



Language Choice and Power Relations in Multilingual Urban Communities

Munazza Khan ^{1*}, Dr. Ali Rafi ², Dr. Faiz Muhammad Brohi ³

¹ Research Specialist, Aga Khan University, Pakistan

² Co-Founder and Consultant, The Advisors' Insights, Pakistan

³ Assistant Professor, Institute of English Language and Literature, University of Sindh, Pakistan

* Corresponding Author: **Muhammad Rizwan**

Article Info

ISSN (Online): 2582-7138

Impact Factor (RSIF): 8.04

Volume: 07

Issue: 02

March-April 2026

Received: 23-02-2026

Accepted: 21-03-2026

Published: 16-04-2026

Page No: 637-644

Abstract

This paper examines how language selection and power structure relate to multilingual urban populations. In these environments, people are in a constant negotiation of identity, status and social belonging via their linguistic practices. The study explores the tendency of dominant languages to represent power, education, and economic mobility, and the minority languages to be linked with marginalization or language preservation. Using sociolinguistic theories, this research examines the daily interactions within an urban context like a market, educational institution, and the workplace. It emphasizes the strategic transfers between languages (code-switching) done by speakers in order to achieve social prestige, political solidarity, or to oppose language hierarchies. The results show that the decision to use language is not a simple communicative action but a mirror of a larger social organization and power dynamics. In addition, the paper highlights the importance of policy, education and media in influencing the preferences in language and perpetrating inequalities. Finally, it does suggest more inclusive language practices that view linguistic diversity as an asset also in urban societies.

Keywords: Language choice, Power relations, Multilingualism, Urban communities, Code-switching, Linguistic identity, Sociolinguistics

1. Introduction

Language is not a mere tool of communication, but it is also an effective tool of social organization, identity creation, and power distribution. The choice of language becomes a very strategic activity in multilingual urban communities where people can negotiate their status, belonging, and access to resources. Speakers are in a continuous movement between languages to identify themselves with the social demands, economic prospects, and cultural affiliations. According to Bourdieu, language is actually linguistic capital, languages have more prestige and power than others, which influence social mobility and inequality (Bourdieu 55).

This study has academic value because it contributes sociolinguistics and social theory in that it analyzes how language as a power mechanism is used in the daily city. This is further supported by Foucault notion of discourse that demonstrates how language creates and controls knowledge, thus defining what is accepted as legitimate or marginal in society (Foucault 101). To this extent, the selection of language is not neutral but profoundly rooted in regimes of power, ideology and control.

The study also adds to the existing body of literature by concentrating on the realities of language life of multilingual urban communities where the norm of linguistic diversity is not an exception but rather a new reality. It points out the way people strategically use language in constructing identity and negotiating social hierarchies in their daily interactions.

1.1. Context and Background

The historical, political and economic influences that affect the distribution and use of language shape multilingual urban community. In societies that are postcolonial and globalized, urban centers are the linguistic melting pot where more than one

language can be found. English as a legacy of colonialism is more likely to be dominant, which is linked to education, professionalism and promotion (Blommaert 23). Conversely, local and indigenous languages can be used as cultural identifiers, emotional outlets, and community identifiers.

Such a stratification of language is not a coincidence but has been historically brought into existence. The policies of colonial language institutionalized the European languages as the means of government and schooling and gave rise to the enduring hierarchies, which are still present in modern societies. Consequently, the speakers in the urban settings must grapple with intricate linguistic environments in which language selection not only indicates available opportunity, but also constrained choice.

One of the most noticeable characteristics of such multilingual environment is code-switching. According to Gumperz, code-switching refers to the interchanging between two or more languages in a conversation, with significant social and communicative roles, such as the identification or interpersonal relationship management (Gumperz 59). Code-switching in urban settings is the attribute of the dynamic and fluid language exchange.

1.2. Research Gap: What Is Not in Current Research?

Although much has been done in multilingualism and sociolinguistics research, there are still a number of gaps in the literature. To begin with, much research is done on structural dimensions of language or formal language policies, and the research ignores ordinary communicative practices. This puts a distance between what is theoretically known and what is actually being lived in the linguistic realities.

Second, the language choice is regarded as a functional or neutral phenomenon of many studies. This view, however, does not consider the fact that the use of language is highly rooted in hierarchies and power relations in society. The speakers do not just select languages at their convenience; they apply them strategically to achieve social benefit or to identify with.

