Standard and non-standard DO-support (?) by monolingual and bilingual children, adolescents and adults in spoken Dutch

Leonie Cornips, Meertens Institute/Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences

The 2nd N'CLA V Grand Meeting
University of Gothenburg, 24 August 2011

1. Introduction

*Gaan* ‘go’ + infinitive structure in standard Dutch (SD): according to Dutch grammar:

auxiliary of (inchoative, ingressive) aspect:

(1)  
  a. Hij *gaat* zwemmen.  
      he    go     swim<sub>inf</sub>  
      ‘He is about to swim.’
  
  auxiliary of tense (future modal reading rooted in the present)
  b. Hij *gaat* verhuizen.  
      he    go     move<sub>inf</sub>  
      ‘he will move’
  
verb of movement:
  c. Ik *ga* naar huis.  
      I     go     to     home  
      ‘I’m going home.’
  
*doen*+inf is dialectal/regional Dutch (*in SD)
  d. *Ik *doe* werken<sub>inf</sub>  
      I     do     work  
      ‘I’m working’?? (see later)

Southern Dutch i.e. Flemish, *gaan* is auxiliary of tense denoting a future modal reading that is no longer rooted in the present (cf. Haegeman 1990: 81):

(2)  
  a. *Gaan* dat nog kunnen?  
      go     that  can<sub>inf</sub>  
      ‘Is that going to be successful?’
  
  b. *Gaan* dat op termijn zijn?  
      go     that  in (short) term  be<sub>inf</sub>  
      ‘Is that going to be in a short term?’

Standard Dutch:
  c. Hij *gaat* een boek schrijven  
      he    go     a     book     write  
      ‘He will write a book’/‘He is about to write a book’
      ‘He is already writing and the end-product will be a book’
  
  d. Hij *gaat* de jongen doodslaan  
      he    go     the     boy     dead     beat  
      ‘He will beat the boy dead’/‘He is going to beat the boy dead’
      ‘He is already beating the boy until he is dead’
He will beat the boy / 'He is going to beat the boy'
not possible: 'He is already beating the boy'

Aim of the talk:
- questioning the link between DO-support as a dummy auxiliary and present tense
  - monolingual and child acquisition: DO 'go'/'do' as device in order to acquire finite verb movement /V2
  - spoken standard Dutch of monolingual and bilingual speakers: aux+inf as in (1)?
  - dialectal/regional DO-support as a dummy auxiliary and present tense: regional Dutch variety
- test derivational complexity hypothesis (Blom and De Korte 2011)

Absence of *doen* ‘do’ +inf in SD: “due to a conscious process of purification of the language in which it was purged of its supposedly illogical or superfluous aspects (…). So what basically seems to be a ‘natural’ tendency is kept from spreading into the most prestigious spoken variant by a deliberate act” (Auer 2004: 74). (SAND 2008: 41): *doen*+inf ‘do’ in declarative sentences can be found throughout the Dutch dialects with the exception of the provinces Friesland, Groningen and Drenthe.

1.1 Linguistic practices
Aux+inf structure has been analyzed as DO-support in:
- in young Dutch child varieties in order to acquire the verbal inflection and its position in root sentences (so-called verb-second (V2) phenomenon);
- in non-standard adult varieties in order to avoid the inflection of morpho-logical compound verbs.
- In both cases, it is assumed that aux+inf always concerns DO-support expressing the same meaning as its synthetic equivalent i.e. expressing present tense.

The process of erasure (Irvine 2001): the aux+inf structure is (always) considered a dummy one in child language and in so-called non-standard varieties whereas it is considered undoubtedly meaningful in adult standard Dutch. The consequences of this process are two-fold:
- linguists ignore to pay attention to so-called non-standard uses of aux+inf in adult standard Dutch and/or
- they ignore aux+inf structures in child and regional/dialect Dutch in which DO cannot be analyzed as a dummy auxiliary.

