

: , ,

* . **

1.

(Kim, 1992; Kim, Lee & Lee, 1999; Lee, 2000; McKie, 1993)

| | 1982 | 1987 |
|--------|------|--------|
| 27.8% | 1997 | 20.4% |
| , 1998 | 1999 | 11.6% |
| | | 6000 |
| 가 | | 1,500- |
| 2,000 | | |

(Ministry of Health and Welfare, 1992, 1999, 2000; Song et al., 1998).

(Pap smear)

(Harokopos & McDermott, 1996; Lyng, 1989).

| | 1987 | 17% |
|------|-------|-----|
| 1995 | 19.6% | |
| | 30.9% | |

(Nam, Choi, Kim & Kae, 1995).

(Chang & Park, 1999; Lee, 2000; McKie, 1993; Twinn & Cheng, 2000)가 (embarrassment)

(Chang & Park, 1999; Lee, 2000; McKie, 1993; Neilson & Jones, 1998).

(embarrassability)

*

**

2002 3 30

2002 6 20

2002 10 25

(Kelly & Jones, 1997; Maltby & Day, 2000; Modigliani, 1968) ,

(Maltby (Leary & Kowalski, 1995; Miller, 1996),
& Day, 2000) Moettus, Skalar Tandberg(1999)가
가 100mm
(Visual analogue scale, VAS) 가
10 100mm

2. 가 가 가
T
90%

1)
2) (Kim, 1992; Lee, Ku, Lee, Cang & Yu, 1999;
McKie, 1993).

3)
4)
5)
3. (Austoker &
McPherson, 1992; Kim et al., 1998).

1)
(Modigliani, 1968)
(Miller, 1996; Modigliani, 1968)
(Kelly & Jones, 1997; Maltby & Day, 2000) 가 (Baileff, 2000; Chang &
Modigliani(1968)가 (Embarrass- Park, 1999; Holroyd, Twinn & Shia, 2001;
ability Scale; ES) Lee, 2000; McKie, 1993; Neilson & Jones,
Kelly Jones(1997) 1998). , Baileff(2000) Lee(2000)
(Susceptibility to Embarrassment
Scale; SES)

2)

(Chang & Park, 1999; Holroyd et al., 2001; Kerr, 1995; Lee, 2000; McKie, 1993; Neilson & Jones, 1998; Twinn & Cheng, 2000).
(1999)

가

가

가

가

Holroyd (2001)
78.6%가

가

가

가

가

가

1.

Kerr(1995), McKie(1993) Twinn
Cheng(2000)

2.

| | 2002 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 22 |
|---|------|---|---|---|----|
| T | | | | | |
| 가 | 82 | | | | |
| 가 | | | | | |

3

Edelmann(1987), Kelly
& Jones(1997), Maltby Day(2000) Miller
(1996)

100mm
25
100mm가
0mm가
3. 0mm 100mm 가
가
Moettus
11 100mm
73
(1999) 100mm
10
가
1)
가
Modigliani(1968)가
(Embarrassability Scale, ES) 가
26
100mm 가
5 가 26 130
가 10
Cronbach's alpha = .92
Cronbach's alpha = .88
Cronbach's alpha = .87
Kelly Jones(1997) SAS
(Susceptibility to Embarrassment
Scale, SES) 가
25
1 가 7
25 175 가
ANOVA , ANOVA 가
Scheffe's test
Cronbach's (skewness)가
Cronbach's 가 Kruskal-
Wallis test, Wilcoxon's rank sum test
Median 1-Way analysis
Pearson correlation coefficients
가 7
3
10
가
2) Moettus (1999) 가 가 90% 가 31%
30 39 가 45%,
가 51%, 39%,
가 90% 가 31%

100 199 , 100
 26% ,
 28% . 61%가 4 6
 , 67.1%가 2 3
 , 55%가 가
 . 54%가 3 3 가
 , 27%
 , 37%가 30 39
 .
 53%가
 ,
 (n = 39) 5% .

2.

<Table 1>
 82.6, 106.7 .
 82.6 27.4mm ,
 Miller(1995)
 72 ,
 106.7 Maltby
 Day(2000)
 73 ,

Edelmann Iwawaki(1987)가

<Table 1> Embarrassability of subjects

| Embarrassability | N | Mean | SD | Range |
|-----------------------------------|----|--------|------|---------|
| Situational embarrassability | 82 | 82.60 | 13.4 | 49- 115 |
| Dispositional embarrassability | 82 | 106.70 | 21.8 | 49- 153 |

3.