Third, little is paid to the multilingual communities in cities as dynamic and fast changing environments. Majority of the available studies dwell on the rural multilingualism or institutional language use and so the urban linguistic practices are poorly studied.

Lastly, an absence of both sociolinguistic theory and discourse-level interpretation is lacking. Theoretical insights cannot be complete without analysing the functioning of language in actual interactions.

This paper seeks to fill these gaps by examining the study of the language choice as a power-based and socially embedded practice in cities.

1.3. Research Objectives and Questions

The main aim of the research is to investigate how the choice of language can influence and determine power relations in multilingual urban society. It seeks to comprehend the ways in which language practices are deployed to create identity, arbiter social status, and determine resource allocation.

The research aims are:

- To investigate the relationship between dominant languages and power, prestige, and mobility.

- To examine the identity formation and cultural maintenance through minority languages.
- To explore the role of code-switching as a social and communicative strategy.
- To investigate how institutions like education and media affect the use of language.

The research question of the study is as follows:

1. What does the language choice in multilingual cities with urban communities tell us about the power relations?
2. How do speakers negotiate identity and social status by using code-switching?
3. In which way do the dominant and minority languages operate in the linguistic hierarchies of urban areas?
4. How do institutions influence the linguistic behavior and preferences?

These questions offer a systematic model on the analysis of language practices in urban multilingual settings.

1.4. Scope and Significance of the Study

This research is directed at multilingual urban societies in which linguistic diversity is the characteristic of the daily life. It studies the relations within the social space of the market, workplace, school and the informal social setting.

What is important about this work is that it adds to the discussion of language as a social practice that becomes established in relations of power. It opposes the idea that language selection is functional in nature but puts more emphasis on its strategic and symbolic aspects. According to Bourdieu, the language practices are highly associated with social disparities and resource access (Bourdieu 55).

More so, the research has significant policy ramifications on language policy and education. Understanding that linguistic diversity is a resource, and not an obstacle, can be used to facilitate more inclusive and equitable communication practices in urban societies. It is also known to be instrumental to sociolinguistic theory since it has given an insight into the way language works in multilingual settings in reality. This work ultimately places language not as a fixed system, but as a dynamic and socially negotiated practice as indicative of larger systems of power, identity, and inequality.

2. Literature Review

The interplay between language and power has been a major issue of concern in sociolinguistics and discourse studies. Among the most significant theoretical contributions, it is possible to mention Pierre Bourdieu who views language as a type of linguistic capital. Bourdieu argues that language is not a communicative means but also a resource that is unevenly distributed in the society with some forms of language being more prestigious and legitimate than others (Bourdieu 55). This point of view is especially applicable to multilingual urban society, where dominating languages are often the key to social mobility and economic prospects.

The theory of discourse is another contribution of Michel Foucault to the understanding of language and power. According to him, language is located in the structures of knowledge that establish what can be said, who can speak, and what is real (Foucault 101). In this sense, language is not neutral, but rather involved in social construction of reality. This implies that in multilingual cities, the mainstream

languages tend to influence knowledge in institutions and push minority languages to the periphery.

There is empirical support of these theoretical insights offered by sociolinguists like William Labov. The analysis of language variation conducted by Labov reveals that language variations are strictly connected to social status, ethnicity and identity, presenting language as an indicator of the general stratification in society (Labov 241). The fact that language variation is not random but systematic is developed in his work supporting the idea that language choice has social significance.

The interactional sociolinguistics theory proposed by John Gumperz contributes to the research of multilingual communication. He presents the notion of code-switching as a situational approach employed by speakers to bargain meaning, identity and relationships in a conversation (Gumperz 59). Code-switching is thus not a linguistic mistake or weakness, but a strategic asset that speakers employ to find their way in thorny social conditions.

2.2. Multilingualism and Urban Linguistic Practices

Modern studies of multilingualism emphasize the growing complexity of the language use in the global metropolitan areas. According to Jan Blommaert, globalization has changed language to a portable and versatile resource which functions in various levels of communication (Blommaert 23). In cities, people tend to utilize various linguistic repertoires, based on the context, audience, and intent.

Language choice, in such a case, is highly strategic. Speakers can access institutional power, education, or jobs by speaking a dominant language like English, but retain cultural identity and interpersonal solidarity by speaking local languages. This double role of language is a result of stratified urban communication systems.

