정책학 석사 학위논문

A Study of the Effects of Occupational Stress Factors on Organizational Commitment

- A Case Study of Air Force Interpreting Officers -

직무 스트레스 요인이 조직몰입도에 미치는 영향에 관한 연구

공군통역장교를 중심으로

2017년 8월

서울대학교 행정대학원

행정학과 정책학전공

장 훈 익

A Study of the Effects of Occupational Stress

Factors on Organizational Commitment

- A Case Study of Air Force Interpreting Officers -

Academic Advisor: Lee, Soo Young

Submitting a master's thesis of Public Administration

March 2017

Graduate School of Public Administration

Seoul National University

Public Policy Major

Chang, Hoon Ik

Confirming the master's thesis written by: Chang, Hoon Ik

June 2017

Chair	**Kim, Soon Eun**	**(Seal)**
Vice Chair	**Koo, Min Gyo**	**(Seal)**
Examiner	**Lee, Soo Young**	**(Seal)**

Abstract

A Study of the Effects of Occupational Stress Factors on

Organizational Commitment

- A Case Study of Air Force Interpreting Officers -

Chang, Hoon Ik
Master of Public Administration
Graduate School of Public Administration
Seoul National University

This paper aims to examine and analyze how occupational stress factors affect the organizational commitment of interpreting officers in the Republic of Korea Air Force. After review of past stress literature, stress factors have been organized into three categories within the context of this research: career factors, environmental factors, and relationship factors. The quantitative analysis of the data gathered shows that career factors have the most dominant effect on organizational commitment. It also shows that there is a meaningful difference in the level of organizational commitment felt by interpreting officers depending on the rank of his/her superior officer. Qualitative research in the form of one on one interviews was also conducted to supplement quantitative findings.

…………………………………………

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

I-1. Purpose of Research

This paper aims to examine and analyze how occupational stress factors affect the organizational commitment of interpreting officers in the Republic of Korea Air Force. As we will come to discover in the literature review portion of this paper, much has been written and studied concerning occupational stress factors and organizational commitment as well as the relationship between them in various settings. In particular, this research examines three factors and their respective effect on organizational commitment of interpreting officers in the Republic of Korea Air Force.

Organizational commitment and the factors that contribute to it have been studied and defined by many scholars in the past. Broadly speaking, organizational commitment is the sense of bond or loyalty employees feel toward their respective affiliated organizations. Hence, employees with high organizational commitment feel connected to their respective organizations and hold a better understanding of the organization's goals and agendas.

Naturally, strengthening organizational commitment is of critical importance to any public or private organization, as it is generally a stable

predictor of turnover, organizational behavior, and job performance among others.

This research intends to distinguish itself from previous research in a number of ways. On one hand, it focuses on a select group: interpreting officers in the Republic of Korea Air Force. To understand the distinctive nature of Air Force interpreting officers, one must understand the political climate that dictates the Korean peninsula. The Republic of Korea is home to a sizeable contingent of U.S. Forces. As such, a means of communication between senior leadership is needed to discuss alliance issues. Young interpreting officers provide such means, acting as the bridge between U.S. and Korean military leadership. The Air Force interpreting officers in particular, have traditionally served the military's top leadership, including leadership such as the Minister of National Defense and other key senior personnel. Thus these young officers serve the unique function of participating in alliance dialogues and military diplomacy despite their young age.[1] This sample group is distinctive for a number of other reasons as well. For one, interpreting officers serve for a fixed duration of three years and discharge from service. As such, turnover to a different job or a different walk of life is assumed for most if not all interpreting officers. Such nature sets interpreting officers apart from other vocations where job factors such as job stability can affect organizational commitment. Interpreting officers are also an elite group of

---

[1] "http://www.afios.org/" is the official webpage for Air Force Interpreting officers and showcases the nature of work interpreting officers carry out.

individuals (all interpreting officers possess bachelor's degrees, mostly from U.S. universities), and observing whether traditionally acknowledged factors that affect organizational commitment apply to such distinguished group will be a noteworthy distinction of this paper.

Secondly, this research will examine whether the organizational commitment felt by officers varies depending on the rank of the superior officer they interpret for. Finally, in examining the aforementioned fields, this research will conduct both quantitative and qualitative methods (one on one interviews).

I-2. Policy Implications

For Korean men, it is a constitutional duty to serve in the Armed Forces for a fixed number of years. The Republic of Korea currently employs a mandatory drafting system to maintain the necessary manpower of its armed forces. The required duration of service differs slightly from service branch to service branch, but is approximately 2 years for enlisted service members.

For officers commissioned through the OCS (Officer Candidate School) program, mandatory service duration is 3 years after commission and 2 years 4 months for officers commissioned through the ROTC (Reserve Officers' Training Corps) program. Upon successful completion of the required service duration, an

officer or enlisted service member is discharged and he/she is returned to civilian status. However, those who wish to serve beyond one's legally required service duration may transition to long term service.

The perceived burden of devoting 2 ~ 3 years in the military during one's twenties can be heavy. The burden Korean males can potentially feel was quite evident when I spoke to all three interviewees. One interview perhaps captures such anxious emotions concerning service as he noted:

"The public perception is such that we perceive military service not necessarily as a virtue to be applauded upon, but rather as a social obstacle that is best taken care of as soon as possible."

-Lieutenant A

Such perception has led to many of the socioeconomic elite to evade mandatory service by either illicit means or through legal loopholes. In 2016, Korean authorities strengthened penalties regarding studying or traveling abroad with the aim of military service evasion (Korea Herald Business, 2017). Such measure is a testament to the fact that military service is still viewed as a socioeconomic burden for many, especially the elite, and that service eligible males frequently try to evade service. It was also evident in the interviews that interviewees, when deciding by which means to fulfill mandatory military service,

also felt tints of hesitation when choosing to serve as an interpreting officer as the mandatory service duration is comparably longer than that of an enlisted service member.

This research aims to identify stress factor variables that affect organizational commitment, the sense of bond, loyalty, and connection an individual feels towards his/her respective organization. If the Korean Armed Forces can successfully ascertain the factors that contribute to organizational commitment, it will be able to identify areas for potential improvement that can make mandatory service more inviting and even potentially make serving as a military service member an attractive long term vocation option. In addition, if the armed forces can successfully persuade the public that workplaces in the military have the factors that lead to high organizational commitment, in time, the public perception that service is a socioeconomic burden may be alleviated to a certain extent.

Furthermore, providing an environment that leads to higher organizational commitment may potentially lead to more officers serving long term beyond their mandatory service durations. The complexity of the security environment surrounding the Korean peninsula continues to grow and conventional might alone can no longer guarantee national security. Traditional brute force will continue to act as a pillar of national security, but the modern age demands that an advanced elite military be equipped with various capacities such

as cyber, diplomatic, and sustainable war fighting capabilities.

Thus, the military must be able to secure adequate talent to meet future requirements. The Korean military's officers who service long term commitments have, up to this point, been largely composed of service academy graduates. While it is true that service academies and its graduates have made significant contributions to national security, it is difficult to forecast that service academies alone will produce a human resource pool capable of supplying all the skill sets and talents needed for future warfare. It is furthermore difficult to conclude that service academies have a monopolistic supply of demanded talent in the armed forces.