<Table 2> 53.4mm
 . Moettus (1999)

| | N | Mean | SD | Range |
|-----------------------|----|------|------|--------|
| Embarrassment (mm) | 82 | 53.3 | 28.4 | 0- 100 |

<Table 3> 10 가
 68.2mm 가 ,
 Maltby Day(2000) 67.9mm ,

<Table 3> Embarrassment of subjects in 10 stages of cervical screening (Unit : mm)

| Stages | Mean | SD | Range | Rank |
|--|------|------|--------|------|
| Staying at the waiting room | 36.8 | 32.7 | 0- 100 | 9 |
| Consulting with a doctor before the exam | 40.7 | 30.6 | 0- 100 | 7 |
| Changing clothes | 49.8 | 30.9 | 0- 95 | 4 |
| Climbing up the exam chair and positioning her thigh for a exam | 63.4 | 31.2 | 0- 100 | 3 |
| Waiting for a doctor | 67.9 | 30.4 | 0- 100 | 2 |
| During the examination | 68.2 | 30.7 | 0- 100 | 1 |
| Walking down from the chair | 41.4 | 31.8 | 0- 96 | 6 |
| Dressing up | 33.5 | 30.6 | 0- 100 | 10 |
| Consulting with a doctor after the exam | 47.8 | 34.9 | 0- 100 | 5 |
| Making an appointment for the result | 38.0 | 33.3 | 0- 100 | 8 |
| Mean | 48.7 | 24.2 | 0- 99 | |

가 63.4mm
가

4.

<Table 4>
10
($r = .301$, $p = .01$)가

(Edelmann, 1987; Kelly & Jones, 1997; Leary & Kowalski, 1995; Maltby & Day, 2000; Miller, 1996)

5.

<Table 5>
가 ($F = 4.00$, $p < .005$),
Scheffe
가
($p < .05$).

가 ($p < .05$).

(Median 1-Way analysis)
가 ($\chi^2 = 7.14$, $p < .05$).

<Table 4> Pearson's Correlation between embarrassability and embarrassment

| | Embarrassment | Embarrassment during the 10 stages of cervical screening | Situational embarrassability | Dispositional embarrassability |
|--|---------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Embarrassment | 1.000 | 0.626*** | 0.019 | 0.104 |
| Embarrassment during the 10 stages of cervical screening | | 1.000 | 0.086 | 0.301** |
| Situational embarrassability | | | 1.000 | 0.220* |
| Dispositional embarrassability | | | | 1.000 |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .0001$

<Table 5> Embarrassability of subjects according to general characteristics

| Variable | Classification | Situational embarrassability | | | Dispositional embarrassability | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------------------|------|--------|--------------------------------|------|-------|
| | | Mean \pm SD | t/F | P | Mean \pm SD | t/F | P |
| Age (years) | ≤ 39 | 81.2 \pm 7.7 | | | 103.6 \pm 23.1 | | |
| | 40-49 | 81.0 \pm 13.2 | 0.90 | 0.466 | 105.0 \pm 20.8 | 0.95 | 0.439 |
| | 50-59 | 83.2 \pm 16.1 | | | 106.1 \pm 24.1 | | |
| | ≥ 60 | 88.5 \pm 13.9 | | | 117.0 \pm 18.7 | | |
| Religion | Protestant | 83.1 \pm 11.4 | 0.22 | 0.881 | 106.6 \pm 23.9 | 0.34 | 0.798 |
| | Buddhism | 82.1 \pm 13.5 | | | 108.8 \pm 20.0 | | |
| | Catholic | 80.3 \pm 10.1 | | | 102.6 \pm 18.0 | | |
| | No religion | 84.3 \pm 16.0 | | | 104.2 \pm 26.5 | | |
| Education level | No education | 96.4 \pm 12.3 ^a | 4.00 | 0.005* | 115.3 \pm 23.9 | 1.24 | 0.300 |
| | Elementary | 80.9 \pm 12.5 | | | 107.0 \pm 15.8 | | |
| | Middle | 77.6 \pm 15.2 ^b | | | 106.1 \pm 27.3 | | |
| | High | 82.9 \pm 12.1 | | | 108.2 \pm 20.2 | | |
| | College and over | 78.8 \pm 9.1 ^c | | | 95.2 \pm 18.4 | | |

