

: 가 ,

가 *

- 가 -

1) . 1) . 1) . 1) . Hesook Suzie, Kim 2)
3) . 4) . 4) . 5) . 5)

가

1.

(Kim et al, 1993).

Olson, Bell Portner(1980) 가

가

가 (Family Adaptation and

, , 가 ,

가

Cohesion Evaluation Scales : FACES I, II, III)

. 가

Circumplex Model

가

가

가

,

,

가

,

가

(Kim, 1996)

.

,

가

,

,

가

.

가

가

(Bae & Kim,

(process model)

가

1994) 가

,

가

가

. Epstein,

가

가

Baldwin Bishop(1981, 1983)

McMaster

가

Model of Family function(MMFF)

(Blank, Clark, Longman & Atwood, 1989).

가

McMaster

가

Family Assessment Device(FAD)

가

가

,

,

,

,

가

FAPGAR(Family

,

6가

APGAR) 가

Smilkstein(1978)

. FAM(Family Assessment Measure)

* 1999 (KRF-99-042-F00161) “ 가 가 가

1) 4)

2) Rhode Island 5)

3)

2002 3 8

2002 3 18

2002 4 29

Likert type 26 가 81%, 가 15.6% , 210 (91%) .

63 (27.3%), 56 (24.2%) .

7 , 가 147-217 61

(26.4%), 111-146 42 (18.2%) , 가

4 , 가 가

5 , 2 가 121 (52.4%) 가

3 가 48 (20.8%) .

3 , 가 4 113 (48.9%), 3

4 , 44 (19.0%), 5 38 (16.5%) .

3 142 (61.5%), 87 (37.7%) ,

6.40±4.47 .

windows SPSS program 53 (22.9%) 가 47

(Version 10.0) (20.3%), , 10

Chronbach's alpha (item (4.2%) .

total correlation) ,

Varimax (principal 2. 가 , 가

component analysis) .

1) 가

(corrected item to total correlation coefficient)가

1. .30 <Table 2>.

가 .30

36 , 가 가 .

<Table 2> Corrected items of family functioning

Item	Item Content	corrected item total correlation	alpha if item deleted
1	Our family members feel close to each other. (가 ()).	.5111	.8488
2	There is a feeling of togetherness in our family (가 “ , ”).	.4925	.8492
3	We are to show our affection for each other(kissing, hugging..) (가 (,)).	.4088	.8506
4	Our family is harmonious, peaceful. (가).	.5814	.8465
5	Our family members understand each other (가).	.5916	.8455
6	Our family members trust each other. (가).	.5169	.8479
7	Our family members are self - centered. (가 .)	-.0866	.8687
8	Each family member's role is defined in our family. (가 .)	.3121	.8536
9	We are satisfied with the family duties assigned to us. (가 .)	.4490	.8497

가 1.0 6 가 , 가 (Waltz
 . Varimax 6
 1 15.4%, 2 11.8%, & Bausell, 1981). 가
 3 10.5%, 4 8.3%, 5 7.9%, 1 ' 가 , ' 2
 6 7.3% 61.4% <Table " 가 .", 3
 4> ' 가 (,)
 ±0.3 (Kang, ' 4 ' 가
 Serk, & Oh, 1993) , ' 5 ' 가
 .30 ' 6 '
 <Table 3> 가 / 가
 (2) 가 6

<Table 3> Factor Analysis of family functioning items

Item	Item Content of Each Factor	Factor					
		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
1	Our family members feel close to each other.	.726					
2	There is a feeling of togetherness in our family.	.793					
3	We are to show our affection for each other (kissing, hugging... etc)	.588					
4	Our family is harmonious, peaceful.	.756					
5	Our family members understand each other	.715					
6	Our family members trust each other	.690					
11	Our family members like to spend a lot of time together.	.402					
23	When we meet some problems, we always ask a help to our relatives.		.775				
24	When we meet some problems, we always ask a help to our friends, neighbors.		.779				
25	Friends, relatives visit our home frequently.		.794				
26	Our family members get along with other relatives.		.710				
12	There are rules, standards to follow in our family.			-.774			
13	Our family members observe family rules.			-.765			
14	Rules are flexible in our family.			-.658			
16	Our family members follow family precepts.			-.601			
8	Each family member's role is defined in our family.				.224		
9	We are satisfied with the family duties assigned to us.				.712		
10	Our family members meet their family responsibilities.				.783		
17	Our family has an ability to resolve the problem by themselves.				.386		
15	When decided the important thing to the family, all family members can tell frankly, and their suggestions are followed.					.579	
21	We can say anything to our family members frankly.					.826	
22	Our family members resolve the problem together.					.662	
18	When needed, we receive a financial support from our relatives.						.816
19	When needed, we receive a financial support from our relatives in laws.						.821

<Table 4> Eigen Value & Percent of the total variance explained of family functioning factors

