

원 저

Quality Assessment on Social Services in General and Teaching Hospitals in Korea

Heung Gu Kang
Social Service Department of Jeonju University

Abstract

Background : As an empirical study, current research about the quality of social services carried out in general and teaching hospitals across the country. In the flux of health care reforms and market transformation, the quality of social services in the hospital becomes increasingly significant.

Methods : A sample of total 80 hospitals, including general hospitals with one social worker at least and single-department hospital with two social workers or more, were identified nationwide through the registry of Korean

* : .
Tel) 063-220-2931, E-mail) bluekang62@hanmail.net

Association of Medical Social Workers and Korean Association of Hospitals. The subjects of this survey were 80 leaders of social service units. The survey data from each subjects were measured to evaluate level of quality that service provider perceived of sample hospitals. Under the method of one - way ANOVA and multiple regression, the level of quality in social work service was analyzed.

Results : The major findings were as following ; First, the level of quality perceived showed less score, especially the lowest was the score of quality of outcome. Second, the key variables of each hospital which turned out significantly different in quality of social work service were the departmental form of social work unit, unit leader`s age, educational level, field experience, and job rank. Third, the level of quality of social work service correlated positively with the field experience of unit leader, the size of social work unit, the job rank of the unit leader.

Conclusion : The most influential variables to the quality of social work service proved departmental form of social work unit, leader of social work unit. Therefore, to assure the proper level of quality, social work unit in hospital must be structured single, independent department in which entitled social worker is supposed to supervise and manage. And a leadership - development program for leaders in social work unit are strongly recommended.

Key Words : Social services, Quality assessment, Leader

I. (11-13)

1910 Flexner, 1917 (functional quality) 가
(perceived quality)(12) .
가

1972
PSRO(Professional Standards Review Organization)
Donabedian(14) 가 ,
가 .
(peer review), 가, 가 가
(standards), (norms), (criteria)
가가 (1), JCAHO(Joint Committee on Accreditation of Healthcare Organization)
(quality assurance)
(continuous quality improvement) (3). 1950
(2).

1981
1995 가
가 .
, 가 가
(3). 가 가
가 가
(4, 5). NASW(National Association of Social Workers) 가 .
JCAHO 2
가 , ,
가
가(6-8) 가 ,
가(9, 10) .

Donabedian(14)

1.

2

가

A

6

7

31

61

1

4

가

1)

: 가
가

56

4

3.43

가

21

가

4

2)

: 가

가

1

가 가

Cronbach's alpha 0.88

0.79,

0.79

0.60

(assessment)

1.

3)

: 가
가, 가
가

11 0.79

8 0.79

2 0.60

21 0.88

3.

2.

2000

(

)

279

24.1%, 50 7.6% . 4 2.34 (:
 가 67.5% 가 . 0.75) 58.5 .
 23.8% , 3.04 가 , 2.78
 가 6 (7.1%) , , 1.19 가 .
 73.8% . 3 , 1
 5 가 39.2%, 5 10 가 3.88 가 ,
 가 36.7%, 10 24.1% . (3.46)
 가 48.8% , , (3.40) , (3.33)
 18.8%, 32.5% . (3.27) 가 ,
 (2.15) , (2.45) ,
 2. (2.72) , 100
 (2.81) 가 .
 1) (3.51) ,
 4 (3.45) , (3.20)
 3.

	(%)	(%)	(%)
20	2(9.5)	19(90.5)	21(26.6)
30	13(39.4)	20(60.6)	33(41.8)
40	9(47.4)	10(52.6)	19(24.1)
50	1(16.7)	5(83.3)	6(7.6)
	-	2(100.0)	2(2.5)
	7(36.8)	12(63.2)	19(23.8)
()	16(29.6)	38(70.4)	54(67.5)
()	2(40.0)	3(60.0)	5(6.3)
5	6(19.4)	25(80.6)	31(39.2)
5-10	10(34.5)	19(65.5)	29(36.7)
10-15	5(55.6)	4(44.4)	9(11.4)
15	4(40.0)	6(60.0)	10(12.7)
	7(17.9)	32(82.1)	39(48.8)
/	5(33.3)	10(66.7)	15(18.8)
/	13(50.0)	13(50.0)	26(32.5)
	25(31.3)	55(68.8)	80(100.0)

4.