<Table 5> Embarrassability of subjects according to general characteristics (continued)

| Variable | Classification | Situational embarrassability | | | Dispositional embarrassability | | |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------|--------|--------------------------------|------|---------------------|
| | | Mean±SD | t/F | P | Mean ± SD | t/F | P |
| Spouse | Yes | 82.5 ± 13.7 | 0.20 | 0.843 | 107.6 ± 22.0 | 1.19 | 0.237 |
| | No | 83.5 ± 10.5 | | | 98.0 ± 17.8 | | |
| Monthly income | ≤99 | 86.2 ± 14.6 | 1.15 | 0.339 | 107.3 ± 17.3 | 0.36 | 0.835 |
| | 100 199 | 78.7 ± 13.3 | | | 109.1 ± 25.2 | | |
| | 200 299 | 80.1 ± 13.0 | | | 105.1 ± 19.2 | | |
| | 300 399 | 85.0 ± 13.5 | | | 100.1 ± 14.1 | | |
| | ≥400 | 85.0 ± 10.4 | | | 108.8 ± 25.3 | | |
| Job | Yes | 82.6 ± 14.8 | 0.02 | 0.982 | 102.2 ± 18.0 | 1.15 | 0.252 |
| | No | 82.5 ± 12.9 | | | 108.4 ± 23.0 | | |
| No. of pregnancy | 0 3 | 79.9 ± 11.1 | 1.60 | 0.208 | 99.2 ± 21.9 | 7.14 | 0.028 ¹⁾ |
| | 4 6 | 83.0 ± 11.4 | | | 109.5 ± 21.2 | | |
| | ≥7 | 90.5 ± 11.9 | | | 115.5 ± 19.6 | | |
| No. of children | 0 1 | 83.7 ± 12.7 | 0.12 | 0.883 | 100.6 ± 24.6 | 1.50 | 0.229 |
| | 2 3 | 82.0 ± 12.6 | | | 105.2 ± 19.8 | | |
| | ≥4 | 83.6 ± 16.7 | | | 113.1 ± 26.0 | | |
| History of pelvic disease | Yes | 83.2 ± 12.1 | 0.45 | 0.657 | 105.3 ± 18.4 | 0.58 | 0.562 |
| | No | 81.8 ± 15.0 | | | 108.3 ± 25.4 | | |
| Frequency of pap smear preceding 3years(No.) | 1 | 85.7 ± 14.9 | 0.92 | 0.404 | 105.4 ± 20.2 | 0.79 | 0.455 |
| | 2 | 82.7 ± 14.2 | | | 101.4 ± 20.0 | | |
| | ≥3 | 80.9 ± 12.3 | | | 109.2 ± 23.1 | | |
| Age at the time of first pap smear | ≤29 | 84.1 ± 9.8 | 1.44 | 0.228 | 102.5 ± 23.5 | 0.84 | 0.504 |
| | 30 39 | 81.2 ± 12.0 | | | 110.3 ± 20.0 | | |
| | 40 49 | 80.8 ± 13.6 | | | 101.9 ± 21.8 | | |
| | 50 59 | 82.0 ± 18.9 | | | 106.8 ± 25.6 | | |
| | ≥60 | 93.7 ± 12.7 | | | 114.7 ± 22.7 | | |
| Gender of doctor | Male | 82.3 ± 13.6 | 0.53 | 0.598 | 106.2 ± 22.4 | 0.55 | 0.583 |
| | Female | 85.0 ± 11.6 | | | 110.7 ± 15.2 | | |
| Location of service | Clinic of OBGY | 79.2 ± 13.0 | 2.49 | 0.015* | 102.9 ± 23.0 | 1.68 | 0.096 |
| | Centre for Health promotion | 86.4 ± 13.0 | | | 110.9 ± 20.0 | | |

a, b, c; Scheffe's test a-b, a-c 가 (p .05).

1) Nonparametric statistics(Median 1-Way analysis)(p .05).

* p .05

(1999)

가

Maltby Day(2000)

가

가

Holroyd Twinn(2001)

가

가

6.

