

* . ** . *** . **** . *****
 ***** . ***** . *****

1.

1990

가

1997

가

가,

가 가

1998

가

가 가

가 2000 1,449,500

3.09% (

, 2001), 5 2.35% (, 1995) 가

0.74% 가

가

가

(,

1999 1

1997).

가

가

가

(, 2000).

가

가

가

* ,
 ** ,
 *** ,
 **** ,
 ***** ,
 ***** ,
 ***** ,
 ***** ,

4 .

49 , t .

2 .

1 .

3 24 (49%) .

4 25 (51%)

24 (49%) , . 4 가 15 , 3 가 9 .

가

4 25 66.8% , 가 16.6% , 가 16.6%

3 24 .

2 .

27 3

24 .

(Homan, 1996; Chin, Finocchiaro, Rosebrough, 1998; , 1999)

4 , 3 ,

2 , 1

가

< 1>		N = 49	
		%	
3	24	49.0	
4	25	51.0	
	24	49.0	
	25	51.0	
	16	66.8	
	4	16.6	
()	4	16.6	

3 .

2000 8 10 9

123 , 49 가

39.8% .

4 51 18 , 3 72 9 가

2 .

4.0 가 .

'(3.92±.28) ' (3.86±.35), ' (3.84±.43), ' (3.82±.39), ' (3.82±.39), ' (3.81±.39) 가

' (3.41±.70) ' (3.41±.70)가 가

< 2>

4 3

< 2 >

	4 (N=49)		3 (N=25)		3 (N=24)		t	p
	4.00	(-)	4.00	(-)	4.00	(-)		
	3.92	(.28)	3.95	(.21)	3.87	(.34)	- .990	.327
	3.86	(.35)	3.91	(.29)	3.79	(.41)	- 1.160	.252
	3.84	(.43)	3.86	(.34)	3.79	(.51)	- .612	.544
	3.82	(.39)	3.91	(.29)	3.71	(.46)	- 1.807	.077
	3.82	(.39)	3.91	(.29)	3.71	(.46)	- 1.807	.077
	3.81	(.39)	3.86	(.35)	3.75	(.44)	- .959	.343
	3.73	(.53)	3.73	(.45)	3.71	(.62)	- .193	.847
	3.73	(.53)	3.74	(.45)	3.71	(.62)	- .193	.847
	3.69	(.47)	3.83	(.39)	3.54	(.51)	- 2.148	.037*
	3.63	(.57)	3.78	(.52)	3.46	(.59)	- 2.002	.051
	3.61	(.57)	3.74	(.54)	3.46	(.59)	- 1.702	.096
	3.61	(.57)	3.83	(.39)	3.38	(.65)	- 2.681	.010*
	3.58	(.58)	3.55	(.60)	3.58	(.58)	.218	.829
	3.54	(.54)	3.59	(.59)	3.46	(.51)	- .818	.418
	3.50	(.58)	3.70	(.47)	3.26	(.62)	- 2.681	.010*
	3.47	(.58)	3.47	(.59)	3.42	(.58)	- .359	.721
	3.47	(.68)	3.65	(.57)	3.25	(.74)	- 2.082	.043*
	3.47	(.65)	3.39	(.72)	3.50	(.59)	.566	.574
	3.46	(.62)	3.43	(.66)	3.43	(.59)	.000	1.000
	3.45	(.65)	3.34	(.71)	3.50	(.59)	.798	.429
	3.41	(.70)	3.61	(.58)	3.17	(.76)	- 2.228	.031*
가	3.41	(.70)	3.34	(.71)	3.42	(.72)	.330	.743

*: P<.05

가 4 3 (1997) 14 가 가

가 가 4 3 (2000)

< 2 > 가 가 가

3. 가 가

가 66.80% 가

가

가 49 49% 24 4

가 15 1997 가

가
4 3.41

(Homan,

1996, Chin , 1998)

(ARN, 2001)

,1997).

가

4 3

4 3

가

4

3

87.7, 83.4

42.0, 30.3

가 (,

1997)

27

3

24

가

4

(1996)

2000 8 10 9 ,

123

49

가 39.8%

가 , 가, , t

가

1.

49

4

25 ,

3 24

24

가 (66.8%),

. Moccia(1990)

(16.6%)

(16.6%)가

2.

4.0

(가 , , ,)

가 , ' ,

가 가

3 4

3 가

가 4

3

3.

가

가

가

(1997).

24-27

(2000).

2000

(2001). 2000

(1999).

(1997).

3(1), 46-58.

(2000).

100

(1900-2000), 6(2), 303-326.

(1997).

(1995). 1995

(1996).

ARN. (2001), ARN course, Course Content.

Chin, P. A., Finocchiaro, D. N., Rosebrough, A. (1998), Rehabilitation Nursing Practice, McGraw-Hill

Homan, S. P. (1996). Rehabilitation Nursing Mosby Co.

Johnson, R. (1994). Accreditation Professor Nursing Education, , 21-87.

Moccia, P. (1997). NO Sir, it's revolution, Journal of Nursing Education, 29(7), 307-311.

-Abstract-

Key concept : Rehabilitation Nursing,
Educational contents

The Educational contents of Rehabilitation Nursing

*Lee Myung-Hwa**. *Lim Nan-young* **.
Suh Moon-Ja ***. *Kang hyun-sook* ****
Kim Jung-Hwa *****. *Suh Yeon-Ok* *****
So Hee-Young *****. *Jo Bok-Hee* *****

The purpose of this study was to provide fundamental data to propose further directions of education on rehabilitation nursing by investigating the adequacy of the educational contents of rehabilitation nursing.

This study was a descriptive survey study.

The data collected at 25 universities and 24 junior colleges through questionnaires to answer

* Department of Nursing, Kosin University
** Department of Nursing, Hanyang University
*** College of Nursing, Seoul National University
**** College of Nursing, Kyunghee University
***** Department of Nursing, Suncheonhyang University
***** Department of Nursing, Chongnam National University
***** Department of Nursing, Chunnam National University

the research questions from August 10 to September 30, 2000.

The questionnaire was consisted of 24 items . The contents of rehabilitation nursing education were developed by consulting with the rehabilitation nursing professionals.

The results are as follows

Rehabilitation nursing was taught as an independent class in 15 universities and 9 junior colleges.

Most professors majoring in adult nursing(66.8%) were in charge of teaching the courses.

For the adequacy of the teaching contents of rehabilitation nursing, conceptual bases for rehabilitation was the highest score(4.0), and interdisciplinary rehabilitation team, activities of daily living, clients of rehabilitation, nursing process in rehabilitation nursing, functional evaluation, movement and mobility, physical therapy, occupational therapy, sensation and perception, communication/language, eating and swallowing, bladder elimination, community based rehabilitation nursing, sleep, rest &, fatigue, bowel elimination., historical perspectives of rehabilitation nursing, sexuality, pulmonary rehabilitation, pain, cardiac rehabilitation, skin integrity, family care was ordered.