

# Enhancing Korean Dependency Parsing with Morphosyntactic Features

Jungyeul Park<sup>1</sup> Yige Chen<sup>2</sup> Kyuwon Kim<sup>3</sup> KyungTae Lim<sup>4</sup> Chulwoo Park<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The University of British Columbia, Canada

<sup>2</sup>The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

<sup>3</sup>Seoul National University, South Korea

<sup>4</sup>KAIST, South Korea <sup>5</sup>Anyang University, South Korea

<https://github.com/jungyeul/k-unidive>

## Abstract

This paper introduces UniDive for Korean, an integrated framework that bridges Universal Dependencies (UD) and Universal Morphology (UniMorph) to enhance the representation and processing of Korean morphosyntax. Korean’s rich inflectional morphology and flexible word order pose challenges for existing frameworks, which often treat morphology and syntax separately, leading to inconsistencies in linguistic analysis. UniDive unifies syntactic and morphological annotations by preserving syntactic dependencies while incorporating UniMorph-derived features, improving consistency in annotation. We construct an integrated dataset and apply it to dependency parsing, demonstrating that enriched morphosyntactic features enhance parsing accuracy, particularly in distinguishing grammatical relations influenced by morphology. Our experiments, conducted with both encoder-only and decoder-only models, confirm that explicit morphological information contributes to more accurate syntactic analysis.

## 1 Introduction

Modeling morphosyntactic structures in agglutinative languages such as Korean presents significant challenges due to their rich inflectional morphology, non-trivial word segmentation, and complex syntactic constructions. Unlike isolating languages, where words and morphemes align clearly with syntactic units, Korean’s extensive use of suffixes to express grammatical relations complicates traditional approaches to syntactic annotation and parsing. As a result, computational frameworks must go beyond conventional word-based representations to effectively capture both morphological and syntactic properties.

The Universal Dependencies (UD) framework (de Marneffe et al., 2021) has emerged as a widely adopted standard for syntactic annotation, facilitating cross-linguistic comparisons and multilingual

NLP. However, its treatment of morphological information remains limited, especially in agglutinative languages like Korean, where morphosyntactic dependencies are deeply intertwined. The UniMorph project (Batsuren et al., 2022) complements UD by providing a detailed morphological schema for inflectional paradigms but does not encode syntactic dependencies. The lack of integration between these two frameworks leads to inconsistencies, particularly when representing functional morphemes, argument structures, and the boundary between morphology and syntax. To address these issues, we explore the integration of UniMorph and UD under the UniDive framework, which aims to harmonize morphological and syntactic representations in a more systematic way. UniDive proposes a morphosyntactic data structure where lexical words are represented as separate nodes in a dependency graph, while functional words and morphemes contribute feature-based information rather than being treated as independent syntactic units. This approach not only reduces segmentation inconsistencies but also enables better handling of non-concatenative morphology, periphrastic expressions, and argument structures encapsulated within words.

Recent efforts in Korean linguistic resources, such as K-UD (Kim et al., 2024) and K-UniMorph (Jo et al., 2023), have attempted to address these challenges. K-UD provides a syntactically annotated corpus following the UD framework (Noh et al., 2018; Chun et al., 2018), while K-UniMorph offers a morphological dataset aligned with UniMorph’s schema. However, these resources were developed independently, leading to gaps and inconsistencies in transitioning between morphological and syntactic representations.

This paper introduces a UniDive dataset for Korean, designed to enhance the representation of Korean morphosyntactic structures by integrating Google’s Korean UD (McDonald et al., 2013)

within the UniDive framework. We present its practical implementation, demonstrating how this approach improves syntactic parsing, enhances morphosyntactic analysis, and benefits downstream NLP tasks. By adopting this unified representation, we aim to contribute to the development of linguistic resources for Korean and other agglutinative languages while advancing computational methodologies for processing morphologically rich languages.

## 2 Related Work

The Universal Dependencies (UD) framework has established itself as a leading standard for syntactic annotation across a wide variety of languages. Its primary goal is to provide a unified, language-agnostic representation of syntactic structures, enabling cross-linguistic comparisons and facilitating multilingual natural language processing (NLP) tasks. However, while UD has proven effective for many languages, its ability to represent the morphosyntactic complexity of agglutinative languages such as Korean remains limited. The representation of fine-grained morphological details, which are essential for accurate syntactic parsing in Korean, often lacks depth in UD’s annotation scheme (Chen et al., 2022).

The UniMorph project complements UD by focusing on the morphological aspect of linguistic data. UniMorph standardizes the representation of inflectional paradigms across languages, offering a rich resource for morphological analysis. While UniMorph provides detailed morphological annotations, it does not explicitly encode syntactic dependencies. This separation between morphology and syntax poses challenges for languages like Korean, where morphological and syntactic properties are inherently associated. For instance, Korean’s extensive use of suffixes to denote case, tense, and aspect requires a more integrated approach to handle morphosyntactic interactions effectively.

Prior efforts to address these limitations include language-specific adaptations of UD and UniMorph. Projects such as K-UD (Kim et al., 2024) and K-UniMorph (Jo et al., 2023) have made significant contributions in applying these frameworks to Korean. K-UD offers syntactic annotations within the UD framework, while K-UniMorph provides a rich set of morphological annotations aligned with the UniMorph schema. Despite these advancements, the lack of integration between K-UD and

K-UniMorph limits their utility for tasks requiring a unified morphosyntactic representation.

UniDive introduces a novel approach to bridging this gap by integrating UD and UniMorph into a single, cohesive framework. By aligning morphological and syntactic representations, UniDive ensures consistency and compatibility, enabling a more comprehensive analysis of morphosyntactic structures. This approach is particularly beneficial for morphologically rich languages like Korean, where existing frameworks often fail to capture the intricate relationships between morphology and syntax. Additionally, the UniDive framework extends the applicability of UD and UniMorph to other morphologically rich languages, addressing challenges such as non-concatenative morphology, complex agreement patterns, and free word order. By providing a unified structure, UniDive facilitates the development of linguistic resources that are both theoretically robust and computationally efficient. Our work builds on these prior efforts by introducing an integrated dataset for Korean that aligns K-UD and K-UniMorph within the UniDive framework.

