

Thesis Title

The Effectiveness of Health Education Program

applying Problem Solving Approach on Peptic

Ulcer Patients' Behavior, Saraburi Hospital.

Name

Miss Somkuan Vichainsri

Degree

Master of Science (Public Health)

Thesis Supervisory Committee

The committee were as follows:

Assistant Professor Dr. Boongium Tragoolvongse,

M.P.H., Dr.P.H.

Assistant Professor Dr. Nirat Imamee, M.P.H., Ph.D.

Surachat Chakrapee-sirisuk, M.D., Board of Internal
Medicine

Date of Graduation September 1, 1988

Abstract

The objective of this study was to determine the effectiveness of health education program applying problem solving approach on peptic ulcer patients' behavior, Saraburi Hospital.

The sample Consisted of 100 male and female peptic ulcer patients of the Medical department between the ages of 30-65 years. Of these participants, 50 were assigned to experimental group 1 and the rest were assigned to experimental group 2. The experimental group 1 received routine health education program from the officers working in the medical treatment ward while the experimental group 2 received health education program from the researcher using problem solving approach. The study was conducted between December 1987 and May 1988.

Structured, interview schedule, developed by the researcher, was used for collecting data. Knowledge, attitudes and behavior of

the sample in both groups were measured before and after the experiment.

Percentage distribution, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, student t-test and paired samples t-test were used to analyze data.

Experimental group 1's mean score ($p < 0.001$)

Level of significance was set at 0.05.

3. After experiment, the experimental group 2's mean score on attitudes towards peptic ulcer was significantly higher than the

The main results were as follows:

Experimental group 1's mean score ($p < 0.001$)

10. After experiment, the experimental group 2's mean score

1. The results of pre-survey indicated that there were no

significant difference between mean scores on knowledge, attitudes

and health practice regarding peptic ulcer of the experimental

group 1 and 2

2. After experiment, the experimental group 1 gained

significantly higher mean score on knowledge regarding peptic ulcer

than before conducting the experiment ($p < 0.001$)

3. After experiment, the experimental group 2 gained

significantly higher mean score on knowledge regarding peptic ulcer

than before conducting the experiment ($p < 0.001$)

4. After experiment, the experimental group 1 gained

significantly higher mean score on attitudes towards peptic ulcer than

before conducting the experiment ($p < 0.001$)

5. After experiment, the experimental group 2 gained

significantly higher mean score on attitudes towards peptic ulcer than

before conducting the experiment ($p < 0.001$)

6. After experiment, the experimental group 1 indicated

significantly higher mean score on health practice regarding peptic

ulcer than before conducting the experiment ($p < 0.001$)

7. After experiment, the experimental group 2 gained

significantly higher mean score on health practice regarding peptic

ulcer than before conducting the experiment ($p < 0.001$)

8. After experiment, the experimental group 2's mean score on knowledge regarding peptic ulcer was significantly higher than the experimental group 1's mean score ($p < 0.001$)

9. After experiment, the experimental group 2's mean score on attitudes towards peptic ulcer was significantly higher than the experimental group 1's mean score ($p < 0.001$)

10. After experiment, the experimental group 2's mean score on health practice regarding peptic ulcer was significantly higher than the experimental group 1's mean score ($p < 0.001$). The details were as follows:

10.1 Food eating practice of the experimental group 2 was significantly better than the experimental group 1 ($p < 0.001$)

10.2 Tea, Coffee, liquor and smoking cigarette practice of the experimental group 2 was significantly better than The experimental group 1. ($p < 0.006$).

10.3 Practice on resting of the experimental group 2 was better than the experimental group 1. However, the difference was not significant.

10.4 Practice on taking analgesic drugs of the experimental group 2 was significantly better than the experimental group 1 ($p < 0.001$)

10.5 Practice on taking medicine for peptic ulcer treatment of the experimental group 2 was not significantly better than the experimental group 1.