<Table 6>

가 (F = 3.73, p<.05), Scheffe

<Table 6> Embarrassment of subjects according to general characteristics (Unit : mm)

| Variable | Classification | Embarrassment during cervical screening | | | Embarrassment during 10 stages of cervical screening | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|-------|---------------------|--|-------|-------|
| | | M ± SD | t / F | P | M ± SD | t / F | P |
| Age (years) | ≤39 | 5.8 ± 2.2 | | | 52.5 ± 21.1 | | |
| | 40 49 | 5.2 ± 3.0 | | | 49.6 ± 25.2 | | |
| | 50 59 | 4.2 ± 2.7 ^a | 3.73 | 0.015* | 41.9 ± 26.8 | 0.90 | 0.447 |
| | ≥60 | 7.5 ± 2.1 ^b | | | 54.6 ± 17.9 | | |
| Religion | Protestant | 52.7 ± 30.0 | | | 49.7 ± 25.9 | | |
| | Buddhism | 55.5 ± 28.8 | | | 49.2 ± 25.3 | | |
| | Catholic | 44.4 ± 32.0 | 0.41 | 0.745 | 40.3 ± 23.9 | 0.46 | 0.712 |
| | No religion | 53.8 ± 25.8 | | | 50.0 ± 21.7 | | |
| Education | No education | 63.0 ± 30.2 | | | 46.9 ± 25.2 | | |
| | Elementary | 39.3 ± 25.4 | | | 45.2 ± 27.1 | | |
| | Middle | 64.3 ± 22.9 | 1.75 | 0.147 | 55.8 ± 24.3 | 0.46 | 0.762 |
| | High | 49.3 ± 28.1 | | | 47.4 ± 21.8 | | |
| Spouse | College and over | 52.7 ± 32.9 | | | 46.9 ± 28.5 | | |
| | Yes | 53.8 ± 29.1 | | | 49.6 ± 24.4 | | |
| | No | 50.3 ± 24.2 | 0.01 | 0.994 | 42.9 ± 22.3 | 0.69 | 0.493 |
| Monthly income | ≤99 | 51.7 ± 29.6 | | | 43.5 ± 26.4 | | |
| | 100 199 | 51.2 ± 27.5 | | | 52.5 ± 20.3 | | |
| | 200 299 | 65.6 ± 25.7 | 1.00 | 0.414 | 59.2 ± 16.9 | 1.74 | 0.149 |
| | 300 399 | 49.1 ± 24.7 | | | 42.4 ± 24.8 | | |
| Job | ≥400 | 46.5 ± 35.6 | | | 39.3 ± 3.2 | | |
| | Yes | 52.2 ± 23.8 | | | 46.5 ± 17.3 | | |
| | No | 53.8 ± 30.1 | 0.24 | 0.814 | 49.5 ± 26.4 | 0.61 | 0.546 |
| No. of pregnancy | 0 3 | 55.6 ± 24.4 | | | 53.0 ± 26.3 | | |
| | 4 6 | 54.0 ± 30.7 | 0.91 | 0.409 | 47.5 ± 22.9 | 0.84 | 0.437 |
| | ≥7 | 38.5 ± 22.8 | | | 40.2 ± 25.1 | | |
| No. of children | 0 1 | 42.9 ± 26.3 | | | 49.3 ± 27.0 | | |
| | 2 3 | 52.6 ± 29.4 | 1.50 | 0.229 | 48.2 ± 24.3 | 0.04 | 0.960 |
| | ≥4 | 62.0 ± 24.7 | | | 50.0 ± 23.3 | | |
| History of pelvic disease | Yes | 51.8 ± 28.4 | | | 47.2 ± 23.1 | | |
| | No | 55.3 ± 28.6 | 0.50 | 0.585 | 50.5 ± 25.5 | 0.60 | 0.549 |
| Frequency of pap smear preceding 3years(No.) | 1 | 61.0 ± 29.1 | | | 47.5 ± 22.5 | | |
| | 2 | 51.1 ± 21.6 | 1.09 | 0.340 | 44.8 ± 22.3 | 0.38 | 0.688 |
| | ≥3 | 50.3 ± 30.0 | | | 50.7 ± 25.8 | | |
| Age at the time of first pap smear | ≤29 | 40.1 ± 19.1 | | | 51.7 ± 24.6 | | |
| | 30 39 | 57.4 ± 32.8 | | | 43.5 ± 25.2 | | |
| | 40 49 | 49.3 ± 24.8 | 10.50 | 0.033 ¹⁾ | 46.9 ± 24.9 | 0.75 | 0.528 |
| | 50 59 | 46.6 ± 27.5 | | | 54.3 ± 14.4 | | |
| Gender of doctor | ≥60 | 77.1 ± 18.7 | | | | | |
| | Male | 56.0 ± 26.8 | | | 49.1 ± 23.7 | | |
| Location of service | Female | 28.4 ± 1.8 | -2.21 | 0.027 ¹⁾ | 44.9 ± 28.9 | 0.47 | 0.641 |
| | Clinic of OBGY | 50.4 ± 29.1 | | | 45.1 ± 24.4 | | |
| Location of service | Centre for Health promotion | 56.6 ± 27.5 | 0.98 | 0.331 | 52.6 ± 23.5 | 1.41 | 0.164 |

a, b ; Scheffe's test a-b 가 (p .05).

