Linguistic planning of an utterance is at least partially complex sentence production shows cognitive load induced by less frequent dative verbs can have a significant effect on the rates of substitution of the dative for the accusative by L1 speakers.

A significant effect of verb change in the rates of substitution of the dative for the accusative by L1 Turkish speakers. In such an elicited production task, dative verbs can be more common in L1 Turkish speakers.

Main Problem:
Turkish embedded clauses are realized as nominalizations, so the case marking on the subject changes as a function of embedding:

Possible case violation during the production of Turkish embedded clauses:
1) The omission of the genitive on the embedded subject
   - Message/Content:
     The actor fainted.
   - Utterance (with elaborations)
     The actor fainting read(I).

2) The substitution of the accusative for the dative or vice versa on the embedded nominalized object
   - The actor's fainting read(I) X The actor's fainting commented(I)

In Turkish, the case marking on the object is determined by the verb so another possible case violation as a result of a verb change:

Step 1: Replace the verb in the second sentence with the independent verb
Step 2: Combine the second sentence with the first one

Target Sentence Structure:
İlaçlar yüzünden oyuncu bayıldı.
Made due to the actor fainted

Accusative verb: "Ilaçlar" (İlaçlar'ın read(I))
Dative verb: "Yüzünden" (Yüzünden'ın read(I))

Results:

Genitive omission on the embedded subject
- A significant effect of subject group across all case violation types, with higher rates in L2 speakers.
- A significant effect of matrix verb type in the rates of genitive omission by L1 Turkish speakers.

Substitution of the accusative for the dative on the embedded nominalized object
- A significant effect of verb change in the rates of substitution of the dative for the accusative by both L1 and L2 Turkish speakers.

Substitution of the dative for the accusative on the embedded nominalized object
- A significant effect of verb type change in the rates of substitution of the dative for the accusative by both L1 and L2 Turkish speakers.

Discussion:
L1 speakers omitted the genitive on the embedded subject across conditions.
- Tendency to initiate a sentence production with a simple structure (i.e., the nominative over the genitive case, especially under time pressure) as a result of incremental sentence planning.
- The scope of sentence planning: The embedded subject could not be planned readily within a larger VP.
- Decision to embed must occur either concurrently with the nominalization of the embedded verb, or soon after the subject articulation.

L2 speakers omitted the genitive much more than L1 speakers.
- Structural complexity might have had a larger effect on the scope of their advance sentence planning.

Verb type effect on the genitive omission rates:
- L1 speakers omitted the genitive more with the accusative-assigning matrix verb (p < .05), whereas L2 speakers omitted it more with the dative-assigning one (p > .05).
- Cognitive load induced by less frequent dative verbs can have opposing effects on L1 and L2 advance sentence planning.
  - In such an elicited production task, dative-assigning verbs might have helped the L1 speakers allocate more attentional resources to the target (embedded) sentence structure.
  - The same verbs might have increased the L2 speakers' computational capacity, and thus yielded more omission errors.

Verb type effect on the substitution error rates:
- The same asymmetry in the substitution error rates:
  - More erroneous inflections of the accusative case with a dative-assigning verb.
  - Even when there was no change in the verb type, both subject groups substituted the accusative (structural) for the dative (lexical) case on the nominalized object.

Conclusion:
L1 and L2 speakers' complex sentence production show both quantitative (i.e., more error rates in L2 group) and qualitative differences (i.e., genitive omission was modulated by the matrix verb type in L1 group).
- Especially in L1 complex sentence production, incremental sentence planning is disrupted by the matrix verb type, such that advance sentence planning can either include an embedding or not.