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The purpose of this study was to document performance of occupational therapy journals on the metrics of the *Journal Citation Reports* (JCR), the annually appearing index used as a yardstick to assess the quality of scholarly publications. Outcomes for the field’s two indexed journals, the *American Journal of Occupational Therapy and OTJR: Occupation, Participation and Health*, were assessed over a 10-year period (1996–2005) to determine their overall standing and patterns of change on each of the JCR’s five metrics. The mean category ranking for the two journals was generally above the 50th percentile. However, they performed least adequately and evidenced a downward trend over time on the most widely used metric (the journal impact factor). Possible reasons underlying this latter result are explored, pressing implications of the overall findings for practice and research are discussed, and strategic steps toward ethically safeguarding the profession’s viability are offered.


Increasingly, quantitative indexes of publication output have been used to evaluate scholarly production at individual, university, and even profession-wide levels. In connection with this emphasis, the *journal impact factor* (JIF) is the chief performance measure used to evaluate, rank, and compare scholarly journals (Barnaby & Gallagher, 1998; Cartwright & McGhee, 2005). The JIF was initially developed by Eugene Garfield (1963) to inform decisions about journal inclusion in the Science Citation Index. This metric focuses on citations that appear within a specified year of the annual *Journal Citation Reports* (JCR) and for a given journal reflects the average citation rate among the articles that appeared within the 2 years preceding the start of the JCR year. Thus, this metric captures the extent to which a journal’s recently appearing articles have been cited within a given year. Although it is only one of five metrics that appears in the JCR, the JIF is considered the gold standard for measuring publication success within the research community (Price & Jeffrey, 2006). As such, the JIF has important implications for all fields of research, including occupational therapy. Figure 1 presents a calculational example of the JIF metric.

**JIF and the Research Community**

Because of its prominent status as a metric of scholarly worth, universities, grant-funding institutions, and researchers alike are becoming more reliant on JIF scores to guide decisions about issues of scholarship. The increased dependence on this measure is in part an outgrowth of at least three trends in academia: (1) a university’s prestige is largely driven by the publication records of its faculty, (2) the career opportunities and job security of faculty members are influenced by the volume and impact of their publications, and (3) funding agencies such as the National...
Institutes of Health (NIH) award a disproportionate number of grants to successful researchers from prestigious institutions (Cameron, 2005; Cartwright & McGhee, 2005; Druss & Marcus, 2005; Rodger, McKenna, & Brown, 2006; Sombatsompop, Markpin, & Premkamolnetr, 2004). In a recursive manner, the JIF strongly affects all three of these trends. First, universities are calculating JIF scores for individual faculty members and using an aggregate average of their scores to gauge the performance of departments, divisions, and schools. Second, the publication record of a faculty member, in terms of its impact factor, is often used as a key indicator in making decisions pertaining to promotion or tenure. Finally, faculty members who have a strong publication record and have been granted tenure at a prestigious research university benefit from access to in-place mechanisms that facilitate their ability to secure research funding. An awareness of this important dynamic compels occupational therapy researchers to further examine the influence of the JIF; address systematically how occupational therapy research performs on its metric; and begin to consider whether anything should, or could, be done to ensure that occupational therapy receives fair treatment in the areas of research evaluation and funding opportunities.

Although the in-place system supports the use of the JIF, not everyone embraces its widespread application. Many researchers, including the metric’s developer, have criticized the elevated value and misuse of the JIF (Garfield, 2005, 2006; Moed, Van Leeuwen, & Reedijk, 1999; Price & Jeffrey, 2006). Some authors have expressed doubts about the validity and integrity of the measure on the basis of citation tracking errors and the potential for artificial inflation of numbers through self-citation (Cartwright & McGhee, 2005; Cheek, Garnham, & Quan, 2006; Kurmis, 2003; Lawrence, 2003). Others have analyzed trends related to the publishing journal’s influence on an article’s future citations and have noted that the source journal’s prestige can be more predictive of an article’s ultimate success than the quality of the article itself (Callaham, Wears, & Weber, 2002; Nieminen, Carpenter, Rucker, & Schumaker, 2006). Yet, despite these criticisms, the JIF remains the chief criterion for ascertaining a journal’s worth.