The model of World Englishes proposed by Braj Kachru only complicates conservative perspectives on linguistic hierarchy. Kachru believes that English is no longer a monolithic or a purely Western language; it exists in various forms of localization, depending on the local context (Kachru 38). The view is especially pertinent to urban societies that came into existence after colonization and have adopted English, which has been modified and reformulated to represent the realities on the ground.

2.3. Social Identity and Code-Switching.

Code-switching is a prominent characteristic of multilingual interaction that has been extensively researched. According to Gumperz, it is a communicative strategy that conveys social meaning, which includes identity, solidarity, or distance (Gumperz 59). In urban societies, code-switching can be seen as a way of the speaker to manage the various social domains and demands.

The Markedness Model by Myers-Scotton details more on how code-switching is a rational decision by speakers depending on the social expectations and norms. She argues that it is the speakers who choose between linguistic codes that are either marked or unmarked based on the social situation and the intended effect (Myers-Scotton 113). This theory emphasizes the strategic aspect of language use especially in a multilingual setting.

Nevertheless, although these studies focus on the functionality of code-switching, they tend to under-explore the relationship between code-switching and larger structures of power. In most instances, the decision to shift to a powerful language is not an option but an obligation by the societal and institutional forces. This underscores the imbalanced power dynamics of language practices.

2.4. Language, Power, and Inequality

The connection between language and inequality has been a popular topic of sociolinguistic literature. The theory proposed by Bourdieu is still pivotal when it comes to describing the reproducing of social inequality through the linguistic hierarchies that favor some languages over others (Bourdieu 55). This is usually reflected in the monolingualism of the global languages in education, administration and the employment segments in the urban setting.

This analysis is complemented by Foucault concept of discourse which demonstrates how institutions control the use of language and what types of knowledge are validated (Foucault 101). Education systems, such as those in education, tend to support lingual hierarchies through the promotion of standardized forms of language, thus sidelining non-standard or local forms.

In spite of these revelations, most studies are concentrating more on the macro-level structures, but not micro-level interactions. This creates a loophole in the realization of how individuals are involved in negotiating these power structures in their day to day communication.

2.5. Shortcomings and Versatility in Current Studies

Despite the tremendous advancements in sociolinguistic studies, a number of shortcomings exist. First, it is inclined toward considering the language choice as a rather functional or cognitive process, but not as a highly social and political act. This ignores symbolic aspects of language use in identity formation and power bargaining.

Second, although theories like the linguistic capital by Bourdieu and the code-switching theory by Gumperz are helpful in offering effective frames, they do not necessarily describe the lived experiences of multilingual urban populations. Real life interactions can be complex and far beyond models.

Third, conceptualization of English in postcolonial settings is contradictory. One group of scholars regard it as a means of domination, whereas the other considers it as an empowerment and creativity resource (Kachru 38; Blommaert 23). This ambivalent nature of English in multilingual societies is epitomized in this dual view; yet it also causes tension in the literature concerning the conceptualization.

Fourth, the sociolinguistic theory and discourse-based analysis are not well integrated. Numerous studies concentrate on the linguistic structures or social theory, yet few of them integrate both to examine the communicative practices in the real-world in detail.

2.6. Research Gap and Rationale of the Study

The literature review reveals an evident gap in the knowledge about how the language choice is an evolving, tactical, and

power-based practice within multilingual urban communities. Although the existing literature has a great theoretical contribution, it usually does not consider the topic of real-life interaction of linguistic practices in the urban environment in its entirety.

The absence of specific attention to the active use of language by people to negotiate identity and social hierarchy in particular communicative situations including markets, schools and workplaces is also present. Moreover, both the junction of language choice and power relations has not been sufficiently studied at a micro-interactional level.

This research fills these gaps by studying the language choice as a socially constructed practice, defined by power relations, identity negotiation, and institutionalization. It combines the sociolinguistic theory and discourse analysis to give a broader insight into multilingual city communication.

By so doing, the research constructs a logical base to the investigation of how people strategically employ language to negotiate in a complex social world, thus extending to a more sophisticated perspective of language, identity, and power.

3. Theoretical / Conceptual Framework

The theoretical framework of this research is sociolinguistic and critical social theories which describe the functioning of language in the systems of power, identity, and social inequality. The framework combines the theory of linguistic capital by Pierre Bourdieu, the idea of discourse and power by Michel Foucault and the theory of code-switching by John Gumperz. Combined, these theories present a full prism in the study of language choice as a social phenomenon and strategically-purpose-driven practice within the multilingual urban setting.

