscapes become sites of tension and resistance, where different linguistic communities struggle over visibility and recognition. Public signs may be defaced, altered, or replaced in acts that reflect broader societal conflicts. In contested regions or multicultural cities, language choice can become a deeply political act—a way of asserting ownership over space, resisting erasure, or challenging dominant ideologies (Ben-Rafael et al., 2006).

These tensions underscore the fact that linguistic landscapes are not neutral or static; they are constantly negotiated and reimagined. As cities evolve and populations shift, so too do the linguistic

messages inscribed in their public spaces. This fluidity is part of what makes linguistic landscape studies a valuable window into the social dynamics of urban life.

## **V. LANGUAGE POLICY AND PLANNING IN URBAN CONTEXTS**

### **5.1. Policy as a Shaping Force in the Linguistic Landscape**

Language policy plays a central role in determining which languages are visible in public space and how they are used. In urban environments, official regulations and planning decisions can significantly shape the linguistic landscape. Policies at the municipal, regional, or national level often dictate the language(s) to be used in street signs, government buildings, transportation systems, and educational institutions. These decisions impact not only practical communication but also symbolic representation.

Shohamy and Gorter (2008) argue that linguistic landscapes are a key medium through which language policies are implemented, enforced, and at times contested. For instance, in some countries, laws mandate the exclusive use of the official language in signage, marginalizing minority languages or immigrant tongues from public visibility. In contrast, other cities adopt inclusive policies that promote multilingual signage to reflect demographic realities and encourage social cohesion.

Language planning is therefore not a neutral act—it is embedded in ideological frameworks that promote particular identities, histories, and visions of the city. The degree to which different languages are included or excluded from the landscape often reflects broader cultural and political agendas.

### **5.2. The Politics of Visibility and Legitimacy**

In multilingual cities, the question of which languages are allowed to "speak" in public space is deeply political. The inclusion of certain languages in official signage can grant them a degree of institutional legitimacy, while the absence of others may signal their marginalization. Language policy in this context operates as a tool of both empowerment and silencing.

Backhaus's (2006) study of multilingual signs in Tokyo revealed a distinction between top-down signs (created by institutions) and bottom-up signs (created by individuals or businesses). The language patterns in each reflect different priorities: top-down signs tend to reinforce official language norms, while bottom-up signs often reflect the linguistic diversity and practical needs of urban residents. This tension underscores the dual role of policy and grassroots practice in shaping the linguistic environment.

In cases where there is a disconnect between policy and reality—such as in neighborhoods with high immigrant populations but little official support for their languages—the linguistic landscape may expose gaps in language planning. These gaps can become focal points for community activism and linguistic assertion, as residents seek to make their identities and languages visible despite institutional barriers.

### **5.3. Language Commodification in Urban Settings**

Language policy in urban areas is also increasingly influenced by economic considerations. In many cities, the display of English and other global languages in public signage reflects a strategy of language



commodification—using language as a marketable asset to attract tourists, investors, or cosmopolitan consumers (Leeman & Modan, 2009).

This trend can lead to the valorization of certain languages (especially English) over others, regardless of their actual usage within the local population. While such practices may enhance a city's global image, they can also obscure local linguistic diversity and contribute to the symbolic marginalization of non-commodified languages.

The commodification of language also influences design choices, such as the aesthetics of signs, branding strategies, and language hierarchies within multilingual signage. In such cases, the linguistic landscape becomes a hybrid of cultural identity and commercial appeal, where language functions as both a communicative tool and a visual product.

## **VI. IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIOLINGUISTICS**

The study of linguistic landscapes offers valuable insights into broader sociolinguistic processes, particularly in understanding how language variation and identity are shaped by space, power, and visibility. Unlike traditional sociolinguistic approaches that focus on spoken discourse or isolated community studies, linguistic landscape research captures language in situ—as it is embedded in the urban environment and accessible to the public eye.

One of the most significant contributions of this field is its emphasis on language ideology and symbolic value. By analyzing which languages appear in public signage, where they appear, and in what combinations, researchers gain a deeper understanding of societal attitudes toward different language groups. This focus allows for the examination of both dominant language practices and marginalized voices, giving visibility to minority languages, local dialects, and multilingual expressions that might otherwise be overlooked.

Furthermore, linguistic landscape studies contribute to the growing interest in multimodal sociolinguistics, where the visual, spatial, and material dimensions of language use are taken into account. The interplay between written language, typography, placement, and physical surroundings offers a holistic view of linguistic practice that extends beyond verbal communication.