To ensure that the South Korean military acquires all necessary requirements for the future, further diversity among its officer leadership is needed. The hope is that this research and its findings can serve as a small groundwork for constructing a military that can invite other talented individuals to the Korean Armed Forces.

II. Research Scope and Methodology

II-1. Terminology

For purposes of clarification, and to appropriately limit the scope of this paper's research, definitions of key terms will be needed and are as follows:

A. Officer: An officer is a member of the Armed Forces who holds a position of high authority. More specifically, within the hierarchy of the military, officers are those between the grades of O-1 to O-10. Junior officers between O-1 and O-3 inclusive are called company grade officers, O-4 and O-6 field grade officers, and O-7 and O-10 general officers or flag officers. Enlisted personnel are service members of the armed forces that rank below a commissioned officer. Enlisted service members are those between the rank of E-1 to E-9 inclusive (Table 1).

<Table 1. Military Rank Structure (U.S. & Republic of Korea)>

Grade	Army	Marine Corps	Navy	Air Force
O-10	General	General	Admiral	General
O-9	Lt. General	Lt. General	Vice Admiral	Lt. General

O-8	Major General	Major General	Rear Admiral (upper half)	Major General
O-7	Brigadier General	Brigadier General	Rear Admiral (lower half)	Brigadier General
O-6	Colonel	Colonel	Captain	Colonel
O-5	Lt. Colonel	Lt. Colonel	Commander	Lt. Colonel
O-4	Major	Major	Lt. Commander	Major
O-3	Captain	Captain	Lieutenant	Captain
O-2	1st Lieutenant	1st Lieutenant	Lieutenant, Junior Grade	1st Lieutenant
O-1	2nd Lieutenant	2nd Lieutenant	Ensign	2nd Lieutenant
W-1~5*	Warrant Officers (The U.S. Air Force has discontinued the grade of warrant officers)			
E-9	Command Sergeant Major	Sergeant Major	Command Master Chief Petty Officer	Command Chief Master Sergeant
E-9	Sergeant Major	Master Gunnery Sergeant	Master Chief Petty Officer	Chief Master Sergeant
E-8	First Sergeant	First Sergeant	Senior Chief Petty Officer	Senior Master Sergeant
E-8	Master Sergeant	Master Sergeant	Senior Chief Petty Officer	Senior Master Sergeant

E-7	Sergeant First Class	Gunnery Sergeant	Chief Petty Officer	Master Sergeant
E-6	Staff Sergeant	Staff Sergeant	Petty Officer First Class	Technical Sergeant
E-5	Sergeant	Sergeant	Petty Officer Second Class	Staff Sergeant
E-4	Specialist/Corporal	Corporal	Petty Officer Third Class	Senior Airman
E-3	Private First Class	Lance Corporal	Seaman	Airman First Class
E-2	Private	Private First Class	Seaman Apprentice	Airman
E-1	Private	Private	Seaman Recruit	Airman Basic

* The Korean military's warrant officers do not have grades within their rank.

B. Interpreting Officers: Interpreting officers are officers whose primary function is to act as interpreters and translators within the Korean military. Currently, all interpreting officers within the Korean military are commissioned through OCS programs. In the case of the Air Force, it commissions a class of roughly 20 interpreting officers twice in a given year and harbors approximately 120 active duty officers in any given time.

C. Officer Candidate School (OCS): Officer Candidate Schools are institutions

that train civilians to be commissioned into the armed forces. Each service branch has its own OCS program and upon successful completion, an individual will be commissioned as an officer into the program's respective service branch. In Korea, a bachelor's degree is a prerequisite for admission into the program.

D. Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC): The Reserve Officers' Training Corps is a university/college based program for training and educating undergraduate students to be commissioned into the armed forces upon graduation. Cadets of the ROTC will most likely simultaneously conduct schoolwork and their cadet training.

E. Active Duty: Active duty service refers to a full-time obligation to a standing military. It is usually used in comparison to reserve duty, which refers to part-time obligations to the Armed Forces.

F. Reserve Duty: Reserve duty refers to part-time obligation to the military. Often times, there is a mandated duration of training a reserve duty service member must go through in a year. Reserve duty service members will likely have another full-time obligation or vocation and will be augmented to a standing active duty standing force in times of contingency.

G. Action Officers: Staff members within an office or unit. Loosely used to refer to service members who are not the head of an office or a unit. Action officers are generally below the grade of O-6.

II-2. Research Sample

The subjects of this research are current and recently discharged Air Force interpreting officers of the Republic of Korea Air Force. 50 participants have replied to survey forms that measure organizational commitment and stress factors. In this research, stress factors are divided into three categories: career factors, environmental factors, and relationship factors. Stress factor categories will be further discussed in the literature review section.

When gathering data, officers were also asked to state the rank of their superior officer whom they most frequently interpret for. These responses were then categorized into three distinct fields.

1) Officers who interpret for high-profile senior leadership (4-star general officer and above)
2) Officers who interpret for senior leadership (1 star ~ 3 star general officers)
3) Officers who interpret for action officers (O-3 ~ O-6).

The reason for such distinction is as follows. As it will be later discussed in the hypothesis section, one of the hypotheses of this research is that officers will experience different levels of organizational commitment depending on the rank of the superior officer whom they interpret for. The reasoning for this hypothesis is as follows: Of the three stress factors that will be outlined, the career factor measures the extent an individual believes his current job will help with personal growth and career aspects. Depending on the rank of an interpreting officer's superior officer, the officer in question will interpret in different settings with varying degrees of consequence and importance. As one interviewee noted:

"Once I made it as an interpreter for a 4-star officer, I was more attached as I felt I was making a clear and visible difference and making an impact."

-Lieutenant B

Officers will likely interpret for senior level dialogue and be engaged in higher level discussions if his/her superior holds a key position (and corresponding senior rank). As such a superior's rank is likely to be an apt predictor of the level of consequential work (work that an officer considers important or feels that can help him/her personally grow and promote his career) that an interpreting officer will be engaged in.

II-3. Hypothesis

1) H-1: There will be meaningful difference in the level of organizational commitment felt by interpreting officers depending on the rank of his/her superior officer.

2) H-2: Career factors will have a positive(+) effect on organizational commitment.

3) H-3: Environmental factors will have a positive(+) effect on organizational commitment.

4) H-4: Relationship factors will have a positive(+) effect on organizational commitment.

II-4. Research Methodology

To conduct this analysis, I have reviewed past foreign and domestic research regarding organizational commitment and stress factors. Based on such literature review and the theoretical frameworks proposed by past research, I have created a survey that aims to measure organizational commitment and stress factors.

The survey was then distributed online, from May 1, 2017 through May 26, 2017 for a duration of approximately 2 weeks. After distribution, I have called a number of contacts to active duty interpreting officers in an effort to collect as many data points as possible. The collected data was then analyzed through the IBM SPSS statistics data editor.

III. Literature Review

III-1. Occupational Stress

Occupational stress has been defined in various ways by numerous scholars. In dictionary terms, stress is roughly defined as mental, emotional, or physical tensions that may be a factor in disease causation.

