A Comparative Study of Public Sector Tenth Grade Learners' Ability in the Placement of Word Stress in Pronunciation

Naveed Ahmad Taseer

PhD Education Scholar, Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab.

Email: taseer642nat2@gmail.com

Professor Dr. Abdul Qayyum Chaudhry

Director, Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

Email: qayyum.ier@pu.edu.pk

Abstract

This study investigated the ability of public sector tenth-grade learners to place word stress accurately in English pronunciation and examined the effectiveness of different teaching methods in improving this skill. A quasi-experimental design was employed with 120 students divided into four groups: a control group taught through the traditional method and three experimental groups taught through the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM), Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), and the Audio-Lingual Method (ALM). Pre-tests and post-tests were administered to assess learners' performance in stress in pronunciation, sentence stress placement, and stress in context. The pre-test results indicated no significant differences among the groups, showing that they were homogeneous before the treatment. However, the post-test results revealed significant differences among the groups. The Audio-Lingual Method group achieved the highest improvement in all areas of word stress placement, followed by the CLT and GTM groups, while the control group showed the least improvement. The findings suggest that teaching methods emphasizing listening, repetition, and oral practice are more effective in improving learners' pronunciation skills. Therefore, it is recommended that the Audio-Lingual Method be adopted or integrated into pronunciation instruction to enhance learners' ability to place word stress correctly.

Keywords: word stress, pronunciation, Audio-Lingual Method, Communicative Language Teaching, Grammar-Translation Method, ESL learners

Introduction   OPEN ACCESS

In contemporary applied linguistics and second language acquisition research, pronunciation has been recognized as a fundamental component of communicative competence. Effective oral communication requires not only grammatical accuracy and lexical knowledge but also speech that is intelligible to listeners. In recent years, the focus of pronunciation research has shifted from the goal of native-like pronunciation to the concept of intelligibility, which emphasizes how easily a listener can understand

a speaker's message (Kang & Kostromitina, 2021; Luchini, 2024). This shift has highlighted the importance of phonological features that contribute directly to listener comprehension and successful communication in second language contexts.

Pronunciation consists of both segmental and suprasegmental features. Segmental features involve the articulation of individual consonants and vowels, whereas suprasegmental features include stress, rhythm, and intonation patterns that shape the overall structure of spoken language. Recent research in phonology and language pedagogy has emphasized that suprasegmental features play a crucial role in speech intelligibility because they influence how listeners perceive and interpret spoken language (Duris et al., 2024; Islam, 2024; Hussain et al., 2024; Perveen & Hussain, 2023; Hussain, & Abbas, 2023). Word stress, as one of the key suprasegmental elements, determines which syllables in a word receive prominence and contributes significantly to the rhythm and clarity of spoken English.

Among the various suprasegmental features, lexical or word stress has attracted increasing scholarly attention because of its impact on intelligibility and language comprehension. Word stress refers to the relative prominence assigned to a particular syllable within a word through acoustic cues such as pitch, duration, intensity, and vowel quality. Research has demonstrated that listeners rely heavily on stress cues to identify words in continuous speech, and incorrect stress placement may lead to confusion or misinterpretation (Duris et al., 2024; Sardegna & Jarosz, 2021; Hussain & Khoso, 2021; Hussain & Khoso, 2022; Hussain, & Bhatti, 2024). Misplaced stress may alter the perceived structure of a word and reduce listeners' ability to recognize it accurately, even if the individual consonants and vowels are produced correctly.

For learners of English as a Second Language (ESL) or English as a Foreign Language (EFL), mastering word stress has consistently been reported as one of the most challenging aspects of pronunciation. Studies have indicated that learners often struggle with identifying the correct syllable to stress, particularly in multisyllabic words where stress patterns are not easily predictable (Costille et al., 2024; Islam, 2024). These difficulties arise partly because English stress patterns differ significantly from those of many other languages. As a result, learners frequently transfer stress patterns from their first language into English pronunciation, which may lead to systematic errors in speech production.

