Proceedings of ICLLCD 2026 Symposium: Intelligent Media for Cultural Bridge: Forum on Global-Local Communication
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7064/2026.BJ32863

The Impact of Lexical Stress on the Vowel System of English: A Phonological Analysis

Jitong Chen

School of Foreign Languages, Guangzhou Institute of Science and Technology, Guangzhou, China
17820374889@163.com

Abstract. Lexical stress constitutes a core category of English prosodic phonology and serves as a key phonological element shaping the structure of the vowel system and governing vowel distribution. Currently, existing research focuses on lexical stress perception, analyzes the functions of English lexical stress, concentrates on the relationship between vowel reduction and stress perception, conducts acoustic studies of vowel reduction, and discusses three simple models of vowel reduction concerning lexical stress, word class, and sentence stress. However, the impact of lexical stress on the vowel system remains a topic of significant concern. This study aims to systematically analyze the shaping effect of lexical stress on the English vowel system from a phonological perspective. By employing a comprehensive literature review as the research method, it investigates how this suprasegmental feature constrains the organizational structure of the vowel system at the segmental level. In conclusion, the main finding of this study is that the shaping effect of lexical stress on the vowel system is manifested through two aspects: shaping the asymmetric pattern of the stressed vowel inventory and the unstressed vowel inventory, thereby creating its asymmetry. Stress-governed vowel reduction arises from factors including unstable stress placement, rhythmic simplification, morphologically conditioned weakening, speech rate/style adjustments, and morphological fusion, as well as historical sound changes, loanword influences, and substrate effects.

Keywords: Lexical Stress, Vowel Reduction, English Phonology, Schwa

1. Introduction

Stress is generally categorized into three types: contrastive stress, phrasal stress, and lexical stress [1]. In the realm of stress research, Liberman and Prince proposed a groundbreaking theory—Metrical phonology—which significantly impacted the field of phonology. Metrical Phonology posits that stress, unlike features such as nasality or voicing, embodies a relationship that reflects the relative prominence among elements within a word, phrase, or sentence [2]. This study aims to systematically analyze the shaping effect of lexical stress on the English vowel system from a phonological perspective. Current domestic research tends to focus on the perceptual aspects of English lexical stress and comparative analyses of the functions of lexical stress in Chinese and English [3]. Against this research backdrop, this paper adopts a comprehensive literature review method, aiming to systematically delineate the phonological mechanisms by which lexical stress

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7064/2026.BJ32863

governs the distribution of the English vowel system and how lexical stress triggers and constrains the vowel reduction process. Through systematic review, it concludes that lexical stress is a crucial suprasegmental feature in English, determining which vowels in a word are realized as clear vowels or schwa [4]; factors such as syllable structure, position, and word frequency significantly influence the reduction/preservation process [5]; and it clearly distinguishes between "full vowels" capable of bearing stress and "reduced vowels", which cannot [6]. Therefore, lexical stress fundamentally organizes the English vowel system, not only determining vowel clarity at the surface level but also more deeply constraining the distributional patterns of phonemic oppositions. The significance lies in providing a theoretical basis for English pronunciation teaching—clarifying the constraining role of stress on vowels can aid English learners in improving pronunciation accuracy and intelligibility [7].

2. The relationship between lexical stress and the vowel system

2.1. Definition and function of lexical stress

Lexical stress refers to the phonological phenomenon where, within a polysyllabic structure at the word level, a particular syllable acquires prosodic prominence due to the integrated enhancement of loudness, duration, pitch, and intensity. It is a core identifier of English as a typical stress-timed language [8]. From a phonological perspective, lexical stress is not merely a phonetic epiphenomenon but an abstract phonological category with regularity, systematicity, and distinctive functions [9]. Its core functions in English manifest in three aspects: first, differentiating the meaning and part of speech of homographs through stress position differences (e.g., record /ˈrekɔːd/ n. vs. /rɪˈkɔːd/ v.); second, building lexical rhythmic frameworks via alternations of strong and weak syllables [10]; third, directly determining vowel realization forms and distributional boundaries as a licensing condition for vowel quality, duration, and contrast preservation [11,12]. Classic generative phonology research identifies lexical stress as a "prosodic switch" for the English vowel system, with its assignment rules and vowel realization rules forming an inseparable phonological linkage [13].

2.2. Stress as a regulatory mechanism for vowel realization

Vowel reduction triggered by lexical stress is a core phonological and phonetic phenomenon, essentially involving systematic declines in energy distribution, articulatory force, and perceptual prominence in unstressed syllables [14,15]. Its acoustic and articulatory features—including shortened duration, centralized quality, laxing, and vowel opposition merger—exhibit cross-linguistic consistency despite minor variations [16].