More specifically, occupational stress is one that is related to one's occupation or vocation. It occurs when a misalignment occurs between an individual's skills, knowledge, or expectations and the responsibilities that a certain position demands. Stress literature also implies that occupational stress can occur due to relationship issues from the workplace. Occupational stress of such kind can be caused by a lack of support from either peers or supervisors and suggests that relationship concerns and issues across the organizational hierarchy can influence an individual's occupational stress level.

The World Health Organization (WHO) defines occupational stress, or work-related stress as follows: "Work-related stress is the response people may have when presented with work demands and pressures that are not matched to their knowledge and abilities and which challenge their ability to cope." (WHO, 2017)

Furthermore, the WHO posits that stress "occurs in a wide range of work circumstances but is often made worse when employees feel they have little support from supervisors and colleagues, as well as little control over work processes." (WHO, 2017)

An examination of stress literature also offers numerous theoretical frameworks and psychological models that aim to explain occupational stress and its structure. Notable models include:

Person-Environment Fit Model: The person-environment fit model emphasizes the importance of the alignment between an individual's abilities and the demands of the job position or the occupational environment. It states that match or fit between the individual and his/her work environment is a critical factor in influencing one's health. Lewin (1951) stated that the interaction between an individual's personal traits and his/her respective working environment is aptly predictive of the strain an individual perceives. Further study of stress literature regarding this model shows that for healthy working conditions to pursue, an individual's abilities and skill sets must align with the specific demands that the position requires and also that aspects of the working environment must align with the individual's needs, knowledge, and potential. A misfit in either will cause the worker to feel strained and the degree of the perceived strain is correlated to the degree of the gap or misalignment. The model also suggests that

denial and coping may act as responses to such misalignments (Mark & Smith, 2008).

<Table 2. Various Elaborations on the P-E fit Model>

Name	Arguments
Lewin (1951)	Lewin claimed that an individual's strain, behavior, and health are determined by the interaction between one's working environment and one's individual characteristics.
French (1973)	French expanded Lewin's concept and claimed that the match or fit between the working environment and individuals greatly affects an individual's health.
Sonnentag & Frese (2003)	Claimed that the degree of misfit between an individual and his or her working environment correlates to the degree of strain felt by individuals.
French, Caplan & Harrison (1982)	Claimed that strains affect a variety of issues including health and work productivity/efficiency.
Buunk, deJonge, Ybema & de Wolff (1998)	Claimed that in an attempt to reduce the degree of misfit between the individual and the environment, defense mechanisms (denial, reappraisal of needs, coping) are utilized.
Buunk et al. (1998)	Suggests that the model lacks empirical evidence.

Mark & Smith's description of the past scholars' thoughts on the P-E fit model

Source: Stress models: a review and suggested new direction (Mark &Smith, 2008)

Job Characteristics Model: This model posits that core job aspects or characteristics bring about certain work-related outcomes. Such job characteristics include: "skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback." (Mark & Smith, 2008) It concludes that these core aspects lead to certain psychological states that in turn affect an individual's behavior in the workplace such as one's motivation, satisfaction, performance, and absenteeism (Mark & Smith, 2008).

Jobs-Demand Resources Model: The jobs-demand resource model states that strains are a result of the overload of job demands and a relative lack of resources to deal with such demands. This model states that while there is a variety of causes for the well-being of an employee in the context of working environments, these causes can at large be categorized into two categories, job demands and job resources, and that the imbalance between the two effects strains among individuals. (Balducci, Schaufeli and Fraccaroli, 2011)

Job demands: Occupation related demands (physical, psychological, social, organizational) that require a worker's effort to be resolved, usually in the form of investing time and/or energy. (Balducci, Schaufeli and Fraccaroli, 2011)

Job resources: Assets (physical, psychological, social, organizational aspects) that

help achieve work related goals or reduce job demands. (Balducci, Schaufeli and Fraccaroli, 2011)

Effort-Reward Imbalance Model: Rooted in medical sociology, the effort-reward imbalance (ERI) model explores the reciprocal relationship between the efforts an individual puts in and the rewards he/she gains from such efforts (van Vegchel et al., 2005). The distance, or imbalance between effort and reward is what cause strains within the ERI model. For example, work that demands high demands on part of the employee with low rewards characterize what is known as a reciprocity deficit (high cost but low reward) within this model and could cause negative emotions and strain reactions. As the ERI model has medical applications, studies have also shown that effort-reward imbalance also leads to physical disruptions such as cardiac events. This model is also aptly predictive of negative emotions that in turn damage an individual's well being (Gaillard & Wientjes, 1994). In short, the ERI model posits that individuals committing excessive efforts that do not receive corresponding rewards for such efforts experience the most stress imbalance.

III-2. Stress Factors

Stress factors, or stressors, are various work related or occupational

factors within the workplace that cause or promote stress among workers of that environment. There are various causes of stress and scholars have categorized stressors in a number of ways. Scholars such as McGrath identified stress factors lie in areas of job, role, situation, physical environment, social environment, personal factors (Bae, cited in Lee, 2012). Subsets factors include task ambiguity, workload, role conflict, role ambiguity, negative relations among others. Beehr & Newman identified that stressor can be categorized into work environment & personal factors and subset factors include nature of tasks, nature of the organization, worker's physical/mental state among others (Bae, cited in Lee, 2012). Marshall & Cooper identified that the nature of work, relationships within the organization, opportunity for career development, working environment climate, personal factors, among others are stress factors (Lee and Park, 2011).

In this research, stress factors will be organized into three categories: career, environmental, and relationship factors.

Career factor: Career factors measure the extent in which survey participants feel their current work is promoting their careers. Questions address the traditional stressors such as career development factors outlined by scholars such as Cooper & Marshall, but also aim to measure achievement and perceived sense of impact.

Environmental factor: Environmental factors measure how the individual perceives the nature of his/her workplace. Such characteristics include emphasis on individual attention given at the workplace, how much an individual feels personal growth is possible at the workplace, and encouragement towards innovation.

Relationship factor: Relationship factors measure how the participants view their relations with peers and superiors. It also aims to measure the extent of support participants feel they are receiving from peers and superiors.

III-3. Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment has been conceptualized and theoretically framed in various ways by numerous scholars. In general terms, organizational commitment is the sense of bond, connection or loyalty employees feel towards their respective affiliated organizations. Porter, Steer, Mowday & Boulian states that organizational commitment serves as an effective "evaluative linkage" between the employee and his/her organization (Porter et al., 1974). Such evaluation viewed organizational commitment as a singular construct while scholars such as Allen and Meyer suggested a three-component model of

organizational commitment. Allen and Meyer labeled the three components as affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment respectively (Meyer and Allen, 1991).

Affective Commitment: Affective commitment is an emotional alignment or attachment the employee feels towards his or her respective organization. In other words, this component refers to "emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization." (Allen and Meyer, 1990)

Continuance Commitment: The 'continuance' component of Allen and Meyer's model refers to the "commitment based on the costs that employees associate with leaving the organization." (Allen and Meyer, 1990) Anything that increases the cost associated with leaving the organization can lead to the development of continuance commitment.