Factor	Eigen Value	Percent of the total variance explained	Cumulative Percent
Factor 1(Affective bonding)	3.708	15.448	15.448
Factor 2(External relationship)	2.839	11.828	27.276
Factor 3(Family norm)	2.522	10.510	37.786
Factor 4(Roles & responsibilities)	1.997	8.320	46.106
Factor 5(Communication)	1.910	7.959	54.065
Factor 6(Financial resources)	1.751	7.298	61.363

<Table 5> Correlation between factors of family functioning (N = 231)

Factor	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
Factor 1	1.000	.394** (p = .000)	.421** (p = .000)	.440** (p = .000)	.565** (p = .000)	.102 (p = .124)
Factor 2		1.000	.334** (p = .000)	.379** (p = .000)	.348** (p = .000)	.182** (p = .005)
Factor 3			1.000	.467** (p = .000)	.387** (p = .000)	.071 (p = .281)
Factor 4				1.000	.370** (p = .000)	.142* (p = .031)
Factor 5					1.000	.091 (p = .170)
Factor 6						1.000

가, 가, Cronbach's Guttman
<Table 6>. 24 Cronbach
's .87, Guttman .84

<Table 6> Reliability of family functioning factors

Factor	Guttman Reliability Coefficient	Alpha coefficient
Factor 1	.7153	.8345
Factor 2	.6168	.8224
Factor 3	.5603	.7471
Factor 4	.5503	.5521
Factor 5	.6239	.7328
Factor 6	.6850	.6854
Total	.8369	.8733

<Table 5>

(r) .10 .57

.50

3)

가

가

가

		Cronbach' alpha	
.87	.	.51 .84	
		가 .60	
5	가	(Yu & Kwon, 1999)	
FAD, FACE, FAM, FFI		가	
FEF, FFQ	가	가 2-3	
		가	
FAD, FACE, FFI, FFQ	, , ,	가	
가	가	가	
		가 가	
6	가	61.4%	
Lee (1999)	38%	가	
가	가	가 가	
가	가		
가 ,			
가	가		
가 가			
가	가		
가 가			
가	가		
가 가	가		
가, 가 2	Lee (1999)	가	
18, 19	가	가	
가	6가	26	
) 가	(Hybrid	가	
1999) 6가	(Lee et al.,	231 가	
	가		
	SPSSWIN ver 10.0		
1	5	26	24
가 .565		,	, 가
가	, ,	, ,	6
		61.4 %	, ,
	1	15.4%,	2 11.8%,
	3 10.5%,	4 8.3%,	5
	7.9%,	6 7.3%	

proposal for a family function test and its use by physicians, *Journal of Family Practice*, 6, 416-436.

Steinhauer, P., Santa-Barbara, J., & Skinner, H. (1982). The process model of family functioning. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, in press.

Van der Veen, F. (1960) *Family concept Q sort*. Madison, Wisconsin ; Dane County Mental Health Center, unpublished .

Van der Veen, F., (1969). *Family Concept Inventory*. Unpublished manuscript, Institute for Juvenile Research, Chicago.

Waltz, C. F., Bausell, R. B. (1981) *Nursing research · design · statistics and computer analysis*. F. A. Davis company philadelphia.

Yu, D. K., & Kwon, Y. S. (1997). *SPSSWIN for statistical analysis*. Seoul. Keehanjae.

- Abstract -

A Study on the Development of the Korean Family Functioning Scale.

Lee, In-Sook ¹⁾ · Park, Young-Sook ¹⁾

Song, Mi-Soon ¹⁾ · Lee, Eun-Ok ¹⁾

Kim, Hesook-Suzie ²⁾ · Park, Youn-Hwan ³⁾

Choi, Kyong-Won ⁴⁾ · Chin, Young-Ran ⁴⁾

Kim, Dae-Hee ⁵⁾ · Lee, Hyeon-Sook ⁵⁾

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to develop the instrument to measure family functioning for Korean family with a chronic ill child, and to test the validity and reliability of the instrument.

Method: The items of instrument were consisted based on researchers' previous study of concept analysis of the Korean family functioning. Twenty six item scale was developed with six domains. In order to test reliability and validity of the scale, data were collected from the 231 families, who have a child with a chronic illness. Data was collected between August and September in 2001 in a General Hospital in Seoul, Korea.

Result: The results were as follows:

As a result of the item analysis, 24 items were selected from the total of 26 items, excluding items with low correlation with total scale. Six factors were evolved by factor analysis. Six factors explained 61.4% of the total variance. The first factor 'Affective bonding' explained 15.4%, 2nd factor 'External relationship' 11.8%, 3rd factor 'Family norm' 10.5%, 4th factor 'Role and responsibilities' 8.3%, 5th factor 'Communication' 7.9%, and the 6th factor 'Financial resource' explained 7.3%. Cronbach's coefficient of this scale was .87 and Guttman spilt- half coefficient was .84.

Conclusion: The study support the reliability and validity of the scale. There were distinct differences in dimensions of family functioning scales developed in the U. S.

Key words : Family functioning, Instrument development

1) College of Nursing, Seoul National University

2) College of Nursing, University of Rhode Island, USA

3) Seoul Women's College of Nursing

4) Graduate student, College of Nursing, Seoul National University

5) Seoul National University Hospital