1.2 Word order in Dutch
Zwart (1997): variable movement in root clauses to C, verb moves up to C, via AGR and TNS in root clauses with inversion, as in (3b) but verb stays in AGR in root clauses with a straight order, as in (3a):
(3) V2-straight order (AGR)
a. Ik heb een appel gegeten.
   I have an apple eaten
b. Toen heb ik een appel gegeten.
   then have I an apple eaten

No V2-movement in non-root clauses:

(4) Zij zegt dat ik een appel gegeten heb.
   she says that I an apple eaten have

DO-support in Dutch child language:
Blom & De Korte (2011: 908): V2-inverted order involves an additional movement and is derivationally more complex than the V2-straight order.

2 Aux+inf structure in experimental monolingual and bilingual child data
2.1 Monolingual child language: spontaneous production data
(5) Jordens (1990: 1433-34)
   a. We gaan allemaal ete (3;1)
      we go all eat
      “We are all eating”
   Van Kampen (1997: 46)
   b. Ik doe ook praten (S. 3;5.2)
      I do also talk
      “I am talking too”

2.2 Monolingual child language: experimental production data
Zuckerman (2001) tested 24 children in two age groups: 10 children aged 3;0 to 3;11 and 14 children aged 4;8 to 5;0.

(6) Experimenter producing a full coordinating structure (OVf): “Dit is de man die het brood snijdt en dit is de man die de tomaat snijdt.” ‘This is the man who the bread cuts and this is the man who the tomato cuts’
   Experimenter producing a truncated coordinating structure (VfO): “Dus deze man snijdt het brood en deze man ...” ‘So this man cuts the bread and this man.....”

   Expected answer of the child:
   “..... snijdt de tomaat (VfO)” ‘.....cuts the tomato’
Table 1: The distribution of the tokens of DO-support (numerator) and all utterances (denominator) (taken from Zuckerman 2001: 127)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dutch L1 children n = 10</th>
<th>Dutch L1 children n = 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>3;0 – 3;11</td>
<td>4;8 - 5;0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>Dutch (from Limburg and Groningen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-root</strong></td>
<td>4/141 3%</td>
<td>0/210 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Root</strong></td>
<td>33/145 23%</td>
<td>6/210 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign.</strong></td>
<td>$t= 2.583$, df= 18, $p&lt;0.05$</td>
<td>not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Individual variation: the distribution of the tokens of DO-support in root clauses by monolingual children, age 3;0 - 3;11 (taken from Zuckerman (2001: 126), compare with Table 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>DO-support</th>
<th>province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>3;0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Groningen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tessa</td>
<td>3;0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>3;2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jelle</td>
<td>3;7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagmar</td>
<td>3;9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>3;2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo</td>
<td>3;6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowin</td>
<td>3;10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nils</td>
<td>3;10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teun</td>
<td>3;11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total root</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>33/145 = 23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hulk & Cornips (2005):
Table 3: The distribution of the tokens of DO-support by two L1 children, age 3;5 - 3;9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>DO-support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>root</strong></td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>3;5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>3;9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total root</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/73 = 16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>non-root</strong></td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>3;5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>3;9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total non-root</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/68 = 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>significant</strong></td>
<td>$x^2=9.39$, df=1, $p&lt;.01$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum - L1 acquisition:
- The hypothesis of derivational complexity is supported in monolingual acquisition: the young children use aux+inf structure significantly more in root (V2-straight order) than in non-root clauses. Most economical structure (Zuckerman 2001).
- The aux+inf structure appears to be an individual child strategy
- The lexical choice between the auxiliaries gaan 'go' or doen 'do' appears to be induced by input.
2.2.1 Evidence for present tense interpretation of *gaan*+inf -> DO-support/dummy use of DO
- description of picture pairs;
- Comprehension experiment by Zuckerman (2001:132) in which monolingual children presented with a stimulus question were asked to point to a picture representing three different time aspects: present, future and past reveal that children in the age range from three through four interpret sentences of the *gaan*+inf structure as an ongoing event.

