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Which frequency measure(s) represent(s) the associations between construction C and lexeme L the best?

- (relative) frequency of L in C
  - proponents: Goldberg et al. 2004; Bybee 2010
  - evidence: facilitation of L learning, grammaticality judgements
- contingency-based bidirectional measure, e.g. FET log-p
  - evidence: sentence completion, self-paced comprehension task, ESLearners' uptake
- frequency effects may differ
  - proponents: Divjak 2008 (to some extent); Schmid 2010 ('attraction' vs. 'reliance')
  - evidence: not much so far

A case study of the Russian ditransitive construction

**CONCLUSIONS**

1. The corpus measures form two large stable clusters: one with the relative frequency of L in C and the other with reliance of L on C. Most corpus measures are very strongly correlated. Therefore, competitions between individual measures in prediction of experimental results (cf. previous research) should be taken with a grain of salt.

2. The measures from the relative frequency (attraction) cluster correlate positively with the experimental frequencies Construction > Verbs. The reliance cluster measures correlate positively with the experimental frequencies Verb > Construction. These facts can be interpreted as evidence of the bidirectionality of C-L associations.

3. The contingency-based measures (e.g. FET log-p) do not have any additional predictive power. The simple attraction and reliance seem to be the optimal measures of C-L association.