The main supposition of this framework is that language is not neutral. Rather, it is a social resource constructed socially and replicates power relations. Orators do not just select languages to communicate, but they employ them to locate themselves within social hierarchies, to gain access to opportunities, and to negotiate an identity.

The theory of linguistic capital as proposed by Pierre Bourdieu is the basis of this research. The language, he says, is a type of symbolic capital or that some languages or varieties of a language are more socially privileged than others based on their connection to educational, power, and economic mobility (Bourdieu 55).

This hierarchy is seen in the case of multilingual urban societies where dominant languages in these societies include global or official languages like English that tend to have prestige and the ability to climb the social ladder. Those who are eloquent in these dominant languages have access to institutional power and those who use those minority languages might be marginalized.

The framework by Bourdieu can be used to understand why there is no such thing as a neutral choice of language. It is influenced by the inequality in the distribution of linguistic capital which reflects wider social inequalities.

3.1. Foucault: Discourse, Knowledge and Power

The theory of discourse by Michel Foucault further elaborates on the relationship between language, knowledge and power. Discourse, according to Foucault, is defined as systems of language which organize the way knowledge is produced, and what is true or legitimate in a given society (Foucault 101).

In this regard, education, media, and government institutions are at the core of developing linguistic norms. They give the decision on the languages that are deemed as standard, appropriate, or authoritative. Consequently, language is turned into a process in which power is dominated and upheld.

This implies that dominant languages are not inherently superior to other languages in multilingual urban contexts but are socially constructed to be so, using institutional practices. The theory by Foucault thus emphasizes the role of language choice in the greater systems of governance and control.

3.2. Gumperz: Interactional Meaning and Code-Switching

The theory of code-switching by John Gumperz presents a micro level understanding of language use in the day to day interaction. According to him, code-switching is the process of using two or more languages in a conversation and it has significant communicative and social purposes (Gumperz 59).

In contrast to previous beliefs that considered code-switching as unstructured or ungrateful, Gumperz proves that it is a purposeful and strategic activity. Code-switching is a way of signaling identity, controlling the relationships between people, and adapting to varying social situations by speakers. In multilingual urban societies, a major way of coping with multifaceted social milieu is through code-switching. Speakers can also alternate to the dominant language in order to show their authority or professionalism, and they use local languages to show intimacy, solidarity or as part of the culture.

3.3. Theory and Analysis

These three theoretical approaches combine to provide a multidimensional explanation of language choice. Bourdieu describes the structural inequalities inherent in the use of language, Foucault emphasizes institutional and discursive power that constructs linguistic norms, and Gumperz concentrates on the interactional strategies of speakers.

They combine to show that language choice is structurally limited and individually tactical. Speakers work within systems of linguistic hierarchy, which are, nevertheless, actively negotiated by speakers in their daily communicative activities.

Indicatively, an interlocutor in an urban work-related situation can speak English to gain access to professional power (Bourdieu 55), and at the same time, he or she can speak a local language to establish a relationship with his or her workmates (Gumperz 59). Simultaneously, institutional requirements in the use of language are framed by the discourses of power and legitimacy in general (Foucault 101). This combined structure enables the analysis of language as a system of communication, but also as a place of power, resistance, and identity formation.

3.4. Study Conceptual Focus

The major conceptual interest of the research is that language is a social practice, which is constructed by power relations within the multilingual urban context. It does not accept the fact that language is a neutral instrument, but rather it is a dynamic resource to be employed strategically in social interaction.

Using the syncretism of Bourdieu, Foucault, and Gumperz, the paper analyzes the way people cope with linguistic hierarchies, form identities, and negotiate social relations using language. This model offers the theoretical basis of studying the actual linguistic practices in the cities.

4. Research Methodology

4.1. Research Design

The research design that will be used in this study is a qualitative one, as it will be the most appropriate to investigate the multifaceted correlation between language choice and power relationship in the context of urban communities that are multilingual. The qualitative research is interested in the meaning-making and lived experiences and interpretive analysis in comparison to the numeric measurement. Qualitative inquiry, as Creswell defines, can help a researcher to make sense of the social phenomena in their natural environments by analyzing them in a detailed text and observation (Creswell 43).