Normative Commitment: The model's third and final 'normative' component is described as the "employees' feelings of obligation to remain with the organization." (Allen and Meyer, 1990)

Since Allen and Meyer developed the three component approach to viewing organizational commitment, theoretical foundations for discussing

organizational commitment have shifted towards the three component model from a one component model in many academic works that followed Allen and Meyer (Kang, cited in Koo, Jung & Han, 2016).

In the context of this research, organizational commitment will be limited to affective commitment. The reasoning for this limitation is due to the nature of the sample group, namely Air Force interpreting officers. Interpreting officers serve a fixed duration of 3 years after being commissioned as 2nd lieutenants. As discussed before, the timing of the exit from the military is fixed. Interpreting officers rarely choose to serve long term in the military and transition to civilian status upon completion of their mandatory service. Therefore, whether they leave the armed forces is not so much a variable but a constant. An application of continuance commitment, which is organizational commitment that individuals associate with the cost of leaving their respective workplace and normative commitment, which is organizational commitment individuals associate with a sense of obligation to stay within their organization is somewhat difficult to apply to a workplace where the one's exit is confirmed.

III-4. Organizational Commitment and Stress Factors

A handful of stress and organizational commitment literature shows that in many cases, strains or stress factors affect organizational commitment.

A study of nurse administrators by Lee & Henderson showed that stress affects organizational commitment scores. Specifically, the research establishes the relationship between organizational commitment and burnout, which occurs when the stressors an individual experiences outweigh and exceed the individual's ability to cope with them. Commitment scores were found to be inversely correlated with burnout scale scores that measure depersonalization, personal accomplishment, emotional exhaustion (Lee and Henderson, 1996).

Domestic literature also provides some foundation for discussing the effects of stress factors on organizational commitment. A study of Korean provincial public servants has shown that negative relationships with either peers or superiors have a negative effect on occupational satisfaction as well as organizational commitment (Park, cited in Lee, 2012).

Further research by Lee which focused on the effect of stress factors on the organizational commitment of the Korea National Oil Corporation also displayed that the nature of relationships, both peer relations and relations with one's superior, had an impact on organizational commitment. In short, positive

relations meant higher organizational commitment. Furthermore, personal growth factor is another stress factor outlined by Lee that affected organizational commitment. The greater the personal growth factor, which measures whether an employee believes he/she can achieve greater levels of personal growth and gain new skill sets, was shown to have a direct(+) relationship with organizational commitment (Lee, 2012).

IV. Sample Selection and Means of Analysis

IV-1. Sample Selection

Sample group chosen for this research is Air Force interpreting officers in the Republic of Korea Armed Forces. This group is distinctive for a number of reasons. For one, the group sets itself apart from other public servant groups in that these officers are expected to serve a fixed duration. That is, unlike other job groups in which individuals make a conscious choice to either stay or leave, interpreting officers, and at large other military service members serving their respective mandatory service, are expected to exit their work after fulfilling their compulsory service duties. It would be worthwhile to observe whether stress factors will have an effect on a group that is expected to leave after a fixed duration of time.

To gather data, a survey that measures stress factors and organizational commitment was distributed to current active duty Air Force interpreting officers and recently discharged Air Force interpreting officers. 18 questions measured stress factors (4 that measured career growth factors, 4 that measured environmental factors, and 5 that measures relationship factors). Table 3 outlines the number of questions designated per stress factor category. Approximately 160

individuals were reached out via email and social network services. Excluding survey responses that have answer omissions, 50 surveys were ultimately gathered.

<Table 3. Survey Breakdown>

Category		Questions	No. of Questions
Stress Factors	Career Development	7,8,9,10	4
	Environment	11,12,13	3
	Relationships	14,15,16,17,18	5
Job Satisfaction		6	1
Organizational Commitment		1,2,3,4,5	5

IV-2. Method of Analysis

Collected data was then processed the statistics package IBM SPSS. Among other uses, SPSS was utilized to calculate the numeric characteristics of the sample data, verify the relationship between the dependent variable (organizational commitment) and independent variables (stress factors), and also used to check the validity and reliability of independent variables. SPSS was also

used to check if there existed a meaningful difference in the organization commitment felt by interpreting officers depending on the rank or seniority of the superior officer they interpret for.

In addition to quantitative analysis, the research took on a qualitative angle as well. I interviewed three officers that would augment quantitative results. The interviews took place roughly for 30 to 40 minutes each, and was conducted by phone. I told the interviewee that the conversation would be recorded, after which time I wrote down a scripted version of our conversation. I then shared the script with the interviewee to ensure that he was comfortable with the written responses and invited him to make any change he wished. The scripts and quotes from the interview that are displayed on this paper are a result of such editing. For the purpose of protecting privacy, names and personal details are left omitted and whatever personal information that is disclosed in the interview are disclosed at the discretion of the interviewee.

V. Analysis

V-1. Sample Characteristics

The following are the results of the frequency analysis conducted on the sample data gathered.

<Table 4. Sample Characteristics>

Sex					
	Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Cat.	Male	50	100.0	100.0	100.0
Age					
	Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Cat.	24	4	8.0	8.0	8.0
	25	4	8.0	8.0	16.0
	26	17	34.0	34.0	50.0
	27	14	28.0	28.0	78.0
	28	5	10.0	10.0	88.0
	29	3	6.0	6.0	94.0
	30	3	6.0	6.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Class					
	Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Cat.	128	3	6.0	6.0	6.0
	129	4	8.0	8.0	14.0
	130	3	6.0	6.0	20.0
	131	14	28.0	28.0	48.0

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	132	9	18.0	18.0	66.0
	133	6	12.0	12.0	78.0
	134	8	16.0	16.0	94.0
	135	3	6.0	6.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Operational Specialty

	Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Cat.	Air Control	3	6.0	6.0	6.0
	Air Defense Artillery	5	10.0	10.0	16.0
	Air Traffic Control	1	2.0	2.0	18.0
	Communications	1	2.0	2.0	20.0
	Education & Administration	4	8.0	8.0	28.0
	Intelligence	11	22.0	22.0	50.0
	Logistics	15	30.0	30.0	80.0
	Weapons Maintenance	9	18.0	18.0	98.0
	Weather	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Location

	Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Cat.	Other	22	44.0	44.0	44.0
	Seoul	28	56.0	56.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Unit

	Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Cat.	BH	2	4.0	4.0	4.0
	CFC	3	6.0	6.0	10.0
	COM	12	24.0	24.0	34.0
	DAPA	2	4.0	4.0	38.0
	HQ	2	4.0	4.0	42.0
	JCS	3	6.0	6.0	48.0

	MND	16	32.0	32.0	80.0
	OTHER	10	20.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

As for sex, 100% of the survey participants were male. A large bulk of the survey participants were in their mid-twenties with the vast majority of the group composed of officers aged between 26 to 28. Class distribution is shown above. As of April 2017, classes of 128 ~ 131 are discharged reserve officers. In other words, 48% of the sample is composed of recently discharged interpreting officers and 52% is composed of active duty officers. Operational specialty of the survey participants are varied and is displayed on the table above. The location of the units of survey participants is shown above as well. 56% of the survey participants are stationed in units based in Seoul and 44% are stationed elsewhere on the peninsula. Unit breakdown is shown above (BH: Blue House, CFC: Combined Forces Command, COM: Commands, DAPA: Defense Acquisition Program Administration, HQ: Air Force Headquarters, JCS: Joints Chiefs of Staff, MND: Ministry of National Defense).