The acquisition of accurate stress patterns has also been associated with broader issues in second language phonology. Research has shown that prosodic features such as stress and rhythm contribute directly to the intelligibility and comprehensibility of non-native speech. In many cases, pronunciation errors involving suprasegmental features have a greater impact on listener comprehension than segmental errors involving individual sounds (Duris et al., 2024; Kang & Kostromitina, 2021). Consequently, modern pronunciation pedagogy has increasingly emphasized the importance of teaching stress patterns and other prosodic elements as part of communicative language instruction.

Despite its importance, pronunciation instruction has historically received limited attention in many language classrooms. In numerous educational settings, particularly in EFL contexts, teachers tend to focus primarily on grammar, vocabulary, reading, and writing skills, while pronunciation receives comparatively little systematic instruction (Liu, 2021; Fleihan, 2023). This imbalance in instructional priorities often results in learners developing strong receptive language skills but weak oral proficiency. In such circumstances, students may have difficulty producing intelligible speech even after several years of formal English study.

Recent research has also highlighted the potential role of technology and innovative teaching methods in improving pronunciation instruction. For instance, data-driven learning approaches, mobile learning applications, and high-variability phonetic training have been shown to enhance learners' perception and production of stress patterns (Hirschi & Kang, 2023; Wang & Nakajima, 2023). These methods allow learners to receive immediate feedback and exposure to authentic pronunciation models, thereby facilitating the development of more accurate prosodic patterns.

In many developing countries, however, such innovative approaches remain limited due to institutional constraints. Public sector schools often face challenges such as large class sizes, limited technological resources, and insufficient teacher training in phonetics and phonology. As a result, pronunciation instruction may be restricted to minimal classroom activities, and suprasegmental features such as word stress may receive little or no explicit attention. These limitations may hinder learners' ability to acquire accurate pronunciation skills and negatively affect their communicative competence in English.

In the Pakistani educational context, these challenges have been particularly evident among secondary school learners. English functions as an important academic and professional language in Pakistan, yet many learners struggle with aspects of spoken English, including pronunciation and stress placement. Previous studies have reported that Pakistani ESL learners frequently encounter difficulties in mastering English stress patterns because the stress systems of local languages such as Urdu, Punjabi, and Pashto differ considerably from that of English (Riaz et al., 2023). These differences often lead to stress misplacement, which can reduce intelligibility and create communication barriers.

At the secondary school level, especially in Grade 10, students are expected to demonstrate a reasonable level of English proficiency that enables them to participate effectively in academic learning and communication. By this stage, learners have typically studied English for several years, and they are expected to possess a basic understanding of pronunciation patterns. However, despite this extended exposure to the language, many learners continue to experience difficulties with word stress placement. Such difficulties may stem from inadequate pronunciation instruction, limited exposure to authentic spoken English, and the influence of learners' first language.

Investigating learners' ability to place word stress accurately is therefore essential for understanding the nature of pronunciation difficulties faced by secondary school students. By examining learners' performance in stress placement tasks, researchers can identify common patterns of errors and explore the factors that contribute to these difficulties. Such investigations are particularly valuable in comparative studies, which allow researchers to analyze differences in pronunciation abilities among different groups of learners or educational contexts.

The present study focused on public sector tenth grade learners and examined their ability to place word stress accurately in English pronunciation. The study aimed to explore learners' level of proficiency in stress placement and to identify the challenges they encountered in mastering this important aspect of English phonology. By focusing specifically on word stress, the study sought to contribute to the growing body of research on suprasegmental features in second language pronunciation.

