

* • **

1. , 1994; , 1993; Barer, 1989)

가 가 가

가 가

60° 90°

(, , 1990). Gordon, Hewer, Wade(1987) 가

45% 가 가 5 10

, Taesell, Bach, Mcrae(1994) 255 가 (stretch),

54 Horner, Massey,

Riski, Lathrop, Chase(1988) 51%, .(, , 1995)

Linden Sieben (1983) 70%

(1994)

32%(10) 2

(aspiration pneumonia) .(, 1988) 가

, (, 2001; , 1996;

, (, 1997; 2 , 1999; , 1984)

*
**

(1988) 2) (exteroceptors) (proprioceptors)
 가 (kelso, 1982)
 가 (Icing), (Quick stretch), (Pressure)

2.

1.

- 1) .
- 2) . 가 (,
- 3) . 1994).
- 4) . (1990) 40%, Groher, Bukatman (1986) 45%, Gordon (1987) 45%

3. 가

- 1가 : 가 . 가
- 2가 : 가 .(Dodds, Stewart, Logemann,1990 ; Ott, Peele, Chen, Gelfand, 1990) 18
- 3가 : 가 . 10 가 (1997)
- 4가 : 가 . 가

4.

- 1) (pharyngeal recess)
(pharyngeal paresis)
- (1988) (supraglottic space) 32-52%
 , 5 13 .(Blitzer, 1990; Vies & Logemann, 1995)

가 (icing), (rubbing), (stroking) 가

(Dodds, 1990; Ott, 1990).

가 (Robbins, Levins, 1988). Johnson (1992) 가 가

1.0 (1997) (Golgi) 6.15 (vibration) 1.25 (quick stretch) (Golgi) 4.32 (1994) 80%

가 (receptor) (Horner, 1988), Horner (1988) 51%, Linden Siebens(1983) 70%

80 7, 1, 6 가 (1990) 가 60%

(Ayres, 1980). (Griffin, 1974; Logemann, 1989). 가 가 5-10 가 (Stretch), (2001). (1995; 1998). Ayres(1980)가 가 가

2. (exteroceptors) (proprioceptors) (Kelso, 1982). (adaptive behavior)

가

(Fisher, Murray, Bundy, 1991). 1.

(Ayres, 1980). 2.

2000 12 2001 3 K

가 (modality) (icing), (quick stretch), (vibration), / 1) (pressure/stretch pressure) 2) 가 1가 1 3) 4) 5) 6)

, Gaffney 15

& Campbell(1974) 3.

, Marilyn(1982) 8 4 (quick stretch), (stretch pressure), (icing), 30 (rubbing), (vibration) 3 7 (flexion), 7 (가 , 1988) , 가 (Horner , (1988) 6 가 1990 : Gordon , 1987 : , 1993) 가 2000 11 22 2000 12 20 5 (1) 가

가

4.

1)

feeding 가 (1979) Silverman & Elfant Pre-
(1980) Dayhoff & Lai (1988)

1)

2)

가

(Double blind method)

가

13

4

가

가

6.

r = .98 1.0

alpha = .9748

SPSS

χ^2 -test

5.

가 Wilcoxon Signed Rank test
Mann-Whitney U test

9

1)	• • 가	
2)	• - - • - - 가 가 • • •	5 5 5 5
3)	• • 가 • • 가	5 5 5 5
4)	• (3 : 30) •	5

(1)

< 1-1 >

		(N=15)		x ²	P
		N(%)	N(%)		
()	44 ~ 60	6(40.00)	5(33.33)	.144	.705
	61 ~	9(60.00)	10(66.67)	.556	.456
		8(53.33)	10(66.67)		
		7(46.67)	5(33.33)	.133	.715
		8(53.50)	7(46.50)		
		23.7(46.50)	8(53.50)	.556	.456
		5(33.33)	7(46.67)		
		10(66.67)	8(53.33)	1.158	.561
		6(40.00)	5(33.33)		
		8(53.33)	7(46.67)		
	1(6.67)	3(20.00)	.682	.409	
	12(80.00)	10(66.67)			
	()	3(20.00)	5(33.33)		

7.

1)

2) 가 24

< 1-2 >

		(N=15)		x ²	P
		N(%)	N(%)		
		3(20.00)	8(53.33)	3.606	.165
		10(66.67)	6(40.00)		
		2(13.33)	1(6.67)		
		4(26.67)	8(53.33)	2.222	.136
		11(73.33)	7(46.67)		
		11(73.33)	11(73.33)	.000	1.000
		4(26.67)	4(26.67)	.188	.665
		6(54.50)	7(63.60)		
		5(45.50)	4(36.40)		
		13(86.67)	15(100.0)	2.143	.143
		2(13.33)	- (-)		

< 2-1>

							Z	P
	3.26	.88	3.53	.83	.26	.45	2.000	.046*
	3.60	.82	3.80	.41	.20	.56	1.342	.180
U	83.0		96.0		99.5			
P	.160		.374		.438			

* p<.05

2.