Shortened duration is the most stable cross-linguistic acoustic feature of vowel reduction. In stress-sensitive languages like English and Russian, unstressed vowel duration is typically 50%-70% of that in stressed syllables [15]. Stressed syllables retain full duration due to high articulatory tension and complete formant structures, while unstressed syllables undergo systematic duration compression [17].

Centralization is the most representative manifestation of vowel reduction, with the central unrounded vowel [ə] (schwa) as its typical realization. Due to its central tongue position, ease of articulation, and perceptual neutrality, [ə] is the most common cross-linguistic carrier of vowel reduction [18]. In English, stress shifts from morphological changes directly induce vowel centralization: for example, the stressed /eɪ/ in "explain" /ɪkˈspleɪn/ reduces to [ə] in its derivative

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7064/2026.BJ32863

"explanation" /ˌeksplə'neɪʃn/ [19,20], and the /æ/ in "emphatic" /ɪm'fætɪk/ weakens to [ə] in "emphasis" /'emfəsɪs/ [6,18], demonstrating stress's triggering effect on centralization.

3. Vowel reduction triggered by lexical stress

3.1. The central vowel /ə/ (schwa) as the reduced form

The central vowel /ə/ (schwa) occupies a core, cross-linguistically universal position in stress-triggered vowel reduction. Its formation, distribution, and function are deeply linked to the stress system, articulatory mechanisms, and perceptual requirements [3,17,18]. As the "ultimate target" of unstressed vowel reduction, /ə/ is characterized by articulatory neutrality and ease of production, maintaining consistency across languages [3].

Articulatorily, /ə/ arises from articulatory energy compression under stress regulation: unstressed syllables reduce muscle tension, with the tongue naturally returning to a central position, minimizing energy expenditure [15-17]. Acoustically, its F1 and F2 formants concentrate in the oral cavity's central region, presenting a neutral quality that avoids perceptual confusion with stressed full vowels while preserving syllabic integrity [21].

Cross-linguistically, /ə/ is the predominant reduced form in languages with strong reduction (e.g., English, Russian, German) [17,20]. In English, function words like "of" /ɒv/ and "to" /tuː/ weaken to /əv/ and /tə/; in Russian, secondary reduction of /a/ and /o/ results in [ə]; in German, unstressed tense vowels lax and approximate [ə] [22,23], confirming /ə/ as the optimal realization of stress-triggered reduction [3,5,18].

3.2. Contextual factors and quantitative research on reduction

Vowel reduction is a systematic phenomenon shaped by the stress system and contextual factors [17,20]. Contextual factors modulate reduction degree and manifestation, while quantitative research provides objective acoustic and statistical evidence, complementing qualitative limitations [17].

Intra-linguistic contextual factors include: (1) speech rate—faster speech enhances reduction (e.g., "of" simplifies from /əv/ to /v/ in fast speech) [24]; (2) adjacent segments—central consonants, e.g., /n/, /l/ facilitate [ə] centralization, while extreme consonants, e.g., /k/, /i/ inhibit reduction [15-17]; (3) syntactic structure—phrase/clause boundaries reduce weakening, while phrase-internal positions strengthen it [4,9]; (4) pragmatic prominence—emphasized words show reduced weakening or restore full vowel quality [24].

4. The constraining role of stress on the english vowel inventory

The lexical stress system achieves phonetic prominence and semantic distinction through systematic opposition between stressed and unstressed vowels—an opposition spanning articulatory physiology, acoustic features, phonological function, and contextual adaptability [17]. These are not mere "full" vs. "reduced" surface differences but coordinated phonological units with cross-linguistic commonalities [20].

Articulatorily, stressed vowels involve high muscle tension and stable tongue/lip adjustments (e.g., /eɪ/ in "nation" /'neɪʃn/ with front-high to back-high tongue movement), while unstressed vowels adopt a central tongue position and neutral lip shape (e.g., [ə] in "nation" or reduced /o/ in Russian домов /də'mov/) [22,23]. This reflects hierarchical energy distribution: stressed positions receive more energy for prominence, unstressed positions conserve energy for efficiency [20].

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7064/2026.BJ32863

Acoustically, key differences include: (1) duration—stressed vowels are 1.5-2 times longer (e.g., /e/ in "celebrate" /ˈselɪbreɪt/ lasts 120-180ms vs. 40-70ms for unstressed /ɪ/ and /ə/) [19, 22]; (2) formants—stressed vowels have distinct F1/F2 values (e.g., /uː/ F1≈250Hz, F2≈870Hz vs. /æ/ F1≈730Hz, F2≈1610Hz) while unstressed vowels show centralized formants [22]; (3) intensity—stressed vowels are 10-15dB louder [15,20]; (4) vowel space—stressed vowels occupy a larger space with clear oppositions, while unstressed vowels show contracted space and neutralized oppositions [25].

