Chapter V

Conclusion & Pedagogical Implications
Restatement of the Problem

The PhD dissertation is dealt with very crucial issue entitled 'A contrastive study of lexical knowledge between ESL&EFL (Mysore & Tehran) at undergraduate level'.

To achieve the goal, the researcher has adduced arguments on contrastive analysis and its contribution to lexical knowledge, which is defined in terms of lexical categories such as synonymy, antonymy, and idiomaticity, collocation, concrete and abstract. The reasons behind the decision are extensively explained e.g., they are the most commonly used categories in dictionary, which play prominent role in lexicography and remain of paramount importance in language usage. The controversy arises due to inadequate explanations and shortcomings in theoretical standpoints. The researcher has demystified several ambiguities and complexities emanated from definitions of contrastive analysis dealt with lexical knowledge on ESL&EFL learners. Despite the entire misconceptions and disagreements on lexical categories, the investigator has given a clear explanation of each category. He has discerned categories and sub-categories based on various common findings in terms of 'Near synonymy', and 'Propositional synonymy' in synonymy category, 'Complementaries', 'Gradable antonymy', 'Converse (Or Relational) antonymy' and 'Auto-antonymy' in antonymy, 'Flexible idiom' and 'Frozen idiom' in idiomaticity, 'Collocation', 'Concrete & Abstract'. It is worth noting that, the researcher has also tested each category of lexical knowledge in terms of both word and sentence levels to evaluate the effect of contextualization. All categories are mentioned in abbreviation (Chapter IV): 'Near synonymy' (SynNeWo) , (SynNeSe),which mean near synonymy at word and sentence level, and 'Propositional synonymy' (SynPrWo) , (SynPrSe) in synonymy category, 'Complementaries' (AntCoWo) , (AntCoSe) , 'Gradable antonymy' (AntGrWo) , (AntGrSe) , 'Converse (Or Relational) antonymy' (AntReWo) , (AntReSe) and 'Auto-antonymy' (AutoWo) ,(AutoSe) in antonymy, 'Flexible idiom' (IdioFlWo) , (IdioFlSe) and 'Frozen idiom' (IdioFrWo) , (IdioFrSe) in idiomaticity, 'Collocation' (ColloWo) , (ColloSe), 'Concrete' (ConcreWo) , (ConcreSe) & 'Abstract' (AbstraWo) , (AbstraSe).

The outline of research study is:
a. Giving a Clear definition of contrastive analysis
b. Clarifying the ESL&EFL distinctions
c. Defining lexical knowledge in terms of categories
d. Sorting out lexical categories in terms of clear-cut classifications
e. Detecting the contrastive points of ESL (Mysorean) & EFL (Tehrani) learners (Those native undergraduate students who live in Mysore and Tehran)
f. Revealing the correlation between ‘Hobbies’, 'FamBond (Family bond(s))’, ‘SocioAtta (Social attachment(s))’, Language’, ‘FamMem (Family member as siblings)’ and lexical knowledge.
g. Analyzing the effect of non-lexical knowledge in terms of ‘ParenEdu (Parent education) on lexical knowledge
h. Scrutinizing the in-group word and sentence difference

Description of the Procedure

5.1. Pilot and Main Groups
5.1.1. Pilot Groups

The procedures adopted by the researcher are as follows (Flow Chart 3.1):

a. 20 students both equal males and females at the undergraduate level with English language as a medium of instruction are selected as a pilot group at random from five classes from Mahajana College in Mysore within the age group 17-25.

b. The students from the same qualifications of the above pilot group in Mysore are selected from Azad University North branch in Tehran

c. The ETS TOEFL is administered to the randomly selected students from Mysore with the above-mentioned pilot group to determine three levels of 'High”, 'Medium' and 'Low” based on the formulae +1 SD & -1 SD (One plus above the standard deviation and one minus below the standard deviation for the medium level students, above one standard deviation for the high level students and below one standard deviation for the low level students). Totally, 80 minutes are specified for TOEFL tests. The allocated time based on standard TOEFL instructions for Section2 (Structure and written expression) on 40 items is 25 minutes, and it is 55 minutes for 50 items of Section3 (Reading comprehension). The obtained reliability of the standard TOEFL test for Mysorean pilot group is 0.80.
d. In the next session and at the same time, the main test (Pedestal test) addendum to background knowledge, which is only to elicit the general information from the same pilot groups are administered to the pilot group in Mysore.