### Additional JCR Metrics

In addition to the JIF, the JCR provides four other measures that assess journal performance: (1) journal cited half-life, (2) journal immediacy index, (3) total citations, and (4) articles. Although these indexes reflect important aspects of a journal’s publication success, they are given considerably less weight than the JIF by both JCR and the research community.

Journal cited half-life can be understood as an indicator of the continued importance of past contributions (Cartwright & McGhee, 2005; Della Sala & Crawford, 2007). Its measurement reflects the number of source journal publication years, going back from the JCR year of interest, that account for half of the total citations the journal receives in the evaluation year (Thomson Scientific Corporation, 2007). Interestingly, performance on the journal cited half-life often is inversely proportionate to the JIF. According to Della Sala

---

**Figure 1. Sample calculations of the 2005 Journal Citation Reports (JCR) for the American Journal of Occupational Therapy (AJOT).**

1. **Journal Impact Factor** \(\frac{A}{B}\)
   - **A:** Citations in 2005 to AJOT articles published in 2004 (35) + Citations in 2005 to AJOT articles published in 2003 (50) = 85
   - **B:** Research articles and reviews published by AJOT in 2004 (59) + Research articles and reviews published by AJOT in 2003 (75) = 134
   \[\text{Journal Impact Factor: } \frac{85}{134} = 0.634\]

2. **Journal Cited Half-Life**
   - (Number of combined successive publication years that make up 50% of the JCR-year total citations)
   
   - **Year of AJOT Publication:** '05 '04 '03 '02 '01 '00 '99 '98 '97 '96 '95–all
   - **Citations received in 2005:** 24 35 50 81 53 60 65 79 66 63 638
   - **% of 2005 Citations:** 2 5 9 16 20 25 30 37 42 47 48–100%
   \[\text{Journal Cited Half-Life = 10+}\]

3. **Journal Immediacy Index** \(\frac{A}{B}\)
   - **A:** Citations in 2005 to 2005 AJOT articles (24) + **B:** Total 2005 AJOT articles (56)
   \[\text{Journal Immediacy Index: } \frac{24}{56} = 0.429\]

4. **Total Citations**
   - Total citations of AJOT articles (all years) in 2005 contained in JCR-indexed journals = 1,214

5. **Articles**
   - Total research articles and reviews published by AJOT in 2005 = 56
and Crawford (2007), the JIF and journal cited half-life, respectively, emphasize different paces of research success. It has even been argued that the journal cited half-life, relative to the JIF, is a more accurate measure of journal worth because of its inclusion of citing parameters over a broader time span (Della Sala & Crawford, 2007; Garfield, 2005; Moed et al., 1999; Sombatsompop et al., 2004).

The journal immediacy index refers to the average number of citations that a journal’s articles receive during the same year that they were published (Thomson Scientific Corporation, 2007). Similar to the JIF, this metric is based on the notion that articles receiving rapid citation rates soon after publication have a strong influence on the current state of research. Total cites is a raw total for the number of times that a journal’s articles, stemming from all previous years, are cited within other JCR-indexed journals in the evaluation year (Thomson Scientific Corporation, 2007). A high number of cites suggests that the knowledge produced by a journal has resonated in the scholarly community. Last, articles reflect the volume of publications generated during a given year that meet the JCR-citable item criteria of being either research articles or reviews (Thomson Scientific Corporation, 2007). Figure 1 uses the 2005 JCR data for the American Journal of Occupational Therapy (AJOT) to provide a concrete calculational example for each of the JCR metrics.

**Purpose of the Study**

Recognizing the powerful influence of the JIF on the viability of a profession’s judged research success and ultimate ability to secure grant funding, the aim of the current study was to examine the performance of the two indexed occupational therapy journals in relation to the JCR metrics. Specifically, I analyzed the 10-year category ranking trajectories for AJOT and OTJR: Occupation, Participation, and Health (OTJR) on the five JCR measurements. Given the profession’s commitment to research over the past decade and the greater visibility of occupational therapy practice within the health care community, I hypothesized that the JCR metrics would show a steady increase in occupational therapy journal performance over the past 10-year period.