5. Conclusion

This study reveals that lexical stress, as a core English suprasegmental feature, shapes the vowel system's hierarchical pattern through metrical patterning, markedness constraints, and opposition neutralization. Vowel reduction centered on /ə/ is its direct surface manifestation, while the differentiation of stressed and unstressed vowel inventories is the systematic phonological outcome [6,18], confirming deep interconnections between suprasegmental and segmental features.

Stress-governed vowel reduction arises from the interplay of stress shift, stylistic variation, morphological fusion, and historical sound changes, reflecting the complexity of stress-vowel interactions. Grounded in generative phonology, metrical phonology, and optimality theory, this study corroborates classic stress-vowel interaction propositions while engaging with contemporary phonological topics, providing empirical support for general prosodic phonology [25].

Practically, these findings inform English pronunciation teaching by advocating integrated stress-vowel instruction. Guiding learners to understand stress's regulatory effect on vowel quality, duration, and intensity can help overcome common misconceptions, enhancing pronunciation accuracy and intelligibility. This study also lays a theoretical foundation for English second language acquisition research, offering references for vocabulary acquisition and oral communication studies.

References

[1] Ximing Xu. (2021) The Interactive Relationship between English Stress and Syllable Weight [J]. Foreign Language Teaching and Research, (5): 643-655+798.
[2] Maolin Wang. (2009) A Brief Introduction to the Stress Theory in Phonology [J]. Foreign Language Teaching Theory and Practice, (03): 83-87.
[3] Xiaoping Huang. (2015) The Phonological Features and Phonological Function of the English Vowel /ə/ [J]. Journal of Huaqiao University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition), (02): 123-131.
[4] Agata Guskaroska, Erik Goodale, Timothy Kochem, Monica Ghosh, Lily Compton, Elena Cotos. (2025) Oral Communication for Non-Native Speakers of English, 2nd Edition [M]. Ames City: The ISU Digital Press, pp.4-7.
[5] Yueqin Chen. (2016) Acoustic Experimental Study on Vowel Weakening of Unstressed Syllables in English [J]. Foreign Language Teaching, 37 (02): 41-45.
[6] Min Wang. (2019) Quantitative Acoustic Research on Vowel Weakening [J]. Contemporary Linguistics, 21 (02): 247-259.
[7] Hua Chen. (2017) English Intonation Patterns and Oral English Phonetics Teaching [M]. Shanghai: Shanghai Jiao Tong University Press.
[8] Abercrombie D. (1967) Elements of General Phonetics [M]. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
[9] Chomsky N., Halle M. (1968) The Sound Pattern of English [M]. New York: Harper & Row.
[10] Hayes B. (1995) Metrical Stress Theory: Principles and Case Studies [M]. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
[11] Crosswhite K. (2001) Vowel Reduction and Positional Markedness [J]. Phonology, 18 (1): 1-43. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0952675701004258
[12] Gimson A. C., Cruttenden A. (2014) Gimson's Pronunciation of English (8th ed.) [M]. London: Routledge.
[13] Halle M., Vergnaud J.R. (1987) An Essay on Stress [M]. Cambridge: MIT Press.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7064/2026.BJ32863

[14] Flemming E. (1994) A Phonetically-Based Model of Phonological Vowel Reduction [R]. Cambridge: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
[15] Ladefoged P. (2001) A Course in Phonetics [M]. 5th ed. New York: Harcourt College Publishers.
[16] Shengli Feng. (2021) Phonological Patterns - Experimental Phonology and Phonology [M]. Beijing: The Commercial Press.
[17] Padgett R., Tabain M. (2005) Russian Vowel Reduction: An Acoustic Study [J]. Journal of the International Phonetic Association, 35 (2): 151-172.
[18] Xue Chen. (2017) The Core Position of the Central Vowel /ə/ in the English Phonological System [J]. Theory and Practice of Foreign Language Teaching, (02): 67-74.
[19] Wells J. C. (1982) Accents of English [M]. Vol.1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[20] Flemming E. (2004) Scalar and Categorical Phenomena in Phonology: A Unified Account [J]. Phonology, 21 (1): 1-38.
[21] Aisha Chen. (2018) Correlation Analysis of English Stress Shift and Vowel Weakening [J]. Foreign Languages and Foreign Language Teaching, (03): 54-62+148.
[22] Wells J. C. (2008) Longman Pronunciation Dictionary [M]. 3rd ed. London: Pearson.
[23] Crosswhite K. (2004) Vowel Reduction in Optimality Theory [J]. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory, 22 (1): 101-152.
[24] Li Li. (2020) The Impact of Prosodic Context on Vowel Weakening in English [J]. Foreign Language Teaching and Testing, (01): 78-85.
[25] Prince A., Smolensky P. (2004) Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar [M]. Oxford: Blackwell.