V-2. Validity

To review the validity of stress factors (independent variables), a principle component analysis was conducted.

<Table 5. KMO values>

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.714
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	207.545
	df	66
	Sig.	0.000

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test displays whether a given data is suitable for factor analysis. With a KMO value of over 0.7, the data set is deemed as suitable for a principle component analysis.

<Table 6. Total Variance>

Total Variance Explained									
				Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulativ e %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.155	34.622	34.622	4.155	34.622	34.622	2.872	23.937	23.937
2	1.932	16.104	50.726	1.932	16.104	50.726	2.317	19.308	43.245
3	1.254	10.449	61.175	1.254	10.449	61.175	2.152	17.930	61.175
4	0.856	7.132	68.307						
5	0.824	6.869	75.176						
6	0.774	6.450	81.626						
7	0.541	4.506	86.132						
8	0.505	4.211	90.343						
9	0.417	3.476	93.819						
10	0.299	2.488	96.307						
11	0.242	2.019	98.326						
12	0.201	1.674	100.000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

Table 6 shows that three principle components have been revealed and that it accounts for approximately 61% of the variance. The component matrix is shown on table 7. In this research, questions with a value of 0.7 or higher will be chosen for regression analysis and survey questions below 0.7 will be discarded.

<Table 7. Rotated Component Matrix>

Rotated Component Matrix[a]			
	Component		
	1	2	3
Q8	**0.817**	0.195	0.116
Q7	**0.785**	0.136	-0.009
Q10	**0.777**	-0.124	0.239
Q9	**0.760**	0.198	-0.020
Q11	0.080	**0.817**	0.160
Q13	0.089	**0.808**	0.093
Q12	0.486	0.593	0.110
Q17	-0.073	-0.005	**0.790**
Q18	0.252	0.055	**0.760**
Q15	0.147	0.492	0.544
Q14	-0.050	0.374	0.538
Q16	0.251	0.385	0.497
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.			
a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.			

V-3. Reliability

Cronbach alpha values will be used to test the reliability of chosen survey questions to measure their respective variables. Categories with a Cronbach Alpha value of over 0.6 will be deemed as appropriate in this research. Stress factors and the dependant variable all have values over 0.6 and are therefore deemed as reliable.

<Table 8. Cronbach Alpha Values>

Category		No. of Questions	Cronbach's Alpha
Stress Factors	Career	4	0.813
	Environment	2	0.745
	Relationship	2	0.611
D. Variable	Org Commit.	5	0.784

V-4. Quantitative Analysis

< Table 9. Kruskal-Wallis Test>

Test Statistics[a,b]	
	Org. Commit.
Kruskal-Wallis H	10.503
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	0.005
a. Kruskal Wallis Test	
b. Grouping Variable: sup_cat2	

<Table 10. Organizational Commitment by Category>

Ranks				
Category		N	Rank Sum	Average
Org. Commit.	Action Officers (O-3 ~ O-6)	14	24.96	3.6
	General Officers (O-7 ~ O-9)	25	20.52	3.416
	Senior Leadership (O-10 & above)	11	37.50	4.29
	Total	50		

Application of the Kruskal-Wallis test reveals that there is a meaningful difference in the average organizational commitment score of interpreting officers. Those who interpret for mostly action officers scored an average of 3.6, those who interpret for 1 ~ 3 star general officers scored an average of 3.4, and those who interpret for 4-star generals and above scored the highest average score of 4.29.

<Table 11. Regression Result (1)>

Model Summary[b]					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.791[a]	0.626	0.602	0.4715	2.195
a. Predictors: (Constant), rel, career, env					
b. Dependent Variable: Org Commit					

ANOVA[a]					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	17.152	3	5.717	25.713	.000[b]
Residual	10.228	46	0.222		
Total	27.380	49			
a. Dependent Variable: Org Commit					
b. Predictors: (Constant), rel, career, env					

Coefficients[a]								
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients				Collinearity Statistics	
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	1.008	0.336		2.996	0.004		
career	0.577	0.078	0.691	7.369	0.000*	0.923	1.083
environment	0.133	0.068	0.185	1.941	0.058**	0.894	1.119
relation	0.087	0.073	0.111	1.184	0.243	0.918	1.089
a. Dependent Variable: Org Commit							

* $p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.1$

Regression results show that career factors (p-value < 0.05) and environmental factors (p-value < 0.1) have an effect on organizational commitment. It also shows that career factors have the greatest influence on interpreting officers by far.

<Table 12. Regression Result (2)>

Model Summary[b]					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.803[a]	0.645	0.605	0.4699	2.026
a. Predictors: (Constant), edu, rel, Age, career, env					
b. Dependent Variable: Org Commit					

ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	17.665	5	3.533	16.002	.000[b]
	Residual	9.715	44	0.221		
	Total	27.380	49			
a. Dependent Variable: Org Commit						
b. Predictors: (Constant), edu, rel, Age, career, env						

Coefficients[a]								
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	0.015	1.234		0.012	0.990		
	career	0.584	0.078	0.699	7.459	0.000*	0.917	1.090
	env	0.138	0.070	0.192	1.980	0.054**	0.856	1.169
	rel	0.070	0.074	0.090	0.947	0.349	0.897	1.114
	Age	0.039	0.046	0.077	0.845	0.403	0.960	1.042
	edu	-0.277	0.209	-0.122	-1.324	0.192	0.953	1.049
a. Dependent Variable: Org Commit								

* $p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.1$

Regression results that reflect other variables such as age and education also show similar results. Age and education have shown not to have a statistically meaningful effect on organizational commitment of interpreting officers.

V-5. Qualitative Analysis

In order to gain a qualitative evidence to support the quantitative results acquired, three interviews were conducted. The interview was conducted via phone calls and lasted an average of approximately 30 minutes. Upon calling, I told the interviewees that the conversation would be recorded and scripted. Upon completing the script, I mailed the script to the interviewees for final review and modified any changes they wished on their responses. Some interviewees were less reluctant about sharing their experience in detail while others were not. Certain details of the interview have been removed at the request of the interviewee, but overall, the script by and large faithfully reflects the conversations that took place.

The interviews were based on shared questions, but at times I asked follow-on questions to get a more detailed response. Lieutenant A was commissioned as a 2nd lieutenant in December of 2013 and was first positioned at the Air Force Operations Command(AFOC) located within Osan airbase as an intelligence officer where he mostly interpreted for action officers. He later transferred to the Defense Acquisition Program Agency in Seoul, where he interpreted for general officers. Lieutenant B was an officer who ultimately interpreted for a 4-star general. Lieutenant C was an officer who did little

interpreting related work and in rare case where he did interpret, he interpreted for actions officers. The interviews were conducted in English, but the lieutenant C responded with a mix of English and Korean and the Korean portion was translated to the script.

Interview Script - Lieutenant A

Describe your time in the military.