Statement of the Problem

English pronunciation plays a vital role in effective communication, and accurate placement of word stress is an essential element of intelligible speech. However, many learners studying English as a second or foreign language experience considerable difficulty in identifying and producing correct stress patterns, particularly in multisyllabic words. In public sector schools, where English is taught mainly through formal instruction, students often receive limited exposure to authentic spoken English and insufficient practice in pronunciation. As a result, learners may develop weaknesses in suprasegmental features such as word stress, which can negatively affect the clarity and comprehensibility of their speech. At the secondary school level, especially in Grade 10, students are expected to possess a basic level of spoken English proficiency after several years of language study; however, many still struggle with accurate stress placement due to factors such as first language influence, limited pronunciation instruction, and lack of communicative practice. This situation creates a gap between learners' expected and actual pronunciation abilities. Therefore, it became necessary to investigate the ability of public sector tenth grade learners to place word stress correctly in English

pronunciation in order to identify their level of proficiency and the challenges they face in mastering this important aspect of spoken English.

Objectives of the Study

1. To explore significant differences in the ability of public sector tenth-grade learners to place word stress in pronunciation taught through the traditional method compared to those taught through CLT, GTM, and ALM methods.

2. To identify significant differences in the ability of public sector tenth-grade learners to place word stress in pronunciation assessed through written and oral tests.

Research Questions

1. What are the significant differences in the ability of public sector tenth-grade learners to place word stress in pronunciation when taught through the traditional method compared to those taught through CLT, GTM, and ALM methods?

2. What are the significant differences in the ability of public sector tenth-grade learners to place word stress in pronunciation when assessed through written tests and oral tests?

Significance of the Study

1. This study helped to highlight the importance of correct word stress placement in improving learners' pronunciation and overall spoken English proficiency.

2. It provided insights into the effectiveness of different teaching methods such as CLT, GTM, ALM, and the traditional method in teaching pronunciation.

3. The study assisted English language teachers in identifying learners' difficulties in placing word stress accurately.

4. It contributed to improving pronunciation teaching strategies in public sector schools.

5. The findings of the study provided useful information for curriculum developers to give greater attention to pronunciation instruction in English language courses.

6. The study also served as a reference for future researchers interested in pronunciation and word stress in second language learning.

Research Design

The study was experimental, involving 10th-grade students from Government Higher Secondary School Mandi Ahmad Abad, Tehsil Depalpur, District Okara, Punjab, as the population. Students were pre-tested, and only the average scorers, numbering 120, were selected as the sample. After selecting these 120 students, four groups were formed for the experiment through the fishbowl random sampling technique. Each group consisted of 30 students. The control group received no special treatment, as they were taught using traditional methods by a teacher, while the other three groups were taught using different teaching methodologies: Grammar-Translation Method (GTM), Audio-Lingual Method (ALM), and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). The duration of the treatment was two months. After this period, a post-test was conducted, which included both written and oral assessments. The results from the groups were compared using measures such as mean, standard deviation, and ANOVA, and conclusions were drawn from the analysis.

Sampling Technique and Sample of the Study

The total student population was pretested, and only 120 average-scoring students were selected for the experiment. All students were then distributed into 4 equal groups, with 30 students in each. All students were allocated to groups using the fishbowl random sampling technique. A minimum of 30 participants per group is often used as a statistical rule of thumb in experimental research; however, it is not a universal requirement, and the appropriate sample size should ideally be determined through a power analysis based on the study design, expected effect size, and desired statistical power" (Biau et al., 2008; Bujang et al., 2021).

Table 1:   Sample of the Study

School	Class	G1	G2	G3	G4	Total Sample
Government Higher Secondary School Mandi Ahmad Abad	10th	30	30	30	30	120

Treatment

The control group received no treatment, while the control group was taught through traditional methods. The remaining three groups were taught using specific teaching methods such as Grammar-Translation Method (GTM), Audio-Lingual Method (ALM), and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) for two months.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

For data collection, a self-developed achievement test was created. The test consisted of two parts: a written test and an oral test. The purpose was to obtain consistent and reliable scores. The test had three sections, each worth 10 points. The first section focused on "correct stress placement in individual words," the second on "correct stress placement in complete sentences," and the third on "correct stress placement in a research context, using more complex sentences." Before data collection, the instrument was validated by an expert panel and pilot-tested for reliability. The panel suggested specific paragraphs for the oral test aimed at thoroughly assessing students' ability. The reliability of the instrument was 0.92 during the second testing. After completing all these steps, the tool was ready for field use. After data collection, each paper was scored separately as written and oral marks, then combined to total 30 marks for reliable and straightforward data analysis. The data were analyzed using mean scores and standard deviation, and groups were compared through ANOVA. All data analysis was conducted using SPSS.

