

: , . 가

\*\*\*

[illegible]

, (Atkins, Marshall & Javalgil, 1996; Ben-Sira, 1983; Legg & Fittall, 1995; Shaffer & Preziosi, 1988; Yoo, 1994).

(Chai, 1997; Jung, 1995; Lee, 1999, 2000; Lim, 1998, 2000).

---

\* 2001

\*\*\*

2001 5 28

2001 6 12

2001 10 9

가 :  
 가 .  
 가 Parasarman, Zeithaml Berry(1988)가  
 SERVQUAL  
 5가 20가  
 가  
 가  
 가 2)  
 가 :  
 가  
 (expectation), (important) (Nitecki, 1996;  
 Zeithmal, 1987),  
 (performance) 가 , (Parasarman, Zeithaml & Berry ,  
 1988). , 가  
 가  
 가 (Yoo., 1996).  
 : Parasarman  
 (1988) SERVQUAL  
 가 .  
 2. 가 5 가  
 가  
 .  
 1) .  
 1.  
 2)  
 3)  
 가  
 4)  
 .  
 5) 2.  
 3. 1  
 2  
 1)  
 : , 가 ,  
 , ,  
 , , 1)  
 ,  
 (Korean Nurses Association, 1983). ,

- 18 300 259 (86%),  
210 196(93%) 가  
100 300 253 , 192  
2) SPSS/PC  
Cronbach's  
70 210  
3. t  
2001 2 1 3 2 t  
1.  
4. 1)  
<Table 1>  
Parasuraman (1988) SERVQUAL 가  
가 1999 . 60.9%  
가 (45.8%) (33.6%)  
20 79.4% 18 45 가 70.3%  
1 , 5 5 100 가  
. .94 41.1%, 101 200 가 33.2%  
가  
20 5  
<Table 1> Demographic Characteristics of  
Nursing Service Consumers  
(n = 253)  
Characteristics item Frequency Percent  
Gender male 154 60.9  
female 93 36.8  
no answer 6 2.3  
Education <= middle school 35 13.8  
<= high school 116 45.8  
<= university 85 33.6  
>= master's degree 6 4.3  
no answer 11 13.8  
5.

<Table 1> Demographic Characteristics of  
Nursing Service Consumers  
(continued) (n = 253)

Characteristics	item	Frequency	Percentage(%)
Age	18 - 25 years	48	19.0
	26 - 35 years	71	28.1
	36 - 45 years	59	23.3
	46 - 55 years	39	15.4
	56 - 65 years	18	7.1
	> 65 years	3	1.2
	no answer	15	5.9
Income (won /month)	<= 1,000,000	104	41.1
	1,010,000 - 2,000,000	84	33.2
	2,010,000 - 3,000,000	38	15.0
	>= 3,010,000	27	10.7
hospital	D hospital(K city)	85	33.6
	D hospital(P city)	83	32.8
	C hospital(P city)	85	33.6

2)

<Table 2>

가	9
(76%) 3	(87.5) 30
(71.8%)	(82.3%)
3)	
3>	
2.67	2.17
83%가	
(50.2%)	
가	(23.7%),

<Table

<Table 2> Demographic Characteristics of Nursing Service providers (n = 192)

Characteristics	item	Frequency	Percentage(%)
Age	<= 25 years	50	26.0
	26 - 30 years	88	45.8
	31 - 35 years	32	16.7
	35 - 40 years	11	5.7
	41 - 45 years	3	1.6
	46 - 50 years	1	0.5
	no answer	7	3.7
Education	diploma degree(3 years)	168	87.5
	bachelor's degree(4 years)	15	7.8
	>= master's degree	4	2.1
	no answer	5	2.6
Position	staff nurse	158	82.3
	vice-head nurse	18	9.4
	head nurse	11	5.7
	no answer	5	2.6
Length of service	1 - 3 years	55	28.6
	4 - 6 years	57	29.7
	7 - 9 years	34	17.7
	10 - 12 years	20	10.4
	13 - 15 years	12	6.3
	15 - 18 years	6	3.1
	> 18 years	1	0.5
	no answer	7	3.7
Hospital	D hospital(K city)	66	34
	D hospital(P city)	69	36
	C hospital(P city)	57	30

<Table 3> Behavioral Characteristics as Nursing Service Consumers are Using Hospitals  
(n = 253)