The questionnaire is to elicit general information on 'Gender', 'Age', 'Major', 'Degree', 'Hobbies', 'Family bond(s)', 'Social attachment(s)', 'Number of languages', 'Siblings (Family members)' and 'Education' (Appendix B).

The means of allocated time for pilot group indicate 15 minutes are suitable time for background questionnaire.

220 items of main test added to the background questionnaire are administered simultaneously to the same pilot group. Following Item analyses, the results indicate that 165 items of the main test are appropriate for the Mysorean students (ESL learners) in the main group. The main test deals with six categories as synonymy, antonymy, Idiomaticity, collocation, concrete category and abstract. Some of the main categories have sub-categories. The means of allocated time for pilot group indicate 30 seconds are suitable for each test.

It is worth noting that the entire categories and sub-categories comprise near synonymy, propositional synonymy, complementaries, graded antonymy, converse or relational antonymy, auto-antonymy, flexible Idiomaticity, frozen Idiomaticity, collocation, concrete category and abstract category at two levels of word and sentence. Each part of the mentioned categories and sub-categories contains 10 items with 5 items at word level and 5 items at sentence level.

e. The same procedure in the pilot group in Mysore is used for the pilot group in Tehran. The reliability of the standard TOEFL test for Tehrani pilot group is 0.75.

f. In the next session (at the same time), the main test (Pedestal test) addendum to background knowledge, which is only to elicit the general information is administered to pilot group in Tehran. The means of allocated time for pilot group indicate 15 minutes are suitable time for background questionnaire. 220 items of main test added to the background questionnaire are administered simultaneously to the same pilot group. Following Item analyses, the results indicate that 133 items of the main test are appropriate for Tehrani students (EFL learners) in the main group. The categories and sub-categories of the main test are the same in both pilot groups (In Mysore and Tehran). The means of allocated time for pilot group indicate 30 seconds are suitable for each test.
Following Item analyses, the results indicate that 165 and 133 items of the main test from total 220 items are appropriate for the Mysorean and Tehrani students respectively. From the above items, 115 items are discerned appropriate for both Mysorean and Tehrani students. Then, 5 items are discarded at random. In other words, 110 items are selected, as the most appropriate common items comprising he entire determined categories and sub-categories of the lexical knowledge. The test deals with six categories as synonymy, antonymy, Idiomaticity, collocation, concrete category and abstract. Some of the main categories have sub-categories, which are mentioned before.

5.1.2. Main Groups (Representative Samples)

a. The ETS TOEFL test, which is administered to the pilot group, is also administered to the main group or representative sample of ESL learners from Mysore. From the total 250 students who are selected at random, 68 (37 males and 31 females), 120 (61 males and 59 females) and 62 students (32 males and 30 females) are determined, as 'High', 'Medium' and 'Low' students respectively. Totally, 80 minutes are specified for TOEFL test (with 0.80 percent reliability obtained from ESL pilot group). In the next session and at the same time, the main test addendum to background knowledge, which is only to elicit the general information from the main group, are administered. The background knowledge questionnaire with 15 minutes and main test with 55 minutes allocated time (110 items each one with 30 seconds allocated time, which are determined in the pilot study) are administered. The main test with 110 items comprises categories and sub-categories (Flow Chart 1): near synonymy, propositional synonymy (synonymy), complements, graded antonymy, converse or relational antonymy, auto-antonymy (antonymy), flexible Idiomaticity(idiom), frozen Idiomaticity (idiom), collocation, concrete and abstract at two levels of word and sentence. Each part of the mentioned categories and sub-categories contains 10 items with 5 items at word level and 5 items at sentence level. It is worth noting that the means of all sub-categories show the status of a category. Then, the means of all categories are compared. Accordingly, the mean of each sub-category is also compared with the other sub-category in Mysore and in Tehran to demonstrate degree of similarities and differences. In other words, to what extent sub-categories and categories are different or similar to each other. It should be noted that categories and sub-categories demonstrate lexical knowledge of the ESL (Mysorean)
and EFL (Tehrani) students. Besides, correlation of the lexical knowledge with information drawn from questionnaire is taken into consideration. The obtained means of allocated time from ESL and EFL pilot groups in the pilot study indicate 30 minutes are suitable time for the main test. The obtained reliability from the main test from ESL students is 0.861 (high reliability).