The interpretive quality of the study will give a chance to investigate in details the strategic use of language by individuals in daily communication. It is not directed at statistical generalization but is rather oriented on contextualization of linguistic behavior within an urban setting.

4.2. Data Sources and Research Set up

The information to be used in this study is founded on the observational and situational linguistic samples of the multilingual urban areas like markets, schools, workplaces, and even in the streets. The reason behind the choice of these environments is due to the fact that they are important locations where language diversity and socialization intersect.

The perfect place to study language choice is urban communities since they include speakers with a variety of linguistic, cultural, and socio-economic backgrounds. Blommaert describes urban areas as being marked by superdiversity, where there is co-existence and interaction between various languages in dynamic and fluid forms (Blommaert 23).

The analysis concentrates on the naturally occurring interactions, as opposed to controlled experiments, which gives an opportunity to depict the more authentic portrayal of the language use in the real-life situations.

4.3. Sampling Technique

Relevant linguistic contexts are selected by using a purposive sampling technique. Purposive sampling enables the researcher to select carefully and deliberately information rich cases that best address the research questions (Patton 169). In this work, the focus on multilingual interaction situations is chosen due to the possibility to observe definite examples of language selection and code-switching in practice.

This involves interactions of the nature of:

- Discussions in local markets.
- The teaching conversations in educational facilities.
- The communication in the workplace, offices and service sectors.

Informal social interaction at the open areas

These contexts are selected due to the fact that these are the contexts of both formal and informal use of language.

4.4. Analytical Framework and Tools

The research uses both discourse analysis and thematic analysis to analyze linguistic data.

4.4.1. Discourse Analysis

The discourse analysis is employed to trace the way language reflects and creates power relations. Foucault argues that discourse is not just language, but rather a system that creates meanings and controls what we can say and by whom (Foucault 101). In this research, the discourse analysis is used to determine the role of dominant and minority languages in social interactions.

4.4.2. Thematic Analysis

Recurrent patterns in the use of language are identified through thematic analysis. According to Braun and Clarke, thematic analysis is a technique used to identify, organize and interpret patterns of meaning within qualitative data in a systematic manner (Braun and Clarke 79). This method enables the study to classify linguistic behaviors which include code-switching, language preference and identity marking.

4.5. Research Procedure

The study has a systematic approach:

1. Language interactions in chosen urban settings.
2. Determination of patterns of language choices, such as language switching.
3. Theming of linguistic action into dominance, identity, and resistance.
4. Theoretical framework (especially Bourdieu, Foucault, and Gumperz) interpretation.
5. Comparison on the functioning of language in various contexts.

Such a step-by-step methodology makes the linguistic practices to be analyzed systematically and coherently.

4.6. Ethical Considerations

In spite of the fact that the study does not assume direct interviews or gathering of personal data, the ethical considerations play an important role. All the observations are handled confidentially, and personal identities are not revealed. It is analyzed in a manner that honors the linguistic diversity and is not culturally biased.

Ethical research when it comes to qualitative studies is sensitive to context and needs a responsible representation of the social actors (Hammersley and Traianou 64). This paper adheres to such principles in that linguistic practices can be evaluated in a respectful and objective manner.

4.7. Methodology Limitations.

A weakness of this methodology is that it is based on observation and interpretation as opposed to documented linguistic corpora or extensive datasets. Consequently, the results can be context-dependent, and not necessarily applicable to all cities.

But the qualitative depth is emphasized more than generalization and it enables a more in-depth insight into the functioning of language in real life interaction. The other weakness is the interpretative characteristic of the discourse analysis that can create subjective bias. This is handled by basing interpretations on the known theoretical frameworks.

4.8. Summary

In sum, the qualitative methodological approach serves as a powerful basis to study the problem of language choice in the multilingual urban communities. The study is based on discourse analysis and thematic interpretation that allows the researcher to grasp both the structural and interactional aspects of language use. The theoretical framework is directly supported by this methodology and sets the stage of the in-depth analysis of linguistic practices in the next chapter.

5. Analysis / Discussion

5.1. The Use of Language as an indicator of Social Stratification.

The selection of language in multilingual urban societies is rooted in the social stratification system. In normal communication, the speaker tends to use languages not only to communicate but to locate themselves in the social hierarchy. Other official languages like English or even official national languages often hold and represent symbolic meaning in terms of education, professionalism, and promotion. According to Bourdieu, language serves as a form of linguistic capital whereby forms of language that are socially appreciated provide entry to power and resources (Bourdieu 55).