## 3 Morphosyntactic Features

In Universal Dependencies, morphosyntactic features provide detailed grammatical information about words, which defines their tense, aspect, mood, case, number, person, politeness level, and more. These features contribute to accurate syntactic parsing, morphological analysis, and cross-linguistic comparison. Below is an introduction to key UD morphosyntactic features:

CASE marks the grammatical role of a noun phrase in a sentence, such as ablative, accusative, conjunctive, dative, disjunctive, genitive, instrumental, locative, or nominative. EVIDENT refers to evidentiality, distinguishing whether the speaker has firsthand knowledge, inferred knowledge, non-firsthand knowledge, or reported information. MOOD expresses the attitude of the speaker toward the action, including conditional, general conditional, general-potential conditional, potential conditional, desiderative, imperative, indicative, interrogative, necessity, optative, and potential moods. NUMTYPE identifies numerals and their types, such as cardinal numbers. PERSON distinguishes between singular and plural forms, with plural being explicitly marked. Person indicates who is performing the action, whether first person,

second person, or third person. PERSON[PSOR] specifies the possessor’s person in possessive structures, with distinctions for first person, second person, and third person. POLITE reflects the level of politeness or formality in speech, with values for elevated politeness, formal speech, and humble speech. PRONTYPE categorizes pronouns into different types, such as articles, demonstratives, indefinite pronouns, interrogative pronouns, personal pronouns, and reciprocal pronouns. TENSE conveys time reference, distinguishing between present and other tenses. VERBFORM describes how a verb is used, such as converb, finite verb, participle, or verbal noun. VOICE indicates the relationship between the verb’s subject and the action, including causative, causative-passive, passive, reciprocal, and reflexive constructions.

Table 1 shows the morphosyntactic features used in UD and their corresponding annotations in Korean. These features capture key grammatical distinctions across languages and help morphological tagging, syntactic analysis, and linguistic resource development. They include ASPECT, which differentiates habitual, perfective, and progressive actions; CASE, which marks the grammatical roles of nouns; EVIDENTIALITY, which indicates the source of knowledge; and MOOD, which reflects the speaker’s attitude or modality. Additionally, TENSE and VERBFORM distinguish between different time references and verbal inflections, while VOICE accounts for relationships between subjects and actions. These morphosyntactic annotations provide a structured framework for analyzing linguistic variations and ensuring cross-linguistic compatibility in natural language processing tasks.

The updated morphosyntactic features for Korean compared to K-UniMorph (Jo et al., 2023) introduce finer distinctions in case marking, evidentiality, interrogativity, mood, and voice, significantly enhancing the accuracy of linguistic annotation. In case marking, new categories such as comitative, vocative, comparative, and allative have been introduced to better capture distinctions in accompaniment, direct address, comparison, and movement towards a location. These refinements provide a more precise representation of noun phrase functions that were previously conflated under broader categories.

Evidentiality and mood have also been significantly expanded. While previous versions recognize inferential evidentiality, the new system includes hearsay and non-firsthand evidentiality,

which are essential for distinguishing reported speech and indirectly obtained knowledge in Korean. Mood distinctions have been extended to include realis and irrealis, marking factual versus hypothetical statements, as well as purposive and obligative moods, which indicate intent and necessity. These refinements improve the representation of modality, particularly in formal and polite speech.

The voice system has also been expanded with the addition of causative-passive, reciprocal, and reflexive voices, clarifying agent-patient relationships in complex predicates. The inclusion of explicit declarative and interrogative markers further distinguishes statement and question structures. Overall, these enhancements ensure a more comprehensive and language-specific analysis of Korean grammar, improving both syntactic parsing and cross-linguistic compatibility.

## 4 Parsing with Generative LLMs

BERT models have been widely employed in parsing tasks due to their ability to capture bidirectional contextual information, which has proven advantageous over decoder-only architectures (Zeman et al., 2018; Lim et al., 2020). However, with the rapid advancement of generative language models, recent research has explored the feasibility of replacing encoder-only models with generative architectures (Lin et al., 2023; Xie et al., 2023; Tian et al., 2024). Notably, Tian et al. (2024) propose a constituency parsing approach utilizing a decoder-only generative language model, structuring the parsing process into three distinct stages. While their model attained approximately 87% of the performance achieved by encoder-only models, the primary limitation is attributed to the generative model’s difficulty in accurately segmenting chunks within input sentences.

The Llama3.2-3B<sup>1</sup> model, a well-known generative language model from the Llama family, serves as the baseline for evaluation. However, the base Llama3.2 model demonstrates extremely limited proficiency in Korean, making effective training infeasible. To address this limitation, the Bllossom-3B<sup>2</sup> model (Choi et al., 2024), an enhanced version of Llama3.2-3B optimized for Korean, is employed. Further fine-tuning is performed using the proposed

<sup>1</sup>[huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-3.2-3B](https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-3.2-3B)

<sup>2</sup>[huggingface.co/Bllossom/llama-3.2-Korean-Bllossom-3B](https://huggingface.co/Bllossom/llama-3.2-Korean-Bllossom-3B)