Characteristics	item	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Experience using other hospitals	yes	210	83.0
	no	41	16.2
	no answer	2	0.8
Subject's favorite hospital	yes	127	50.2
	no	117	46.2
	no answer	9	3.6
Reason of favorite hospital	near distance	60	23.7
	procedural convenience	36	14.2
	a hospital is large	17	6.7
	an acquaintance is in there	11	4.3
	excellent medical team	37	14.6
	inexpensive medical fee	2	0.8
	the others	24	9.5
	no answer	66	26.1
The most kindly person in the hospital	Dr.	52	20.6
	nurse	162	64.0
	laboratory/radiation staff	10	4.0
	officer	6	2.4
	guard	12	4.7
	no answer	11	4.3
Counselor about health	Dr./nurse	30	3.6
	pharmacist	50	11.9
	family	112	19.8
	friend/colleague	32	44.3
	neighborhood	8	12.6
	the others	12	3.2
	no answer	9	4.7
Average of experience used other hospitals		2.67 hospitals	
Average of visiting hospitals by month		2.17 times	

(14.6%), (14.2%) 가 (64.0%) 가 (20.6%), (20.4) 가 (44.3%) 가 (19.8%) 가 2. 가

1)

2)

<Table 4>

<Table 5> .

&lt;Table 4&gt; The gap analysis of perceived expectation between nursing service consumers and

Factors	Attributes	Statistics	nursing service consumer (n = 253)		nursing service provider (n = 192)		t	p	note
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Tangibles	up-to-date equipment		3.10	.94	3.09	.89	.103	.918	
	working environment arrangement/order		3.60	.99	3.42	.87	2.052	.037	*
	nurse's attractive appearance		3.57	1.00	3.65	.89	-.869	.385	
Reliability	dependable nurse's promise		3.57	1.07	3.72	.87	-1.623	.096	
	sincere attitude		3.65	1.11	3.79	.86	-1.427	.141	
	without any mistake in service		3.11	1.02	3.45	.84	-3.734	.000	*
	supply explanation/material on health		3.43	1.13	3.73	.86	-3.066	.002	*
Responsive ness	response to request promptly		3.68	1.09	3.74	.90	-.615	.539	
	attitude that's willing to help		3.42	1.13	3.68	.89	-2.608	.009	*
	answer even if they are too busy		3.51	1.05	3.68	.81	-1.927	.055	
Assurance	credible nursing service		3.51	1.09	3.66	.82	-1.513	.131	
	safety in transaction		3.65	1.08	3.66	.82	-.086	.932	
	kindliness & etiquette		3.46	1.03	3.60	.75	-1.605	.109	
	sufficient medical knowledge		3.55	1.07	3.68	.86	-1.353	.177	
Empathy	personal attention		3.49	1.02	3.61	.79	-1.344	.180	
	coordinate nursing service flexibly		3.43	1.02	3.58	.88	-1.641	.101	
	provide nursing service heartily		3.34	1.01	3.62	.82	-3.124	.002	*
	accurate understand about patient's need		3.43	1.04	3.67	.90	-2.561	.001	*
	attentively listen what patient says		3.51	1.02	3.64	.91	-1.443	.150	
	equal treatment		3.19	1.14	3.55	.89	-3.678	.000	*

p &lt; .05

&lt;Table 5&gt; The gap analysis of perceived important between nursing service consumers and

Factors	Attributes	Statistics	nursing service consumer (n = 253)		nursing service provider (n = 192)		t	p	note
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Tangibles	up-to-date equipment		3.66	1.23	3.71	1.05	-.436	.663	
	working environment arrangement/order		3.72	1.21	3.86	.99	-1.350	.178	
	nurse's attractive appearance		3.46	1.17	3.71	.82	-2.477	.014	*
Reliability	dependable nurse's promise		3.76	1.26	4.02	.91	-2.387	.017	*
	sincere attitude		3.92	1.25	4.01	.91	-1.726	.085	
	without any mistake in service		3.54	1.17	3.92	.99	-3.616	.000	*
	supply explanation/material on health		3.80	1.25	4.11	.87	-3.008	.003	*
Responsive -ness	response to request promptly		3.76	1.23	4.06	.87	-2.901	.004	*
	attitude that's willing to help		3.72	1.22	3.99	.93	-2.575	.010	*
	answer even if they are too busy		3.82	1.22	4.16	.90	-3.274	.001	*

<Table 5>The gap analysis of perceived important between nursing service consumers and providers (continued)

