

: , , ,

가

1)

, 1993; , 1993). Bergh(1993)

1. (25%), (24%), (14%),
(14%) ,
6 .

가 (, 1994).

가 , , (, 1992).
1-3 (, 1993;
, 1993; , 1996) 가
(, 1996; , 1997). 가

80 가 90% (Humennick & Van Steenkist, 1983;
(Field, 1985; Gulick, 1983), Loughlin, 1985). (1998)
1960 95.1% 가 3

1970 90 21-
34% (, 8
1996; , , 1994). (Loughlin, 1985).

가 , , 가
가 (

1) 03. 5. 3 03. 6. 2 03. 6. 11

2.

3

가

139

1)

1

2)

3

가

114

82%

3)

3

2.

3.

1)

Williams Hammer(1995)가

1)

(1995)

가

10

2

pilot study

(, 2001),

56

47

“ ”, “ ”, “ ”

, 9

1

2)

, 0

가

0

56

, 가

3

가

Cronbach's $\alpha = .63$

10

3)

4

6

“ ” 1 “ ” 6

가 . 2 “ 가

가 ”, “

(0-1)

”

1.

4

1

24

가

4

가

Cronbach's

, 37 42

$\alpha = .50$

139

2)

Kearney, Cronenwett & Barrett

(1990)가 2 43.8% 가 ,
 1 10 pilot 가 71.9% < 1>.
 study 22 < 1> (N = 139)
 0 ,
 1 N(%)
 0 22 가 25 7(5.0)
 가 Cronbach's α 25-29 71(51.1)
 = .81 . 30-34 52(37.4)
 3. 35 9(6.5)
 SPSS Win 10.0 24(17.3)
 115(82.7)
 77(55.4)
 62(44.6)
 1) 가 100 49(35.2)
 2) , , 100-200 70(50.4)
 , F-test, t-test 200 20(14.4)
 3) 3 34(24.4)
 , ²-test 4-6 61(43.8)
 , , 7-12 39(28.1)
 t-test 13 5(3.6)
 39(28.1)
 4) 3 100(71.9)
 logistic regression 86(61.9)
 analysis 53(38.1)
 139(100)

4. 2. , , 22.83(
 5.19) , 10
 36 . 100
 41 ,
 < 2>.
 1. 20.99(3.40) ,
 10 24
 25-29 가 51.1% 가
 가 82.7% ,
 44.6% 가 100 200 “ 가
 50.4% 가 . 4-6 가 ”, “ ”
 (0-1)

가 24 25-29
 가
 “ 가 가
 ” 5.43(1.03) , (t = 3.26, p<.001), 가
 “ (0-1) (t = 2.39, p<.05)
 ” 5.26(1.37),
 “ 가 ”
 5.21(1.46) “ 가
 ” 5.09(, 가
 1.48)
 9.04(3.59)
 가
 17 가
 3.
 < 3>
 가 46.5%(53)
 (F = 8.00, p<.001), 53.5%(61)

< 2>

	()	()	()
24	17.29 (4.71)	19.00(4.20)	8.43(3.51)
25-29	21.80 (5.05)	21.42(2.95)	9.07(3.60)
30-34	24.25 (4.60)	20.90(3.47)	9.29(3.56)
35	27.11 (4.37)	19.67(5.10)	7.89(4.11)
F	8.00***	1.67	.46
	22.21(5.55)	22.71(5.22)	8.58(3.67)
t	23.61(4.61)	21.03(5.82)	9.61(3.44)
	1.60	.91	1.69
100	22.49(5.70)	21.12(3.51)	8.96(3.69)
100-200	22.79(4.79)	20.97(3.43)	8.91(3.51)
200	23.85(5.42)	20.75(3.18)	9.70(3.76)
F	.49	.09	.39
3	21.88(4.92)	20.18(3.29)	9.41(3.36)
4-6	22.66(5.10)	21.10(3.35)	8.97(3.64)
7	23.82(5.45)	21.52(3.50)	8.86(3.75)
F	1.41	1.71	.25
	25.05(4.67)	20.26(5.56)	8.51(3.63)
t	21.97(5.14)	19.28(5.68)	9.25(3.57)
	3.26***	.25	1.09
	24.15(5.17)	19.40(5.31)	9.42(3.66)
t	22.02(5.05)	19.01(5.85)	8.81(3.55)
	2.39*	1.42	.96
	22.83 (5.19)	20.99(3.40)	9.04 (3.59)

