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Abstract

*Background:* Time use is a defining interest within occupational therapy and occupational science. This is evident through the range of contributions to the disciplinary knowledge base. Indeed, it has been suggested that time use methods are amongst the most established research techniques used to explore aspects of human occupation. However, the extent and nature of such activity in occupational therapy and occupational science has not been examined to date. *Aim:* This study sought to map the extent and nature of time use research in occupational therapy and occupational science journals and the extent to which studies explored the relationship between time use and health. *Method:* A scoping review method was used. *Results:* Sixty-one studies were included. Scandinavian countries contributed the most number of studies (n=16, 26%). While time use diaries were used most frequently (n=30, 49%), occupational therapists and occupational scientists have developed a range of data collection instruments. Forty-nine studies (80%) focused on time use in clinical or defined population subgroups. Ten studies (16%) included an empirical examination of the relationship between time use and health. *Conclusion:* Future research should examine time use and health amongst well populations across the lifespan and in different parts of the world.
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**Introduction**

Time use is a defining interest in the fields of occupational therapy and occupational science. Adolph Meyer [(1), p. 642], widely considered the ‘father of occupational therapy’ [(2), p. 44] called for ‘the awakening to a full meaning of time as the biggest wonder and asset of our lives’. Kielhofner revisited the work of Meyer and Meyer’s contemporary, Eleanor Clarke Slagle and credited them with one of occupational therapy’s core propositions that ‘in the richness of man’s daily routines and his purposeful use of time, there was both health maintaining and health regenerating potential’ [(3), p. 236]. To this day, occupational therapists are passionate in their belief that the things people do in their everyday lives are the foundation of health and well-being (4).

In the first publication from the discipline of occupational science Yerxa et al. [(5), p. 8] similarly positioned a ‘concern for time’ as central to understanding human occupational behaviour, with consideration required of ‘how a person occupies time, how satisfied she or he is with the use of time and how well time use supports values and goals’. Yerxa [(6), p. 3] further argued that occupational science sought to address a major question confronting societies – ‘what is the relationship between human engagement in a daily round of activity (such as work, play, rest, and sleep) and the quality of life people experience including their healthfulness’. Eminent Canadian economist and time use researcher Andrew Harvey [(7), p. 2] asserted that what people do minute-by-minute day-by-day is at the heart of understanding them as occupational beings. Wilcock (8) recently commented on the goodness of fit between the interdisciplinary field of time use research and occupational science, remembering a key meeting of time use researchers (including Andrew Harvey) interested in exploring time use, health, and well-being that took place in Canada in 1993 as the interdisciplinary potential of occupational science grew.
In 2003 Australian occupational therapist Louise Farnworth (9) renewed attention on occupational therapy’s association with time use. She explored the related concepts of time use, tempo, and temporality and questioned whether such topics are the core business of occupational therapy or of other professions. The central and enduring importance of time use in occupational therapy and occupational science is evident through the broad and sustained range of outputs and contributions to the knowledge base (see Table I). While the information in this table did not emanate from the scoping review process, it provides a useful background to contextualise this review.

[Insert Table I about here]

Wilcock (44) suggested that time use methods are amongst the most established research techniques used in exploring important aspects of human occupation. However, to date, the extent and nature of such research activity in occupational therapy and occupational science has not been examined. Therefore the purpose of this study is to map the extent and nature of time use research in occupational therapy and occupational science. A secondary aim is to examine the extent to which the included studies explored the relationship between time use and health. In this regard, Yerxa’s [(45), p. 412] definition of health is employed. She described health not as the absence of pathology, but as a ‘positive, dynamic state of ‘well-beingness’, reflecting adaptability, a good quality of life and satisfaction in one’s own activities’.

**Method**

A scoping review method was used to map the relevant literature. According to Rumrill, Fitzgerald, and Merchant [(46), p. 399) ‘many medical and social science fields have witnessed the emergence of scoping literature reviews as an alternative to traditional literature review methods’. The Cochrane Public Health Group [(47), p. 147] described scoping reviews as ‘a useful and increasingly popular way to collect and organize important background information and develop a picture of the existing evidence base’. Unlike traditional systematic reviews, scoping studies do not seek to assess the quality
However scoping reviews are particularly useful when an area is complex or has not been reviewed comprehensively before, where many different study designs are employed (48), when there is a high volume of published work (46), and in younger disciplines when the lack of randomized controlled trials makes it difficult to undertake systematic reviews (49). Moreover scoping reviews are more time and cost effective than full systematic reviews. Scoping review methodology is growing in popularity in occupational therapy (50) and has been used to examine interventions for chronic diseases (51), immigration and its impact on daily occupations (52), occupational and self identity after a brain injury (53), occupational engagement of older adults with low vision (54), and ecological sustainability (55).