In the workplace and even in learning institutions of cities, English has been equated with competency and intelligence. Fluency in English makes a speaker sound more educated or authoritative and speakers who use local languages may be marginalized. This relationship strengthens the social inequalities that exist in the society because it is associated with language proficiency and economic opportunity.

This can also be described through the Foucaultian notion of discourse which demonstrates how the institution creates the linguistic hierarchies. The educational systems, media platforms and government policies determine what is considered to be standard or acceptable language, thus controlling the access to knowledge and power (Foucault 101). By so doing, the use of language is not merely a matter of personal preference but an answer to institutional expectations.

5.2. Code-Switching as a Strategic Social Practice

One of the most important linguistic strategies of multilingual urban settings turns out to be code-switching. It is the usage of two or more languages in one communication. Instead of being random, code-switching is a socially relevant phenomenon that demonstrates identity, power negotiation, and contextual adaptation. According to Gumperz, code-switching has interactional roles of indicating group membership, regulation of social distance, and the construction of meaning in conversation (Gumperz 59). In cities, people often alternate languages based on the social environment and listeners.

In the case of a speaker, he/she can use English speaking to a professional authority figure and use a local language to talk with peers or family members. This change does not only endure linguistically but symbolically as well, as an indication of identity positioning. Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model further explains this behavior by suggesting that speakers choose linguistic codes based on social expectations and desired outcomes (Myers-Scotton 113). In this way, code-switching is a negotiative process in language, which enables speakers to move between various social worlds at the same time.

5.3. Minority Languages and Cultural Identity

Although most prevailing languages may be a symbol of institutional power, minor languages serve as a key symbol of cultural sharing and emotionality. Local languages are often spoken in close personal, family and community-based communication in multilingual urban communities.

Blommaert underlines that language is a resource that is mobile and is formed by social context, not by systems (Blommaert 23). In this context, the minority languages are not inferior but contextually relevant. They are emotionally rich, culturally memorable and have the meaning of identity that the mainstream languages might not have.

Most speakers consciously adopt minority languages in most instances to counter language assimilation. This resistance is not necessarily blatant but can manifest itself in the form of conversational decisions in everyday life. Through continued use of local languages within informal areas, speakers keep certain cultural continuity and affirm group identity. It shows that language selection is not just a matter of power, but of belonging and culture maintenance as well.

5.4. Influences of Institution on the practices of language

Schools, universities, workplaces, and media organizations are vital in determining language preferences and strengthening language hierarchies. Most systems of education, especially those of learning, tend to support master languages as the means of instruction hence augmenting their social worth.

The theory of discourse is a concept advanced by Foucault that details how institutions control the nature of languages that are deemed to be legitimate or authoritative (Foucault 101). Academic achievement and employability in most urban situations have been associated with command of English, which places a strain on people to learn it instead of local languages.

Media also plays a role in this hierarchy by advertising, news and entertainment by promoting dominant languages. This exposure also makes linguistic inequality normal and shapes the way people feel about using language.

Consequently, people tend to change their linguistic preferences to fit the demands of the institution, strengthening the position of some languages in urban communities.

5.5. Construction of identity in Language

Language is a key component in social identity creation. In multicultural urban societies, the people use various languages to convey various identities. The choice of language turns into a mirror of social belonging, social status

and cultural affiliation. The concept of symbolic capital proposed by Bourdieu can be used to understand the role played by language in the formation of identity (Bourdieu 55). Orators who employ prestigious languages can build identities of modernity and upward mobility, whereas those who employ local languages might focus on cultural rootedness and authenticity. Meanwhile, identity is not static, but fluid. There is often the use of two or more languages by the speakers to convey their various identities depending on the context. This fluidity is an indication of the multilingual city life that is so complex. The ability to change identity in real-time, especially through code-switching, is made possible. It is transformed into a verbal means by which identity is negotiated as opposed to determined.

5.6. Power, Resistance and Linguistic Agency

Though the dominant languages are linked to institutional power, languages are not received passively by speakers. They are proactive in language to resist, bargain, and rewrite power relations. The interactional sociolinguistics theory by Gumperz demonstrates that speakers are strategic in the use of language to control meaning and social relationships (Gumperz 59). People can speak local languages in the workplace to affirm cultural identity or change to major languages to acquire authority when necessary in the multilingual urban environment. This proves that the choice of language is constrained as well as agentive. Although the linguistic behavior of individuals is affected by institutional structures, people still have capabilities to manipulate language strategically so that they can gain social benefits.

