

: , . 가

- SERVQUAL - *

**

가

1. 가 가 가

가 가 가 (Reichheld & Sasser, 1990). Parasuraman (1988)

(Youssef et al., 1996).

가 가 SERVQUAL SERVQUAL

가, 3 가 가 가 1990 가 가 (Bolton & Drew, 1991; Cronin & Joo, 2001).

* 2002

**

2002 1 9

2002 4 22

2002 8 1

Taylor, 1994; Gravin, 1983; Puay & Nelson, 2000).

가 가
가

2.

가

가

(Atkin, Marshall & Javalgil, 1996; Legg & Fittall, 1995; Shahher & Preziosi, 1988; Yoo, 1994; Lee, 2001).

1)

2)

(-

3)

가

(Park, 1998).

가

3.

가 (Bond & Thomas, 1991; Chai, 1996; Greeneich, 1993; Hassison, 1995; Hegyvary, 1991; Lee 1998; Lee, 1999, 2001; Lee & Kwon, 1996; Lim & Kim, 2000; Peter, 1995), 가

1)

:

가

가 가

(Nitecki, 1996), 가

가

가 가

(Olshavsky, 1985).

:

Parasuraman (1988)

SERVQUAL

(Redferm & Norman, 1990),

가

가

가

가

가

5 ,

1

가

가

가

가

가

2)

:

가

SERVQUAL

가

가

(Kotler,

1997; Oliver, 1980).

:

가 , , , 가
 7 , 20가
 1 7 , 3 가 ,
 4 가 , 3 가 , 4 가
 6 가
 5 , 1
 1. 5
 0.94
 가
 가 20 5
 0.98
 7
 2. 5.
 1 300 259 86%
 2 253
 300
 1) SPSS/PC ver 10.0
 2) 1)
 18 2)
 3) 3)
 4) 가 4)
 3. paired t-test
 4)
 2001 2 1 3 2
 Pearson Correlation
 Coefficient
 4. 1.
 1)

Parasuraman (1988) SERVQUAL
 가 1999

<Table 1>

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

Characteristics	Item	Frequency	Percentage(%)
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	13.6
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
	> 3,000,000	27	10.7
hospital	D hospital(K city)	85	33.6
	D hospital(P city)	83	32.8
	C hospital(K city)	85	33.6
the number of times using the other hospitals			2.67
the number of times visiting hospital by month			2.17

500 가
 33.6%, 32.8%,
 33.6% 1) 가
 2.67 , 가 <Table
 2> .
 2.17 , 3.43,
 60.9% 36.8% 3.38, 3.51, 3.53
 14.1% 3.46 가
 13.8%, 45.8%, 가
 33.6%, 4.3% .
 가 18 가
 25 가 19.0%, 26 35 가 28.1%, 1 가 ' ,
 36 45 가 23.3%, 46 55 가 2 가 ' 가 ' 3 가 '
 15.4%, 56 65 가 7.1% 65 , 4 가 ' , 5
 1.2% 26 35 가 가 가 ' 가 ' 가
 . 20 가 '
 100 가 41.1%, 101 200 , 19 가 '
 가 33.2%, 201 300 가 15.0% , 18 가 ' ' 17
 301 가 10.7% 100 가 ' , 16 가
 가 가 . ' , .

<Table 2> Consumers' Perception about the Nursing Service Expectation (N = 253)

Factors (Mean/ SD)	Nursing service Attributes	Consumers (n = 253)		Rank
		Mean	SD	
Tangibility (3.43/ .77)	up-to-data equipment/facilities	3.10	.94	20
	well arranged the working environment	3.60	.99	4
	nurses' clean and attractive appearance	3.57	1.00	5
Reliability (3.38/ .85)	dependable nurses' promise	3.57	1.07	6
	nurses' sincere attitude	3.65	1.11	3
	without any mistake in nursing service	3.11	1.02	19
Responsiveness (3.51/ 1.00)	provide explanation/materials on health	3.19	1.14	18
	response to the patient's needs promptly	3.43	1.13	15
	nurses' attitude that's willing to help	3.68	1.09	1
Assurance (3.53/ .90)	always answer even if nurses are too busy	3.42	1.13	16
	credible nursing service	3.51	1.05	9
	patients feel safe in relationship with nurses	3.51	1.09	10
Empathy (3.46/ .84)	nurses' kindness & good etiquette	3.65	1.08	2
	nurses' sufficient medical knowledge	3.46	1.03	12
	pay attention personally	3.55	1.07	7
	coordinate nursing service flexibly	3.49	1.02	11
	provide nursing service heartily	3.43	1.02	13
	understand the patient's needs accurately	3.34	1.01	17
	listen whatever patient says attentively	3.43	1.04	14
	treat with equality	3.51	1.02	8

2) 가
가

3> .