2.2.2 The process of erasure
Aux+inf in monolingual Dutch child language is analysed as completely different from standard adult language:
- it is considered a dummy one in child language expressing present tense
- it is considered standard in adult Dutch with the modal and aspectual readings as in (1) but
- Lalleman (1986: 74):
  
  (7) Wat *gaat* het hondje *doen*? Het hondje *gaat* blaffen!
  what goes the doggie do? the doggie goes bark
  ‘What does the doggie do? The doggie is barking!’

Child directed speech in regional Dutch or dialect for the use of *doen*+inf (Giesbers 1983-1984:61):
  
  (8) Doe jij lief spelen?
  do you sweet play
  ‘Are you playing in a sweet way?’

Thus:
- (7) is a possible, grammatical option in standard Dutch although in a specific genre, i.e. child directed speech.
- Children are exposed to *gaan*+inf expressing present tense from early on.
- Process of erasure by which standard structures in (1) supposedly shared by the linguistic community are picked out whereas others, as in (7) are ignored.

Developmental path:
- L1’s have to unlearn the use of present tense reading in other adult genres.
- L1’s have to acquire the standard temporal (future) and aspectual (inchoative) readings of the aux+inf structure.
- The learning task of L1’s targeting standard Dutch consists in increasing the subset of aux+inf to a superset in which this type of structure occurs in all clause types i.e. both root and non-root clauses.

2.3 Bilingual: Dutch/Moroccan, Dutch/Turkish, Dutch/Surinamese and Dutch/Ghanaian child language: experimental production data
Bilingual children:
- 2L1 and/or
- child L2 and/or
- children in between 2L1 – child L2 (descendants of migrants)- cross-linguistic influence?

Hulk & Cornips (2005):
• do children acquiring Dutch as bilinguals go through the same aux+inf stage (DO-support?)
• do they show the same root - non-root clause asymmetry as their monolingual peers?

Table 4: The distribution of the tokens of DO-support by the youngest bilingual children, ages 3;0 - 3;10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ewe/ Akan//Sranan/ Moroccan-Arabic/Turkish</th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>DO-support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-root</td>
<td>Youssra</td>
<td>3;0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>3;2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romy</td>
<td>3;2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>3;5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stefano</td>
<td>3;10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>3;6</td>
<td>15/31 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-root</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18/175 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root</td>
<td>Youssra</td>
<td>3;0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>3;2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romy</td>
<td>3;2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>3;5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stefano</td>
<td>3;10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>3;6</td>
<td>10/26 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total root</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16/194 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The younger and the older bilingual children use non-target S-Vf-O word order in 20% of the cases instead of the target S-O-Vf:

(10) Experimenter: Dus dit is de man +...
so this is the man

Stefano:++ die strijk de broek
who irons the trousers
S Vf O

Hulk & Cornips (2005): non-target S-Vf-O word in the non-root clause is missetting the head parameter for IP in Dutch to head initial, possibly under the influence of their other languages which are all SIVO. Monolingual and bilingual children appear to take different routes:
• the monolinguals struggle with the word order in root clauses, going through a (short) aux+inf stage,
• bilinguals struggle with the word order in non-root clauses and hardly use aux+inf.

Blom & De Korte (2011) designed an experimental task containing three different word order conditions that differ in derivational complexity:
• V2-straight order,
• V2-inverted order and
• a non-root clause
31 children classified as child L2 with an age range between 4;8 and 8;2: 10 Dutch/Turkish and 21 Dutch/Moroccan. Result: confirmation of the derivational complexity hypothesis but aux+inf structure is an individual child strategy.