b. The ETS TOEFL test, which is administered to the pilot group, is also administered to the main group or representative sample of EFL learners. From the total 250 students, 61 (31 males and 30 females), 119 (63 males and 56 females) and 70 students (33 males and 37 females) are determined, as 'High', 'Medium' and 'Low' students respectively. Totally, 80 minutes are specified for TOEFL test (with 0.75 percent reliability obtained from EFL pilot group).

In the next session and at the same time, the main test addenda to background knowledge with the aforementioned qualifications are administered. The means of allocated time of both groups indicate 30 minutes are suitable time for the main test. The obtained reliability from the main test from EFL students is 0.727 (high reliability).

5.2. Summary and Discussion of Findings

To attain the goal, the researcher adopted different statistical procedures to reject or confirm the various null hypotheses:

H1: There is no significant difference between ESL and EFL learners’ lexical knowledge.

The obtained results drawn from the total significant means of the entire lexical categories reveal EFL learners are more than ESL learners (Table4.1, Chart4.1). Besides, the mean of every individual category in ESL learners rather than EFL learners is significantly better (Table4.1.1). The obtained results reveal that the format of lexical knowledge in ESL learners (Synonymy > Antonymy > Idiomaticity > Concrete > Abstract > Collocation) is partially different from EFL learners (Synonymy > Antonymy > Idiomaticity > Concrete > Collocation > Abstract) (Table4.1.2).

Hypothesis one (H1) also falls into some six sub-divisions (Chapter IV). Analyzing the sub-divisions has shown significant difference of lexical knowledge on lexical categories and sub-categories ESL&EFL learners: ESL learners are better than
EFL learners in synonymy within the format of SynPr > SynNe (Tables4.2&4.3, Charts4.4&4.5).

ESL learners are better than EFL learners in antonymy since AntCoWo > AntCoSe, AntReSe > AntReWo, AntGrSe > AntGrWo > AntGrSe and AutoWo > AutoSe in the ESL learners and the means of all of them (either individually or totally) are more than AntCoSe > AntCoWo, AntReSe > AntReWo, AntGrSe > AntGrWo > AntGrSe and AutoSe > AutoWo of EFL learners (the format of hierarchy in ESL learners is partially different from EFL learners on antonymy e.g., AutoWo > AutoSe in ESL learners, whereas AutoSe > Auto in EFL learners). Besides, AntCo > AntRe > AntGr > Auto (Antonymy) of ESL learners are more than AntCo > AntRe > AntGr > Auto of EFL learners (Table4.4&4.5, Chart4.7&4.8). In other words, mean of each sub-category of antonymy in ESL learners is more than EFL learners. Totally, ESL learners are better than EFL learners in Antonymy category are, which a part of lexical knowledge (H1.2) is.

ESL learners are better than EFL learners in idiomaticity since the means of IdioFrSe > IdioFlWo, IdioFrSe > IdioFrWo of ESL learners are bigger than IdioFlSe > IdioFlWo, IdioFrSe > IdioFrWo of EFL learners. Besides, IdioFl > IdioFr of ESL learners are better than IdioFl > IdioFr of EFL learners (Table4.6&4.7, Chart4.10&4.11). On the whole, ESL learners are better than EFL learners in idiomaticity category, which is a part of lexical knowledge (H1.3).

ESL learners are better than EFL learners in collocation category (ColloWo) (Table4.8, Chart4.12), which is a part of lexical knowledge (H1.4).

ESL learners are better than EFL learners in concrete category, which is a part of lexical knowledge (H1.5). Besides, ConcreSe > ConcreWo of ESL learners are more than ConcreSe > ConcreWo learners (Tables4.9&4.9.1, Chart4.13&4.14).

ESL learners are better than EFL learners in abstract category, which is a part of lexical knowledge (H1.5). Besides, AbstraSe > AbstraWo of ESL learners are also more than AbstraSe > AbstraWo of EFL learners (Table4.10&4.11, Chart4.15&4.16).