가

(n=80)

가		
1	3.88	0.52
100	2.81	0.81
	3.46	0.88
	3.33	0.77
	2.15	1.21
	3.27	0.96
	2.72	1.30
	3.40	1.06
	3.02	1.31
	3.01	1.26
	2.45	1.04
	3.04	0.58
	3.45	0.96
	2.61	1.40
	3.20	1.26
	3.03	1.33
	2.03	1.40
	3.51	0.79
	1.55	1.12
	2.85	1.22
	2.78	0.76
	1.18	1.59
가	1.21	1.60
	1.19	1.34
	2.34	0.75

가 , (1.55)

(2.03)

(1.18), 가

가(1.21)

가 2.97

2) 2.56

5 (p<0.05).

5.

(n=80)

	n	()	()	()	()	
500	23	3.03(0.59)	2.60(0.80)	1.29(1.38)	2.31(0.80)	
501-800	34	3.06(0.61)	2.81(0.71)	1.36(1.40)	2.41(0.76)	
800	23	3.03(0.55)	2.90(0.80)	0.84(1.17)	2.26(0.70)	
,	37	3.01(0.53)	2.56(0.64)*	1.02(1.16)	2.20(0.62)	
	43	3.07(0.63)	2.97(0.81)	1.34(1.47)	2.46(0.83)	
	50	3.06(0.62)	2.72(0.80)	1.14(1.25)	2.30(0.74)	
	30	3.03(0.53)	2.88(0.69)	1.28(1.49)	2.39(0.77)	
1980	10	3.40(0.39)*	3.33(0.30)*	0.82(0.89)	2.52(0.44)	
1981-1990	20	3.15(0.55)	2.75(0.95)	1.48(1.49)	2.46(0.84)	
1990	49	2.92(0.61)	2.66(0.70)	1.17(1.35)	2.25(0.77)	
1 -20	27	3.26(0.54)	2.94(0.73)	1.49(1.51)	2.56(0.82)	
	26	2.88(0.57)	2.76(0.71)	1.11(1.31)	2.25(0.71)	
	21-40	17	2.87(0.62)	2.51(0.90)	1.00(1.23)	2.13(0.74)
	40	9	3.19(0.55)	2.76(0.70)	1.05(1.12)	2.33(0.64)
		3.04(0.58)	2.78(0.76)	1.19(1.34)	2.34(0.75)	

* p<0.05

가
 . 1980 가 2.45 2.29
 가 ,
 . 1980 가 가
 3.40 3.33 . 40 30 가
 1980 가 2.63 , 2.56 20 50
 (p<0.05). 1.87 1.94
 (p<0.001).
 3) 2.49
 6 1.92 (p<0.01).
 가 가

6.

(n=80)

	n	()	()	()	()
	25	3.20(0.64)	2.85(0.72)	1.31(1.31)	2.45(0.75)
	55	2.98(0.55)	2.74(0.78)	1.14(1.36)	2.29(0.75)
20	21	2.65(0.58) ^{***}	2.29(0.62) ^{***}	0.66(1.03) [*]	1.87(0.61) ^{***}
30	33	3.20(0.51)	2.88(0.75)	1.59(1.47)	2.56(0.73)
40	19	3.38(0.45)	3.20(0.69)	1.31(1.36)	2.63(0.73)
50	6	2.63(0.33)	2.75(0.61)	0.45(0.71)	1.94(2.40)
	21	2.70(0.65) ^{***}	2.45(0.89) [*]	0.60(0.99) [*]	1.92(0.72) ^{**}
	59	3.17(0.51)	2.89(0.68)	1.40(1.39)	2.49(0.71)
5	31	2.71(0.53) ^{***}	2.41(0.62) ^{***}	0.82(1.06)	1.98(0.56) ^{***}
5-10	29	3.08(0.51)	2.82(0.76)	1.15(1.43)	2.35(0.75)
11-15	9	3.67(0.26)	3.20(0.68)	1.86(1.62)	2.91(0.70)
15	10	3.49(0.39)	3.47(0.57)	1.87(1.36)	2.94(0.71)
	39	2.77(0.55) ^{***}	2.47(0.71) ^{***}	0.78(0.41) [*]	2.01(0.60) ^{***}
/	15	3.27(0.39)	3.10(0.73)	1.90(1.69)	2.76(0.80)
/	26	3.32(0.56)	3.05(0.68)	1.40(1.33)	2.59(0.73)
		3.04(0.58)	2.78(0.76)	1.19(1.34)	2.34(0.75)

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

가 가 (p<0.001). 3.