In sum:

- monolingual children go through an aux+inf stage supporting the hypothesis of derivational complexity (Zuckerman 2001, Blom & De Korte 2011).
- The lexical choice between gaan ‘go’ or doen ‘do’ is induced by input (Zuckerman 2001).
- The aux+inf structure appears to be an individual strategy in both mono- and bilingual children.
- On the one hand, the monolingual and bilingual children converge. Blom & De Korte (2011): bilingual Dutch/Moroccan and Dutch/Turkish children go through the same aux+inf stage,
- On the other hand, Hulk & Cornips (2005) show that the bilingual children (with the exception of one Dutch/French child) hardly make use of aux+inf. Let us now examine another type of bilingual child acquirers i.e. English/Dutch children.

2.4 Bilingual English/Dutch children

(11) I do wash my hands

Early Child Bilingualism-project (cf. Unsworth et al. 2011): 170 English/Dutch bilinguals, aged 3 to 17 years, three equally divided types of clauses: non-root order (SOV), V2-straight order (SVO) and V2-inverted order (PPVSO) by means of a picture description task (based on those of Zuckerman’s 2001 and, in particular, Blom & De Korte 2011).

Table 1: Number of children producing aux+inf structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n=170</th>
<th>total # of children</th>
<th># children using aux+inf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>young 3-5 yrs</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old &gt; 6 yrs</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.65 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher’s Exact test p< .0001

- Only 28 out of 170 children (16%) produce aux+inf: individual strategy
- Young children produce significantly more aux+inf than the children older than 6 years.

Table 2: Aux+inf tokens (n=146) across three expected clause-types per age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>young: 3-5 yrs</th>
<th>old: &gt; 6 yrs</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aux+inf %</td>
<td>aux+inf %</td>
<td>aux+inf %</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2 INVERTED</td>
<td>67/140</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2 STRAIGHT</td>
<td>50/140</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-ROOT</td>
<td>23/140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x² = 22.032, df=2, p< 0.0001
• Confirmation of the derivational complexity hypothesis (for all tokens and for youngest subjects): V2-inverted < V2-straight < non-root clauses.

Table 3: Targetlike aux+inf tokens (n=82) across three clause-types per age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targetlike clause-types</th>
<th>*targetlike tokens n=82</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AdvVSO</td>
<td>41/82</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>32/82</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>9/82</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 19.827, \text{ df} = 2, p < .0001; \text{ *produced object but subject is optional} \]

Table 4: Aux+inf tokens with non-targetlike AuxVO order across two root clause-types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AuxVO</th>
<th>not targetlike</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V2 INVERTED</td>
<td>7/57</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2 STRAIGHT</td>
<td>10/47</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>17/104</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher’s Exact test p = .2882 (n.s.)

(12) and (13): ‘missetting’ the head parameter for IP as head initial (as in English) instead of head final (as in Dutch):

• Aux+inf structure in the ungrammatical AuxVO order in root clause:
  (12) SauxVO *De jongens gaan aaien een hond
  the boys go stroke a dog
  ‘The boys are stroking a dog’

• Aux+inf structure in the ungrammatical AuxOV order in non-root clause:
  (13) SauxOV *dat de jongen gaat een boek lezen
  that the boy goes a book read
  ‘that the boy is reading a book’

In sum:

• Blom & De Korte (2011): Dutch/Moroccan and Dutch/Turkish go through an aux+inf stage confirming the derivational complexity hypothesis.
• Early Child Bilingualism project (Unsworth et al 2011): Dutch/English children go through an aux+inf stage confirming the derivational complexity hypothesis.
• Some Dutch/English children: missetting head parameter IP as head initial
• Hulk & Cornips (2005): Dutch/Moroccan, Dutch/Surinamese and Dutch/Ghanaian children - missetting head parameter IP as head initial
• Important: for all children in all experiments: aux+inf is an individual strategy