1) Nonparametric statistics(Wilcoxon rank sum test or Kruskal-Wallis test analysis)(p .05).

* p .05

60 (p<.05). 가 Kruskal-Wallis test 가 (x²= 10.50, p<.05). 가 Wilcoxon rank sum test 가 (x²= -2.21, p<.05).

가 , (1999)가 30 60 가 . 60 (Lee, 2000), (Kerr, 1995; Kim et al., 1998; McKie, 1993) Moettus (1999) , Holroyd (2001), McKie(1993) Twinn Cheng(2000)

가 30 60 가 , 가

가 가 82 1. 82.6, 106.7 2. 54.3mm , 10 68.2mm 가 , 67.9mm, 가 63.4mm 3. 10 (r= .301, p<.01) 가 4. (F=4.00, p<.005) (t= 2.49, p<.05) , (x²= 7.15, p<.05) 가 5. (F= 3.73, p<.05), (x²= 10.50, p<.05). (x²= -2.21, p<.01)

가 가

References

Austoker, J., & McPherson, A. (1992). *Cervical Screening*, (2nd ed.) Oxford Medical

Publications

- Baileff, A. (2000). Cervical screening: Patient's negative attitudes and experiences, *Nursing Standard*, 14(44), 35-37.
- Chang, S. B., & Park, S. M. (1999). A study on the relationship between emotion related to Pap smear and continuous participation Pap smear screening in married Korean women. *J of Korean Women's Health*, 5(3); 287-297.
- Edelmann, R. J. (1987). *The psychology of embarrassment*. New York: Wiley.
- Edelmann, R. T., & Iwawaki, S. (1987). Self-reported expression and consequences of embarrassment in the United States and Japan. *Psychologica: An International J of Psychology in the Orient*, 30, 205-211.
- Harokopos, V., & McDermott, R. (1996). Cervical cancer screening : Benefit and barriers. *J of Health Education*. 27(6), 351-356.
- Holroyd, E., Twinn, S. F., & Shia, A. T. Y. (2001). Chinese women's experiences and images of the Pap smear examination. *Cancer Nursing*, 24(1), 68-75.
- Kerr, J. (1995). Cervical cancer: improving the service. *Nursing Standard*, 9(18), 26-29.
- Kelly K. M., & Jones, W. H. (1997). Assessment of dispositional embarrassability. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, 10, 307-333.
- Kim, M. H. (1992). *A study of related factors on women's cervical screening behaviors*. Master degree dissertation, Department of Nursing, Chonnam National University Medical school.
- Kim, Y. H., Lee, M. S., & Lee, T. S. (1999). Factors Related with Experience and Compliance of Pap Smear for Cervical Cancer Among Women in Some Rural Area of Korean. *J of Korean Cancer Association*, 31(4), 758-772.
- Kim, J. W., Kang, S. B., Seo, D. K., Choi, S. H., Lee, C. M., Kim, Y. B., Park, N. H., Song, Y. S., Kang, S. B., & Lee, H. P. (1998). Cytologic Screening History of 249 Patients with Cervical Cancer, *J of Korean Cancer Association*, 30(6), 1198- 1206.
- King, A., Clay, K., Fleamar, E., Heustis, D. G., Karns, R. m., Krah1, P., & Tench, W. D. (1992). The Papanicolaou smear. *Western J of Medicine*, 156, 202-204.
- Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1995) *Social anxiety: Self-Presentational disasters*. Guilford Press.
- Lee, M. C. (2000). Knowledge, barriers, and motivators related to cervical cancer screening among Korean-American women; A focus group approach, *Cancer Nursing Vol* 23, No 3, p.168-175.
- Lee, K. S., Ku, H. W., Lee, W. J., Cang, S. H., & Yu, K. Y. (1999). Factors associated with the use of pap test in a rural area. *Korean J of Preventive Medicine*, 32(2), 147-154.
- Lyng, E. (1989). Screening for cancer of the cervix uteri. *World J Surg*, Jan-Feb;13(1), 71-78.
- Maltby, J., & Day, L. (2000). The reliability and validity of a susceptibility to embarrassment scale among adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29, 749-756.
- McKie, L. (1993). Women's views of the cervical smear test: Implication for nursing practice-women who have not had a smear test. *J of Adv Nursing*, 18, 972-979.
- Miller, R. M. (1995). On the nature of embarrassability: Shyness, social evaluation, and social skill. *Journal of Personality*, 63(2), 315-339.
- Miller, R. M. (1996). *Embarrassment; Poise and peril in everyday life*. The Guilford Press.
- Ministry of Health and Welfare (1992). Central Cancer Registry Center in Korea, National Medical Center, *Annual Report of the Central Cancer Registry in Korea* (1982-