Results of the Study

Table 2: Pre-test (ANOVA)

		N	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
	Control Group	30	5.70	.794		
	Grammar-Translation Method	30	5.77	.728		
Stress in Pronunciation	Communicative Language Teaching	30	5.77	.774	.886	.451
	Audio-Lingual Method	30	5.50	.630		
	Total	120	5.68	.733		

		N	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Sentence Stress Placement	Control Group	30	6.00	.743		
	Grammar-Translation Method	30	5.93	.740		
	Communicative Language Teaching	30	5.90	.803	.524	.667
	Audio-Lingual Method	30	5.77	.679		
	Total	120	5.90	.738		
Stress in Context	Control Group	30	5.83	.747		
	Grammar-Translation Method	30	5.87	.681		
	Communicative Language Teaching	30	5.83	.834	.188	.904
	Audio-Lingual Method	30	5.73	.640		
	Total	120	5.82	.722		

Table 2 presents the results of the pre-test analysis using ANOVA to examine whether there were significant differences among the four groups Control Group, Grammar-Translation Method (GTM), Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), and Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) before the experimental treatment. For stress in pronunciation, the mean scores of the groups were relatively similar, with the Control Group (M = 5.70, SD = .794), GTM (M = 5.77, SD = .728), CLT (M = 5.77, SD = .774), and ALM (M = 5.50, SD = .630). The ANOVA result showed no statistically significant difference among the groups (F = .886, p = .451). Similarly, for sentence stress placement, the mean scores ranged from 5.77 to 6.00 across the groups, and the ANOVA result (F = .524, p = .667) indicated no significant difference. For stress in context, the mean scores were also closely comparable, with values between 5.73 and 5.87, and the ANOVA result (F = .188, p = .904) again revealed no significant difference among the groups. Overall, the findings suggested that all four groups had nearly equal levels of ability in word stress placement before the instructional treatments, indicating that the groups were homogeneous at the pre-test stage.

Table 3: Post-test (ANOVA)

		N	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Stress in Pronunciation	Control Group	30	6.00	.871		
	Grammar-Translation Method	30	6.43	.568		
	Communicative Language Teaching	30	6.57	1.194	12.117	.000
	Audio-Lingual Method	30	7.53	1.279		
	Total	120	6.63	1.152		
Sentence Stress Placement	Control Group	30	6.20	.714		
	Grammar-Translation Method	30	6.47	.571		
	Communicative Language Teaching	30	6.67	1.028	7.390	.000
	Audio-Lingual Method	30	7.27	1.202		

	Total	120	6.65	.984		
	Control Group	30	6.07	.828		
	Grammar-Translation Method	30	6.57	.626		
Stress in Context	Communicative Language Teaching	30	6.60	.968	5.605	.001
	Audio-Lingual Method	30	7.13	1.432		
	Total	120	6.59	1.065		