I was commissioned as a 2nd lieutenant in December of 2013. After that I vividly remember entering interpreter training at Osan airbase. The training continued for 3 months and in the following months after training I was positioned first at the Air Force Operations Command(AFOC) located within Osan airbase. Specifically I worked at the intelligence division within AFOC, more commonly known as A2[2]. Within the office, I was an interpreter as well as an aircraft intelligence officer, which meant I dealt with foreign intelligence and was in charge of any and all coordination that need to occur between Korean and U.S. intelligence branches within Osan. After that I PCSed[3] and moved to DAPA, short for Defense Acquisition Program Agency. DAPA is a government agency under the Ministry of National Defense and is responsible for all matters related to developing or selling defense products. Within DAPA, I was part of the UAV projects team, which overlooked the development and sales of unmanned aerial vehicles. This was the office I spent most of my career, both time wise and effort wise I would say. There I translated defense contracts and was acted as an interpreter for meetings and negotiations. I discharged honorably November 2016.

---

[2] A2: Military term for intelligence branches in an Air Force command structure.
[3] PCS (Permanent Change of Station): Military term for transferring to a new unit/office. Often used in verb form in conversations.

As you know Korean males must serve in the military. Why did you choose to fulfill your mandatory service as an interpreting officer? Was it your first choice among other options to fulfill your mandatory service?

For me I feel the largest factor was timing. At the time It felt like the most fitting option. To be completely honest fulfilling my service duties as and interpreting officer was my 2nd choice. I think like it is the case for many of my peers serving as a KATUSA[4] was my first choice. The public perception is such that we perceive military service not necessarily as a virtue to be applauded upon, but rather as a social obstacle that is best taken care of as soon as possible.

Knowing what you know now, would you choose to serve as an interpreting officer over serving as an enlisted KATUSA?

If I knew back then what I know now, yes serving as an Air Force interpreting officer would be my first choice option for fulfilling my mandatory service requirement. Back then, I wanted to serve as a KATUSA mainly because the duration of service is shorter. But throughout my service I've experienced what it is like to work as an interpreting officer and I have also observed KATUSA soldiers. I feel KATUSA soldiers, because they are enlisted personnel, have

---

[4] KATUSA (Korean Augmentation To the United States Army): Korean Army enlisted personnel who are augmented to U.S. units on the Korean peninsula. KATUSAs work and live with U.S. service members. As it is somewhat implied in the interview, the opportunity to work as a KATUSA is highly coveted among qualified individuals. KATUSAs also serve for approximately 2 years.

limited opportunities. As an officer, one would be given a lot more responsibility, and as a consequence, would be able to come across more diverse and in-depth opportunities.

What kind of opportunities?

The opportunity to do something meaningful or do significant work. And getting something out of your time in the military.

Overall, would you say you are satisfied with your military career?

For the reasons I've outlined, yes.

Do you feel your work was important? Do you have a sense of attachment to your organization?

Yes. Not everyday, but when I was interpreting for important and consequential meetings or translating an important contract or letter I definitely felt my work was important and felt attached to my office.

What is the most meaningful memory you have in the military?

There was this one TDY[5] that was both memorable and meaningful. It was early 2016, in other words, the early phase of last year. I was in Washington DC and

---

[5] TDY (Temporary Duty): Travel assignments.

met with State Department officials to discuss a set of regulations hampering development of ROK UAV assets. I was only accompanying a colonel, not a high profile officer or a general. It was very much an action officer level talk, not a senior general officer level meeting. It lasted less than 30 minutes, but it was meaningful for me because this talk ultimately initiated a series a long chain of meetings that eventually led to the wavering of certain regulations. It was the most immediate and visible chain reaction of positive change I've seen in my career. This made me feel like I contributed to something important and consequential.

Compare your two posts during your military career.

When I moved to DAPA, it definitely felt like a promotion. I was of course, promoted to a 1st lieutenant, but I also felt like I moved up in the hierarchy. Whereas I was working on exclusively military affairs at Osan and working with strictly military personnel, at DAPA I had an opportunity to work not with just military leadership, but also officials from external organizations, other government departments, and foreign government officials. It felt the scope of work I was doing was expanded to a greater degree. I felt I was empowered to make greater impact.

Do you think you felt that because you were now working with higher ranking leadership?

I would say it has more to do with the spectrum of interactions. For me, it's the diversity of the experience that matters. With that said, I would say there would be some correlation with your leader's grade and the nature of your work, as interpreting for senior leadership does open doors for exciting opportunities for career growth.

Between good relations with your co-workers and your boss, an environment that is caring to its members, and getting the experience that will help your career, what is most important to you?

they are all important. But if I had to rank them, the second is less important for me. career and personal growth that is possible based on the position that I am given is the most important. It's all about the nature of what I do. If I had to choose only one, I would prefer having an opportunity to learn and grow versus having a good environment or having good relations.

Interview Script - Lieutenant B

Describe your time in the military.

I first worked as an intelligence officer and interpreted for action officers, between O-3 and O-5. I spent about a year doing that, worked alongside U.S. intelligence counterparts and PCSed to Seoul. There, I worked for a general officer, participated in annual military simulated exercises until I was picked up to interpret for a 4-star general.

As you know Korean males must serve in the military. Why did you choose to fulfill your mandatory service as an interpreting officer? Was it your first choice among other options to fulfill your mandatory service?

Frankly, serving as an interpreting officer was not my first choice at the time. It was serving as a KATUSA, but I wasn't selected. At which point I had two options: serve as a conscripted enlisted soldier for 2 years or serve as an officer. I ultimately chose the latter because I felt I can learn more and get something out the experience. As I was contemplating on how to fulfill my duties, some of my acquaintances as well as my father recommended that I serve as an interpreting officer as they felt serving underneath high ranking officials and observing such

senior leadership will be a worthwhile experience.

Knowing what you know now, would you choose to serve as an interpreting officer over serving as an enlisted KATUSA?

Looking back, I think serving as an interpreting officer is still my second choice. The experience I had, serving for a 4-star general was a rare one, one that not all interpreting officers have the privilege to experience. If I had the guarantee that I will interpret for a high ranking figure like I did, I would then definitely choose to serve as an officer. The lessons I learned were invaluable. I guess we all have different priorities in serving.

Overall, would you say you are satisfied with your military career?

I think this experience will definitely help me in the long run. I don't feel any immediate benefits, but the lessons learned during my service were invaluable. My military career gave me a glimpse into senior military leadership and how to run a 4 star command.

Do you feel your work was important? Do you have a sense of attachment to your organization?

I feel my attachment grew as I moved positions. During my first assignment, briefings and updates I was responsible for could just get canceled if they had no

time for that. It happened frequently and when it happens it was a letdown. It feels like your work isn't appreciated, and you start doing the bare minimum. I'll do it to a certain standard, but I was not proactive. When I moved to Seoul and interpreted for a general officer, everything I did mattered – sometimes it went on the news, my work would go up to higher leadership, and I'll be there to brief other general officers. I felt the amount of work I put in correlated to the quality of the outcome. I certainly felt the appreciation and got attached, tried even harder. I think people around me noticed this and helped me get recommended to become an interpreter for a 4-star general. Once I made it as an interpreter for a 4-star officer, I was more attached as I felt I was making a clear and visible difference and making an impact.

What is the most meaningful memory you have in the military?