Arksey and O’ Malley (48) published the first methodological framework for conducting scoping reviews. They outlined five steps to guide researchers through the process: identifying the research question, identifying relevant studies, study selection, data charting and finally, collating, summarizing and reporting the results. Levac, Colquoun, and O’ Brien (49) noted some challenges and limitations with Arksey and O’ Malley’s framework. They argued that the purpose of scoping studies can lack clarity, that the study selection process is iterative rather than linear and that the analytical method of charting data is poorly defined. Furthermore they acknowledged the ongoing debate regarding the need or otherwise for quality assessment of included studies particularly given the large number of studies often included in scoping reviews. Importantly they highlighted how the breadth and comprehensiveness of the scoping process needed to be balanced with feasibility. Arksey and O’ Malley’s (48) five steps are outlined below.

**Identifying the research question(s)**

This review seeks to address the following two questions:
1. What is the extent and nature of time use research in occupational therapy and occupational science? Specifically research trends, gaps in evidence, and methodological issues are examined.

2. To what extent do the identified studies examine the relationship between time use and health? Specifically the review examines whether the studies empirically explored the relationship between time use and health using psychometrically tested instruments.

Identifying relevant studies

The following databases were searched: CINAHL, EMBASE, PsycINFO, Medline, Proquest, OTDBase, PubMed, with the keywords: Activity pattern, time, diary, time use, time budget, yesterday diary, time studies, time utilization, daily activities, time allocation and MeSH terms: time factors, time perceptions, time, occupational therapy, time and motion studies, time management. Boolean operators and truncation were used.

Study selection

The review period was from when the first occupational science publication emerged in 1990 to June 2011 in the first instance. The review was then updated to March 2014. Studies were selected using the inclusion and exclusion criteria detailed in Table II.

[Insert Table II about here]

Data charting

The data charting form captured information relating to the author(s) and year of publication; geographical location of the study; study participants; sample size; if data was collected across 24 hours of the day; whether the study employed primary or secondary data analysis; the data collection method and analysis system used; the extent
to which the studies addressed the varied methodological issues associated with time use research and whether the study empirically explored the relationship between time use and health using psychometrically tested instruments.

_Collating, summarizing and reporting the results_

Numerical analyses of the extent, nature, and distribution of the studies included in the review were conducted (48) and the results were mapped in tables and charts. Non-numeric findings (e.g., the methodological issues associated with time use research) were synthesised and these results are presented in narrative form.

_Results_

Sixty-one studies published between 1990 and 2014 met the inclusion criteria for this review. Figure I illustrates the number of publications in each year of the review period.

*[Insert Figure I about here]*

The number of studies has generally increased with a peak of seven studies in 2010. Of the regions represented in the review, Scandinavian authors contributed the most studies (n=16, 26%) followed by USA, Canada, and Australia (Table III). The most frequently studied population was people with enduring mental illness followed by other clinical groups, defined population sub-groups, and finally ‘well’ populations across the lifespan (Table IV). The vast majority of studies (n=50, 82%) were small/medium scale primary research projects with sample sizes ranging from one to 731. An additional seven (11%) studies related their findings (empirically or descriptively) with population-level time use datasets. Secondary analysis of representative population-level time use datasets was employed in 5 (7%) studies. Almost half of the studies (n=30, 49%) used time diaries as data collection instruments. In 10 of these cases the time diary was a modified version of that used in the respective national time use surveys in Australia, Canada, Ireland, Japan, and Sweden. Table V presents the data collection methods used in the included studies.
Forty-eight studies (79%) captured data across the 24 hours of the day, with three of these studies only reporting selected activities in the featured publication. Six studies (9%) captured data from early morning to late at night. These studies generally used the original Occupational Questionnaire (38) which records time use from 5am – 12midnight. Five studies (8%) employed daytime momentary observations while the remaining two studies focused on time use during a school day and working day respectively. The studies captured data from various combinations of single weekdays; a weekday and a weekend day; ‘typical’ days; and full weeks; or single days recorded at intervals of a few weeks or pre and post an intervention.