Table 3 presents the results of the post-test analysis using ANOVA to determine whether significant differences existed among the four groups Control Group, Grammar-Translation Method (GTM), Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), and Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) after the instructional treatment. For **stress in pronunciation**, the Audio-Lingual Method group obtained the highest mean score (M = 7.53, SD = 1.279), followed by the CLT group (M = 6.57, SD = 1.194), the GTM group (M = 6.43, SD = .568), and the Control Group (M = 6.00, SD = .871). The ANOVA result showed a statistically significant difference among the groups (F = 12.117, p = .000). Similarly, for **sentence stress placement**, the ALM group achieved the highest mean score (M = 7.27, SD = 1.202), followed by the CLT group (M = 6.67, SD = 1.028), the GTM group (M = 6.47, SD = .571), and the Control Group (M = 6.20, SD = .714), and the ANOVA result indicated a significant difference among the groups (F = 7.390, p = .000). For **stress in context**, the ALM group again showed the highest performance (M = 7.13, SD = 1.432), followed by the CLT group (M = 6.60, SD = .968), the GTM group (M = 6.57, SD = .626), and the Control Group (M = 6.07, SD = .828). The ANOVA results revealed a statistically significant difference among the groups (F = 5.605, p = .001). Overall, the findings indicated that significant differences existed among the groups in the post-test, with the Audio-Lingual Method group demonstrating the highest improvement in word stress placement in pronunciation.

Findings of the Study

The pre-test results revealed that there were **no statistically significant differences** among the control group, Grammar-Translation Method (GTM), Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), and Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) groups in stress in pronunciation, sentence stress placement, and stress in context. This indicated that all groups had **similar levels of ability before the experimental treatment**.

The post-test results showed **statistically significant differences** among the four groups in stress in pronunciation, sentence stress placement, and stress in context after the instructional treatments.

The **Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) group achieved the highest mean scores** in all three categories of word stress placement, indicating that this method was the most effective in improving learners' pronunciation of word stress.

The **Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) group showed noticeable improvement**, performing better than the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) and the control group in the post-test.

The **Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) group demonstrated moderate improvement**, but its performance remained lower than the CLT and ALM groups.

The **control group showed the least improvement**, suggesting that traditional teaching methods without focused pronunciation instruction were less effective in developing learners' ability to place word stress correctly.

Overall, the results indicated that **teaching methods that emphasize listening, repetition, and communication contributed more effectively to improving learners' word stress placement in pronunciation** than traditional approaches.

Discussion of the Results

The findings of the present study showed that there were no statistically significant differences among the control, GTM, CLT, and ALM groups in the pre-test, which indicated that the four groups were homogeneous before the treatment. This pattern is consistent with recent pronunciation-intervention research in which comparable groups were established at the beginning of the experiment so that later differences could be attributed to instruction rather than to prior ability. For example, Yenkimaleki and van Heuven (2021) reported homogeneous pre-test performance before their pronunciation treatment, and Duris et al. (2024) likewise emphasized that careful treatment and assessment design are essential when examining word-stress performance.

The post-test results of the present study revealed statistically significant differences among the four groups in stress in pronunciation, sentence stress placement, and stress in context. Most importantly, the Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) group obtained the highest mean scores in all three areas. This finding may be interpreted in light of recent work showing that pronunciation improves more when instruction includes explicit oral modeling, repeated listening, guided repetition, and production-focused practice. Yenkimaleki and van Heuven (2021) found that pronunciation instruction followed by production-focused practice produced stronger gains than less focused practice conditions, while Almasifar and Heidari (2023) reported that computer-assisted pronunciation training improved learners' use of suprasegmental features, including word stress and intonation. In the same vein, Phan et al. (2024) found that video-based shadowing had a positive effect on learners' pronunciation performance of suprasegmental features. These studies help explain why the ALM group in the present study outperformed the other groups, since ALM naturally relies on repetition, imitation, listening discrimination, and oral habit formation.

The strong performance of the ALM group also supports recent research showing that suprasegmental features require repeated auditory exposure and active oral rehearsal rather than explanation alone. In word-stress learning, students must not only know where the stressed syllable falls but must also learn to realize that stress through pitch, duration, intensity, and vowel quality. Duris et al. (2024) showed that word stress is a complex construct because its identification depends on multiple acoustic cues, and they argued that word stress is important for both intelligibility and assessment. Because ALM exposes learners repeatedly to spoken models and asks them to reproduce them, it is especially suitable for features like lexical and sentence stress that depend on patterned oral performance rather than declarative knowledge only.