**Method**

**Data Source**

JCR data were used to examine the performance of AJOT and OTJR over the 10-year period from 1996 through 2005. Measures of journal performance were obtained primarily through database subscription access of the University of Southern California (USC). Data for 1998–2005 were retrieved online through the Thomson Scientific Corporation’s Web of Knowledge. Data for 1996 and 1997 were made available through collaboration with USC resource librarians and representatives at the Thomson Scientific Corporation, as well as through access to microfiche collections at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Comparison data were drawn from the JCR Social Science Rehabilitation subject category, which contains the two JCR-indexed occupational therapy journals. The rationale for using this dataset for comparison is that meaningful results can only be obtained through examination of journals within the same JCR subject category (Garfield, 1998; McVeigh, 2004). Within JCR, two large groupings termed the science edition and the social science edition contain 171 and 54 subject categories, respectively. Journals within each of these subject categories have been clustered by the Thomson Scientific Corporation (2007) according to relatedness calculations involving content and citation relationships.

The number of journals indexed within the social science rehabilitation category ranged from 35 to 48 journals between 1996 and 2005. Within-category performance data were gathered for JCR years 1996–2005 on each of the previously reviewed five metrics: (1) JIF, (2) journal cited half-life, (3) journal immediacy index, (4) total cites, and (5) articles.

**Data Analysis**

The performance of AJOT and OTJR on each of the five measures was first examined by noting their ranking relative to other journals in the rehabilitation category. The rankings were then considered in the broader context of trends over time. To account for yearly fluctuations in the number of JCR-indexed journals, rankings were converted into percentiles. Such percentiles were calculated for all five metrics within each year of the 10-year study period. For each journal by metric combination, a Spearman rank–order correlation was performed to test for trend in the percentile rankings over time. A nonparametric (i.e., Spearman) correlational procedure was used because of the nonnormality of both the percentile and year of publication distributions, as well as because of the small sample of paired observations ($n = 10$). All significance testing was conducted at the .05 alpha level using a two-tailed alternative hypothesis.

**Results**

Table 1 provides the mean, standard deviation, and median percentile rank for AJOT and OTJR on each of the five JCR metrics collapsing across the years 1996 through 2005. AJOT’s mean rankings were above the 50th percentile for each measure, with greater than 90th percentile rankings for
Table 1. 1996–2005 Percentile Ranks on Journal Citation Reports Metrics Relative to Journals From the Social Sciences Rehabilitation Category, 1996 through 2005 (N = 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>American Journal of Occupational Therapy</th>
<th>OTJR: Occupation, Participation, and Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal impact factor</td>
<td>54.70</td>
<td>12.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal cited half-life</td>
<td>69.20</td>
<td>21.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal immediacy index</td>
<td>69.40</td>
<td>18.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total citations</td>
<td>91.60</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>92.60</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. M = mean, SD = standard deviation, Mdn = median.

articles and total citations. OTJR’s mean rankings were above the 50th percentile for three of the five metrics but exhibited a low average percentile ranking of 30th for articles. Appendixes A and B provide the raw scores, associated rank, and percentile rank according to each year on all JCR measures for AJOT and OTJR, respectively.

Over the 10-year study period, both AJOT (Spearman \( r = -.73, p = .02 \)) and OTJR (Spearman \( r = -.86, p < .01 \)) experienced a statistically reliable drop in JIF ranking percentiles. AJOT held its highest ranking of 14th (70th percentile) in 1997 and 1998 before dropping to 30th (38th percentile) in 2005. OTJR’s rankings were characterized by a more pronounced downward trend, decreasing in rank from 2nd (96th percentile) in 1998 to 40th (13th percentile) by 2003.

AJOT’s journal cited half-life rankings began a statistically significant climb from a ranking of 24th (31st percentile) in 1996 to a top ranking (98th percentile) in 2004 and 2005 (Spearman \( r = .97, p < .001 \)). Changes in OTJR percentile rankings over time were not statistically significant (Spearman \( r = -.06, p = .87 \)). Despite several fluctuations, OTJR’s rankings shifted only from 16th (54th percentile) in 1996 to 12th (74th percentile) in 2005.

