

* . ** . ***

(, 1997; Biegel, Sales & Schulz, 1991).

1.

가

1997).

가

1970

1990

가

1992).

(,

1990

가

,

가

가 가

1990

가

(, 1998).

가

75

15 20%

, 10%

70 75%

*
**

(Feibel & Springer, 1982)

(Stensrud & Stensrud, 1981).

2.

(Roberts, 1986)

가

King(1996)

,

가

가

(, 1987; , 1988).

(Goetter, 1986: Stein &

Reissman, 1980).

가

. 가

90%

가

가

1988) .

(Wilson & Carol,

가

(Andersen, Vestergaard, Ingemann-Nielsen, & Laurizen, 1995).

(Litman, 1974) 가 가

(, 1997).

가

가

(Astrom, Asplund &

Astrom, 1992)

Murray, Kijek(1987)

가

가

가

Briggs(1982)

가

가

가

(, 1994; , , , , 1995; , 1995; , , , 1997)가

, , (, 1992) 가 (Gallent, 1991).

(1997)

가 가

1

가

가 가

가 , 가

(Anderson, Linto, & Stewart-

67%

Wynne, 1995).

1 가

43%

28%가

2.

가 가

가

2

1.

19

7

10 ,

9 ,

6 ,

4 ,

4 ,

4 ,

3 ,

가

1

1991

1992

3 ,

1993

1994

7 ,

1995

1996

13 ,

1997

1998

23 , 1999

2000

6

29

. 2000

2

가 가

< 1 >

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
(N=19)			1		1		2		3	7
		3	2		4		6		4	19
(N=25)				1			3		7	10
					2		1		5	9
					2		2		2	6
					1		3			4
					1		1		2	4
					1				3	4
							1		2	3
							1			1
()			1							1
()									1	1
					1					1
							1			1
							1			1
					1					1
			1							1
			1							1
	3		7		14		21		29	75

< 1>. 가 가 . 1995
 68
 가 15 , 가 53 < 3>
 37 ,
 11 , 5 가 9 ,
 가 7 가 7 ,
 가 4 , 가 3 2 가 2 .
 < 2>

2.

< 3>

		(N=44)		(N=28)	
		가		가	
가	가 ,	1991	1992	2	1
	1996	1993	1994	4	4
가 14 ,		1995	1996	8	1
7 , 1997	30 ,	1997	1998	10	11
가 21		1999	2000	20	7
				44	24
					4

< 2>

		(N=68)					(N=7)	
1991	1992	1		1	1			3
1993	1994			4	1	1	1	7
1995	1996	2	1	6	1	1	1	13
1997	1998	4	1	14		3		23
1999	2000	5	1	12	8	3		29
		2		1			2	7
		7		6	4	1	1	19
			1	7	1			10
		1		4	2	2		9
			2	3		1		6
		1		3				4
				3	1			4
				4				4
				1	2			3
							1	1
						1		1
				1				1
				1				1
				1				1
				1			1	1
				1	1			1
		12	3	37	11	5	4	75

< 3-1 >

				(N=15)	(N=57)	(N=7)	
11	35	4	22	11	35	3	49
가	3	4		3	19	2	24
가	10	30	51	70	1	2	5
가	5		51	70	가	1	1
111	130	가	11				
4	10	< 3-1 >		10	2	4	6
				10 - 30	5	3	11
				31 - 50	2	3	5
				51 - 70	5	11	16
				71 - 90	1	5	6
				91 - 110		5	5
				111 - 130		11	11
				130		10	10

< 4 > () - **: *:

(1985)** - 15, (1992) - 4, Mahoney & Barthel(1965) - 4
 (1995) - 3, 가 (1992)** - 2, 가 (1993) - 2,
 Lawton's(1971), (1991)
 (1988)
 Mayewski(1988) - 2, Uniform Data System - 2, (1997)*
 Tinetti, Williams, & Mayewski(1988), (1996) *
 (1984) - 2
 Carey(1993)
 Cote (1986), Brott(1989), (2000)*
 Archbold & Stewart(1986) - 2
 McDowell & Newell(1987)
 Diener (1985)** - 2, (1988)** , (1993)
 McColl & Friedland(1989)** - 4, Brandt & Weinert(1981),
 가 (1984) - 6, Cobb(1976)
 McCubbin, Patterson & Glynn(1982)
 가 (1964)
 MuCubbin, MuCubbin, & Thompson(1986)** - 2, Dupuy(1978)
 McCubbin, McCubbin, & Thompson(1986), Dupuy(1978)
 McCubbin, Lasen, & Olson(1982) - 2, (1996) *
 가 (1993)
 가 (1997)
 , 가 (1992)** - 7, (1993)* - 4 , (1995)* - 2
 (1993), (1996), (1999) *
 (1990)
 Spielberge
 Zung(1965)** - 5, (1992) - 5,
 (1981), (1987), (1977)* - 2
 Miller(1983)** - 2
 UCLA Loneliss Scale(1988)
 Beck, Weissman, Laser, Trexler(1974)
 (1974)*
 Andrew & Withey(1993), (1992)

(1994)

(1994)

가 (1992) - 3, (1992) - 2, (1988) - 2,
 (1988), (1991), (1993), (1993)*,
 (1993) - 2, (1995), (1997)

Lazarus & Folkman(1984), (1987), (1994)

Shererer Maddux(1982)**

(1990)* - 2

(1984)** - 2

(1984)*

Kim(1991)

Kahn, Goldfarb, Pollack, & Peck(1960)** - 5,

NIH Brott (1989)**

Andrew & Whitney(1976)

Bohannon, Smith(1978)

Dirette(1994)

Bergman, Braden, Laguzza & Holman(1987)

(1998), (1999)

(1998), (1999)

가 (1999)*

(1988)**

(1988)**

(1995) - 2

가 (1991), (1984)**

가 (1997)

가 (1997)

(1999)

Devins (1983)** - 2

Devins (1983)

Woods, Haberman, & Packard(1987)

(1998)

, 가 Archbold & Stewart(1986)**

가 (1993)*

< 4-1 >

	(1992) - .95, Mahoney & Barthel(1965) - .96
	Lawton's(1971) - .9258, (1991) - .96
	(1997)* - .9383
	(1996) * - 89
	Archbold & Stewart(1986) - .65
	McDowell & Newell(1987) - .70
	Diener (1985)** - .70, (1988)** - .89, (1993) - .69
가	McColl & Friedland(1989)** - .86, Brandt & Weinert(1981) - .83
	(1984) - .89, Cobb(1976) - .83
	MuCubbin, MuCubbin, & Thompson(1986)** - .82, Dupuy(1978)
가	(1996) * - .7257
	(1993) - .90
	, 가 (1992)** - 89, (1993)* - .70 ,
	(1995)* - .96-99
	(1993) - .93, (1996) - .68, (1999) * - .73
	Zung(1965)** - .73, (1992) - .85, (1987) - .79,
	(1977) - .76
	Miller(1983) - .8958
	UCLA Loneliss Scale(1988) - .94
	Beck, Weissman, Laser, Trexler(1974) - .97
	(1974)* - .73
	(1994) - .60
	(1994) - 70
	(1992) - .67, (1988) - .91, (1991) - .78,
	(1993), - .73 , (1993) - .92, (1997) - .8184
	(1994) - .75
	Shererer Maddux(1982)** - .86
	(1990)* - 2
	(1984)* - .52
NIH	Kim(1991) - .60
	Brott (1989)** - .69
가	(1999)* - .91
	(1988)** - .9599
	(1988)** - .9235
	(1995)** - .69
가	(1997) - .91
가	(1997) - .97
	(1999) - .95
	Devins (1983)** - .80
, 가	Archbold & Stewart(1986)** - .90
가	(1993) * - .92

3.

, 가

, 가

3

(1985) 가 15 가 4 .
 , 가
 .
 1990
 McColl & Friedland(1989)
 가 4 , 가 가 , ,
 가 6 가 (1992) 가 7 가 , 가 , 가
 . Zung(1965) , 가 (1992) 가 , 가
 가 5 , 3 , 가
 < 4> . 가
 Cronbach
 < 4-1> .