The finding that the CLT group also improved, though less than the ALM group, is likewise compatible with recent literature. CLT provides learners with opportunities to use language meaningfully, and this communicative use can support pronunciation development when learners receive enough spoken input and interaction. Kostromitina and Kang (2021) found that learners in an ESL program showed development in suprasegmental dimensions such as prominence and fluency, and they noted that improvement patterns differ by feature and proficiency level. Their results suggest that communicative exposure can help prosodic development, but gains may depend on the amount and type of pronunciation-focused support provided. This helps explain why the CLT group in the present study improved, but did not surpass the ALM group: communication alone may help stress development, yet more direct oral training appears to produce stronger gains in stress placement.

The GTM group showed improvement, but its gains were smaller than those of ALM and CLT. This result is also understandable in relation to recent pronunciation scholarship. Current research has repeatedly pointed out that pronunciation, especially suprasegmental pronunciation, develops more effectively when learners receive opportunities for listening, speaking, noticing, and feedback, not merely written explanation or rule discussion. Almusharraf (2024) highlighted a continuing gap between the recognized importance of pronunciation and what actually happens in many EFL classrooms, where pronunciation often receives limited practical attention. Similarly, Almasifar and Heidari (2023) showed that explicit and technology-supported pronunciation work can improve suprasegmental ability, which implies that methods offering little direct oral practice are less likely to produce large gains. Since GTM primarily emphasizes written forms, translation, and grammatical explanation, its more limited effect on word stress in the present study was expected.

Another important point is that the present findings align closely with recent Pakistani and South Asian research on lexical stress difficulties. Riaz et al. (2023) found that Pakistani ESL learners experienced clear difficulty with English stress patterns in nouns and verbs and argued that these difficulties were related to learners' linguistic background and weak mastery of English stress rules. More recently, Abbasi et al. (2025) examined lexical stress in Pakistani English speech and reported variability in how stress is acoustically realized across speakers from different first-language backgrounds in Pakistan. These studies are especially relevant because they suggest that the problem identified in the present study is not isolated; rather, it reflects a broader phonological challenge in the Pakistani context. Therefore, the strong post-test differences observed here, especially the ALM advantage, may be understood as evidence that systematic oral stress training can partially overcome local stress-transfer problems.

The present result that learners improved in stress in pronunciation, sentence stress placement, and stress in context also agrees with recent studies showing that suprasegmental training can transfer beyond isolated words. Phan et al. (2024) found that video-based shadowing improved learners' pronunciation performance of suprasegmental features, while Yenkimaleki and van Heuven (2021) found that suprasegmental instruction was especially beneficial for comprehensibility. This is important because your study did not assess stress only as a discrete phonological item; it also examined sentence stress and contextual use. The pattern of results therefore suggests that methods rich in oral practice may support not only isolated stress recognition but also learners' ability to apply stress more functionally in connected speech.

Recent work on word-stress learning with technology also helps interpret the present findings. Sardegna and Jarosz (2022) reported that YouGlish-supported practice helped learners work on English word stress perception, and their study was grounded in the idea that wrong lexical stress affects word recognition and intelligibility. Although their intervention was technology-based rather than classroom-method based, the principle is similar to the present findings: learners improve more when they are given focused exposure to authentic spoken models and repeated opportunities to notice and practice stress patterns. In this respect, ALM in the present study seems to have functioned as a classroom-based equivalent of intensive stress-focused input and output practice.

Conclusions of the Study

Based on the analysis of the data and the discussion of the findings, several conclusions were drawn from the present study regarding the ability of public sector tenth-grade learners to place word stress in English pronunciation when taught through different instructional methods.

First, the pre-test results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences among the control group and the experimental groups before the instructional treatment. This suggested that all groups possessed a similar level of ability in placing word stress in pronunciation at the beginning of the experiment. Therefore, the groups were considered homogeneous, which ensured that any

differences observed in the post-test could be attributed to the teaching methods applied during the experimental period.