- 1987).
- Ministry of Health and Welfare (1999). Central Cancer Registry Center in Korea, National Medical Center, *Annual Report of the Central Cancer Registry in Korea* (1997,1-1997,12).
- Ministry of Health and Welfare (2000). Central Cancer Registry Center in Korea, National Medical Center, *Annual Report of the Central Cancer Registry in Korea* (1998-1999).
- Modigliani, A. (1968). Embarrassment and embarrassability, *Sociometry*, 31, 313-326.
- Moettus, A., Sklar, D., & Tandberg, D. (1999) The effect of physician gender on women's perceived pain and embarrassment during pelvic examination. *American J of Emergency Medicine*. 17(7), 635-637.
- Nam, J. J., Choi, C. S., Kim, T. J., & Kae, H. B. (1995). Korean health consciousness; A survey on public health and a pattern of health consciousness, *Report of Korea Institute for Health and Social Affairs*, 95-26.
- Neilson, A., & Jones, R. K. (1998). Women's lay knowledge of cervical cancer/cervical screening: Accounting for non-attendance at cervical screening clinics. *J of Adv Nursing*, 28(3), 571-575.
- Song, C. H., Lee, H. P., Kim, J. U., Namkoong, S. E., Mok, J. E., Moon, H., & Park, I. S. (1998). Gynecologic Cancer Registry Program in Korean Women (Jan. 1. 1995 - Dec. 31. 1995). *Korean J of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 41(1), 253-293.
- Twinn, S., & Cheng, F. (2000). Increasing uptake rates of cervical cancer screening amongst Hong Kong Chinese women: the role of the practitioner. *J of Adv Nursing*, 32(2), 335-342.
- Weijts, W., Widdershoven, G., & Kok, G. (1991) Anxiety scenarios in communication during gynaecological consultations. *Patient*

Education and Counseling, 18, 149-163.

- Abstract -

A Descriptive Survey on Women's Embarrassability and Embarrassment during Cervical Screening

Cho, Eun-Jung*, Chung, Bok-Yae**

Purpose: The aim of this study was to describe women's embarrassability and embarrassment during cervical screening.

Method: The subjects of this study were 82 women who had a cervical screening at a National University Hospital. The data were collected through personal interview using a questionnaire from February 4, 2001 to February 22, 2002. The questionnaire consisted of embarrassability scale, embarrassment Scale, and demographic data.

Result: 1) The mean scores of situational embarrassability was 82.6 and that of dispositional embarrassability was 106.7. 2) The mean scores of subject's embarrassment was 54.3 and 48.7 in 10 stages of cervical screening. The following three situations of 10 stages of cervical screening were highly ranked as to be embarrassing: 'during the examination', 'waiting for a doctor', and 'climbing up the exam chair and positioning her thigh for a exam'. 3) There was a positive correlation between dispositional embarrassability and embarrassment of 10 stages of cervical screening. 4) There were significant differences in situational embarrassability of subjects according to education and the locations of service. There were significant differences in

* Graduate student of Dep. of Nursing Studies at Kyungpook National University

** Professor of Dep. of Nursing Studies at Kyungpook National University

dispositional embarrassability of subjects with regard to frequencies of pregnancy. 5) There were significant differences in embarrassment of subjects during cervical screening with respect to age, age at the time of first smear and gender of the examiner.

Conclusion: The finding of this study indicates that women experienced a high level of embarrassment during cervical screening, assuming a need for nursing intervention

reduces women's embarrassment. Also, there is a positive correlation between embarrassability and embarrassment of cervical screening, suggesting a need for further research identifying the effect of nursing intervention on embarrassment according to embarrassability.

Key words : Pap smear, Embarrassability, Embarrassment