<Table

<Table 3> Consumers' Perception about the Nursing Service Performance (N = 253)

Factors (Mean/ SD)	Nursing service Attributes	Consumers (n = 253)		Rank
		Mean	SD	
Tangibility (3.21/ 1.01)	up-to-data equipment/facilities	2.92	1.09	20
	well arranged the working environment	3.36	1.16	7
	nurses' clean and attractive appearance	3.33	1.16	9
Reliability (3.24/ 1.09)	dependable nurses' promise	3.33	1.22	10
	nurses' sincere attitude	3.46	1.23	2
	without any mistake in nursing service	3.16	1.20	18
Responsiveness (3.37/ 1.15)	provide explanation/materials on health	3.01	1.30	19
	response to the patient's needs promptly	3.37	1.22	6
	nurses' attitude that's willing to help	3.48	1.23	1
Assurance (3.34/ 1.11)	always answer even if nurses are too busy	3.27	1.21	16
	credible nursing service	3.42	1.21	4
	patients feel safe in relationship with nurses	3.32	1.23	12
Empathy (3.32/ 1.11)	nurses' kindness & good etiquette	3.44	1.25	3
	nurses' sufficient medical knowledge	3.19	1.13	17
	pay attention personally	3.35	1.20	8
	coordinate nursing service flexibly	3.30	1.18	13
	provide nursing service heartily	3.32	1.17	11
	understand the patient's needs accurately	3.30	1.19	14
	listen whatever patient says attentively	3.30	1.22	15
	treat with equality	3.38	1.24	5

가 가 . 가
 2) <Table 8> 가
 <Table 8> 가
 <Table 7> 가
 20 가
 5 가 , 가 가 1 가 ‘
 가 가 , , 2 가 ‘ , 3 가 ‘
 , , , 4 가 ‘
 , 5 ‘
 3) 가

<Table 7> Pearson Correlation Coefficient between Consumers' Satisfaction and Nursing Service Factors (N = 253)

Item	Satisfaction	Tangibility	Reliability	Responsiveness	Assurance	Empathy
Satisfaction	1.000(.)					
Tangibility	.454(.000)**	1.000(.)				
Reliability	.489(.000)**	.732(.000)**	1.000(.)			
Responsiveness	.465(.000)**	.671(.000)**	.806(.000)**	1.000(.)		
Assurance	.494(.000)**	.747(.000)**	.880(.000)**	.885(.000)**	1.000(.)	
Empathy	.500(.000)**	.712(.000)**	.860(.000)**	.863(.000)**	.913(.000)**	1.000(.)

** : p < .01

<Table 8> Pearson Correlation Coefficient between Consumers' Satisfaction and Nursing service Attributes (N = 253)

factors	Nursing service attributes	Satisfaction		note	Rank
		r	p		
Tangibility	up-to-date equipment/ facilities	.263	.000	**	19
	working environment arrangement/ order	.295	.000	**	15
	nurses' attractive appearance	.266	.000	**	18
Reliability	dependable nurses' promise	.358	.000	**	2
	nurses' sincerely attitude	.328	.000	**	9
	without any mistake in nursing service	.253	.000	**	20
Responsiveness	supply explanation/ material on health	.302	.000	**	14
	response to the patient's needs promptly	.287	.000	**	16
	nurses' attitude that's willing to help	.331	.000	**	8
Assurance	always answer even if nurses are too busy	.334	.000	**	7
	credible nursing service	.335	.000	**	6
	patients feel safe in relationship with nurses	.323	.000	**	10
Empathy	nurses' kindness & good etiquette	.359	.000	**	1
	nurses' sufficient medical knowledge	.274	.000	**	17
	pay attention personally	.316	.000	**	11
	coordinate nursing service flexibly	.349	.000	**	4
	provide nursing service heartily	.346	.000	**	5
	understand the patient's needs accurately	.313	.000	**	12
	listen whatever patient says attentively	.303	.000	**	13
	treat with equality	.358	.000	**	2

** : p < .01

(3.30)

가 가
가 가

5가 가
가

가 ,

가
2 가 4
5 . 5

(Lumby, J. & England K., 2000),

가 20 가
19 18
17 16 가

- 가
(8가)
(+)
(-)
8가

가

(Headley
& Miller, 1993; Kitting & Lee, 1997)

3
300

가 ' ' (2.92)
(Lee, 2001)
가

253 가 SPSS
Cronbach's Alpha, percentages frequencies,
paired t-test, Pearson Correlation Coefficient

1.

가
가
Joo(2001)

5가 , 5
3가 가 5

Chai(1997)

4가 가

Lumby England(2000) 2.

가

20가 가 가
 가
 가 4가 5가
 가 20가 12가
 3.
 5가 20가 가
 1.
 가
 2. SERVQUAL ()
 SERVQUAL
 가
 3. 가
 가 가

References

Atkins P. M., Marshall B. S., & Javalgi R. G. (1996). Happy employees lead to loyal patients. *Online J Health Care Markrting* [On-line serial], 16(4),14-24.

Bolton R. N., & Drew J. H. (1991). A multistage model of customers' assessment of service quality and value. *Journal of Consumer Research* (March), 375-384.

Bond, S., & Thomas, L. H. (1991). Issues in measuring outcomes of nursing. *Journal of*

Advanced Nursing, 16,1492-1502.

