Argument Omission between Valency and Construction
Evidence for Sentence Type Effects from Acceptability Rating Studies

**Primary Sentence Type Effect**

We are dealing with a primary sentence type effect (PSTE) if a sentence type determines directly whether and which arguments can be omitted independently from the choice of the verb and independently from the possibility of AO in other sentence types.

To argue for a PSTE in the data, we had to show that

- (a1) the results in the respective sentence type were not influenced by the verb and

Validation of (a1)

Correlation of mean acceptability values of all verbs across all four sentence types (MV) with the results of all verbs in the respective sentence type (RES).

For a PSTE, there should be no significant correlation.

- (a2) the results for this sentence type were independent from the results for other sentence types.

Validation of (a2)

Correlation of RES of each sentence type with the RES of the other sentence types.

For a PSTE, there should be no significant correlation between the sentence type in question and any of the other sentence types.

**Secondary Sentence Type Effect**

We are dealing with a secondary sentence type effect (SSTE) if the verb has a large influence on AO in the respective sentence type and there is also a systematic relationship between the AO behaviour in the respective sentence type and the AO behaviour in at least one other sentence type.

To argue for a SSTE in the data, we had to show that

- (b1) the verb has an influence on an argument’s omissibility and

Validation of (b1)

Correlation of mean acceptability values of all verbs across all four sentence types (MV) with the results of all verbs in the respective sentence type (INF).

For a SSTE, there should be a significant correlation.

- (b2) the results for this sentence type are related to the results of at least one other sentence type.

Validation of (b2)

Correlation of RES of each sentence type with the RES of the other sentence types.

For a SSTE, there should be a significant correlation between the sentence type in question and at least one of the other sentence types.

**grammatical modeling**

We suggest an analysis based on a division of labor between valency and constructions (4):

- non-complex constructions are also sentence types
- construction frames of determining the possibility to omit arguments (5)
- direct omission are still syntactically active - optional nominative NPs aren’t subjects
- non-finite main clause
- expletive argument construction requires should be allowed in non-sentential
- heterogeneity of RES
- declarative is the most conservative sentence type with respect to AO
- imperative forms are considered non-omissive constructions (6)
- direct determination of sentential context (7)
- general determinacy of imperative forms
- imperative forms do not belong to the regular
- existential paradigm of a verb
- verbal gradation in strong verbs
- realization of word order
- infinitive and complex sentence type (8) making non-expletive sentence (9)
- imperative construction is determined (9)
- multiple factors may play a role on AO in idioms
- influence of imperative forms
- processing efforts due to the complexity of the construction
- more marginal status of this sentence type

**conditions of the study**

- from 6/2013 - today
- ca. 1,100 participants
- ca. 100 test items
- 12 different questionnaires
- pseudo-anonymous/pseudo-randomized
- 20 minutes written and oral instruction
- 720 minutes to work through the questionnaire
- in between the test phases solving math problems
- only native speakers
- every judgment: acceptable (yes) - unacceptable (no)
- participants were given a free internet-access to their homes
- contacts: every day oral communication
- all participants were asked to judge the last sentences (validated) on the green buttons.
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**Tables and Figures**

1. Table showing distribution of results across sentence types.
2. Graphs illustrating the influence of imperative and declarative constructions on acceptability ratings.
3. Diagrams comparing the acceptability of imperative and declarative constructions.
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