:   ,   ,   ,

–

–

.

:
:

•

1.

,

.

.

,

.

.

.

,

.

(1994)

.   (1994)

.

(1995)   .

(1995)   .   (1995)

.   ,

,   (1990)   –

,   .

,   .

.

.

4

(Summer, 1977).   ,   ,

,   (, 1982).

, (, 1983).
. (1978)

.

,

.

1
.

1 .

.

.

2.
.

1) .
2) .
3) .
4) .
3.
1) .
2) .
3) .
4) .
4.
1)

15

. .

2)

7 .

.
3)

18

.

.
4)

14 .

.

5)

,

1

.

·

1.

(1   )

O₁   **X**   **O₂**

1.

2.

1995   8   20   9   10   21   1

39   .

1)   .

2)   .

3)   .

4)   .

5)   .

27.8   ,   10   (25.6%),   29   (74.4%)

.   30   (76.9%)

9   (32.1%)   .   ,   ,

21   (54.8%)   18   (46.2%)   .   22   (56.4%),

17   (43.6%)   .   152   .

25   (64.1%)   ,   14   (35.9%)   .

11   20   (51.3%)   6   - 10

38(97.5%)   .   31   (79.5%)   ,

8   (20.5%)   ,   1

.   21   (53.8%),

18   (46.2%)   .   34   (87,2%)

5   (12.8%)   .

3.

4   (, 1990)

.   (1990)   5

4   .

1)   15   ,   ,   ,

,   ,   ,

．   Chronbach-*a*   0.81   ，

Chornbach-*a*   0.91   ．

　　2)   7   ，   ，

　　　　，   ．

Chronbach-*a*   0.86   .3)   18

　　　　　　　　　，   ，   ，   ，   ，

　　　　　　　．

Chronbach-*a*   0.86   ．

　　3)   18   ，

　　　，   ，   ，   ，   ．

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Chronbacl-*a*   0.80   ，

　　　　　　　　Chornbach-*a*   0.94   ，

　　4)   14   ，   ，

　　　，   ，   ，

　　．   Chronbach-*a*   0.86   ，

　　　　　　　Chronbach-*a*   0.93   ．

　　　4   '   (   )' 4 ,'   ．

(   )' 3 ,'   (   )' 2 ,'   .(   )' 1

．

4.

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　．

　　　　，   ．

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　．

　　　　　　20   ．

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　1

　　　　　　　　　　　．   20   ．

　　　　　　　　　　　　1

　　　　　　　　　　．   3

　　　　　　　　　　　7   ．

5.

　　　　　　　　　　Chronbach-*a*   ．

　　　　　　，

　　　paired t-test   ．

　　　　　　SAS/PC(Release 6.04 for DOS)Program   ．

6.

　　　　　　　　．

•

DuGas(1977)   ,   ,   ,

                    .

            (Winslow, 1976).   .

(1974)

                ,   ,   ,   ,

                                                            .

                                                . Schlotfeldt(1976)

        ,   ,

                            .

                                                                        .

    (1971)

                                                                    .

(1981)

                                ,   ,   ,   ,   ,

        ,   ,

            .   (1978)   (1983)

                    .

        ,   ,   ,   .

                            .

                                                                            .

                                                .

                                                        .

    (Moss, 1981)   -

            ,   .

                                ,   (, 1990).

        (Swanson, 1978).

                                    (Mercer, 1986).   (1995)

288

. Rubin(1967)

. , , (1973)

, ,

,

. (1991)

, , , , ,

,

3

.

. Pohl(1965)

.

Marecki.(1979)

.

(1979) ,

,

. (1991)

, , , , ,

, 3

.

. Pohl(1965)

.

Marecki.(1979)

.

(1979) ,

,

.

. (1983)

, , . (1983)

(1994) . (1985)

. (1983) (1990)

,

,

.

,   ,

.

(1982)   ,   ,
,   ,
.

.

1.

(1   ).

<   1>

					t		p
37.10	4.63	47.97	5.07	10.04	38	0.0001
10.08	2.55	21.74	2.44	6.53	38	0.0001
42.92	5.53	55.33	6.69	9.74	38	0.0001
34.26	4.34	42.80	9.26	8.22	38	0.0001

1)
10.87   .(t=10.04,
df=38, p=0.0001)

2)
3.67   .(t=6.53. df=38. p=0.0001)

3)
12.41   .(t=9.74,
df=38, p=0.0001)

4)
8.67   .(t=8.22,
df=38, p=0.0001)

2.

.

1)

(2   ).

(0.91),

(0.80),   (0.92),   (1.23), 1   (0.92),

(0.97)   .