1.

1)

가 (1-1), 1) 1 가

2)

가 " 1 가

, (2-1) (.26) (.20)
가 가 ,
(1-2). 1가
(u = 99.5, p = .438)

< 2-2>

	p		p		p		Z	P
	16.80	3.02	18.93	2.05	2.13	2.41	2.552	.011*
	16.20	2.07	17.73	2.43	1.53	2.92	1.831	.067
U	93.5		82.0		100.5			
P	.389		.146		.594			

* p<.05

(2-3)

							Z	P
	11.93	1.38	15.13	1.55	3.20	1.61	3.353	.011*
	11.66	2.25	12.80	1.65	1.13	2.69	1.786	.074
U	112.0		40.5		52.0			
P	.976		.001*		.007*			

* p<.05

< 2-4 >

							Z	P
	2.06	.79	2.86	.35	.80	.77	2.762	.006*
	2.20	.86	2.73	.45	.53	.53	2.271	.023*
U	101.5		97.5		90.0			
P	.627		.369		.307			

* p<.05

(3.26) 가(3.53) 가 가 ,
 .(Z=2.000, p= .046) 가 가 4 가 .(u = 90.0,
 (3.80)가 (3.60) p = .307)

2) 2 가 가
 “ 가 ” 2 가 ,
 , (2-2) (2.13) (3.20 ± 1.61)
 (1.53) 가 가 , (1.13 ± 2.69)
 가 2 가 가 ,
 . (u = 1005, p = .594) 가
 (18.93)가 (16.80) 가 가 Gaffney Campbell(1978)
 가 . (Z= 2.552, P = .011) 가
 (17.73)가 (16.20) 가

3) 3 가 가
 “ 가 ” 3 가 . Siverman Elfant(1979)
 (2-3) 가 가 (3.20) (1.13) 가 가 , (1988)
 3 가 .(u = 52.0, p = .007) 가

4) 4 가 가 가
 “ 가 ” 4가 가 가 가
 , (2-4) (0.80) (0.53) . Barer(1989)

rotation on pharyngoesophageal dysphagia, Archives of Physical Medical and Rehabilitation, 70, 767-771.

Marilyn, C.D. (1982). An exploratory study of sensory-motor stimulation in patients following cerebral vascular accident, Unpublished manuscript.

Ott, D.J., Peele, V.N., Chen, Y.M., Gelfand, D.W. (1990), Oropharyngeal function study : radiologic means of evaluating swallowing difficulty, South Med J, 83, 191-193.

Patricia, L.T. (1999). Post stroke Dysphagia : Implications for Nurses, Rehabilitation Nursing, 24(2), 69-73.

Robbins, J., Levins, R.L. (1988), Swallowing after unilateral stroke of the cerebral cortex : preliminary experience, Dysphagia, 3, 11-17.

Silverman, E.H., Elfant, I.L. (1979). Dysphagia : An evaluation and treatment program for the adult. The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 33(6), 382-392.

Taesell, R.W., Bach, D., McRae, M. (1994). Prevalence and recovery of aspiration poststroke. Dysphagia, 9(1), 35-39.

Vies, S.L., Logemann, J.A. (1995), Swallowing disorders in persons with cerebrovascular accident, Arch-Phys Med Rehabil, 66, 372-375.

Willoughby, E.W., Anderson, N.E. (1984), Lower Cranial nerve motor function in unilateral vascular lesions of the cerebral hemisphere, British Med. J, 289, 791-794.

-Abstract-

Key concept : Stroke, Oropharyngeal function, Sensory stimulation

The Effects of Sensory Stimulation for Ingestion in Dysphagic Patients with Stroke

*Park, Hee-Ja *· Kang, Hyun-Sook ***

The purpose of this study is to identify the effects of a nursing intervention using sensory stimulation in dysphagic patients.

Quasi-experimental with a nonequivalent control group pretest-posttest design was used. 15 patients of each group were assigned for this study, who were hospitalized in the oriental medicine hospital of K. University.

Specific stimulation plans were devised based on a dysfunctional area of the subjects. For each modality, subjects were systematically stimulated for 30 minutes, in the experimental group prior to each meal and 3 times per day for a week.

The data were analyzed by SPSS PC program using χ^2 -test, Wilcoxon Signed Rank test and Mann-Whitney U test.

The results of this study are as follows :

1. The tongue control score of the experimental group is greater than that of the control group ($u = 52.0, p = .007$).
2. The score of chewing ability, lip control, swallowing ability of the experimental group is greater than that of the control group. But no difference is statistically seen between the experimental group and control group.

Therefore, this study shows that sensory stimulation using icing, quick stretch, etc., was effective in improving oropharyngeal function in patients with dysphagia.

* Kyung Hee Medical Center

** College of Nursing, Kyung Hee University