The journal immediacy index trajectories for both journals were characterized by pronounced variation in rankings. As revealed in Appendix A, AJOT was ranked as one of the top five social science rehabilitation journals from 1996 through 1998 (86th, 91st, and 89th percentiles, respectively) before beginning a downward trend that eventuated in a ranking drop to 30th (36th percentile) in 2003, followed by a rebound to ninth (81st percentile) in 2005. Over the 10-year study phase, the trend in AJOT’s journal immediacy index percentile ranking was not statistically significant (Spearman \( r = -.58, p = .08 \)). OTJR began by holding top 10 rankings from 1996 through 1998 (89th, 91st, and 83rd percentile, respectively) before beginning a rapid descent to a rank of 35th (27th percentile) in 2000 (see Appendix B). After that point, OTJR’s rankings fluctuated markedly, ranging from 4th (92nd percentile) in 2001 to 39th (19th percentile) in 2005. Overall, the downward trajectory of OTJR rankings was not statistically reliable (Spearman \( r = -.60, p = .07 \)).

As shown in Appendixes A and B, the results pertaining to total citations revealed notable differences between the two journals. AJOT’s rankings demonstrated little fluctuation over 10 years and were uniformly very high (between 88th and 96th percentiles). AJOT’s percentile ranking change over time was not statistically significant (Spearman \( r = -.02, p = .96 \)). By contrast, OTJR presented a clear, statistically significant negative trajectory over time (Spearman \( r = -.86, p = .01 \)). OTJR’s total cites ranking fell from 11th (69th percentile) in 1996 to 39th (19th percentile) in 2005.

Both AJOT and OTJR’s category rankings for the articles criterion remained stable from 1996 to 2005. As shown in Appendix A, AJOT fluctuated little, maintaining a position between second (94th percentile) and sixth (88th percentile) in the absence of significant change over time (Spearman \( r = -.59, p = .07 \)). OTJR exhibited greater fluctuation but still demonstrated a relatively stable trajectory in its movement from 29th (17th percentile) in 1996 to 40th (17th percentile) in 2005 (see Appendix B). Although OTJR did have ranking peaks of 22nd (54th percentile) in 2000 and 13th (73rd percentile) in 2002, no systematic change was present across its 10-year trajectory (Spearman \( r = .13, p = .72 \)).

Discussion

The results provide mixed support for the study hypothesis that between 1996 and 2005 there was a steady increase in occupational therapy journal performance on JCR metrics. Of the five examined AJOT rank trajectories, only two were statistically significant: the declining JIF and the improving journal cited half-life. Nevertheless, in the most recent year covered in the study (2005), AJOT exceeded its category average on all metrics but one: the JIF. It is noteworthy that, for the metrics of journal cited half-life, total citations, and articles, AJOT ranked at or near the very top of the social science
rehabilitation category for 2005. Two OTJR performance trajectories were statistically significant. The reliable OTJR trends, observed for JIF and total cites, however, were both negative. In addition, in 2005 OTJR performed below the 20th percentile on all indexes but journal cited half-life.

**Representation and Performance on the JCR Metrics**

Unfortunately, the metric on which occupational therapy journals perform the worst is the JIF. The statistically significant negative trajectory of JIF results for occupational therapy’s two indexed journals should warrant careful attention from the profession. A comprehensive interpretation of this metric should take into account the factors that influence these trends, such as a profession’s level of representation within the JCR. Not every peer-reviewed journal is indexed by the JCR, but the number of JCR-indexed journals varies across disciplines and influences outcomes significantly. This relationship is important to consider in light of occupational therapy’s limited representation in the JCR rehabilitation category and its link to observed performance trends.

Of the 15 occupational therapy journals indexed by the American Occupational Therapy Association/American Occupational Therapy Foundation resource database, OT Search, only 2, AJOT and OTJR, are included by JCR. Within their respective 2005 JCR category of social science rehabilitation, they account for only 4% of the 48 journals. By comparison, speech therapy journals are also classified under the category of social science rehabilitation, and they account for 6 of the 48 indexed journals (13%). Physical therapy contributes 3 of the 25 indexed journals within JCR’s science rehabilitation category (12%) and 1 additional journal within the category of sport sciences. These differences among allied health professions in the number of JCR-recognized journals illustrate that there is a diminished representation of occupational therapy.