H2: Gender difference of ESL&EFL learners’ lexical knowledge is insignificant. (M stands for male and F stands for female).

The finding indicates the gender difference is significant since lexical knowledge of Male ESL learners is more than Females'. The same trend is detected in EFL learners. On the whole, M > F of ESL learner is bigger than M > F of EFL learner (Table4.12, Chart4.17).
Hypothesis two also falls into six sub-divisions (Chapter IV). Analyzing the sub-divisions can demonstrate at which categories ESL&EFL are significantly different:

ESL male’s lexical knowledge in synonymy is better than female’s, whereas EFL Female’s lexical knowledge in synonymy is better than male’s (Table4.13, Chart4.18). On the whole, ESL male and female’s lexical knowledge in synonymy is more than EFL male and female’s lexical knowledge (H2.1).

ESL male’s lexical knowledge in antonymy is better than female’s, and EFL male’s lexical knowledge in antonymy is better than female’s (Table4.14, Chart4.19). On the whole, ESL male and female’s lexical knowledge in antonymy is more than both EFL male and female’s lexical knowledge (H2.2).

ESL male’s lexical knowledge in idiomaticity is better than female’s, and EFL male’s lexical knowledge in idiomaticity is better than female’s (Table4.15, Chart4.21). On the whole, ESL male and female’s lexical knowledge in idiomaticity is more than EFL male and female’s lexical knowledge (H2.3).

ESL male’s lexical knowledge in collocation is better than female’s, whereas EFL Female’s lexical knowledge in collocation is better than male’s (Table4.16, Chart4.22). On the whole, ESL male’s lexical knowledge in synonymy is more than EFL male’s lexical knowledge, while ESL female’s lexical knowledge is less than EFL male’s (H2.4).

ESL male’s lexical knowledge in concrete category is better than female’s, and EFL male’s lexical knowledge in concrete category is better than female’s (Table4.17, Chart4.23). On the whole, ESL male and female’s lexical knowledge in concrete category is more than EFL male and female’s lexical knowledge (H2.5).

No gender difference is detected in the means of lexical knowledge of abstract word. Thus, H2.6 is not rejected.

H3: No significant difference can be detected at various levels of ESL&EFL learners’ lexical knowledge (word or sentence). It should be noted that 'H', 'Me' and 'L' stand for High, Medium and Low respectively in the dissertation.

The finding shows that the effect of various levels of ESL lexical knowledge, namely H > Me > L and the same model for EFL lexical knowledge (Table4.18). On the whole, High, Medium and Low ESL students are better than High, Medium and Low EFL ones (H3).
Hypothesis three also falls into six sub-divisions (Chapter IV). Analyzing the sub-divisions can demonstrate at which categories ESL&EFL are significantly different:

Significant differences are detected at various levels of ESL&EFL learners with the format of H > Me > L in synonymy (Table4.19, Chart4.24&4.25). On the whole, each level of ESL learners is better than EFL ones within the same format in synonymy (H3.1).

Significant differences are detected at various levels of ESL&EFL learners with the format of H > Me > L in antonymy (Table4.20, Chart4.26). On the whole, each level of ESL learners is better than EFL ones within the same format in antonymy (H3.2).

Significant differences are detected at various levels of ESL&EFL learners with the format of H > Me > L in idiomaticity (Table4.21, Chart4.28&4.29). On the whole, each level of ESL learners is better than EFL ones within the same format in idiomaticity (H3.3).

Significant differences are detected at various levels of ESL&EFL learners with the format of H > Me > L in collocation (Table4.22, Chart4.30). On the whole, Two levels of ESL learners are better than EFL ones (H > Me) within the same format in collocation (H3.4).

Significant differences are detected at various levels of ESL&EFL learners with the format of H > Me > L in concrete category (Table4.23, Chart4.31&4.32). On the whole, each level of ESL learners is better than EFL ones within the same format in concrete category (H3.5).

Significant differences are detected at various levels of ESL&EFL learners with the format of H > Me > L in abstract category (Table4.24, Chart4.33). On the whole, each level of ESL learners is better than EFL ones within the same format in abstract category (H3.6).