ASPECT	Habitual (Aspect=Hab) Perfective (Aspect=Perf) Progressive (Aspect=Prog)	하곤 했다 <i>hagon haetda</i> 했다 <i>haetda</i> 하고 있다 <i>hago itda</i>	('used to' repeated or habitual actions in the past) (has done' completed actions or results) (is doing' ongoing or continuous actions)
CASE	Ablative (Case=AbI) Accusative (Case=Acc) Conjunctive (Case=Conj) Dative (Case=Dat) Disjunctive (Case=Disj) Genitive (Case=Gen) Instrumental (Case=Ins) Locative (Case=Loc) Nominative (Case=Nom)	에서 <i>eseo</i> , 부터 <i>buteo</i> 을 <i>eul</i> , 를 <i>reul</i> 와 <i>wa</i> , 과 <i>gwa</i> 에게 <i>ege</i> , 한테 <i>hante</i> , 께 <i>kke</i> 이나 <i>ina</i> , 나 <i>na</i> 의 <i>ui</i> 로 <i>ro</i> 에 <i>e</i> 이 <i>i</i> , 가 <i>ga</i> , 은 <i>eun</i> , 는 <i>neun</i>	('from' a place or time point) (marks direct object') (and') (to, for' recipient or indirect object) (or') (possessive, of, 's') (by, using, with') (at, in, on' a location) (subject marker')
EVIDENT	Firsthand (Evident=Fh) Inferential (Evident=Infer)	내가 봤어 <i>naega bwasseo</i> 비가 올 것 같다 <i>biga ol geot gata</i>	('I saw it myself' directly witnessed event) (It looks like it will rain' deduced or inferred from evidence)
MOOD	Non-firsthand (Evident=Nfh) Reported (Evident=Rep) Conditional (Mood=Cnd) General Conditional (Mood=CndGen) Potential Conditional (Mood=CndPot) General-Potential Conditional (Mood=CndGenPot)	들었어 <i>deureosseo</i> 비가 왔다고 해 <i>biga watdago hae</i> 비가 오면 갈게 <i>biga omyeon galge</i> 사람이면 누구나 실수한다 <i>saramimyeon nuguna silsuhanda</i> 시간이 있으면 도울 수 있어 <i>sigani isseumyeon doul su isseo</i> 건강하면 오래 산다 <i>geonganghameyeon orae sanda</i>	(I heard about it' information learned from others) (They say it rained' reported or quoted speech) (I will go if it rains' hypothetical condition) (Anyone can make mistakes' general truth under a condition) (I can help if I have time' potential action under a condition) (If you are healthy, you live long' general possibility based on a condition)
NUMTYPE	Desiderative (Mood=Des) Imperative (Mood=Imp) Indicative (Mood=Ind) Interrogative (Mood=Int) Necessitative (Mood=Nec) Optative (Mood=Opt) Potential (Mood=Pot)	가고 싶다 <i>gago sipda</i> 조용히 해! <i>joyonghi hae</i> 나는 학교에 간다 <i>naeun hakgyoe ganda</i> 어디에 가니? <i>eodie gani?</i> 가야 한다 <i>gaya handa</i> 행복하길 바란다 <i>haengbokhagil baranda</i> 할 수 있다 <i>hal su itda</i>	(I want to go' expressing desire) (Be quiet!' giving a command) (I go to school' neutral statement of fact) (Where are you going?' asking a question) (I must go' expressing necessity) (I hope you will be happy' expressing a wish) (I can do it' expressing ability or possibility)
PERSON	Cardinal Number (NumType=Card)	세 개 <i>se gae</i> , 다섯 명 <i>daset myeong</i>	(three things', 'five people' counting objects or people)
PERSON	Plural (Number=Plur) First Person (Person=1) Second Person (Person=2) Third Person (Person=3)	학생들 <i>haksaeungdeul</i> 나는 <i>naeun</i> , 우리가 <i>uriga</i> 너는 <i>neoneun</i> , 당신이 <i>dangsin-i</i> 그는 <i>geuneun</i> , 그들은 <i>geudeureun</i>	(students' plural marker) (I', 'we' speaker including self) (you' listener/addressee) (he', 'they' third party reference)
PERSON[PSOR]	First Person Possessive (Person[psor]=1) Second Person Possessive (Person[psor]=2) Third Person Possessive (Person[psor]=3)	내 책 <i>nae chaek</i> , 우리 집 <i>uri jip</i> 네 가방 <i>ne gabang</i> 그의 차 <i>geuui cha</i> , 그들의 의견 <i>geudeurui uigyeon</i>	(my book', 'our house' first-person possession) (your bag' second-person possession) (his car', 'their opinion' third-person possession)
POLITE	Elevated (PoIite=EleV)	선생님께서 오십니다 <i>seonsaengnimkkeseo osimnida</i>	(The teacher is coming' honorific subject marking)
PRONTYPE	Formal (PoIite=Form) Humble (PoIite=Humb) Article (PronType=Art) Demonstrative (PronType=Dem)	갑니다 <i>gamnida</i> , 합니다 <i>hamnida</i> 드리겠습니다 <i>deuriggesseubnida</i> 그 책 <i>geu chaek</i> 이 사람 <i>i saram</i> , 저 집 <i>jeo jip</i>	(go', 'do' formal speech level) (I will give (to you)' humble expression of giving) (the book' definite article-like determiner) (this person', 'that house' indicating specific reference)
TENSE	Indefinite (PronType=Ind) Interrogative (PronType=Int) Personal (PronType=Prs) Reciprocal (PronType=Rcp)	어떤 사람 <i>eotteon saram</i> , 아무도 <i>amudo</i> 누구 <i>nugu</i> , 무엇 <i>mueot</i> 나는 <i>naeun</i> , 그들은 <i>geudeureun</i> 서로 <i>seoro</i>	(some person', 'nobody' unspecified reference) (who', 'what' used in questions) (I', 'they' referencing persons) (each other' mutual action reference)
VERBFORM	Present (Tense=Pres) Past (Tense=Past)	먹는다 <i>meokneunda</i> , 공부한다 <i>gongbuhanda</i> 먹었다 <i>meogeotda</i> , 공부했다 <i>gongbuhayetda</i>	(eats', 'studies' present or habitual action) (ate', 'studied' completed action in the past)
VOICE	Converb (VerbForm=Conv)	먹고 <i>meokgo</i> , 공부하며 <i>gongbuhamyeo</i>	(eating', 'while studying' expressing simultaneous or sequential actions)
VOICE	Finite (VerbForm=Fin) Participle (VerbForm=Part)	먹는다 <i>meokneunda</i> , 공부한다 <i>gongbuhanda</i> 먹은 <i>meogeun</i> , 공부한 <i>gongbuhaneun</i>	(eats', 'studies' main finite verb in a clause) (eaten', 'studied' adjectival participle modifying a noun)
VOICE	Verbal Noun (VerbForm=Vnoun)	먹기 <i>meokgi</i> , 공부하기 <i>gongbuhagi</i>	(eating', 'studying' verbal noun used as a subject or object)
VOICE	Causative (Voice=Cau)	먹였다 <i>meogyetda</i> , 울렸다 <i>ullyeotda</i>	(made someone eat', 'made someone cry' causative action forced by subject)
VOICE	Causative-Passive (Voice=CauPass)	보였다 <i>boyeotda</i> , 들렸다 <i>deullyeotda</i>	(was shown', 'was heard' causative-passive meaning)
VOICE	Passive (Voice=Pass)	먹혔다 <i>meokhyeotda</i> , 잡혔다 <i>japhyeotda</i>	(was eaten', 'was caught' action performed on the subject)
VOICE	Reciprocal (Voice=Rcp)	만났다 <i>mannatda</i> , 싸웠다 <i>ssawotda</i>	(met each other', 'fought each other' mutual action between subjects)
VOICE	Reflexive (Voice=Rfl)	씻었다 <i>ssiseotda</i> , 숨었다 <i>sumeotda</i>	(washed oneself', 'hid oneself' subject performs action on itself)