Chai, G. S. (1997). *A study on positioning of nursing services in tertiary hospital*. Unpublished health science and management Master's thesis

Cronin J. J. Jr., & Taylor S. A. (1994). SERVPERF vers SERVQUAL : Reconciling performance based and perceptions-minus expectations measurement of service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(January), 125-131.

Gravin D. A. (1983). Quality on the Line. *Harvard Business Review* 61(September-October), 65-73.

Greeneich, D. (1993). The link between new and return business and quality of care : Patient satisfaction. *Advanced Nursing Science*, 16(1), 62-72.

Harrison, E. (1995). Nursing caring and the new health care paradigm. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality*, 9(4), 14-23.

Headley D. E., & Miller S. J. (1993). Measuring service quality and its' relationship to future consumer behavior. *Journal Health Care Marketing*, 13(4), 32-41.

Hegyvary, S. T. (1991). Issues in outcomes research. *Journal of Nursing Quality Assurance*, 5(2), 1-6.

Joo, M. K. (2001). *A study on the determinants of consumer-oriented nursing service quality-SERVQUAL model based-*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. The Seoul National University of Korea, Seoul.

Kitting W. J., & Lee C. C. (1997). Pragmatic perspectives on the measurement of information systems service quality. *MIS Quality*, (June) 223-241.

Kotler, P. (1997). *Marketing management*. New Jersey : Prentice-Hall Inc.

Lee, B. S., & Kwon, Y. S. (1996). Evaluation of outcome in nursing practice. *JKANA*, 2(2), 59-71.

- Lee, M. A. (1999). *Nursing service quality analysis for nursing service repositioning*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. the Kyunghee University of Korea, Seoul.
- Lee, M. A. (2001). A study of the perception gap on nursing service between consumers and Providers. *J Korea Acad Nurs*, 31(5), 871-884.
- Lee, S. A. (1998). the relationship among patient's perception, patient's satisfaction of nursing service quality and revising intention. *JKANA*, 4(2), 307 - 320.
- Legg, S., & Fittall B. (1995). Planning nursing resources. *Int Nurs Rev*, 42(2), 37-49.
- Lim, J. Y., & Kim, S. I.(2000). Measurement of nursing service quality using SERVQUAL Model. *JKANA*, 6(2), 259-279.
- Lumby J., & England K. (2000). Patiwnr satisfaction with nursing care in a colorectal surgical population. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, 6, 140-145.
- Nitecki, D. A. (1996). Changing the concept and measure of service quality in academic libraries. *J Academic Librarianship*, 22(3), 181-191.
- Oliver R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedants and consequences of satisfaction decision. *J Marketing Research*, 17(November), 460-469.
- Olshavsky R. W. (1985). *Perceived quality in consumer decision making : an intergrated theoretical perspective in perceived quality*. J. Jacoby and J. Olson ed. Lexington Massachusetts : Lexington Books.
- 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.
- Peter, D. A. (1995). The mainstay of a framework for quality care. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality*, 10(1), 61-69
- Puay C. L., & Nelson K. H. T. (2000). A study of patients' expectation and satisfaction in singapore hospitals. *Int J Health Care Quality Assurance*, 13(7), 290-299.
- Reichheld, F. F., & Sasser, W. E. Jr (1990). Zero defections : Quality comes to services. *Harvard Business Review*, September-October, 105-110.
- Shaffer F. A., & Preziosi P. (1988). Nursing : The hospitals' competitive edge. *Nursing Clinic of North America*, 23(September), 597-612.
- Yoo, D. K. (1994). *Intergrated marketing*. Seoul : Future Management.
- Youssef, F. N., Nel, D., & Bovaird, T. (1996). Health care quality in NHS Hospitals. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 9(1), 15-28.

- Abstract -

A study of the Nursing Service Quality and Satisfaction that Admitted Patients Perceived - being used SERVQUAL -

Lee, Mi-Aie *

Purpose: This study was performed to measure the nursing service quality being used SERVQUAL model and satisfaction that the admitted patients perceived.

Method: The questionnaire founded on the SERVQUAL was developed and distributed to 300 patients at the three general hospitals in three provincial city, Korea. For data analysis, Cronbach's , frequencies, percentages, paired t-test, Pearson Correlation Coefficient were used.

Result: In expectation, patients most highly perceived the assurance factor that was one

* Department of Nursing, College of Medicine, Don University

among the 5 factors being constituted nursing service. In performance, patients most highly perceived the responsiveness factor. The performance degrees of the 5 factors and 20 attributes being constituted nursing service did not exceed the expectation degree of those. So the calculated figures for nursing service quality of the three subjected hospitals were all minus. In relation of the patients' demographics and nursing service characteristics to their general satisfaction, patients' sex, age, income

and the all factors and attributes of nursing service had relation to their general satisfaction.

Conclusion: It could be concluded that the nursing service quality of the three subjected hospitals was poor and the patients' demographic and nursing service characteristics had relation to their general satisfaction.

Key words : Hospital Nursing Service,
Healthcare Quality, Access,
Evaluation