< 5>

				()	
	(,)			(18)	가, , 가,
	3 -			(62)	가, ,
	20 2			(57)	, , , 가
	(35cm, 70gm)			(57)	
10				(65)	, 가,
	()			(69)	가 , , , ,
	()			(59)	가 , , , ,
가				(56)	가 , 가
	()	가		(61)	가
가	40 50 3-4	가		(35)	, , ,
	1 1 8	가		(25)	, , , 가,
				(18)	, , 가
	2 1 - 1 30 (6)			(37)	, , , ,
	5 1 - 30 (5)	가		(86)	, , 가
	5 1 - 2			(10)	가, ,
가	2 가	가		(13)	가
				(30)	

5. 가 가
 가 가
 가 가
 ,가 ,가
 ,가 ,
 가 . < 5>.

6. 7.
 8 , 가 3
 3 , 가 1 2, 2 가
 가 가 가 , 가
 < 6>.

< 6>	
()	()
(1996)	(7)
(1997)	(2)
(1997)	(17)
(1993)	가 (24)

가 .

가 .

1990

2000 6

75

1. (34.7%) 49 (65.3%) 26

19 , 7

15 , 53 ,

7

2. 가 44

, 가 ,

가 28

3. 가

가 15 가

, 가

7 , 가

2

4. 가 , 가

5. 가

, 가

가 , 가

6. 3 7 ,

4 , 가

7. 가 , 가 , ,

4 , 3 .

1990

가

가

1. 가

가

2. 가 .

(1985). _____ 가

_____ .

, , , , ,

(1992). _____

_____ (1960- 1991. 8). : .

, , , , ,

(1996). _____

_____ : .

(1997). _____ (1995- 1997). 81-111.

, (1997). 가 가 .

_____ . 2(1), 22-36.

(1994). _____ .

. 3(1), 180-206.

(1997). 가 _____

_____ . 4(2), 175-192.

(1992). _____ 가 _____ .

- (1991). _____ .
- _____. 28(2), 569-584.
(1987). _____
- _____.
(1999). _____ .
- _____. 11(4), 743-755.
(1994). _____ .
- _____. 8(1), 53-78.
(1999). _____ .
- 가 _____ . 11(1),
119-134.
(1988). _____ 가 _____
- _____.
(1988). _____ . 27(2). 83-98.
(1995). _____ . 25(1), 30-44.
(1996). _____ . 26(4), 868-877.
가 (1992). 가 _____ . 23(3), 467-486.
(1997). _____ . 3(2),
661-677.
(1996). _____ . 26(3), 709-727.
(1996). _____ . 8(1), 180-200.
(1992). _____ . 22(3),
271-296.
(1993). _____ . 23(4),
694-712.
(1994). _____
- _____.
(1995). _____ .
Functional Independence Measure(FIM)
Modified Barthel Index(MBI) _____
19(2), 271-280.
(1995). _____
- _____.
(1997). _____ . 1 _____ .
(1998). _____ . 28(3), 786-800.
(1998). '97
- Anderson, C.S., Linto, J., Stewart-Wynne, E.G. (1995). A population-based assessment of the impact and burden of caregiving for long term stroke survivors. Stroke, 26(5), 848-849.
- Anderson, G., Vestergaard, K., Ingemann-Nielsen, M., & Lauritzen, L. (1995). Risk factors for post-stroke depression. Acta Psychiatrica Scand, 92, 193-198.
- Angeleri, F., Angeleri, V.A., Foschi, N., Giaquinto, S., Nolfi, G., Saginario, A & Signorino, M (1997). Depression After Stroke: An Intervention Through Catamnesis. Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 58(6), 261-265.
- Astrom, M., Asplund, K., & Astrom, T. (1992). Psychosocial function and life satisfaction after stroke. Stroke, 23, 527-531.
- Biegel, D.E., Sales, E., & Schulz, R. (1991). Family Caregiving in Chronic Illness. SAGE Publications.
- Briggs, R. S. (1982). Stroke management of the elderly in Great Britain. Postgraduate medicine, 71(4), 101-111.
- Brocklehurst, J.C., Morris, P., Anderws, K., Richards, B., & Laycock, P. (1981). Social effects of stroke. Social Science and Medicine, 15A, 35-39.
- Enterlante, T.M., & Kern, J.M. (1995). Wive's