Factors	Attributes	nursing service consumer (n = 253)		nursing service provider (n = 192)		t	p	note
		Statistics						
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Assurance	credible nursing service	3.81	1.24	4.06	.94	-2.337	.020	*
	safety in transaction	3.80	1.21	3.99	.87	-1.905	.057	
	kindliness & etiquette	3.66	1.20	4.04	.91	-3.624	.000	*
	sufficient medical knowledge	3.74	1.22	4.01	.89	-2.593	.010	*
Empathy	personal attention	3.62	1.18	3.96	.80	-3.368	.001	*
	coordinate nursing service flexibly	3.82	1.20	4.01	.90	-1.809	.071	
	provide nursing service heartily	3.71	1.23	4.02	.90	-2.944	.003	*
	accurate understand about patient's need	3.71	1.22	4.05	.92	-3.233	.001	*
	attentively listen what patient says	3.69	1.27	4.04	.89	-3.301	.001	*
	equal treatment	3.63	1.28	4.05	.89	-3.869	.000	*

---

p < .05

3/4 15가

가 3)

가                    , ‘                    ,  
/                    , ‘  
                  , ‘  
                  ,  
가                    , ‘

&lt;Table 6&gt;

<Table 6>The gap analysis of perceived performance between nursing service consumers and providers

Factors		Attributes	nursing service consumer (n = 253)		nursing service provider (n = 192)		t	p	note
			Statistics						
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Tangibles	up-to-date equipment	2.92	1.09	2.92	.74	-.010	.992		
	working environment	3.36	1.16	3.20	.76	1.668	.096		
	arrangement/ order	3.33	1.16	3.42	.70	-.950	.343		
	nurse's attractive appearance	3.33	1.16	3.42	.70	-.950	.343		
Reliability	dependable nurse's promise	3.33	1.22	3.39	.75	-.588	.557		
	sincere attitude	3.46	1.23	3.49	.74	-.310	.756		
	without any mistake in service	3.16	1.20	3.45	.70	-2.951	.003	*	
	supply explanation/material on health	3.37	1.22	3.47	.79	-1.012	.312		
Responsive-ness	response to requeat promptly	3.48	1.23	3.51	.82	-.225	.822		
	attitude that's willing to help	3.27	1.21	3.41	.80	-1.360	.174		
	answer even if thet are too busy	3.42	1.21	3.52	.77	-.979	.328		

&lt;Table 6&gt; The gap analysis of perceived performance between nursing service consumers and providers (continued)

Factors	Attributes	Statistics	nursing service consumer (n = 253)		nursing service provider (n = 192)		t	p	note
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Assurance	credible nursing service		3.32	1.23	3.58	.72	-2.595	.010	*
	safety in transaction		3.44	1.25	3.55	.74	-1.074	.283	
	kindliness & etiquette		3.19	1.13	3.47	.68	-3.039	.003	*
	sufficient medical knowledge		3.35	1.20	3.55	.77	-2.008	.045	*
Empathy	personal attention		3.30	1.18	3.50	.77	-2.076	.038	*
	coordinate nursing service flexibly		3.32	1.17	3.49	.81	-1.729	.085	
	provide nursing service heartily		3.30	1.19	3.47	.77	-1.710	.088	
	accurate understand about patient's need		3.30	1.22	3.51	.77	-2.000	.046	*
	attentively listen what patient says		3.38	1.24	3.56	.82	-1.759	.079	
	equal treatment		3.01	1.30	3.40	.82	-3.625	.000	*

p &lt; .05

가 4) -

&lt;Table 7&gt;

&lt;Table 7&gt; The gap analysis of perceived expectation-performance between nursing service consumers and providers

Factors	Attributes	Statistics	nursing service consumer (n = 253)				nursing service provider (n = 192)			
			expect- -ation	perform -ance	p	note	expect- -ation	perform -ance	p	note
Tangibles	up-to-date equipment		3.10	2.92	.004	*	3.09	2.92	.014	*
	working environment		3.60	3.36	.002	*	3.42	3.20	.001	*
	arrangement/order									
	nurse's attractive appearance		3.57	3.33	.002	*	3.65	3.42	.000	*
Reliability	dependable nurse's promise		3.57	3.33	.003	*	3.72	3.39	.000	*
	sincere attitude		3.65	3.46	.016	*	3.79	3.49	.000	*
	without any mistake in service		3.11	3.16	.505		3.45	3.45	1.000	
	supply explanation/material on health		3.43	3.37	.450	*	3.73	3.47	.000	*
Responsive- -ness	response to request promptly		3.68	3.48	.015	*	3.74	3.51	.000	*
	attitude that's willing to help		3.42	3.27	.072		3.68	3.41	.000	*
	answer even if they are too busy		3.51	3.42	.300		3.68	3.52	.006	*