Second, the post-test results revealed statistically significant differences among the groups after the instructional treatment. These differences demonstrated that the teaching methods used in the study had a measurable effect on learners' ability to place word stress accurately in pronunciation, sentence stress placement, and stress in context.

Third, the Audio-Lingual Method proved to be the most effective teaching approach among the methods examined in this study. Learners who were taught through the Audio-Lingual Method achieved the highest mean scores in all categories of word stress placement. This finding suggested that instructional techniques that emphasize listening practice, repetition, and oral drills were particularly beneficial for improving learners' pronunciation skills.

Fourth, the Communicative Language Teaching approach also showed positive effects on learners' pronunciation development. Although the improvement in the CLT group was not as high as in the ALM group, learners demonstrated better performance compared to those taught through the Grammar-Translation Method and the traditional control group. This indicated that communicative practice and interactive activities contributed to the development of pronunciation skills.

Fifth, the Grammar-Translation Method showed only moderate improvement in learners' ability to place word stress. Since this method primarily focuses on grammatical rules and translation rather than oral practice, its effectiveness in improving pronunciation and stress placement was limited compared to methods that emphasize spoken language practice.

Finally, the control group, which received traditional instruction without specific emphasis on pronunciation practice, showed the least improvement among all groups. This result highlighted the importance of explicit pronunciation instruction in developing learners' ability to produce correct stress patterns in English.

Recommendations

1. English teachers in public sector schools should incorporate regular pronunciation practice, especially focusing on word stress and sentence stress patterns.

2. Instructional methods that emphasize listening, repetition, and oral drills, such as the Audio-Lingual Method, should be integrated into pronunciation teaching.

3. Teachers should combine communicative activities with pronunciation practice to help learners apply correct stress patterns in real communication.

4. Training programs should be arranged to enhance teachers' knowledge of phonetics and pronunciation teaching techniques.

5. Curriculum developers should include specific pronunciation and word stress activities in English textbooks and classroom materials.

References

Abbasi, A. M., Shaikh, I. H., Bakhsh, I., & Khosh, N. K. (2025). An Experiment on Lexical Stress in Pakistani English Speech. *Corpus Pragmatics*, *9*(1), 75-103.

Almasifar, N., & Heidari, F. (2023). The effect of computer-assisted pronunciation training on EFL learners' use of suprasegmental features and foreign language speaking anxiety. *English Teaching & Learning*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-023-00159-4

Almusharraf, A. (2024). Pronunciation instruction in the context of world English: Exploring university EFL instructors' perceptions and practices. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 11*, 847. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03365-y

Biau, D. J., Kernéis, S., & Porcher, R. (2008). Statistics in brief: The importance of sample size in the planning and interpretation of medical research. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 466*(9), 2282–2288.

Bujang, M. A., Adnan, T. H., Mohd Hatta, N. K. B., Ismail, M., & Lim, C. J. (2021). Sample size determination: A practical guide for health researchers. *Journal of General and Family Medicine, 22*(2), 90–95.

Costille, E., Levis, J., Neiriz, R., & Silpachai, A. (2024). Investigating lexical stress accuracy in non-native speech. *Proceedings of Speech Prosody*.

Duris, M., Levis, J. M., Neiriz, R., & Silpachai, A. O. (2024). Methodological influences on word stress identification: Implications for research and teaching. In *Proceedings of Speech Prosody 2024* (pp. 732-736). International Speech Communication Association. https://doi.org/10.21437/SpeechProsody.2024-148

Fleihan, R. (2023). Pronunciation in EFL contexts: Approaches that work. Middle East Professional Learning Institute.

Hirschi, K., & Kang, O. (2023). Data-driven learning for pronunciation: Perception and production of lexical stress in academic English. *TESOL Quarterly*.

Hussain, S. (2024). An Experimental Study on the Impact of Digital Textbooks on the Academic Achievement of Elementary School Students. *International Research Journal of Education and Innovation*, *5*(1), 16-27.