<   2>

1.		?	2.82	3.48	0.62	0.85
2.		?	2.38	3.13	0.91	0.91
3.	?		2.59	3.18	0.59	0.64
4.	?		2.56	3.21	0.64	0.74
5.		?	2.67	3.18	0.51	0.68
6.		?	2.90	3.26	0.36	0.49
7.		?	2.64	3.10	0.46	0.76
8.	?		2.74	3.31	0.56	0.68
9.		?	2.67	3.23	0.56	0.72
10.	?		2.21	2.92	0.72	0.76
11.		?	2.46	3.26	0.80	0.73
12.		?	2.41	3.33	0.92	0.87
13.		?	1.87	3.10	1.23	0.67
14.		?	2.15	3.08	0.92	0.74
15.	?		2.23	3.21	0.97	0.71

2)

(3   ).

.   (0.69)

.

<   3>

1.		?	2.46	2.97	0.56	0.82
2.		?	0.74	3.15	0.41	0.64
3.		?	2.51	3.10	0.60	0.68
4.		?	2.64	3.13	0.49	0.72
5.	?		2.73	3.15	0.36	0.74
6.		?	2.51	3.21	0.69	0.57
7.		?	2.53	3.10	0.56	0.72

3)

(4

).   (0.95),

(0.92)   (0.97),   (0.95)   .

<   4>

1.	?	3.10	3.36	0.26	0.55
2. ?		2.54	3.23	0.69	0.77
3.	?	2.56	3.18	0.62	0.63
4.	?	2.15	3.03	0.87	0.73
5.	?	2.18	3.13	0.95	0.72
6.	?	2.26	3.18	0.92	0.70
7.	?	2.64	3.18	0.54	0.64
8.	?	2.28	2.72	0.44	0.68
9. ?		2.15	2.82	0.67	0.74
10.	?	2.59	2.97	0.39	0.67
11.	?	2.36	2.97	0.62	0.60
12. ?		2.18	2.95	0.77	0.71
13. ?		2.18	2.97	0.80	0.66
14.	?	2.00	2.97	0.97	0.74
15. (, , ,) ?		1.95	2.90	0.95	0.65
16.	?	2.97	3.39	0.41	0.60
17.	?	2.69	3.41	0.82	0.79
18.	?	2.23	2.97	0.74	0.64

4)

(5

)   .

(0.77),   (0/87),   (0.82),

(0.72)   .

<   5>

1.	?	2.26	2.85	0.59	0.71
2.	?	0.18	0.95	0.77	0.71
3.	?	1.95	2.82	0.87	0.73
4.	?	2.82	3.24	0.46	0.60
5. ?		3.00	3.26	0.26	0.55
6.	?	2.85	3.29	0.49	0.72
7. ?		2.13	3.95	0.82	0.79
8.	?	2.46	3.13	0.67	0.74
9.	?	2.46	3.10	0.64	0.74
10. (, , , ,) ?		2.05	2.77	0.72	0.65

11.		?	2.61	3.15	0.54	0.76
12.		?	2.55	3.10	0.49	0.96
13.		?	2.47	3.26	0.72	0.83
14.		?	2.69	3.18	0.64	0.71

•

.

.

74.4%   24.6%   ,

76.9%   ,   48.7%   fdiddbr

.

.   51.3%   11

87.2%

.

.

.

.

.

,   ,

.

.

.

.

.

,   ,   ,   ,

,   .

(1982)   (1983)   ,   ,   ,

.

,

.

1   .

30

.

.

.

.

•

1

.

1995   8   20   9   10   21

39   .

1   .   ,

,   4   .

.

.

1.   .

37.10   47.97   (T =10.04, DF =38, P<0.0001)

.

2.   .

10.08   21.74   (T =6.53, DF =38, P<0.0001)

.

3.   .

32.92   55.33   (T =9.74, DF =38, P<0.0001)

.

4.   .

34.26   42.80   (T =8.22, DF =38, P<0.0001)

.

.

1.

.

2.

.

3.

.

1.   (1971).   ,   , 2(1), 1-7.
2.   ,   (1983-A).   1.   ,
44(1), 25-30.
3.   ,   (1983-b).   2,   ,
46(1), 67-73.
4.   ,   ,   (1995).   .   , 34(3),
85-96.
5.   ,   (1995).   .   , 25(3),
431-439.
6.   (1991).   ,   ,   .
7.   (1978).   .
   , 8(1), 154-162.
8.   (1983).
      .   ,   .
9.   (1982).   .
   , 12(2), 67-79.
10.   (1990).   ,
           ,   .
11.   ,   ,   (1973).   ,   , 25(6),
721-728.
12.   (1995).   .
                  , 1(1), 23-24.
13.   (1981).   ,   . 11(2), 33-40.
14.   (1974).   ,   , 4(1), 1-19.
15.   (1995).   ,   , 1(1), 5-22.
16.   (1983).   ,
           .   .
17.   (1979).   ,   ,   .
18.   ,   ,   (1990).
              .   , 12   .
19. DuGas, W.(1977). Introduction to patient care, A comprehensive Approach to Nursing care. 3rd ed, New York, W.B.Saunders CO.