Barnaby and Gallagher (1998) noted a similar discrepancy in the case of emergency medicine journals. In their discussion, they stated:

Because most citations to a journal are derived from within the discipline that is the focus of that journal, lack of representation among the source journals from within a given specialty diminishes the impact factor of every journal in that field . . . . this methodological bias may offer an explanation for the consistently low and unchanging annual impact factors attributed to emergency medicine over many years. (p. 81)

Because of the limited inclusion of occupational therapy journals in its index, JCR is unable to track both intra- and extradisciplinary citations made to occupational therapy journals to the degree afforded other allied health professions. As an example of the positive effect associated with greater journal inclusion, consider the changes experienced by speech therapy journals between 1996 and 2000. Most of the journals added to the JCR index between 1996 and 1997 were interdisciplinary in nature, but two in particular belonged to the profession of speech therapy. With a more inclusive tracking mechanism in place to capture intradisciplinary citation trends, the average JIF scores for the speech therapy journals in the JCR jumped from a four-journal average of 0.671 in 1996 to a six-journal average of 1.330 by 2005. Accordingly, speech therapy journals held the ranks of first, fourth, and sixth within the 2005 social science rehabilitation category. Although these changes may be somewhat artificial because of increased intradisciplinary self-citations, they demonstrate the influence of journal inclusion in the ultimate calculation of JCR metrics. Arguably, the addition of more occupational therapy journals in the JCR index could heighten the JIF scores of both AJOT and OTJR in a manner analogous to the elevation of JIF scores for speech therapy journals.

In addition to the effects of inclusion on journal status, the JIF and journal immediacy index time frames both fail to capture the peak cumulative citations that occupational therapy journals receive. Although a more inclusive time frame may also elevate the JIF for other journals, the high ranking of AJOT and OTJR in journal cited half-life suggests that occupational therapy journals would still climb in rank when compared with category peers. Relative to fields characterized by the need for rapid dissemination of research findings to drive current studies, occupational therapy publications become most influential only after the window for JIF and the journal immediacy index have long passed. In this context, it is worth noting that Garfield (2005) has suggested that the 2-year timeframe may give an incomplete picture of journal performance and that using a 5- or 10-year period would be potentially more valid.

Because occupational therapy research is often holistic and interacts with other disciplines, the results presented here may be related to the fact that interdisciplinary citations of research occur at a significantly slower pace than intradisciplinary citations (Rinia, Van Leeuwen, Bruins, Van Vuren, & Van Raan, 2004). However, further research is needed to explain the time lag effect for the two journals.

Despite current emphasis on the JIF, it is noteworthy that the journal cited half-life arguably represents the best JCR measure of a journal’s worth (Cartwright & McGhee, 2005; Garfield, 2005; Moed et al., 1999; Sombatsompop et al., 2004). The excellent results for both AJOT and OTJR on this metric indicate that their contributions are being recognized later relative to most journals. Not only was
AJOT’s positive trajectory for journal cited half-life statistically significant, but it also received the number one rehabilitation category rank in 2004 and 2005.

Another study finding is that, despite markedly lower rankings in the JIF metric, AJOT consistently maintained an extremely high rank pertaining to the total number of citations it received and the volume of its publications. Although the rankings for OTJR’s total cites and articles are notably lower than those of AJOT, it is important to consider that journals publishing a smaller volume of articles each year will be less likely to have a high ranking in either of these two categories.

**Wider Implications of Findings**

Because of the profound impact of the JIF on the potential of occupational therapy researchers to obtain the funding necessary to conduct high-quality research, it is critical that occupational therapy develop an organized plan to promote the viability of the profession through explicit, but ethical, attempts to enhance its JCR standing. This article represents a first step in this regard by identifying occupational therapy’s standing on the metrics. The results suggest several possible avenues that occupational therapy may pursue in response to the challenges of the self-perpetuating JIF cycle.