The urban linguistic landscape also reflects changing patterns of global communication, migration, and identity. As urban populations become increasingly transnational and multilingual, the linguistic landscape becomes a space where individuals and groups articulate complex affiliations—sometimes blending, sometimes resisting dominant cultural narratives.

These developments suggest that sociolinguistics must continue to engage with spatial and visual dimensions of language, recognizing the city as a vital context for understanding contemporary language variation, identity, and policy.

## **CONCLUSION**

This article has explored how urban environments shape language variation through the lens of the linguistic landscape. It has shown that public signs in cities are not merely functional markers but are ideologically loaded texts that reveal, reinforce, or challenge social structures.

By drawing from a rich body of research, including the work of Backhaus (2006), Ben-Rafael et al. (2006), Shohamy & Gorter (2008), and others, this study has emphasized that the linguistic landscape serves as a space for identity construction, political expression, and social negotiation. It reflects the sociolinguistic diversity of urban populations while also highlighting asymmetries in power, visibility, and access.

Language variation in cities is not accidental; it is shaped by language policies, economic motivations, demographic patterns, and community agency. Through signage, language becomes visible—and visibility, in turn, becomes a marker of belonging, legitimacy, and cultural presence.

As cities continue to evolve in response to globalization and migration, the study of linguistic landscapes offers a timely and necessary framework for understanding the visual politics of language. It calls for an expanded sociolinguistic lens—one that captures the interaction between language and space, and between the global and the local.

In doing so, scholars can better understand how urban linguistic environments mediate the everyday experiences of multilingual individuals and communities, and how language lives not only in speech but also in streets, signs, and symbols.

#### References:

- Backhaus, P. (2006). Multilingualism in Tokyo: A look into the linguistic landscape. *International journal of multilingualism*, 3(1), 52-66.
- Ben-Rafael, E., Shohamy, E., Hasan Amara, M., & Trumper-Hecht, N. (2006). Linguistic landscape as symbolic construction of the public space: The case of Israel. *International journal of multilingualism*, 3(1), 7-30.
- Biber, D. (2015). Corpus-based and corpus-driven analyses of language variation and use.
- Cenoz, J. (2013). Defining multilingualism. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 33, 3-18.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2006). Linguistic landscape and minority languages. *International journal of multilingualism*, 3(1), 67-80.
- Chambers, J. K. (2004). Studying language variation: An informal epistemology. *The handbook of language variation and change*, 3-14.
- Chambers, J. K., & Schilling, N. (Eds.). (2018). *The handbook of language variation and change*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Coupland, N. (2007). *Style: Language variation and identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, P. A. (2015). Transnationalism, multilingualism, and identity. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 35, 57-80.
- Edwards, W. F. (1992). Sociolinguistic behavior in a Detroit inner-city black neighborhood1. *Language in society*, 21(1), 93-115.
- Foulkes, P., & Docherty, G. J. (2014). Urban voices—overview. *Urban voices*, 1-24.



- Franceschini, R. (2011). Multilingualism and multicompetence: A conceptual view. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 344-355.
- Gorter, D. (2006). Introduction: The study of the linguistic landscape as a new approach to multilingualism. *International journal of multilingualism*, 3(1), 1-6.
- Gorter, D. (Ed.). (2006). *Linguistic landscape: A new approach to multilingualism*. Multilingual Matters.
- Horner, K., & Weber, J. J. (2017). *Introducing multilingualism: A social approach*. Routledge.
- Koenig, E. L., Chia, E., & Povey, J. (Eds.). (1983). *A sociolinguistic profile of urban centers in Cameroon*. Crossroad Press.
- Landry, R., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1997). Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: An empirical study. *Journal of language and social psychology*, 16(1), 23-49.
- Leeman, J., & Modan, G. (2009). Commodified language in Chinatown: A contextualized approach to linguistic landscape 1. *Journal of sociolinguistics*, 13(3), 332-362.
- Marten, H. F., Van Mensel, L., & Gorter, D. (2012). Studying minority languages in the linguistic landscape. In *Minority languages in the linguistic landscape* (pp. 1-15). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Shohamy, E. G., Rafael, E. B., & Barni, M. (Eds.). (2010). *Linguistic landscape in the city*. Multilingual Matters.
- Shohamy, E., & Gorter, D. (Eds.). (2008). *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery*. Routledge.
- Snyder, W. B. (1995). *Language acquisition and language variation: The role of morphology* (Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology).
- Washio, R. (1997). Resultatives, compositionality and language variation. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*, 6(1), 1-49.