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Raw data of five dialect phenomena

1. complementizer agreement (CA)
   (1) da-n Pol-en Jan goan kommen
   that-cl Pol and Jan go-PIll come
   ‘that Pol and Jan will come.’
   
2. clitic doubling (CD)
   (2) da-ze zaaiie lachen.
   that-cl theylaugh nowadays
   ‘they are laughing.’

3. short do rephases (SDR)
   (3) A: le slaapt rie. B: le doet.
   He sleeps not he does
   ‘A: He’s not sleeping. B: Yes, he is.’

4. negative clitic (NEG)
   (4) Hij en slaapt nie.
   he NEG sleeps no
   ‘He doesn’t sleep.’

5. clitics on yes and no (CYN)
   (5) A: Wil je nog koffie? B: Jaa-k.
   Will you PART coffee? Yes-I
   ‘Will you PART coffee? Yes-I.’

… and plot those (dis)similarities in a low-dimensional space:

Step #1: statistical analysis of the aggregate data

- Van Craenenbroeck's analysis of clitic doubling:
  - strong pronouns in doubling dialects are pro-DPs,
  - subject clitics are pro-Ops.

- The occurrence of clitics on 'yes' and 'no' are derived from short do rephases: they involve higher (further) elision of an already truncated structure.

- Supporting evidence: these-expletives in short do replies and yes/no-clitics.

Step #2: three parameters

First parameter: setting apart CA
- Van Craenenbroeck's analysis of clitic doubling:
  - strong pronouns in doubling dialects are pro-DPs,
  - subject clitics are pro-Ops.

Second parameter: setting apart CD
- starting point: van Craenenbroeck and van Koppen's analysis of clitic doubling:
  - strong pronouns in doubling dialects are pro-DPs,
  - subject clitics are pro-Ops.

Step #3: parameter interactions

- 86% of the dialects have the same value for the D-parameter and the PolP-parameter.
- moreover, all the non-matching dialect locations (red on the map below) are situated in the transition zone between Flemish and Dutch.

Step #4: Conclusion
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