Table 1: Morphosyntactic features for Korean

Korean UniDive dataset for dependency parsing. This process requires converting the Korean UniDive data into an instruction tuning (IT) format, following the IT training data structure proposed by Stanford Alpaca (Taori et al., 2023).

This instruction tuning dataset comprises three components: the user's intent (Instruction), the provided input data (Input), and the expected output data (Output). Figure 1 illustrates the process of transforming Korean UniDive training data into an instruction tuning format. Consequently, the entire training set of the Korean UniDive dataset

is converted into IT-formatted data for model training. The instruction tuning process follows a next-word prediction paradigm, akin to causal language modeling (CLM) pretraining commonly used for language models. The key distinction lies in the loss computation, where feedback is applied exclusively to the Output portion that the model is required to generate, while the Instruction and Input components remain unpenalized. This process can be formally expressed using the following



loss function:

$$L_{it}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{IT}} \left\{ - \sum_{i \in out} \log P(x_i | x_{<i}; \theta) \right\} \quad (1)$$

where  $\theta$  denotes the model parameters, and  $\mathcal{D}_{IT}$  refers to the dataset obtained by converting the previously proposed UniDive training data into an instruction tuning dataset. Each training sample can be represented as a token sequence  $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_i)$ , which tokenizes instruction, input, and output, as illustrated in Figure 1. After completing the IT stage, the model generates parsing results for the given input. For evaluation, we convert all samples in the original test data into the IT format, following the Instruction, Input, Output example in Figure 1, and then provided only Instruction and Input to the model to predict the Output. Detailed information on the hyperparameters used for training, computational resources, and training duration can be found in Appendix B.

```
[instruction]: 아래의 문장을 의존구조분석에 맞게 분석해줘
('Please parse the following sentence as a formal dependency parsing')
```

<b>[input]:</b>							
1	학교	학교	NOUN	NNG	-	head	re1
2	분위거나	분위기+나	NOUN	NNG+JC	Case=Disj	head	re1
3	경관이	경관+이	NOUN	NNG+JKS	Case=Nom	head	re1
4	굉장히	굉장히	ADV	MAG	-	head	re1
5	좋다	좋+다	ADJ	VA+EF	Mood=Ind	head	re1
6	.	.	PUNCT	SF	-	head	re1
<b>[output]:</b>							
1	학교	학교	NOUN	NNG	-	5	nsubj
2	분위거나	분위기+나	NOUN	NNG+JC	Case=Disj	1	flat
3	경관이	경관+이	NOUN	NNG+JKS	Case=Nom	1	conj
4	굉장히	굉장히	ADV	MAG	-	5	advmod
5	좋다	좋+다	ADJ	VA+EF	Mood=Ind	0	root
6	.	.	PUNCT	SF	-	5	punct

('The school atmosphere and scenery are very good.')

Figure 1: Example of the instruction tuning data

## 5 Experiments and Results

### 5.1 Korean GSD

We refine UD’s Korean GSD treebank for the Korean UniDive dataset by addressing inconsistencies in part-of-speech (POS) tagging and morphological analysis. By integrating UniMorph-derived features and applying systematic corrections, the dataset enhances syntactic parsing accuracy and morphosyntactic analysis, which are essential for improving dependency parsing and NLP applications that rely on precise linguistic annotations.

Each word in the Korean UniDive dataset is enriched with UniMorph-derived features, assigned using deterministic rules based on morphological patterns observed in surface forms. These features are integrated directly into the UD format, ensuring

compatibility with existing UD tools. To maintain consistency and accuracy, we employ a two-step approach: (i) automatic annotation using established tagging tools, including POS tagging (Park and Tyers, 2019) and Named Entity Recognition (NER) (Chen et al., 2024) applied to UD-annotated sentences, and (ii) manual verification by linguistic experts, who validate the assigned POS tags. This approach systematically refines the dataset and improves its reliability.

Each word in the Korean UniDive dataset is further analyzed at the morpheme level, enabling the extraction of morphosyntactic features based on both individual morphemes and their corresponding POS tags. These features are assigned using a set of detailed linguistic rules that account for Korean’s agglutinative morphology, including suffix-based inflection, grammatical function markers, and verb-final particles. By leveraging fine-grained segmentation and feature extraction, we systematically capture case markers, tense and aspect distinctions, and honorifics, ensuring that morphosyntactic information is accurately preserved. This rule-based refinement not only improves alignment between morphological and syntactic annotations but also enhances consistency across dependency structures, making the dataset more robust for parsing and NLP applications.