**H4: No correlation can be detected between non-lexical elements and lexical knowledge of ESL&EFL learners.**

A positive relationship is found between ‘Hobbies’ and lexical knowledge of ESL&EFL learners, while a negative relationship is detected between ‘FamMem’ (Family member) and lexical knowledge of ESL&EFL learners (Table4.25).
Hypothesis four also falls into two sub-divisions (Chapter IV). Analyzing the sub-divisions can demonstrate at which categories ESL&EFL are significantly different:

A positive relationship is found between ‘Hobbies’ and lexical knowledge of ESL learners, while a negative relationship is detected between ‘FamMem’(Family member) as well as ‘Language ’and their lexical knowledge (Table4.26, H4.1).

A positive relationship is found between ‘Hobbies’ and lexical knowledge of EFL learners, while a negative relationship is detected between ‘FamMem’ (Family member) and their lexical knowledge (Table4.27, H4.2).

**H5: The effect of parents’ education on lexical categories knowledge of ESL&EFL learners is insignificant.**

According to the obtained result (Table4.29), H5 is not rejected in any lexical categories. In other words, the effect of parents’ education on lexical categories knowledge of ESL&EFL learners is insignificant.

**H6: There is no in-group word & sentence difference between ESL&EFL learners.**

According to Table30, The finding reveals that H6 (Hypothesis six) is rejected in SynNeWo1 Vs SynNeSe1, SynPrWo1 Vs SynPrSe1, AntGrWo1 Vs AntGrSe1, AntGrWo1 Vs AntGrSe1, IdioF1Wo1 Vs IdioF1Se1, ColloWo1 Vs ColloSe1, ConcreWo1 Vs ConcreSe1, AbstraWo1 Vs AbstraSe1, SynNeWo2 Vs SynNeSe2, AntCoWo2 Vs AntCoSe2, AntoGrWo2 Vs AntoGrSe2, AntoReWo2 Vs AntoReSe2, AutoWo2 Vs AutoSe2, IdiomFlWo2 Vs IdiomFlSe2, IdioFrWo2 Vs IdioFrSe2, ColloWo2 Vs ColloSe2 and AbstraWo2 Vs AbstraSe2. The above result indicates lexical knowledge of words of testees in the form of sentence is better than single word.

**H7: No correlation is detected between the same lexical categories of ESL&EFL learners.**

In all types of synonymy, correlation is detected (Table4.31).
In some parts of antonymy, correlation is detected (Table4.32).
In all types of idiomaticity, correlation is detected (Table4.33).
In all types of collocation, correlation is detected (Table4.34).
In all types of concrete category, correlation is detected (Table4.35).
In all types of abstract category, correlation is detected (Table4.35).
In other words, all parts of each lexical category except antonymy are closely related to each other.

### 5.3. Similarities with other Conducted Researches

1. The present finding confirms the synonymy differentiation in terms of word and sentence based on Frege (1968) who refers to the synonymy in sentence in terms of analytic point (Table4.2, H1.1).

2. Synonymy > Antonymy > Idiomaticity > Concrete > Abstract > Collocation format in ESL learners is partially different from EFL learners as Synonymy > Antonymy > Idiomaticity > Concrete > Collocation > Abstract EFL learner. The finding confirms Casagranda and Hale’s (1967) research study since antonymy is noted as one of the common communicative tools (Table4.1, H1 & Table4.1.1, H1).

3. It is in favor of Murphy and Andrew (1992) who emphasize antonymy category, which is meaningful within the lexical knowledge (Table4.4, H1.2).

4. It is in favor of Cruse’s (2000) assumption that complementaries (Complementary antonymy) are very basic form of oppositeness (AntCo > AntRe > AntGr > Auto, which is drawn from the result of dissertation study).

5. It is in favor of Makkai’s (1972) classification on encoding and decoding, which is shown as flexible and frozen idioms (Table4.6, H1.3).

6. It is in favor of Gribb’s (1987) finding that flexible idioms can be understood better than frozen idioms (Table4.7, H1.3).

7. It is in favor of Gibb (1980), Swing and Cutler’s (1979) finding that idiomatic context can be understood better than sporadic idioms, which is compatible with the dissertation finding (IdioFlSe > IdioFlWo, IdioFrSe > IdioFrWo of ESL learners are bigger than IdioFlSe > IdioFlWo, IdioFrSe > IdioFrWo of EFL learners).