- reported role changes following a husband a stroke : A pilot study. Rehabilitation Nursing, 20, 155-160.
- Feibel, J.H., & Springer, C.J. (1982). Depression and failure to resume social activities after stroke. Arch. Phys. Medicine, Rehabilitation, 63, 276-277.
- Feibel, J.H., Springer, C.J. (1982). Depression and failure to resume social activities after stroke, Arch. phys. Medicine, Rehabilitation, 63(6), 76-278.
- Fukunishi, I., Aoki, T., & Hosaka, T. (1997). Correlations for social support with depression in the chronic poststroke period. Perception, Motion, and Skills, 85(3 Pt 1), 811-818.
- Gallent, G. (1991). The experience of being a family caregiver to a person after a stroke ; a review of the literature. Canadian Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing, 2(3), 17-23.
- Goetter, W. (1986). Nursing diagnosis and interventions with the acute patient. Nursing Clinics of North America, 21(20), 309-319.
- King (1996). Quality of life after stroke. Stroke, 27(9), 1467-1472.
- Litman, T.J. (1974). The Family as a basic Unit in Health and Medical Care : A social behavioral overview. Social science & Medicine, 8, 495-519.
- McColl, M., & Friedland, J. (1989). Development of a multidimensional index for assessing social support of rehabilitation. Occupational Therapy Journal of Research, 9, 218-234.
- Murray, C.M. & Kijek, F.L. (1987). Current perspective in rehabilitation Nursing. St Louis, the C. V. Mosby co.
- Roberts, S.L. (1986). Behavioral Concepts and The Critically _____ patients. 2nd, Norwalk connecticut appleton-century psychologist
- Sandin, K.J., Cifu, D.X., & Noll, S.F. (1994). Stroke rehabilitation : Psychologic and social implication. Arch Phys Medi Rehabilitation, 75, S52-55.
- Stein, R.E.K., & Reissman, C.K. (1980). The development of an impact on family scale : Preliminary finding, Medical Care, 18(4), 465-472.
- Stensrud, R. & Stensrud, K. (1981). Interpersonal stress as a consequence of being disabled. Rehabilitation, Apr/Mar/June, 43-46.
- Wilson, H. S. & Carol, R. K.(1988). Psychiatric Nursing. California : Addison-Wesbypub. Co.
- Zung, W.W.K. (1965). A self Rating Depression Scale. Archives of General Psychiatry, 12, Jan, 63-70.
- Abstract -
- Key concept : Stroke, Research review
- ### Analysis of Nursing Studies about Stroke Research in Korea
- Ham, Mi Young*· Choi, Kyung Sook**
Ryu, Eunjung****
- This study was done to analyze the trends of research on stroke in Korea, to suggest future direction, for research on stroke. This article reviewed 75 nursing research papers on stroke done since 1990 to 2000 by examining them according to the period of publication or presentation, research design, type of subjects, measurement variables, the intervention outcome of experimental research, and theme of qualitative research.
-
- * Instructor, Chung Ang University, Department of Nursing
- ** Professor, Chung Ang University, Department of Nursing
- *** Assistant Professor, Konkuk University, Department of Nursing Science

The research were as follows :

1. 26 of 75 studies were composed of master thesis and dissertation of graduate school. There were 53 nonexperimental research, 15 experimental research, and 7 qualitative studies design.
2. Stroke patients subject' Characteristic were 44 and Family and Spouses of caregiver support were 28 of total studies.
3. Most measurement instruments used for research were translated and redesigned it into Korean that developed by foreigners, and development measurement instruments used Kang's ADL.
4. Family support and Social support was shown the frequently among correlational research.
5. Methodological research were development of an evaluation tool for the quality of nursing care in stroke patients, caregiver support of development of nursing intervention list, and Home care Nursing Intervention protocol, and development of client selection criteria based on the needs of services to be offered.

6. The experimental research of intervention were mostly education nursing intervention, rehabilitation program on functional recovery, support nursing intervention, and applying a home care protocol on the nursing care intervention.
7. Theme of qualitative research were family experience, home care in family experience, soobal experience, illness experience, hope of Stroke patients and so on. Phenomenologic methodology and Granded Theory was designed of Qualitative research.

On the basis of the above finding the following recommendations are made:

1. It's necessary to develop a reliable and variable measurement tool for stroke patients and family care of stroke patients.
2. It's necessary to study the comparison of Nursing Studies of stroke research abroad, the replication to establish the effect of nursing intervention stroke patients and family care of stroke patients.