3. Aux+inf in (older child and adolescent) bilingual spontaneous speech

3.1 Older bilingual Dutch/Turkish and Dutch/Moroccan children telling jokes
The recordings took place in 1998: 36 out of 69 (52%) bilingual children use 86 tokens of gaan+inf; transcript counts 7.586 words (cf. Cornips 2000).
Hij ging springen toen ging ’t hij ook proberen toen... hij ging op z’n kop vallen....
He jumped, then he tried it too and then he fell on his head

Een uurtje later ging Jantje weer vragen (Mement, D/T)
an hour later went Jantje again ask
‘Jantje was (going to) asking again an hour later

Child 1: ‘Jantje was op school, en ze deed steeds broembroem’
naapt, hij naapt mij. Hij gaat me naäpen.’

Child 1: ‘Jantje was at school and she said broembroem again and again’
Child 2: [indignant] ‘(s)he has it [the joke] from me, he is imitating me, stop stop he is imitating me, he
is imitating me. He goes me imitate’

a. Ging Jantje weer lopen lopen
Went Jantje again walk walk
b. Toen ging ’ie huilen huilen huilen [Harun, D/T]
then went he cry cry cry

Lopen twee mannen door de Damstraat en toen…
walk two men through the Damstreet and then…. ‘There are two men who walk through Amsterdam and then…’

Ging hij onder de bed kijken
Went he under the bed look

Imperative clause (n=6)
Zeit de Marokkaan: “Ga eerst je handen wassen.”
Said the Moroccan go first your hands wash
‘The Moroccan said: “first wash your hands”

Imperative clause with subject (n=1)
Ga jij maar eten, kleine eendje
go you just eat_{inf} little duck

V2-inverted order (n=34)
10
(23) En gingtie ‘nee’ zeggen
and went-he ‘no’ say_{inf}

ROOT CLAUSE – V2 STRAIGHT ORDER (DO POSITIONED IN AGR):
declarative clause (n=36)
(24) Jantje ging door de bos wandelen
Jan_{DIM} went through the forest walk_{inf}

root clause V3 order (n=1)
(25) en toen Marokkaan ging vallen
and then Moroccan went fall_{inf}

Results:
• no tokens of negative, interrogative, and non-root clauses.
• gaan+inf is used more in V2-inverted (n=51) than in V2-straight (n=37) order but this is not a significant distribution ($\chi^2 = 2.227$, df =1, p=.1356).
• limitations of the corpus: The type/token distribution per root clause is clearly due to the frequent use of narrative-V1 that is a characteristic of this genre as no non-root clauses

Conclusion:
• Aux+inf structure is not used as an acquisition device
• use of aux+inf to denote an ongoing event in addition to expressing future modal and inchoative aspect readings
• question: is it the case that present tense reading of aux+inf is not inherently connected to the so-called dummy use of the auxiliary part, but, instead is part of spoken standard Dutch grammar?

3.2 Adolescent bilingual spontaneous speech
(26) a Ga je gaan?
go you go_{inf}
‘Do you go?’
b Ik ga je zien
I go you see_{inf}
‘I see you’

Spontaneous speech of adolescents of Surinamese, Creole descent in Rotterdam (Cornips 2002, Cornips & De Rooij (to appear)).:
(27) a in de straat ga je het niet horen
in the street go you it not hear
‘You don’t hear it in the street’
b dat je bun met je meisje gaat blijven nooit
that you well with your girl go remain never
‘You will never have a permanent good relationship with your girl’

c gaat ie gek worden
goes he crazy get
‘He gets crazy’

Non-intentional gaan+inf:
(28) we gaan het even op het bandje laten horen
we go it for a moment on the tape let hear
‘We let the tape play for you so you can hear it’

Doen+inf in standard Dutch area: bilingual Dutch/Moroccan and Dutch/Turkish adolescents in Utrecht:
(29) a. dan doe je al denken [Metin, D/T]
then do you already think
‘Then you already think’

b. deden we iedere keer uitgaan [Badir, M/D]
did we every time go out
‘We went out every time’

Aux+inf in hybrid Dutch varieties such as Moroccan Arabic-Dutch and Turkish-Dutch code-switching varieties: Boumans (1998: 233) and Backus (1996):

Moroccan Arabic/Dutch
(30) a. ma ka-t-dir-ha-š voelen?
NEG ASP-2-do-3SG.F NEG feelinf
‘Don’t you feel it.’