8. It is in favor of Al-Zahrani’s (1998) finding that collocation is a challenging issue (Table4.8, H1.4).

9. It is in favor of Schwanenflugel’s (1992) claim that subjects can perform better in concrete tests rather than abstract ones (Table 4.10, H1.6).

10. It is in favor of Levin and Miller (1979) that concrete words can be recalled better than abstract ones.

### 5.4. Dissimilarities with other Conducted Researches

The present study disagrees with the following findings:
1. Labor (1992) defines synonymy in terms of difference, which is generally attributed to 'near synonymy'. The present finding reveals that synonymy categories are easily differentiated by the testees, and the knowledge of both ESL and EFL learners are more in 'propositional synonymy, than 'near synonymy.

2. It does not show the findings of Beer et al (2004) who have considered the synonymy category in terms of synonymy/antonymy.

3. It does not show Katz and Fodor’s (1963) notion that demonstrate synonymy in terms of full semantic meaning. However, reaching full meaning is impossible just by resorting to one category of lexical knowledge.

4. It does not show Murphy and Andrew's (1992) results since they have underestimated synonymy and antonymy categories.

5. It does not show Justeson and Katz’s (1992) assumption that calls antonymy a category devoid of meaning.

6. It does not show Murphy's (1992) suspicious sense of determining a perfect taxonomy in antonymy.

7. It does not show Winkler (2008) and Fromkin et al,(2007) and Ackman's (1982) assumptions who have defined idiom merely in terms of combinations of words, which do not add up literally to their meaning. The finding indicates that .IdioFlSe>IdioFlWo, IdioFrSe>IdioFrWo of ESI learners are bigger than IdioFlSe>IdioFlWo, IdioFrSe>IdioFrWo of EFL learners. It demonstrates that flexible idioms can be differentiated from the frozen ones.

8. It does not show Ackerman’s (1982) finding that idiomatic words cannot be understood when they are excluded from the context. Despite the fact that the dissertation finding underscores the advantage of sentence in lexical knowledge of idioms (IdioFlSe > IdioFlWo, IdioFrSe > IdioFrWo of ESI learners are bigger than IdioFlSe > IdioFlWo, IdioFrSe > IdioFrWo of EFL learners), it does not ignore the idiomatic knowledge at word level, indicating idiomatic knowledge that is devoid of context.

9. It does not show Benson’s (1986) assumption that collocation is a group of words that occur repeatedly in a language since collocation knowledge of ESL and EFL learners is little (Synonymy > Antonymy > Idiomaticity > Concrete > Abstract > Collocation in ESL learners, whereas the format is Synonymy > Antonymy > Idiomaticity > Concrete > Collocation > Abstract in EFL learner).
10. It does not show Pawley and Syder’s (1983) notion that collocation is very
significant part of lexical items.

11. It does not show Kjellmer’s (1984) argument, indicating idiom as a
collocation whose meaning can not deduced from its constituents. However, ESL and
EFL learners understand idiom and collocation differently since their knowledge on
idioms are significantly better than collocation (Synonymy > Antonymy > Idiomaticity
> Concrete > Abstract > Collocation in ESL learners, whereas the format is Synonymy
> Antonymy > Idiomaticity > Concrete > Collocation > Abstract in EFL learner).

12. It does not show Miller’s (1999) finding that has attributed understanding of
concrete category to contextualization; however, it can be understood at both word and
sentence levels (At all levels). It is worth noting that it can be understood even better
than abstract word at both word or sentence levels (ConcreSe > ConcreWo of ESL
learners are more than ConcreSe > ConcreWo learners and AbstraSe > AbstraWo of
ESL learners are also more than AbstraSe > AbstraWo of EFL learners as well as
Synonymy > Antonymy > Idiomaticity > Concrete > Abstract > Collocation in ESL
learners, whereas the format is Synonymy > Antonymy > Idiomaticity > Concrete >
Collocation > Abstract in EFL learner).