First, occupational therapy researchers must not be neglectful in citing funding sources that facilitated their research publications, because citation of grant support in published articles is a key point of consideration in selecting journals that will be listed in future JCR indexes (Rodger, McKenna, & Brown, 2006). Specifically, scholars should be cautious to avoid any occasional oversights, because these omissions prevent JCR from tracking the true percentage of occupational therapy publications that reflect funded research.

Second, as a profession, occupational therapy should critically examine the submission and publication process to promote a more strategic balance between the potentially conflicting needs to elevate the status of its own journals and to respond to the contemporary mandate for interdisciplinarity by publishing in outside journals. Rodger et al. (2006) noted that the Australian Occupational Therapy Journal, British Journal of Occupational Therapy, and Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy all have petitioned the Thomson Scientific Corporation for inclusion in JCR but have been denied because of their lack of publications linked to funded research. In light of this fact, occupational therapy researchers need to think carefully regarding where they submit their grant-supported research articles, given the need for greater occupational therapy journal presence in the JCR.

Last, occupational therapy researchers need to pursue dialogue with other underrepresented disciplines and the Thomson Scientific Corporation to encourage a more equitable representation of disciplines within JCR categories. This approach could begin with a multidisciplinary collaboration to analyze JCR data and identify potential sources of bias related to the current JCR indexing policy. If such discrepancies are documented, occupational therapy and other underrepresented disciplines will be in a more favorable position to encourage the Thomson Scientific Corporation to reexamine the JCR index inclusion criteria.

In considering the previously mentioned issues, there are at least three barriers that complicate occupational therapy’s efforts to enhance its JCR prestige. First is its pronounced lack of representation in the JCR index. Because the majority of citations take place within the same discipline, the citation results for all occupational therapy journals are severely curtailed because of this exclusion. The second barrier is the short timeframe that is used in JIF calculations. A third barrier pertains to the historical prevalence of qualitative occupational therapy research. Although qualitative research is important to occupational therapy and beyond, NIH does not have a strong history of funding such endeavors. This fact is compounded by the NIH and other institutions’ general disinclination to prioritize rehabilitation research (Frontera et al., 2006), a situation that complicates occupational therapy’s nonindexed journals’ petitions for JCR recognition. Each of these barriers is a very real limitation that has negatively affected the ability of occupational therapy journals to achieve high JIF scores. However, through a carefully coordinated response, the profession has the potential to help eliminate these barriers and thereby enhance both the scholarship and practice of occupational therapy.

**Future Considerations**

This first examination of the performance of occupational therapy journals on the JCR metrics suggests avenues for future research. First, there is a need to better understand the relative value of publishing occupational therapy work in intradisciplinary versus interdisciplinary dissemination outlets. As Cartwright and McGhee (2005) have argued, there is already an imbalance of citations between clinical and scientific journals that puts clinical journals at a further disadvantage when they fail to publish their own field’s high-impact research. Do the gains in visibility and recognition associated with outside journals outweigh the costs of publishing in outlets that are not readily accessible to their clinicians? Also, what can occupational therapy learn about the citation practices and JCR standings of other allied health professions that may enable a multidisciplinary movement to enhance their cumulative research representation in the JCR evaluation process? These considerations warrant further exploration.
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**Appendix A**

**Metrics of the Journal Citation Reports for the American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 1996 Through 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Journal Impact Factor</th>
<th>Journal Cited Half-Life</th>
<th>Journal Immediacy Index</th>
<th>Total Cites</th>
<th>Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Rank and % (percentile rank) pertain to the Rehabilitation Social Science Edition category.*

**Appendix B**

**Metrics of the Journal Citation Reports for OTJR: Occupation, Participation, and Health (OTJR), 1996 Through 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Journal Impact Factor</th>
<th>Journal Cited Half-Life</th>
<th>Journal Immediacy Index</th>
<th>Total Cites</th>
<th>Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1.935</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Rank and % (percentile rank) pertain to the Rehabilitation Social Science Edition category. Data from 2002 for Total Cites and Articles reflect the combined values from two names under which OTJR was indexed in that year.*