I remember a TDY to the US. We met with senior leadership, and in the dialogues that followed, I felt I was part of a bigger diplomatic effort. I was making change behind curtains. It felt great because making such contribution was one of my initial goals for joining as an interpreting officer.

Interview Script - Lieutenant C

Describe your time in the military.

I worked initially at KDLI[6]. My first role was as an English instructor. In that capacity, I trained Army, Navy, and Air Force officers as well as NCOs who were planning for overseas deployment or education as well as those who needed English proficiency in their respective unit. There I also developed teaching contents and textbooks for my class. Later on, I developed more special courses such as the "E-clinic," which was designed to help better pronunciations for students. It was a special 1 on 1 course.

As you know Korean males must serve in the military. Why did you choose to fulfill your mandatory service as an interpreting officer? Was it your first choice among other options to fulfill your mandatory service?

Yes it was actually my first choice since I entered college. I knew many seniors who were serving as interpreting officers in the Army and Air Force. I would have served as a regular officer had I not got accepted as an interpreting officer. It felt better to serve as an officer than as a conscripted enlisted personnel. The reason I wanted to be an officer was because it felt like a better use of my time.

---

[6] KDLI: Korea Defense Language Institute.

Yes, you do have to serve for three years compared to the 2 years you would serve as an enlisted soldier. But as an enlisted, you do not have control over those 2 years. As an officer you work, and get off at work at six. You can do other things for your personal development. While they are both serving your country, I felt if I served as an officer the time would be more meaningful - I would have more responsibility and could contribute more.

Overall, would you say you are satisfied with your military career?

Overall, I was satisfied in the beginning, but I feel I could have done more other than just teaching. For three years I did more or less the same work. I feel I could have been more motivated if I did other things. The working environment was not motivating. It was very repetitive. Every course was pretty much the same. But yes, initially I was satisfied and that's also the reason I didn't PCS to another post.

When you say you think you could have done more, does that include transferring to a different post if you had a chance?

Definitely. As I've said, I was initially satisfied with my work and decided not to PCS. But after seeing my peers move on to other positions, making deals and coordinating negotiations, I felt I could have gained a sense of satisfaction through such experiences as well.

Where did the initial satisfaction come from?

The initial satisfaction came from my students. They really motivated me. I saw non natives who couldn't speak a word of English grow and learn through me and that was the biggest satisfaction. I felt like I was positively influencing them. The second source was free time to prepare for my career as an accountant.

Do you feel your work was important? Do you have a sense of attachment to your organization?

Yes. I was attached to my work. It's something that is not on the books, you are not told to do it, but I feel what you do matters. I spent a lot of time preparing for classes and students became much better. After the first course, I felt I could make a difference. However, the sense of attachment withered away with repetition. I wanted to make a new impact.

What is the most meaningful memory you have in the military?

The most meaningful moments are when students contacted me or come back to KDLI. It's meaningful to me when students come back with a higher TOEIC score or other tangible results. It was much different than what I expected. I came into the Air Force thinking I'll mostly be interpreting. I was doing something different, but I learned to gain satisfaction from that.

Between good relations with your co-workers and your boss, an environment that is caring to its members, and getting the experience that will help your career, what is most important to you?

All three are important of course. Without good peers, boss relationships and a good environment I think I would lose motivation. But career opportunities is of course the most important. Teaching was what I did in the military, but at the end of the day, that experience is not something that will likely help me in my career after the military. For example, I was interested in pursuing an MBA or career in finance. So in the latter phase of my military career I wasn't as motivated to teach well. You begin to question whether your commitment to this job will help you in your career. In the end, I think I did the bare minimum for work. Normally, I would go beyond my given expectations but at the end I did only what was required and spent the rest of my time trying develop my career prospects. Overall, I ask whether this work will help me in my career and that's the most important.

V-6. Cross Case Analysis

A number of commonalities were observed across three interviews. Firstly, across all three interviews, what these interpreting officers deemed most important was opportunity for growth, impact, and career development.

"[at DAPA] It felt the scope of work I was doing was expanded to a greater degree. I felt I was empowered to make greater impact."

-Lieutenant A

"I remember a TDY to the US. We met with senior leadership, and in the dialogues that followed, I felt I was part of a bigger diplomatic effort. I was making change behind curtains. It felt great because making such contribution was one of my initial goals for joining as an interpreting officer."

-Lieutenant B

"You begin to question whether your commitment to this job will help you in your career. In the end, I think I did the bare minimum for work. Normally, I would go beyond my given expectations but at the end I did

only what was required and spent the rest of my time trying develop my career prospects. Overall, I ask whether this work will help me in my career and that's the most important."

-Lieutenant C

Such emphasis on career is consistent with regression results as well. It is also interesting to note that lieutenant A & B both considered serving as an enlisted KATUSA over serving as an interpreting officer. lieutenant C on the other hand, wanted to serve as an officer since college because he thought he can best utilize his time in the military as an officer. In the case of lieutenant A & B, it is clear that to them, the duration of service mattered because initially serving 2 years as an enlisted KATUSA was their first choice in terms of fulfilling their mandatory service. However, lieutenant A noted that knowing what he knows now serving as an interpreting officer would be his first choice and lieutenant B noted that he would serve as an officer again if he were guaranteed to interpret for senior leadership.

"If I knew back then what I know now, yes serving as an Air Force interpreting officer would be my first choice option for fulfilling my mandatory service requirement ... As an officer, one would be given a lot more responsibility, and as a consequence would be able to come across more diverse and in-depth opportunities."

<div align="right">-Lieutenant A</div>

"If I had the guarantee that I will interpret for a high ranking figure like I did, I would then definitely choose to serve as an officer. The lessons I learned were invaluable."

<div align="right">-Lieutenant B</div>

What we see here again is that individuals hold opportunities for career development of utmost importance to the extent they are willing to serve longer durations if such opportunity is given.

As lieutenant B mentioned, it also seems that the rank of the superior officer whom an interpreter works for is of some importance as well. Lieutenant B was only willing to consider serving as an officer as a first choice option if there were guarantees that he can serve for a senior general like he did. Lieutenant C also mentions that he does look back and think he could have enjoyed more opportunities had he aimed at transferring to a post that involves

engaging with senior leadership. However, it is also worthy to note that lieutenant C also felt a great deal of satisfaction and attachment during his early career teaching his students.

> *"The initial satisfaction came from my students. They really motivated me. I saw non natives who couldn't speak a word of English grow and learn through me and that was the biggest satisfaction. I felt like I was positively influencing them."*
>
> -Lieutenant C

Such statement suggests that when interpreting officers seek career growth, the issue is not so much about the rank of the officer one supports, but rather the experience and opportunity for personal development that likely accompanies interpreting for a senior military leader. Lieutenant A captures this idea best when he comments:

> *"I would say it has more to do with the spectrum of interactions [than rank] ... With that said, I would say there would be some correlation with your leader's grade and the nature of your work, as interpreting for senior leadership does open doors for exciting opportunities for career growth."*
>
> -Lieutenant A

This may explain why the organizational commitment scores for interpreting officers who serve 1~3 star generals are only slightly lower than those who serve action officers while the organizational commitment scores for those who serve 4-star generals and above have significantly higher scores.

VI. Conclusion and Limitations

Quantitative analysis has shown that of the four hypotheses outlined, three hold.