Turkish/Dutch
b Jun’de afstuderen yapacak
‘She does graduate in June.’

In sum:
• older bilingual and adolescent Dutch/Surinamese, Dutch/Moroccan and Dutch/Turkish children and individual speakers do not use aux+inf as a part of an acquisition procedure to facilitate the acquisition of V2-inverted and V2-straight in Dutch root clauses.
• Instead, in addition to the future modal reading and inchoative aspect, some tokens of gaan+inf indicates that these older bilingual children produce it also to denote an ongoing event.
• Thus: present tense reading may be considered a grammatical option in spoken Dutch and in child directed speech (Lalleman 1986:73)
• in all these cases a present tense reading of aux+inf cannot be excluded
• The coupling of the present tense reading to the functional use of aux+inf as a short term substitute for V2 signals the process of erasure in which so-called the non-standard readings
of a certain type of construction that is considered standard are ignored by linguists i.e. the present tense reading of aux+inf as part of standard Dutch as well.

3.3.1 Doen+inf in dialect varieties and iconization
(i) if doen+inf is allowed in a negative clause with a stative verb, then
(ii) doen+inf is also allowed in a negative clause with a dynamic verb, then
(iii) doen+inf also occurs in a declarative and interrogative clause.
(iv) if doen+inf occurs in an imperative clause, then it also shows up in a declarative clause.

Process of iconization:
• Duinhoven (1994: 111): adults use doen+inf as a strategy in order to avoid the morphological complexity of compound verbs (see also Giesbers 1983-84).
• Nuijten (1962: 156): dialect speakers who do not have a good command of Standard Dutch use doen+inf
• Doen+inf is used by small children or in child directed speech by adults (cf. Giesbers 1983-84, Duinhoven 1994: 111, Tieken 1990)
  o doen+inf stereotyped and marginalized as ‘childish’ when adults use it among each other (Tieken-Boon van Ostade et al. 1998: 1).


“Zij:           Goed zo. Is Ventje fijn met baas uit wezen doene daan?
Hondje:        Wrrrraf! Waf!
Hij:           Ja, ja ik weet het. Ventje heeft nog geen brokje kregen doene daan.
Zij:           Hier is vrouw al met brokje. Ventje lekker brokje eten doene daan.
               (....)....
Zij:           ...Als er andere mensen bij zijn, moeten we niet doene daan zeggen, hoor.”

“She:           Oh lookee here, my baby-waybe is back from his walky-walk!
Doggy:         Woof, woof!
He:            Yes, siree. He did a great big doggie-do, and now he wants his dinner-winner.
She:           Well here comes mommy with a great bigbowl. Doggie-woggie’s gonna eat it right up, aren’t you boy?
               (....)
She:           I sure hope we can remember to cut out the talkie-walky talk when people are around”

(Harris 1984: 303): “presupposes that standard and nonstandard syntactic variants are non-rooted in structurally identical grammars” “encourages the impression that differences between the standard and a particular vernacular are merely superficial and tend to obscure whatever deep-seated divergences there might exist between the two varieties”.