**POS misclassification** One of the most frequent errors observed in the Korean GSD treebank is the misclassification of proper nouns (NNP) as common nouns (NNG) in their language-specific part-of-speech (XPOS) labels. Additionally, the corresponding universal part-of-speech (UPOS) tags were often incorrectly assigned, failing to distinguish between proper nouns (PROPN) and common nouns (NOUN) at the universal level.

Beyond noun-related errors, verbs (VV) and adjectives (VA) were also frequently mislabeled. In many cases, verbs were incorrectly tagged as adjectives (ADJ), particularly when descriptive verbs were involved, as Korean adjectives (VA) function similarly to stative verbs. Likewise, verb-adjective misclassification affected UPOS, where Korean adjectives (VA) were incorrectly labeled as verbs (VERB), despite their distinct morphological and syntactic behaviors.

To correct these errors, we systematically verify the consistency between POS tagging and NER results for nouns while also applying morphosyntactic analysis for verbs and adjectives. If a token

is identified as both a proper noun (NNP) and a named entity in NER but is incorrectly labeled as a common noun (NNG), we reclassify it as a proper noun (PROPN). Conversely, if a token is not recognized as a named entity but is incorrectly tagged as a proper noun (NNP), we adjust it to a common noun (NNG, NOUN).

For verbs and adjectives, we analyze inflectional patterns and conjugational endings to ensure correct classification. If a verb (VV) is incorrectly tagged as an adjective (VA), we examine morphological cues and predicate structure to determine whether the word exhibits verbal or adjectival properties. This approach ensures that adjectives (VA) are correctly assigned to ADJ and verbs (VV) to VERB, preserving the accuracy of the dependency structure.

Additionally, we observed inconsistencies in the annotation of inflected verb and adjective forms, where derivational suffixes led to misclassifications between adverbs (ADV), adjectives (ADJ), and verbs (VERB). In particular, verb-derived adjectives were frequently misclassified as adverbs (ADV) instead of adjectives (ADJ) due to their sentence context. To address these inconsistencies, we reviewed and corrected POS information, including morphological analysis with explicit morpheme boundaries, following Sejong corpus guidelines to ensure that each word’s annotation accurately reflected its true morphological category. However, these corrections were limited to POS tagging and morphological segmentation, with no modification to the dependency structure.

**POS assignment based on syntactic roles** A significant source of error in the Korean GSD treebank is the misclassification of words due to an overemphasis on their syntactic roles within a given sentence rather than their inherent lexical categories. This issue led to frequent misannotations, particularly in cases where temporal nouns and other category-specific words were assigned adverbial roles based on their sentence context rather than their fundamental lexical identity. One prominent example is 가격에 *gagyeog-e* (‘price+-E’), which was originally labeled as ADV instead of its correct annotation as NOUN for NNG+JKB (common noun + adverbial postposition). This misclassification likely stemmed from the word’s function as a modifier in specific contexts, leading to an erroneous assignment of an adverbial tag. However, based on the Sejong POS guidelines, such words

should retain their noun classification regardless of their syntactic role in a particular sentence. To address these issues, we systematically revised the affected annotations, ensuring that UPOS labels were determined based on the lexical properties of each word rather than their contextual function within a sentence. This correction improves consistency in POS tagging and aligns with best practices for Korean morphological annotation.

**Misclassification of XR as a noun fragment** XR is defined as a root, which is the core part of a word that carries the essential meaning when analyzing words. However, in the Sejong Corpus, it is defined as a noun fragment that does not function independently. For example, the root 민주 *minju* can form a noun when combined with other affixes, such as in 민주화 *minjuhwa* (‘democratization’) or 민주주의 *minjujuui* (‘democracy’). Only when it becomes a noun can it combine with derivational endings to be transformed into other parts of speech.

**Complement markers in Korean grammar** In Korean grammar, *nominals* that appear before the verbs 되다 *doeda* (‘become’) and 아니다 *anida* (‘not be’) function as complements (predicate nominatives) rather than subjects. This is because 되다 *doeda* and 아니다 *anida* act as linking verbs (copulas) rather than action verbs. Additionally, while these complements take the subject marker (-이/가, *-il-ga*), they function as predicate complements rather than typical subjects in the sentence structure. Therefore, their case marker should be annotated as JKC (predicate nominative marker) instead of JKS (nominative case marker).

We also revise the morphological analysis after manual verification, correcting cases where the GSD annotation and automatic annotation differ. For example, the analysis of 중일 as 중+이+ㄹ;VERB;NNB+VCP+ETM (bound noun + copula + adnominal ending) is corrected to 중일;PROPN;NNP *jung-il* (‘China and Japan’). By refining the UPOS and XPOS annotations, we have enhanced the reliability of the GSD treebank as a training resource for Korean syntactic parsing and morphological analysis, particularly for deriving morphosyntactic features from POS tags. Our systematic corrections in the Korean GSD dataset effectively address major inconsistencies. Table 2 presents the top five UPOS and XPOS conversion results.

Original	UPOS correction				Orig	XPOS correction			
	Correction	Count	Ratio	Correction		Count	Ratio		
ADV	→ NOUN	3607	0.0636	XR+XSA+ETM	→ NNG+XSA+ETM	321	0.0056		
NOUN	→ PROPN	2654	0.0468	XR+XSA+EC	→ NNG+XSA+EC	248	0.0043		
VERB	→ ADJ	1065	0.0187	NNG+JKS	→ NNG+JKC	51	0.0008		
ADV	→ PROPN	404	0.0071	XR	→ NNG	44	0.0007		
ADV	→ ADJ	268	0.0047	MAG	→ MAJ	44	0.0007		

Table 2: Top-5 UPOS and XPOS conversion results

## 5.2 Integration with UniDive

**Morphosyntactic feature extraction and rule-based annotation** Each word in the Korean UniDive dataset is analyzed at the morpheme level, allowing for the extraction of morphosyntactic features based on both individual morphemes and their corresponding POS tags. Feature assignment is governed by an extensive set of linguistic rules grounded in Korean’s agglutinative structure, including suffix-based inflection, grammatical function markers, and verb-final particles. By incorporating fine-grained segmentation and systematic feature extraction, we accurately capture case markers, tense and aspect distinctions, and honorific expressions, ensuring the preservation of essential morphosyntactic information. This rule-based refinement enhances the alignment between morphological and syntactic annotations, contributing to the dataset’s overall consistency and linguistic accuracy. Table 1 explicitly summarizes the extraction rules applied in this process.