A range of data coding approaches was noted. In the majority of studies the researcher(s) coded the activities recorded by the respondents. Coding schemes were derived from discipline specific sources such as the American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA) Uniform Terminology (113), the AOTA (114) Practice Framework and the Canadian Association of Occupational Therapists Guidelines for Client Centred Practice (115). One study referred to the terminology of the World Health Organisation (116) International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. Twenty studies (33%) used modified versions of coding schemes developed for use in national time use surveys in Australia, Canada, Ireland, the UK, and the USA as well as harmonised European coding systems (117). A small proportion of studies used a pre-coded diary where respondents recorded what they were doing by picking one of a number of listed activities largely representative of the diary day. The Occupational Questionnaire requires respondents to record their activities in their own words and also assign one of four codes to each listed activity. Additionally several authors used previous research to guide their data coding. Instrument specific coding systems and analysis software were used where applicable e.g., the Daily Life software (118) used by time-geographers. Although some of the coding schemes and software have up to
600 individual activity codes, the number of codes reported across all studies ranged from three to 79 and in some cases included the use of sub-categories. Finally some researchers combined their time use data with interview transcripts and used qualitative methods in their analyses.

Ten studies (16%) included empirical examinations of the relationship between time use and health using generic instruments with established reliability and validity. The measures used were the Short Form 36 (in full or part) (119), the Swedish version of the Manchester Short Assessment of Quality of Life (120), the Göteborg Quality of Life Scale (121), the Life Satisfaction Index-Z (122), the Self-esteem scale (123), the Sense of Coherence scale (124), the Mastery instrument (125), the Life satisfaction measure (126), overall perceived health (127) and the Satisfaction with Life Scale (128).

The majority of studies (n=46, 75%) included some consideration of the methodological issues present in time use research. These included using quality measures such as explicit training and procedures to maximise accuracy and consistency in data collection and coding; having a defined cut-off for the amount of ‘missing time’ in a diary day; and the examination of extreme values/outliers. The psychometric properties of instruments were generally reported when applicable. Furthermore many studies assessed the validity of their data by asking respondents to rate how well the diary day represented an average day. In some cases supplemental interviews were used to enhance diary quality. A smaller number of studies addressed one or more specific time use research issues, such as seasonal variation in time use, the potentially high level of variability in time use across days of the week undermining the idea of a ‘typical day’, the potential underreporting of simultaneous and short duration activities, the challenge of classifying activities, the time lapse between the designated diary day and diary completion, the error associated with retrospective recall of activities, and the possible social desirability bias when doing so.
Discussion

This is the first scoping review of time use research in occupational therapy and occupational science. Evidently time use is of enduring interest to occupational therapists and occupational scientists. The number of publications has generally grown in the time period. Indeed the decision to focus only on discipline specific occupational therapy and occupational science journals means that the increasing numbers of occupational time use researchers who are publishing to a wider audience in a broad range of interdisciplinary journals was not captured (129-133). Taken together there is evidence to suggest that occupational therapists and occupational scientists are making an important contribution to the field of time use research.

The geographical distribution of the included studies may reflect the parameters of the scoping review which included studies written in English only. It may also reflect the Western perspective that dominates the occupational therapy and occupational science literature (134). This is an important consideration in time use research when there are such variations in the perception and meaning of time across cultures (135, 136). There is some evidence of culturally sensitive explorations of unique time perceptions for Maori (137) and Aboriginal (138) peoples by occupational therapists and occupational scientists. The findings of this scoping review suggest that further time use research is required ‘to gain a better understanding of occupational engagement for individuals from diverse communities, cultures and in varying geographical locations’ [(139), p. 440).

This study provides evidence in support of Wilcock’s [(44), p. 3] claim that there is a ‘propensity for studies that are small scale, individually based, and have significance or relevance to the practice of current day occupational therapy such as disability, care-giving and ageing’. Over half of the included studies involved clinical populations with modest sample sizes. Approximately 20% (n=12) of the studies examined the time use of ‘well’ populations, with eight of the 12 focusing on the time
use of older people. Without doubt the focus on older people is warranted as the World Health Organisation (140) projects the number of people aged 65 or older will grow from an estimated 524 million in 2010 to nearly 1.5 billion in 2050, with most of the increase in developing countries. As a result they call for coordinated research to discover the most cost-effective ways to maintain healthy lifestyles and everyday functioning in countries at different stages of economic development and with varying resources. However given that there is also growing international recognition of the need for targeted, holistic, age-appropriate preventive and clinical services for all young people, not just those who are at risk or experiencing difficulties (141-143), occupational researchers are encouraged to advance this agenda and prioritise studies on the lives of well children and young people as Hunt et al. (105) and Lynch (107) have done.