3.3.2 Doen+infinitive in spoken bidialectal adult Dutch i.e. Heerlen Dutch
[IP [f [ASP [ASP doen [VP NP [V V]]]]]]

Empirical Heerlen Dutch corpus:
ROOT CLAUSE – V2 INVERTED ORDER (DO POSITIONED IN C):

V1 with topic drop (n=2)

(31) doe een keer in de week nog zaalvoetballen
do one time in the week also soccer-indoor play
‘(I) play once a week indoor soccer’

V2-inverted order (n=15)

(32) ...dan doe ik hem föhnen...
then do I him blow-dry
‘then, I (always) blow-dry him’

interrogative clause (n=2)

(33) ...doe je ook auto’s spuiten en zo?...
Do you also cars spray-paint and so
‘Do you spray cars and so?’

interrogative clause with negation (n=1)

(34) Waarom doen ze dat (...)? niet aan koppelen?
why do they that not P attach
‘Why don’t they attach it?’

imperative clause (n=1)

(35) ...doe nou die mensen terughalen in het werk (13: Michiel)
do those people back-fetch in the work
‘Fetch those people back into work’

ROOT CLAUSE – V2 STRAIGHT ORDER (DO POSITIONED IN AGR):

declarative clause (n=11)

(36) ...ik doe timmeren en ophouwen (12: Anton)
do I hammer and build-up
‘I am a carpenter and a builder’

NON-ROOT CLAUSE (DO POSITIONED IN VP):

declarative clause (n=1)

(37) als je voetballen doet
if you soccer-play do
‘if you play soccer’

• Doen ‘do’ is present in declarative, interrogative, imperative and negative root, and non-root clauses.
• Doen ‘do’ is used more in root clauses with V2-inverted (n=21) than in V2-straight orders (n=11) but this distribution is not significant ($x^2 = 3.125$, df= 1, p=.0771).
• Doen+inf is more frequent in root clauses than in non-root clauses (n=1) ($x^2 = 18,182$, df= 2, p=.0001). Thus, it’s not the type but the token distribution that confirms at first sight a significant distribution between root and non-root clauses.
• Face-to-face conversations in the Spoken Dutch Corpus of 3 million words: 36,549 root (79%) and 7,847 (21%) non-root clauses.
• Heerlen Dutch corpus: one token in non-root clause
• It is likely that the distribution of *doen*+inf tokens in (29) through (35) simply reflects the type/token distribution of the three clause-types (without aux+inf) in this type of speech sample

4. Conclusion
Process of erasure (Irvine 2001) simplifying the field
However:
• in the so-called standard Dutch area, adults use *gaan*+inf with a present tense reading as a grammatical option in a specific genre, namely child directed speech and in regular discourse. In fact, this reading of *gaan*+inf should be included in the standard grammar;
• both monolingual and bilingual adolescents use aux+inf structure in their spontaneous standard Dutch speech that is considered ungrammatical in the standard Dutch grammar. In this sample, aux+inf does not express intentionality. This reading should be present in the standard grammar as well
• monolingual and bilingual children use *gaan*+inf that denotes an ongoing event. Since adolescents and adults use this as well in spoken mode, these children produce a grammatical option both in spontaneous and experimental data and, subsequently, *gaan* in aux+inf is not a dummy auxiliary;
• the use of DO in *doen*+inf in a regional spoken speech cannot be analyzed as a dummy one since it expresses habitual aspect that can not be expressed in this way in standard Dutch.

Derivational complexity hypothesis by Blom & De Korte (2011)
• yes for monolingual children (Zuckerman 2001, Hulk & Cornips 2005)
• yes for bilingual children but not all
• aux+inf is individual strategy

But:
• wrt the child experimental data: it is not the type but the token distribution that confirms the hypothesis. Aux+inf occurs in all three clause-types.
• wrt to the spontaneous speech samples, the token distribution of the aux+inf tokens reflects the type/token distribution of the three clause-types in the speech sample.
• It is a question whether frequencies is a reliable measure to confirm or reject the derivational complexity hypothesis since various types of spontaneous speech samples belong to different genres with different structural properties.
• What is needed for a maximal comparison is: (i) experimental data for both monolingual and bilingual adults and children, (ii) spontaneous speech data of the same genre for both monolingual and bilingual adults and children, in addition to child-directed speech.
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