**Functional words** As part of our UniDive adaptation for Korean, we manually selected a set of potential functional words from the Sejong corpus, focusing on high-frequency adverbs (MAG) and determiners (MM). These functional categories often contribute to sentence structure and meaning without introducing new content, making them particularly relevant for syntactic and typological analysis. For adverbs, we selected frequently occurring items such as 더 *deo* (‘more’), 또 *tto* (‘again’), and 다시 *dasi* (‘again’), which often express degree, repetition, or negation. For determiners, we included high-frequency words like 그 *geu* (‘that’), 이 *i* (‘this’), and 한 *han* (‘one’), which are commonly used in reference and quantification. These selections are intended to represent functionally salient elements within Korean, facilitating cross-linguistic comparisons in the UniDive framework.

**Conjunctive verbal endings** For verbs—particularly those that do not carry morphosyntactic features—we follow the UniDive

convention of adding a transcription of the verbal ending. For example, a verb with the conjunctive ending 가<sub>ㅅ</sub> *ga-seo* (‘go + seo’) can be annotated with a feature such as Case=seo to reflect the surface form of the ending. Many conjunctive verbal endings in Korean, however, are semantically rich and encode relations such as causality, contrast, sequence, or condition. Given the complexity and variability of these meanings, we leave a more fine-grained semantic classification of conjunctive endings as future work.

## 5.3 Experimental setup

To evaluate the effectiveness of incorporating UniMorph-derived morphosyntactic features, we conduct dependency parsing experiments using the Korean UniDive dataset. Our objective is to determine how enriched morphosyntactic representations influence parsing performance across different models. In this study, we train two types of dependency parsing models to examine the effects of morphosyntactic features on syntactic analysis. The first is an encoder-only model using UDPipe 1 (Straka and Straková, 2017), which serves as a baseline for conventional deterministic parsing and makes use of morphosyntactic features during training. The second is a decoder-only model, implemented using B1lossom-3B (Choi et al., 2024), a fine-tuned variant of the Llama-family model, trained via instruction tuning. These models allow for a comparative assessment of how structured linguistic features contribute to parsing accuracy. The training procedure follows the standard data splits provided by the Korean GSD treebank, ensuring a controlled experimental setup. Each model is trained both with and without UniMorph-derived morphosyntactic features, allowing us to compare their performances. The encoder-only approach follows a more traditional dependency parsing methodology, whereas the decoder-only model reconstructs syntactic structures generatively, utilizing instruction tuning. It is important to clarify that our aim is not to compare the absolute perfor-

mance of UDpipe 1 and Blossom-3B, as these are fundamentally different models. Rather, the goal is to investigate how morphosyntactic enhancements influence each model type, highlighting the impact of linguistic features on dependency parsing.

## 5.4 Results

Table 3 presents the results of our dependency parsing experiments. The findings indicate that integrating morphosyntactic features consistently improves parsing accuracy across both encoder-only and decoder-only models. The incorporation of morphosyntactic features leads to significant gains in parsing performance. The encoder-only UDpipe model, which initially struggles with Korean’s complex morphology, exhibits the most pronounced improvements, with an increase of 14.09 LAS points. This enhancement demonstrates that explicit morphological information plays a crucial role in refining syntactic structures, particularly in feature-driven dependency relations. For the decoder-only Blossom-3B model, improvements are more modest but still notable, with LAS increasing by 2.6 points. Since large-scale generative models inherently capture some morphosyntactic properties during pretraining, the additional morphosyntactic annotations serve as complementary refinements rather than primary determinants of performance.

		UAS	LAS
udpipe 1	Without MS features	61.05	50.24
	With MS features	71.41	64.33
Blossom-3B	Without MS features	88.30	84.37
	With MS features	<b>89.16</b>	<b>86.97</b>

Table 3: Dependency parsing results with and without morphosyntactic features

## 6 Discussion

**Alignment with Korean linguistic theories** The integration of morphosyntactic features into dependency parsing aligns with Korean linguistic theories, particularly in case marking, argument structure, and predicate composition. As an agglutinative language, Korean relies on suffix-based morphology to encode grammatical relations, making explicit morphological annotations essential for syntactic disambiguation. Traditional linguistic analyses emphasize postpositional case markers in distinguishing subjects, objects, and adjuncts, which directly benefits parsing models when these features are incorporated.

Our findings reflect theoretical accounts of Korean syntax, where syntactic roles are determined by morphological markers rather than fixed word order. Explicit case distinctions mitigate subject-object confusion, especially in non-canonical SOV structures. Additionally, refined verbal morphology representation, including tense, aspect, and modality, enhances the analysis of predicate-argument structures and captures Korean’s complex predicates involving auxiliary verbs and honorifics.

Our approach also differentiates functional and lexical morphemes, ensuring more accurate dependency relations. Functional morphemes like case markers and sentence-final endings often cause misclassification in models relying on surface forms alone. By incorporating detailed morphosyntactic features, we obtain a linguistically informed representation that improves parsing accuracy in feature-driven syntactic relations.

**Cross-linguistic applicability** To assess the broader applicability of our approach beyond Korean, we conduct additional experiments on the UD Turkish Penn Treebank, a dataset that similarly incorporates rich morphosyntactic annotations. Turkish, like Korean, is an agglutinative language with extensive suffixation and complex morphosyntactic dependencies, making it an ideal test case for evaluating the effectiveness of our method in a cross-linguistic setting.