가 . / , /

가 7

2.76 , 2.59

가

2.01

(p<0.001).

가 .

. F

27%,

41%,

34%,

40%가

7.

(n=80)

		B(S.E)		B(S.E)		B(S.E)		B(S.E)	
		-1.77(1.69)	-0.10	2.15(2.38)	0.90	-6.62(4.41)	-0.17	-2.07(2.22)	-0.09
		0.48(0.16)	0.44***	0.55(0.20)	0.38**	0.76(0.33)	0.37**	0.68(0.17)	0.46***
38)	-0.17(0.15)	-0.14	-0.30(0.21)	-0.19	-1.15(0.40)	-0.42**	-0.54(0.20)	-0.35**
(0=)	0.31(0.12)	0.23*	0.31(0.17)	0.18	0.49(0.32)	0.16	0.37(0.16)	0.21*
(0=)	0.41(0.14)	0.35**	0.47(0.19)	0.31*	1.16(0.36)	0.43**	0.68(0.18)	0.45***
		2.46		1.90		0.46		1.61	
R ²		0.41		0.34		0.27		0.40	
F		10.27		7.81		5.41		9.82	
F		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

가 0.30(p=0.00),
0.57(p=0.00)

가

가

가

=0.44)
=0.23)

(=0.35),

(

(=0.38, =0.37)

(=0.31, =0.43)가

. Donabedian(14)

3가

가

가

, 1980
가

가

가 20 40 30 가 1 / 가

가

가 가 가

/ , / 가 가

가

가

가

500

1 가

가 NASW JCAHO

가 가 가

가

INHSWIS(Israel National Health
Social Work Information System)

가

가

4 2.34
 3.04 , 2.78 ,
 1.19
 가 가
 가
 가
 가
 가
 가
 가
 가
 가

1. Germain CB. Social work practice in health care. The Pree Press, 1984.
2. Shahar IB, Auslander G. & Cohen, M. Utilizing data to improve practice in hospital social work: A case study. *Soc Work Health Care* 1995; 20(3): 99-111.
3. " ".
 1999: 227-256.
4. National Association of Social Workers. Standards for the practice of clinical social work. Silver Spring, 1989.
5. Croxton TA, Jayaratne S. & Mattison D. Social work and emerging practice standards: A review and exploratory study. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, School of Social Work. 1995.
6. Vourlekis BS. The field's evaluation of proposed clinical indicators for social work services in the acute care hospital. *Health Soc Work* 1990; 15(3): 197-206.
7. Vourlekis BS, Bakke-Friedland K. & Zlotnik JL. Clinical indicators to assess the quality of social work services in nursing homes. *Soc Work Health Care* 1995; 22(1): 81-93.
8. patti RJ. & Ezell M. performance priorities and administrative practice in hospital social work departments. *Soc Work Health Care* 1988; 13(3): 73-90.

9. Masterson D. What business are we in? In L. Friedman(Ed.), *The AMA handbook of marketing for the service industries*(25-38). NY: American Management Association. 1991.
10. McNeill T, Nicholas D, Szechy K. & Lach L. perceived outcome of social work intervention: beyond consumer satisfaction. *Soc Work Health Care* 1998; 26(3): 1-18.
11. John G. Improving quality through patient-provider communication. *Journal of Health Care Marketing* 1991; 11(4): 51-60.
12. Bopp KD. How patients evaluates the quality of ambulatory medical encounters: A marketing perspective. *Journal of Health Care Marketing* 1990; 37(1): 13-36.
13. Babakus E. & Mangold WG. Adapting the SERVQUAL scale to hospital services: An empirical investigation. *Health Service Research* 1992; 26(6): 767-786.
14. Donabedian, A. The definition of quality and approaches to its assessment. Michigan: Health Administration press. 1980.
15. Donabedian, A. Quality assessment and assurance : Unity of purpose, diversity of means. *Inquiry* 1988; 25: 173-192.
16. . 가 . QA 1994; 1(1): 12-15.
17. Bloch, D. Evaluation of nursing care in terms of process and outcomes : Issues in research and quality assurance. *Nursing Research* 1975; 24(4): 256-263.
18. Lohr, K. N. Outcome measurement: concepts and questions. *Inquiry* 1988; 25: 37-50.