**Pedagogical Implications**

The research study can be a contributing factor in the realms:

a. **Lexicography:** Making an unabridged or even an abridged dictionary is not
an easy task. It needs mutual contemplation and cooperation as well as spending time,
energy and money. Undoubtedly, many intervening variables are effective in
compiling a dictionary. Various dictionaries at different levels are available e.g.,
Monolingual, Bilingual, Multilingual, Elementary, Intermediate, Advanced, American,
British, Slang dictionaries and so on.

The researcher raises the question whether a monolingual dictionary without
considering variations of ESL&EFL learners in understanding the context can satisfy
their growing demands e.g., a dictionary takes benefit from different lexical devices
such as synonymy, antonymy ,idiomaticity, collocation, concrete and abstract words to
define a word in a comprehensible manner. It is impossible or improbable to expect
the ESL and EFL to understand the exact meaning of so-called well-defined meaning
of a given word, which is due to variation of understanding. The recent study
underscores the importance of variation and distinction of ESL&EFL learners.
Consequently, it can pave the way for further research on compiling the most suitable dictionary, which is modified in terms of the lexical knowledge of ESL&EFL learner to facilitate better understanding the lexical concepts of each word.

b. **Computational Linguistics:** Recognizing the strong points and shortcomings of ESL&EFL learners’ lexical knowledge can work as a troubleshooter in designing the computer programs to enhance communication in terms of ESL and EFL knowledge variation. In other words, computer can utilize the diction, which is more comprehensible and varies from ESL learners to EFL ones.

c. **Pedagogical Modification:** The study also can raise or lower the expectation arises in the curriculum spheres. Paying due attention to the core skills necessitates proper modification by being attentive to variation to language knowledge specifically the lexical knowledge, which plays a major role in understanding the curriculum subjects.

d. **Psycholinguistics and Neurolinguistics:** Distinctive Lexical knowledge on categories such as synonymy, antonymy, idiomacity, collocation, concrete & abstract words can imply the function of brain concerning each category. Significant distinctive lexical knowledge can indicate susceptibility and the sensitivity of the brain towards each category. It implies distinctive location of each category in the brain since the degree of lexical knowledge of each category is different. The extent of difference also increases when ESL & EFL learners are taken into consideration. It can also contribute to better understanding of the function of brain.

e. **Linguistics:** It can also reveal universals or commonalities between ESL&EFL in understanding the lexical knowledge indicating the most accessible knowledge as core to less accessible one. It can also indicate a degree of variation in lexical knowledge in terms of various categories. In other words, it can indicate principle and parameter in terms of lexical categories since the common lexical knowledge can imply language principles, which was ignored in lexical knowledge due to more attention that was paid to syntactic features.

f. **Discourse and Pragmatics:** The study can foster modification in texts to convey the meaning and intention beyond the written text smoothly, which can be materialized by due attention to varieties in understanding the lexical categories in order to make the texts more comprehensible.
g. **Interdisciplinary Studies:** The research can be a contributory factor in interdisciplinary studies, which encourage the scholars to mull over distinctive understanding of ESL&EFL learners that are not restricted to English students.

**Suggestion for Further Studies**

No research is absolutely complete and consequently no research can claim that the result of his/her study can be applied in all possible cases.

This research is not an exception. There are other alternatives related to this research, which are worthy of further investigation. Due to the limitation of dissertation study, further researches can be conducted, which are as follows:

1. The effect of age is not taken into consideration.
2. The contrastive study of lexical knowledge between ESL&EFL of other countries at undergraduate level should be investigated.
3. The contrastive study of lexical knowledge between ESL&EFL of other countries at various educational levels should be studied.
4. The contrastive study of lexical knowledge among EFL learners should be considered.
5. The contrastive study of lexical knowledge among ESL learners should be considered
6. The contrastive study of lexical knowledge between native speakers and ESL learners at undergraduate level should be investigated.
7. The contrastive study of lexical knowledge between native speakers and EFL learners at undergraduate level should be investigated.
8. The contrastive study of lexical knowledge between bilingual or multilingual ESL&EFL learners at undergraduate level should be investigated.
9. Other lexical categories except what is mentioned between ESL&EFL learners by the researcher such as hyponymy can be studied.
10. A contrastive study of lexical knowledge between ESL&EFL learners with optional English (Mysore & Tehran) at undergraduate level can be investigated.
11. The effect of general vocabulary knowledge on Lexical knowledge of lexical categories can be taken into consideration.