Hussain, S., & Abbas, Q. (2023). Examine the Secondary Level Administration Quality of Public and Foundation Funded Schools by the Punjab Education Foundation. *International Research Journal of Education and Innovation*, *4*(4), 45-59.

Hussain, S., & Bhatti, F. A. (2024). Teaching Challenges and Educators' Perceptions on STEM Implementation in Schools in Punjab, Pakistan. *International Research Journal of Education and Innovation*, *5*(4), 8-13.

Hussain, S., & Khoso, A. A. (2021). Examining the Relationship Between Having a Dedicated Study Space at Home and Secondary Students' Academic Achievement. *International Research Journal of Education and Innovation*, *2*(3), 337-345.

Hussain, S., & Khoso, A. A. (2021). Examining the Relationship Between Access to Home Amenities and Students' Academic Achievement at the Secondary Level. *International Research Journal of Education and Innovation*, *2*(3), 325-336.

Hussain, S., & Khoso, A. A. (2022). Examining the Relationship Between Homeownership Status and Secondary Students' Academic Achievement. *International Research Journal of Education and Innovation*, *3*(1), 398-407.

Hussain, S., & Khoso, A. A. (2022). Investigating the Relationship Between Parents' Education and Students' Academic Achievement at the Secondary Level. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, *3*(1), 352-363.

Hussain, S., Khan, Z., & Khan, R. M. A. (2024). Building Students Creative Thinking Ability Through STEM Integrated Curriculum: An Experiment on Elementary School Students. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, *5*(1), 12-24.

Islam, M. N. (2024). Understanding and teaching English word stress patterns: Approaches, challenges, and practical solutions for EFL/ESL learners. *An Overview of Literature, Language and Education Research*, 8, 125–141.

Kang, O., & Kostromitina, M. (2021). The effects of ESL immersion and proficiency on learners' pronunciation development. *Frontiers in Communication*, 6. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2021.636122

Kostromitina, M., & Kang, O. (2021). The effects of ESL immersion and proficiency on learners' pronunciation development. *Frontiers in Communication, 6*, Article 636122. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2021.636122

Liu, Y. (2021). Innovative approaches to English pronunciation instruction in ESL contexts. *Frontiers in Psychology*.

Luchini, P. (2024). Integrating pronunciation teaching and intercultural communicative competence in L2 learning.

Perveen, F., & Hussain, S. (2023). Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness: The Significance of Subject Matter Proficiency in Alignment with Pakistan's National Professional Standards for Teachers. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, *4*(4), 624-633.

Phan, T. T. V., Ly, K. L., & Nguyen, D. K. (2024). Effects of video-based shadowing on suprasegmental features: EFL learners' pronunciation performance and attitudes. *rEFLections, 31*(3), 896-924.

Riaz, S., Ahmad, M., Akhtar, N., & Ashraf, M. A. (2023). Impact of stress patterns on the pronunciation of English nouns and verbs among Pakistani ESL learners. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*.

Riaz, S., Arshad, M., & Khalil, B. (2023). An analysis of the impact of stress patterns on the pronunciation of English nouns and verbs among Pakistani ESL learners. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review, 7*(3), 845-857. https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2023(7-III)68

Sardegna, V. G., & Jarosz, A. (2022). Exploring how YouGlish supports learning English word stress: A perception study. In V. G. Sardegna & A. Jarosz (Eds.), *Theoretical and practical developments in English speech assessment, research, and training* (Second Language Learning and Teaching). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-98218-8_10

Wang, W., & Nakajima, A. (2023). Detecting syllable-level pronunciation stress with a self-attention model. *IEEE Speech Processing Research*.

Yenkimaleki, M., & van Heuven, V. J. (2021). Effects of attention to segmental vs. suprasegmental features on the speech intelligibility and comprehensibility of the EFL learners targeting the perception or production-focused practice. *System, 100*, Article 102557. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102557