<Table 8>The gap analysis of perceived importation-performance between nursing service consumers and providers

Factors	Attributes	Statistics	nursing service consumer (n = 253)				nursing service provider (n = 192)			
			expect -ation	perform -ance	p	note	expect -ation	perform -ance	p	note
Tangibles	up-to-date equipment		3.66	2.92	.000	*	3.71	2.92	.000	*
	working environment		3.72	3.36	.000	*	3.86	3.20	.000	*
	arrangement/order									
	nurse's attractive appearance		3.46	3.33	.046	*	3.71	3.42	.000	*
Reliability	dependable nurse's promise		3.76	3.33	.000	*	4.02	3.39	.000	*
	sincere attitude		3.92	3.46	.000	*	4.11	3.49	.000	*
	without any mistake in service		3.54	3.16	.000	*	3.92	3.45	.000	*
	supply explanation/material on health		3.80	3.37	.000	*	4.11	3.47	.000	*
Responsive -ness	response to request promptly		3.76	3.48	.000	*	4.06	3.51	.000	*
	attitude that's willing to help		3.72	3.27	.000	*	3.99	3.41	.000	*
	answer even if they are too busy		3.82	3.42	.000	*	4.16	3.52	.000	*
Assurance	credible nursing service		3.81	3.32	.000	*	4.06	3.58	.000	*
	safety in transaction		3.80	3.44	.000	*	3.99	3.55	.000	*
	kindliness & etiquette		3.66	3.19	.000	*	4.04	3.47	.000	*
	sufficient medical knowledge		3.74	3.35	.000	*	4.01	3.55	.000	*
Empathy	personal attention		3.62	3.30	.000	*	3.96	3.50	.000	*
	coordinate nursing service flexibly		3.82	3.32	.000	*	4.01	3.49	.000	*
	provide nursing service heartily		3.71	3.30	.000	*	4.02	3.47	.000	*
	accurate understand about patient's need		3.71	3.30	.000	*	4.05	3.51	.000	*
	attentively listen what patient says		3.69	3.38	.000	*	4.04	3.56	.000	*
	equal treatment		3.63	3.01	.000	*	4.05	3.40	.000	*

p < .05

(45.8%) (60.9%) 18 45 (2.67) (2.17)

가 70.3%, 100 가 41.1%

9

(76%) (82.3%), Lee

(1999) (71.7%) (50.2%) ‘가’

(57.6%) 25 30 가 ’(23.7%), ‘ ’(14.6%), ‘

46.8%, 250 30.1%, 150 ’(14.2%) Kim (1987)

250 가 40.2% 150 3가 ‘ , ‘

70.3% , 10 , ‘ ,

가 32.5% 가 ,

, 가

‘가 ,

. Lee(1999)

. 가



## Reference

- 253 , 192 SPSS , t , t
1. , t .
1. , , , , 가 / , 가
2. 가 . 20가
- 가 , 가
- 7가 , 18가 , 7 가 .

- Agarwal, J. (1992). Health Care Marketing Abstracts. *J Health Care Marketing*, 12(3), 82-83.
- Atkins, P. M., Marshall, B. S. & Javalgi, R. G. (1996). Happy Employees lead to Loyal Patients. Online *J Health Care Marketing* [On-line serial], 16(4), 14-24.
- Ben-Sira, Z. (1983). The Structure of a Hospitals' Image. *Medical Care*, 21 (October), 943-954.
- Chai, G. S. (1997). *A study on positioning of nursing services in tertiary hospital*. Unpublished health science and management Master's thesis
- Fish, T. A., Brown, C. J., Cannizzaro, B., & Naftal, B. (1990). Creating Patient Satisfaction and Loyalty. Online *J Health Care Marketing* [On-line serial], 10(2), 5-16.