The experimental setup remains identical to our Korean experiments, ensuring a controlled comparison of the impact of morphosyntactic features on dependency parsing. Preliminary results indicate that the integration of morphosyntactic annotations leads to improvements in parsing accuracy for Turkish, a tendency that aligns with findings from experiments on the Korean GSD treebank. These findings suggest that our approach is not only effective for Korean but also extends to other morphologically rich languages, reinforcing the importance of explicit morphosyntactic representations in dependency parsing across diverse linguistic typologies.

**Future directions** UniMorph provides word-level morphological predictions, independently assigning features without considering sentence context. In contrast, our experiments assumed gold-standard morphosyntactic features, directly integrating them into dependency parsing. As future work, we aim to bridge this gap by developing a sentence-level feature prediction pipeline. This involves first predicting word-level features using



UniMorph-style annotation methods, then contextually refining them based on syntactic dependencies. By propagating features across dependency arcs, we can resolve ambiguities and enhance their alignment with sentence structure. Extending word-level UniMorph predictions to sentence-level applications will improve parsing accuracy, particularly for morphologically rich languages. Future work will focus on refining feature propagation and interaction within dependency parsing models, ensuring a seamless integration of morphosyntactic annotations in structured syntactic analysis.

## 7 Conclusion

In this work, we developed the Korean UniDive dataset, integrating UniMorph-derived morphosyntactic features with Universal Dependencies to enhance Korean dependency parsing. Our dataset systematically aligns morphological and syntactic annotations, addressing inconsistencies in existing resources and improving linguistic representation. We demonstrate that explicit morphosyntactic annotations significantly enhance encoder-only models, while providing complementary refinements for decoder-only generative models.

## Limitations

While the integration of UniMorph and Universal Dependencies under the UniDive framework presents a promising approach to representing Korean morphosyntactic structures, several limitations remain. These challenges highlight areas for further refinement and potential extensions to enhance the framework’s applicability. One of the inherent difficulties in modeling Korean within UD is the word segmentation issue. Unlike languages with clear word boundaries, Korean’s agglutinative structure means that functional morphemes (e.g., case markers, verb endings) are tightly linked to content words. While UniDive addresses this by encoding functional morphemes as morphological features rather than separate syntactic nodes, boundary inconsistencies persist when transitioning between different annotation schemes.

While our dataset enhances the representation of core morphosyntactic structures, certain non-canonical constructions remain challenging. These include: (i) elliptical structures, where Korean frequently omits subjects or objects, requiring models to infer missing elements from context (Han et al., 2020); (ii) periphrastic constructions, where

multi-word verb phrases, such as 먹어 보고 싶다 *meog-eo bogo sipda* (‘want to try eating’), introduce structural complexity that UniDive does not fully capture (Chung, 1998); and (iii) multi-function morphemes, where certain morphemes serve multiple syntactic roles depending on context (e.g., -고 *go*, which can indicate either coordination or sequencing) (Park and Kim, 2023). These limitations suggest that a more fine-grained approach to Korean morphosyntactic variation may be necessary for future work.

## Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Omer Goldman and the UniDive Consortium for their valuable support and collaboration in building the Korean UniDive dataset.

## References

Khuyagbaatar Batsuren, Omer Goldman, Salam Khalifa, Nizar Habash, Witold Kieraś, Gábor Bella, Brian Leonard, Garrett Nicolai, Kyle Gorman, Yustinus Ghanggo Ate, Maria Ryskina, Sabrina Mielke, Elena Budianskaya, Charbel El-Khaissi, Tiago Pimentel, Michael Gasser, William Abbott Lane, Mohit Raj, Matt Coler, Jaime Rafael Montoya Samame, Delio Siticonatzi Camaiteri, Esaú Zumeta Rojas, Didier López Francis, Arturo Oncevay, Juan López Bautista, Gema Celeste Silva Villegas, Lucas Torroba Hennigen, Adam Ek, David Guriel, Peter Dirix, Jean-Philippe Bernardy, Andrey Scherbakov, Aziyana Bayyr-ool, Antonios Anastasopoulos, Roberto Zariquiey, Karina Sheifer, Sofya Ganieva, Hilaria Cruz, Ritván Karahóga, Stella Markantonatou, George Pavlidis, Matvey Plugaryov, Elena Klyachko, Ali Salehi, Candy Angulo, Jatayu Baxi, Andrew Krizhanovsky, Natalia Krizhanovskaya, Elizabeth Salesky, Clara Vania, Sardana Ivanova, Jennifer White, Rowan Hall Maudslay, Josef Valvoda, Ran Zmigrod, Paula Czarnowska, Irene Nikkarinen, Aelita Salchak, Brijesh Bhatt, Christopher Straughn, Zoey Liu, Jonathan North Washington, Yuval Pinter, Duygu Ataman, Marcin Wolinski, Totok Suhardijanto, Anna Yablonskaya, Niklas Stoehr, Hossep Dolatian, Zahroh Nuriah, Shyam Ratan, Francis M. Tyers, Edoardo M. Ponti, Grant Aiton, Aryaman Arora, Richard J. Hatcher, Ritesh Kumar, Jeremiah Young, Daria Rodionova, Anastasia Yemelina, Taras Andrushko, Igor Marchenko, Polina Mashkovtseva, Alexandra Serova, Emily Prud’hommeaux, Maria Nepomniashchaya, Fausto Giunchiglia, Eleanor Chodroff, Mans Hulden, Miikka Silfverberg, Arya D. McCarthy, David Yarowsky, Ryan Cotterell, Reut Tsarfaty, and Ekaterina Vylomova. 2022. **UniMorph 4.0: Universal Morphology**. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 840–855, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.