5.7. Conclusion of Major Results

The discussion can bring to light a number of insights:

- The choice of language indicates and strengthens social inequalities (Bourdieu 55).
- Code-switching is a negotiation strategy of identity (Gumperz 59).
- Minority languages are critical in the preservation and resistance of culture.
- Institutions are very powerful in shaping linguistic behavior by educating and media (Foucault 101).
- Multilingual urban identity is fluid and a construction of language. On the whole, language becomes a location of power, identity and resistance within multilingual cities.

5.8. Discussion Insight

The results support the claim that language choice does not constitute a neutral communicative process but a highly social and political action. The speakers are always in negotiations between dominant and the minority languages to establish themselves in these complicated hierarchies in the cities. This confirms the theoretical assertion that language is a product as well as producer of power relations within the society.

6. Conclusion

This paper has discussed the functioning of the language choice as an expression of power dynamics in multilingual urban societies. It has proved that language is not a mere communication tool but a socially situated practice, which

has been influenced by institutional frameworks, cultural categories, and power relations. Among the key conclusions, it is possible to note that major languages, especially those related to education and international mobility, are viewed as a sort of linguistic capital which grants access to social and economic possibilities (Bourdieu 55). Conversely, minority languages, although generally sidelined in institutional life, are vital in cultural identity and interpersonal communication. This research has also demonstrated that code-switching is important in multilingual communication. Instead of being a linguistic anomaly, code-switching is a negotiating mechanism that speakers employ to negotiate their identity, relationship management, and adjust to varied social environments (Gumperz 59). This underscores the variability and adaptability of language in the city setting. Moreover, the institutional frameworks, including education systems and media, are influential in the development of linguistic hierarchies. Such institutions support the superiority of some languages at the expense of other languages, thus recreating social inequalities (Foucault 101). In the theoretical terms, the amalgamation of Bourdieu linguistic capital, Foucault discourse theory and Gumperz interactional sociolinguistics has given a holistic approach to the understanding of language as both a structural and interactional phenomenon. The research also adds to the sociolinguistic studies by underlining the significance of treating language choice as a type of social action. It questions the idea that the use of language is merely functional and points to the identity formation and power negotiation in language use. Nevertheless, the research has its own flaws. The qualitative research implies that the results are not generalizable statistically and are context-dependent. Future studies might increase the area of study by including more data or comparative urban analysis in various cultural settings.

To sum up, language in multilingual cities is a resource that is dynamic and a conflictual resource. It is an expression of larger social injustice as well as giving people instruments of bargaining and fighting back. It is important to understand the multi-faceted nature of language choice in order to be able to formulate more inclusive linguistic and educational policies that can help in valuing diversity and not in suppressing it. In conclusion, this paper contends that language is not a system but an ongoing social practice, where power, identity and culture are produced and reproduced.

References

1. Auer P. Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity. Routledge; 1998.
2. Baker C. Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism. Multilingual Matters; 2011.
3. Blommaert J. The sociolinguistics of globalization. Cambridge University Press; 2010.
4. Bourdieu P. Language and symbolic power. Harvard University Press; 1991.
5. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol.* 2006;3(2):77-101.
6. Creswell JW. Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Sage; 2014.
7. Foucault M. The archaeology of knowledge. Routledge; 1972.

8. Fishman JA. Language and ethnicity in minority sociolinguistic perspective. *Multilingual Matters*; 1989.
9. Gumperz JJ. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press; 1982.
10. Heller M. *Linguistic minorities and modernity: a sociolinguistic ethnography*. Longman; 1999.
11. Heller M, Martin-Jones M, editors. *Voices of authority: education and linguistic difference*. Ablex Publishing; 2001.
12. Hymes D. *Foundations in sociolinguistics: an ethnographic approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press; 1974.
13. Kachru BB. *The other tongue: English across cultures*. University of Illinois Press; 1992.
14. Labov W. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press; 1972.
15. Makoni S, Pennycook A. *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. *Multilingual Matters*; 2007.

How to Cite This Article

Khan M, Rafi A, Brohi FM. Language choice and power relations in multilingual urban communities. *Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval*. 2026 Mar-Apr;7(2):637-644.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.