- Headley, D. E., & Miller, S. J. (1993). Measuring Service Quality and Its' Relationship to Future Consumer Behavior. *J Health Care Marketing*, 13(4), 32-41.
- Hughes-Linda, L. & Navaro, F. H. (1990). *Should You Be Satisfied with Your Patient Satisfaction Survey? Vision 2000 : New Forces*, New Relationships Symposium Digest. Academy for Health Services Msrketing of the Amerrikan Marketing Association.
- Jung, M. S. (1995). *An analysis of image for the repositioning of hospital nursing services*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. The Seoul National University of Korea, Seoul.
- Kang, Y. S. (1998). *Concept development of service marketing promotion in nursing*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Yonsei University of Korea, Seoul
- Kim, P. Y. (1998). *The strategies of hospital management and marketing for nurses*. Paper presentated at the meeting of the Hanyang University's Nursing Development Institution on Nursing and Marketing, Seoul.
- Kim, S. Y. (1987). *Effects of hospital image on the hospital selection behavior*. Unpublised Master's Thesis. The Yonsei University of Korea, Seoul
- Kittinger, W. J., & Lee, C. C. (1997). Pragmatic Perspectives on the Measurement of Information Systems service Qaulity. *MIS Quality* (June), 223-241.
- Korea Nurses Association (1983). *Definition of nursing*. Paper presented at The 1st National Convention on The 60th Anniversary of The Founding.
- Lee, M. A. (1999). *Nursing services quality analysis for nursing services repositioning*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. The Kyunghye University of Korea, Seoul.
- Lee, M. A. (2000). A study on the differences of perception between consumers and providers about nursing service quality, and the usefulness of tools measuring nursing service quality. *J Korean Acad Nurs*, 30(5), 1121-1132.
- Legg, S. & Fittall, B. (1995). Panning Nursing Resources. *Int Nurs Rev*, 42(2), 37-49.
- Lim, J. Y. (1998). *A study on positioning of nursing service image in general hospital-centering around general hospital in seoul*. unpublished Master's Thesis.
- Lim, J. Y., Kim, S. I. (2000). Measurement of nursing service quality using SERVQUAL model. *J Korean Nurs Admin*, 6(2), 259-279.
- Nelson, E. C., Rust, R. T., Zahorik, A., Rose, R., Batalden, P., & Siemanski, B. A. (1992). Do Patient Perceptions of Quality relate to hospital financial performance?. Online *J health care marketing* [On-line serial], 12(December),
- Nitecki, D. A. (1996). Changing the Concept and Measure of Service Qaulity in Academic Libraries. *J Marketing Research*, 17(November), 460-469.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL : A Multiple-item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality. *J Retailing*, 64(Spring), 12-40.
- Shaffer, F. A., & Preziosi, P. (1988). Nursing : The Hospitals' Competitive Edge. *Nurs Clinics of North America*, 23(september), 597-612.
- Yaves, U., & Shemwell, D. J. (1996). Competing for Patient and Profit. *J Health Care Marketing*, 16(2), 30-38.
- Yoo, D. K. (1994). *Integrated marketing*. Seoul : Future management.
- Yoo, D. K. (1996). A study on quality perceptions and satisfaction for medical service marketing. *J Korean Nurs Admin*, 2(1), 97-114.
- Zeithmal, V. (1987). *Defining and Relating*

*Price, Perceived Quality, and Perceived Value*, Report No. 87-101, Cambridge, MA : Marketing Science Institute.

Zifko-Baliga, G. M., & Kramp, R. F. (1997). Management Perceptions of Hospital Quality *Marketing Health Services*, 17(1), 28-36.

- Abstract -

## A Study of the Perception Gap on Nursing Service between Consumers and Providers

*Lee, Mi-Aie \**

**Purpose:** this study was to investigate the perception gap on nursing service between consumers and providers.

**Method:** the questionnaire founded on the SERVQUAL was developed and distributed to 300 patients and 210 nurses at the three subjected general hospitals in three provincial city, Korea during February to March, 2001. For data analysis, Cronbachs' Alpha, frequency, t-test, and paired t-test were used.

**Result:** 1. In the gap analysis on the 20 properties constituting nursing service, providers almost all perceived higher than consumer in quality. Among them, the number of properties being statistically significant was 7 in the expectation, 18 in the important and 7 in the performance.

2. In the comparison analysis of the perception gap on the expectation-performance and the important-performance, it turned out that the subjected hospitals had to improve their equipment and facilities immediately. It was suggested a good strategy to strengthen the responsiveness factor and the assurance factor of nursing service.

**Conclusion:** it could be concluded that nurses have to recognize the blind spot of their perception and endeavor to take away the perception gap between consumers and providers.

**Key words :** Hospital nursing service,  
Healthcare quality, Access  
and evaluation

---

\* Department of Nursing, College of Medicine, Dongguk University