- Yige Chen, Eunkyul Leah Jo, Yundong Yao, Kyung-Tae Lim, Miikka Silfverberg, Francis M. Tyers, and Jungyeul Park. 2022. [Yet Another Format of Universal Dependencies for Korean](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 5432–5437, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Yige Chen, KyungTae Lim, and Jungyeul Park. 2024. [Korean named entity recognition based on language-specific features](#). *Natural Language Engineering*, 30(3):625–649.
- ChangSu Choi, Yongbin Jeong, Seoyoon Park, Inho Won, HyeonSeok Lim, SangMin Kim, Yejee Kang, Chanhyuk Yoon, Jaewan Park, Yiseul Lee, HyeJin Lee, Younggyun Hahm, Hansaem Kim, and Kyung-Tae Lim. 2024. [Optimizing Language Augmentation for Multilingual Large Language Models: A Case Study on Korean](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 12514–12526, Torino, Italia. ELRA and ICCL.
- Jayeol Chun, Na-Rae Han, Jena D. Hwang, and Jinho D. Choi. 2018. Building Universal Dependency Treebanks in Korean. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, Miyazaki, Japan. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Chan Chung. 1998. [Argument Composition and Long-Distance Scrambling in Korean: An Extension of the Complex Predicate Analysis](#). In Erhard Hinrichs, Andreas Kathol, and Tsuneko Nakazawa, editors, *Complex Predicates in Nonderivational Syntax*, pages 159–220. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands.
- Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, Christopher D. Manning, Joakim Nivre, and Daniel Zeman. 2021. [Universal Dependencies](#). *Computational Linguistics*, 47(2):255–308.
- Chung-hye Han, Kyeong-min Kim, Keir Moulton, and Jeffrey Lidz. 2020. [Null Objects in Korean: Experimental Evidence for the Argument Ellipsis Analysis](#). *Linguistic Inquiry*, 51(2):319–340.
- Eunkyul Jo, Kyuwon Kim, Xihan Wu, KyungTae Lim, Jungyeul Park, and Chulwoo Park. 2023. [K-UniMorph: Korean Universal Morphology and its Feature Schema](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 6613–6623, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kyuwon Kim, Yige Chen, Eunkyul Leah Jo, KyungTae Lim, Jungyeul Park, and Chulwoo Park. 2024. [K-UD: Revising Korean Universal Dependencies Guidelines](#). *arXiv*, pages 1–6.
- KyungTae Lim, Jay Yoon Lee, Jaime Carbonell, and Thierry Poibeau. 2020. [Semi-Supervised Learning on Meta Structure: Multi-Task Tagging and Parsing in Low-Resource Scenarios](#). In *Proceedings of The Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-20)*, pages 8344–8351, New York, USA. AAAI Press, Palo Alto, California USA.
- Boda Lin, Xinyi Zhou, Binghao Tang, Xiaocheng Gong, and Si Li. 2023. [ChatGPT is a Potential Zero-Shot Dependency Parser](#).
- Ryan McDonald, Joakim Nivre, Yvonne Quirnbach-Brundage, Yoav Goldberg, Dipanjan Das, Kuzman Ganchev, Keith Hall, Slav Petrov, Hao Zhang, Oscar Täckström, Claudia Bedini, Núria Bertomeu Castelló, and Jungmee Lee. 2013. [Universal Dependency Annotation for Multilingual Parsing](#). In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 92–97, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Youngbin Noh, Jiyeon Han, Tae Hwan Oh, and Hansaem Kim. 2018. [Enhancing Universal Dependencies for Korean](#). In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Universal Dependencies (UDW 2018)*, pages 108–116, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jungyeul Park and Mija Kim. 2023. [A role of functional morphemes in Korean categorial grammars](#). *Korean Linguistics*, 19(1):1–30.
- Jungyeul Park and Francis Tyers. 2019. [A New Annotation Scheme for the Sejong Part-of-speech Tagged Corpus](#). In *Proceedings of the 13th Linguistic Annotation Workshop*, pages 195–202, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Milan Straka and Jana Straková. 2017. [Tokenizing, POS Tagging, Lemmatizing and Parsing UD 2.0 with UDPipe](#). In *Proceedings of the CoNLL 2017 Shared Task: Multilingual Parsing from Raw Text to Universal Dependencies*, pages 88–99, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2023. [Stanford Alpaca: An Instruction-following LLaMA model](#). [\url{https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford\\_alpaca}](https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca).
- Yuanhe Tian, Fei Xia, and Yan Song. 2024. [Large Language Models Are No Longer Shallow Parsers](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7131–7142, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tingyu Xie, Qi Li, Jian Zhang, Yan Zhang, Zuozhu Liu, and Hongwei Wang. 2023. [Empirical Study of Zero-Shot NER with ChatGPT](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7935–7956, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Daniel Zeman, Jan Hajič, Martin Popel, Martin Potthast, Milan Straka, Filip Ginter, Joakim Nivre, and

Slav Petrov. 2018. [CoNLL 2018 Shared Task: Multilingual Parsing from Raw Text to Universal Dependencies](#). In *Proceedings of the CoNLL 2018 Shared Task: Multilingual Parsing from Raw Text to Universal Dependencies*, pages 1–21, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

## A Licenses

Our Korean UniDive dataset, derived from the Universal Dependencies (UD) Korean GSD Treebank, is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0). This license allows users to share (copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format) and adapt (remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, including commercial use), provided that proper attribution is given to the original dataset and that any derivative works are released under the same license.

## B Technical Details on Experiments

**Optimization and training strategy of LLM** Table 4 provides an overview of the hyperparameter configuration. We train the model using AdamW-8bit, a memory-friendly derivative of AdamW, with a weight decay of 0.01 to mitigate overfitting. The initial learning rate is set to  $5e-5$  and is gradually lowered according to a cosine schedule. Training is conducted with a batch size of 1, and gradient accumulation is performed for 4 steps to attain an effective batch size of 4.

**GPUs used** We used a single NVIDIA A6000 GPU for both training and evaluation. Training took approximately 47 minutes per epoch, and the model was trained for a total of 10 epochs.

Hyperparameter	Value
D-type	bfloat16
Learnign-rate	$5e-5$
Warm-up ratio	0.03
Learning-rate scheduler	cosine
Optimizer	AdamW-8bit
Weight decay	0.01
Batch size	1
Gradient accumulation steps	16
Training epochs	1

Table 4: Hyperparameter settings used for training