*p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001

< 3 >

(N = 114)

		N	N(%)	N(%)	² or t
	24	5	2(3.3)	3(5.7)	
	25-29	63	31(50.8)	32(60.4)	.57
	30-34	38	25(41.0)	13(24.5)	
	35	8	3(4.9)	5(9.4)	
		68	34(55.7)	34(64.2)	.52
		46	27(44.3)	19(35.8)	
가	100	41	22(41.5)	19(31.1)	
	200	58	28(52.8)	30(49.2)	3.80*
	200	15	3(5.7)	12(19.7)	
	3	25	21(34.4)	4(7.5)	
	4-6	54	23(37.7)	31(58.5)	13.33***
	7	35	17(27.9)	18(34.0)	
		31	16(26.2)	15(28.3)	.001
		83	45(73.8)	38(71.7)	
		40	25(41.0)	15(28.3)	.001
		74	36(59.0)	38(71.7)	
			22.64(5.17)	22.79(5.12)	.15
			21.25(3.49)	21.20(3.14)	-.08
			7.94(3.79)	10.02(3.59)	3.00**
		114	53(46.5)	61(53.5)	

*p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001; + ()

4. 3

(X² = 3.80, p<.05),
p<.001)

(X² = 13.33,

logistic regression
analysis (enter)

37.7% 가 , 4-6 analysis (enter) 6
3 34.4%, 7 3 9
27.9% , 가 ,
4-6 , , 가
58.5% 가 , 7 , , 가
34.0%, 3 7.5%
Hosmer-Lemeshow
11.67, 8, p .17
200 19.7% 가 5.7%
60.4% ,
3 64.9% . 68.9% 2
(t = 3.00, p<.01)가 , 가
< 4 >

Cox & Snell R2 .16

< 4 >

	B	SE	Wald	p	OR	95% Low	CI Upper
	-.25	.37	.48	.49	.78	.38	1.59
	-.22	.48	.24	.63	1.25	.51	3.06
가	-.45	.35	1.64	.20	.64	.32	1.27
	.75	.32	5.35	.02	2.11	1.12	3.97
	.74	.72	1.06	.30	2.09	.51	8.53
	-.78	.69	1.28	.26	.46	.12	1.77
	-.02	.05	.27	.60	.98	.89	1.07
	-.06	.68	.93	.34	.94	.82	1.07
	-.16	.06	7.34	.01	.85	.75	.96

*Hosmer and Lemeshow Test: Chi-square= 11.67, df=8, p= .17

*Model summary: Cox & Snell R square=.16

*Classification Table

Observed \ Predicted	(3)		Percentage Correct
	+		
+	42	19	69%
	21	32	60%
Overall Percentage			65%

16%

가 (97.8%), “ 1 가 “(94.2%), “
 . Odds ratio 2.11 “(85.6%), “
 (Wald=5.36, p<.05), “(85.6%)
 가 .85 “(85.6%)
 (Wald=7.34, p<.05)). , 41 (1997)
 42.3 (1995)
 46.5% ,
 , 1990 (1992) 14.9%, (1994) 26.1% 가 가
 , 2000 (2002) 3 ,
 가 15.7% , ,
 , 가 (Mackey, 1981; , 1983),
 가 가