1) H-1: There will be meaningful difference in the level of organizational commitment felt by interpreting officers depending on the rank of his/her superior officer.

2) H-2: Career factors will have a positive(+) effect on organizational commitment.

3) H-3: Environmental factors will have a positive(+) effect on organizational commitment.

4) H-4: Relationship factors will have a positive(+) effect on organizational commitment.

It has also been shown that career factors have a greater magnitude of effect on organizational commitment than environmental factors. The interviews have also shown that officers hold opportunities for growth and career development of utmost importance, which is a finding that is consistent with the quantitative examinations made.

Additionally, The organizational commitment scores of interpreting officers displayed different average values depending on the rank of the officer one interprets for, with the organizational commitment scores for those who serve senior leadership displaying the highest scores by far. This finding can be

understood as an extension of the first finding that states that officers in the end ultimately seek opportunities for growth. The interviews also suggest that in general, officers feel working for top senior officer will open doors to opportunities for growth and career development.

The research is of course, not without its limitations. Firstly, the sample group is an exceptionally select group of officers - most of them hold degrees from top foreign universities and are ambitious individuals. Testing this research in the context of a broader and more general audience will also be worthwhile. Secondly, the sample size is also a limiting factor. It is reasonable to assume a much larger set of data might have yielded different results.

Appendix: Survey Questions

A. Survey Primary Questions

No	Question	1	2	3	4	5
1	I feel as if my workplace's problems are my own.					
2	I feel emotionally attached to this organization and its agendas.					
3	I feel the work I do has a great deal of meaning and consequence.					
4	I am proud to tell others I work at my workplace.					
5	Working at my workplace has a great deal of personal meaning.					
6	Overall, how much are you satisfied with your job?					
7	I feel the experience I gain here will help me in my career.					
8	There is a great sense of achievement and impact.					
9	I feel a great sense of challenge with my work.					
10	This post has lived up to the expectations I had when I first entered.					
11	There is great emphasis on individual attention at my workplace.					
12	I feel personal growth is possible at this workplace.					
13	My workplace encourages innovation regarding my work.					
14	There is adequate amount of communication between co-workers at the workplace.					
15	There is a sense of unity and cohesiveness at my workplace.					
16	My co-workers give me the support I need for my work.					
17	My immediate superior can be relied upon when the things get tough.					
18	There is good quality performance feedback.					

1: Strongly Disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Undecided, 4: Agree, 5: Strongly Agree

B. Survey Personal Information Questions

Personal Information	Sample Answer
Class	OCS Class of 131
Name	Hong, Gil Dong
Age	27
Education	Undergraduate
Rank	First Lieutenant
Military Operational Specialty	Air Defense Artillery
Current/Former Office	Office of the Minister
Superior Officer Rank	General (O-10)
Superior Officer Title	Minister of National Defense

Bibliography

Allen, N. and Meyer, J. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63(1), pp.1-18.

Balducci, C., Schaufeli, W. and Fraccaroli, F. (2011). The job demands–resources model and counterproductive work behaviour: The role of job-related affect. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20(4), pp.467-496.

Gaillard, A. W. K., & Wientjes, C. J. E. (1994). Mental load and work stress as two types of energy mobilization. Work and Stress, 8, 141–152.

Koo, B., Jung, H. and Han, H. (2016). The Effect of Reward to Hotel Employees on Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention : Focusing on the Five Star Hotels in Seoul. Korean Journal of Hospitality & Tourism, 25(3), pp. 273-291.

Lee, J. and Park, K. (2011). Job Stress Factors among Firefighters and Their Priority: The Case of Incheon Metropolitan Fire Station. Korean Journal of Public Administration, Vol.49(4), p.331-351.

Lee, J. (2012).   Analysis of the effect of Stress variables on job satisfaction and
organizational commitment. - Based on the Korea National Oil Corp -.
Seoul National University Master's Thesis.

Lee, V. and Henderson, M. (1996). Occupational Stress and Organizational
Commitment in Nurse Administrators. The Journal of Nursing
Administration, 26(5), pp.21-28.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science; selected theoretical papers. New
York: Harper & Row.

Mark, G. M. and Smith, Andrew Paul (2008). Stress models: a review and
suggested new direction. Occupational Health Psychology, European
Perspectives On Research, Education and Practice, vol. 3. Nottingham:
Nottingham University Press, pp. 111-144.

Meyer, J. and Allen, N. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of
organizational commitment. Human Resource Management Review, 1(1),
pp.61-89.

Porter, L., Steers, R., Mowday, R. and Boulian, P. (1974). Organizational
commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians.
Journal of Applied Psychology, 59(5), pp.603-609.

van Vegchel, N., de Jonge, J., Bosma, H. and Schaufeli, W. (2005). Reviewing the
effort–reward imbalance model: drawing up the balance of 45 empirical
studies. Social Science & Medicine, 60(5), pp.1117-1131.

WHO (2017). Stress at the workplace. [online] Available at:

http://www.who.int/occupational_health/topics/stressatwp/en/ [Accessed 1

Jun. 2017].

Original Titles of Referenced Material

Koo, B., Jung, H. and Han, H. (2016). The Effect of Reward to Hotel Employees on Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention : Focusing on the Five Star Hotels in Seoul. Korean Journal of Hospitality & Tourism, 25(3), pp. 273-291.

구본학, 정희경, 한희섭. (2016). 호텔 종사원의 보상이 조직몰입과 이직의도에 미치는 영향. 호텔경영학연구, 25(3), 273-291.

Lee, J. and Park, K. (2011). Job Stress Factors among Firefighters and Their Priority: The Case of Incheon Metropolitan Fire Station. Korean Journal of Public Administration, Vol.49(4), p.331-351.

이종열, 박광욱. (2011). 직무스트레스 요인과 우선순위에 관한 연구: 인천지역 소방공무원을 중심으로. 행정논총, Vol.49(4), p.331-351.

Lee, J. (2012).   Analysis of the effect of Stress variables on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. - Based on the Korea National Oil Corp -. Seoul National University Master's Thesis.

이종협. (2012). 직무스트레스 요인이 직무만족도와 조직몰입도에 미치는 영향 분석 : 한국석유공사를 중심으로. 서울대학교 석사학위 논문.

국문초록

장 훈 익

서울대학교 행정대학원 정책학과

본 연구는 직무 스트레스 요인이 대한민국 공군통역장교들의 조직몰입도에 미치는 영향에 관한 연구이다. 직무 스트레스에 관한 선행연구를 기반으로 본 연구에서는 3가지의 스트레스 요인(경력요인, 환경요인, 관계요인)을 판별하였고 양적 실증연구를 통하여 통역장교들의 주 통역대상의 계급에 따라 통역장교들이 느끼는 조직몰입도의 유의미한 차이가 있음을 발견했다. 더불어 본 연구의 결과를 보면 직무 스트레스 요인 중 경력요인이 조직몰입도 가장 큰 영향을 미치는 것을 확인하였다. 양적 실증연구의 결과를 보완하기 위해 일대일 인터뷰 형태의 질적 연구 역시 진행하였다.

주요어 : 직무 스트레스 요인, 조직 몰입도, 통역장교
학 번 : 2015-24532