20. Marecki M.D.(1979), Postpartum follow-up goals & assistment. J.O.G.N.N., 8(4), 214-217.

21. Mercer, R.T.(1985). The process of menternal role attaintment over the first year. Nursing Research. 34(4). 198-204.

22. Moss J.R.(1981). Comcern of multiparas on the third postpartum day. J.O.G.N.N., 10(5), 421-466.

23. Pohl, M.(1965). Teaching actives of the nurse practitioner. Nursing Research, 14(1), 5.

24. Rubin, R.(1967). Attainment of the maternal role, Nursing research, 16(3), 237-245.

25. Schlotfeldt R.(1976). Can we bring order of the choas of nursing education, A.J.N, 76(1), 104-109.

26. Summer G.(1977). Postnatal concerns, the first six week of life. J.O.G.N.N., 6(1), 27-31.

27. Swanson J.(1978). Nursing Intervention to facilitate matrnal-infant Attachment. J.O.G.N.N., 7(2), 35-38.

28. Winslow, E.H.(1976). The role of the nursein patient education. Nursing Clinics of North America, 11(2), 213-218.

-Abstract-

**Key Words : Parent Education Postpartal Self-Care,
Newborn Baby care Self-confidence**

The Effects of Education on Knowledge and Confidence in Postpartal Self-care and New baby care

Kwang, Youn Hee· Lee, Mila

Kwang, Youn Hee:Staff nurse Sam Sung Hospital
Lee, Mila:Professor, Dept. of Nursing, College of Medicine, Chung-Ang University

A maternity ward in a hospital in Seoul has an educational program for postpartal mothers since its opening, but evaluation on the program has not been done. This study was to find whether the educational program contributed to increase of knowledge and confidence of the post-partal mothers in the area of postpartal self-care and the newborn baby care or not. This study aimed at improvement of the educational program for posrpartal mothers and the

newborn babies.

Subjects were 40 primiparae who were admitted to the obstetric ward in a general hospitals in Seoul from August 20th to September 10th, 1995. Subjects were those who had no labor pain at the admission time, had no complications during labor and delivery, gave a birth to a healthy baby, and agreed to participate in this study. All subjects were well educated and were in well-to-do group. Most of them received antenatal care adequately.

They were tested on knowledge and self-confidence in the area of postpartal self-care and infant care two times, one at the admission time and the other prior to discharge. After the first test, nurses in a maternity ward and nursery taught them on postpartal self-care and infant care. Education consisted of a 1 hour planned program and incident teachings done at bed side.

Four tools were developed by authors based literature review.

The test tool for knowledge of postpartal self-care consisted of 15 items which included the definition of postpartum, dangerous symptoms in postpartum, lochia, time to begin coitus, postpartum exercise, sitz-bath, and perineal care.

The test tool for self-confidence in postpartal self-care included such items as emergency care on dangerous symptoms in postpartum, sexual life and contraception after postpartum, self-confidence in postpartum exercise and perineal care.

The test tool for knowledge of newborn baby care consisted of 18 items which included bathing, umbilical cord care, vaccination, breast feeding, abnormal symptoms of neonate.

The test tool for self confidence in the newborn baby care included umbilical cord care, vaccination, breast feeding, emergency care for baby.

Analysis of demographic data were analyzed with calculation of percentage. Score differences between the first test and the second test were analyzed with paired t-test. SAS / PC (Release 6.04 for DOS) program are as follows.

1. Mothers' knowledge of postpartal self-care increased significantly after education (t=10.04, df=38, p=0.0001).

2. Mothers' self-confidence in postpartal self-care increased significantly after education (t=6.53, df=38, p=0.0001).

3. Mother's knowledge of the newborn abay care increased significantly after education (t=9.74, df=38, p=0.0001).

4. Mothers' self-confidence in the newborn baby care increased significantly after education (t=8.22, df=38, p=0.0001)

Suggestions for further studies and nursing practice were as follows.

1. We suggest studies by randomized control-group pretest-posttest design or nonequivalent control group pretest-posttest design will be done.

2. We suggest follow-up studies to find if mothers's confidence will last or not after discharge.

3. We suggest general hospitals to establish a phone-counseling system.