- , , , , , , (1997).
- (1993). ;
- UNICEF.
- , (2002).
- , , 6(1), 149-167.
- , , , , , , (1993).
- , 3(2), 126-141.
- (2002).
- , , 12, 605-618.
- (1995).
- , (1997).
- , 36(2), 64-72.
- , (1994),
- & Co.
- , (1982).
- . 25(4), 27-35
- Bergh, A. M. (1993). Obstacles to and motivation for successful breastfeeding. *Curationis.*, 16.
- Combs, V. L. Narino B. L. (1993). A Comparison of Growth Patterns in Breast and Bottle-fed Infants with Congenital Heart Disease. *Pediatr. nurs.* 19(2), 175-179.
- Field, P. A. (1985). Parect's reaction to maternity care, *Midwifery*, 1, 37-46.
- Gulick E. E. (1982). Informational Correates of Successful Breast-feeding. *MCM*, 7(6), 370-375.
- Hofferman, S. L. Combest, C. (1990). Role of breast-feeding in the prevention and treatment of diarrhea. *Journal of Diarrheal Disease Research*, 8, 68-81.
- Humenick, S., and Van steenkiste S. (1983). Early indicator of breast-feeding progress. Issues in Comprehensive. *Pediatric Nursing*, 6, 205-215.
- Kearney, M. H., Cronenwett, L. R., & Barrett, J. A. (1990). Breast-feeding problems in the first week postpartum. *Nursing Research*, 39(2), 90-95.
- Loughlin, H. (1985). Early termination of breast-feeding : Identifying ttose at risk. *Pediatrics* 76, 1004-1008.
- Mackey & Susan (1981). Infant breast & Bottle feeding practices. Some related factors & attitudes. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*. 72(5), 312-318.
- Manstead A. S., Proffitt C, Smart J. L. (1983) Predicting and Understanding Mother' Infant-feeding Intentions and Behavior. Testing the Theory of Reasonde Action. *J. of personality & Social Psychology*. 44(4), 657-671
- Mogan, J. (1986). A study of mother's breast feeding concern. *Birth* 13, 104-108.
- Williams, E., & Hammer, L. D. (1995). Breast feeding attitudes and knowledge of pediaticians in training. *Am J of Preventive Medicine* 11(1), 2-33.
- Abstract -
- A Study about Breastfeeding Knowledge, Attitude and Problem of Breastfeeding in Early Postpartum Period and Breastfeeding Practice**
- Lee, Sun Ok¹⁾*

1) Department of Nursing, College of Medicine, Pusan National University

Purpose: The purpose of this study was examine levels of breastfeeding knowledge, attitude and number of breastfeeding problems in early postpartum period and rate of breastfeeding practice at 3 months.

Method: The total numbers of the study subjects were 139 mothers at postpartum unit and followed by postpartum 1 week and 3 months.

Result:

1. The mean score of knowledge and attitude and problems toward breast feeding scale were 22.83(SD=5.19), 20.99(SD=3.40), and 9.04(SD=3.59) respectively, indicating low to moderate level according to subjects characteristics, breastfeeding knowledge scores were significantly different by age ($F=8.00$, $p<.001$), breastfeeding experience ($t=3.26$, $p<.001$) and parity($t=2.39$, $p<.05$), but no difference were found in rate of breastfeeding attitude and number of problems.

2. Rate of breastfeeding practice was 46.5% at three months of postpartum and the breastfeeding practice was significantly different by breastfeeding plan period($\chi^2=13.33$, $p<.001$) and monthly income ($\chi^2=3.80$, $p<.05$).

3. Further, breastfeeding practice at 3 months was continuously influenced by number of problems of the breast-feeding(OR=.85) and breastfeeding plan period(OR=2.11) at early postpartum period.

Conclusion: The findings suggest the necessity of maternal support during postpartum period to provide correct information about rate of breastfeeding knowledge and attitude to teach problem solving skills for any breastfeeding problems in order to increase rate of breastfeeding practice.

Key words : Breastfeeding Knowledge, Attitude, Problem, Practice