Secondary analysis of representative population-level time use datasets was employed in only five (7%) of the studies in this review. Evidently occupational researchers have yet to fully realize the potential of large population-level datasets, some of which now include data on time use and well-being (24). Pierce (144) called for large pattern predictive research on population differences in occupation and occupational patterns across 24-hour cycles, requiring methods and instruments that are better fit to the study of large samples. Indeed there are increasing calls for the strengthening of population and public health perspectives in occupational therapy and occupational science research, policy, and practice (139, 145-149). Wilcock (8, 150-153) and Hocking (4) have been key proponents in this regard. Hocking [(4), p. 34] argued that ‘occupational therapists need to look beyond providing good quality intervention for individuals who have already acquired a health condition’ and extend their thinking to ‘practice that influences groups, organisations, communities – the whole of society’ (p. 37). Moll, Gewurtz, Krupa, and Law (148) believed that the benefits associated with occupation should be promoted in the realm of public health, as
well as how occupation can be a risk factor for ill-health. Similarly in her editorial in the recent edition of the *Journal of Occupational Science*, devoted in its entirety to occupation for population health, Wicks [(154), p. 2] encouraged occupational scientists’ ‘quest to understand how occupation has positive and negative implications for health at the personal, local, and global levels’.

Ten studies (16%) were indentified that included an empirical examination of the relationship between time use and subjective well-being. Some studies did collect health and well-being data but did not examine their relationship with time use (108) while others examined related concepts such as occupational balance and health related variables (57). Arguably then Yerxa’s (6, 155) question of how daily occupations including their patterns in time contribute to human happiness, life satisfaction, quality of life, and health requires further empirical attention. Law, Steinwender, and Leclair (156) found little empirical evidence in the occupational therapy literature to support the belief that there is a relationship between occupation, health, and well-being. More recently Pierce [(144), p. 302] claimed that the lack of research on the relationship of occupation to health and quality of life is a ‘critical gap’ in occupational science research. Wilcock [(44), p. 3-4] has called for further exploration of ‘the apparent health or illness outcomes of contemporary lifestyles from an occupational perspective’. Such explorations need to include quantitative and qualitative studies to grasp actual relationships between occupation and health at the population level (157). Crucially longitudinal research is required that may identify causal pathways in the relationship between time use and health (156).

A significant number of the included studies used discipline specific coding schemes to guide their analyses. Wilcock (8) suggested recently that the use of discipline specific terminology by all those who seek to ‘describe or study particular aspects of all that people do across the wake-sleep continuum from birth to death’ has restricted knowledge development. For example, the term occupation is ‘not currently in the lexicon of public health’ [(148), p. 115]. Clark [(158), p. 176] advocated the careful
use of language that ‘travels well in interdisciplinary contexts to describe the relationship of occupation to health’. Farnworth (28) argued that activity is a more appropriate concept to use in population-level time use research rather than occupation which relates to time use at the individual level. Occupational researchers may wish to consider using generic activity coding schemes such as that contained in the recently released United Nations (159) *Guidelines for Harmonising Time Use Surveys*. In this way time use research can contribute important and valid information on the ‘form’ or ‘observable aspects’ [(160), p. 80] of occupation at a population level. Alternative approaches to categorising occupation have also been used developed that reflect ‘the complexity of human occupation from a time and doing perspective [(15), p.16] by exploring main, hidden and unexpected occupations, as well as sleep, which is considered a building block in the patterns of daily occupation.

According to Pentland and Harvey [(135), p. 264], ‘in order that time use research be maximally useful across disciplines, investigators have a responsibility to consider and consult various theoretical and methodological aspects’. While it was reassuring to find that the majority of the studies in this review were sensitive to issues of reliability, validity, and trustworthiness, specific time use research methodological considerations received less attention. Many excellent resources are available to assist occupational researchers in conducting high quality time use research (27, 159).

Finally, as Michelson [(161), p. 103] stated, ‘the whole is greater than the sum of its parts’ particularly given the zero-sum nature of time ‘in which there is only a fixed amount of time to be distributed and traded off among necessary and desired activities’ (p. 18). The reporting of aggregate-level statistics and major time allocation estimates does not allow for the full richness of time use data to be utilized (135). Unique patterns that are not represented by the aggregate-level average may be identified by person-centred rather than more traditional variable-centred approaches (162). While such methods are increasingly popular in contemporary research on
lifestyles and health behaviours (163-167), none of the studies in our review used these empirical cluster or latent class analytic strategies. [An interesting study by Andersson, Eklund, Sundh, Thundal, and Spak (168) did employ cluster analytic techniques in the analysis of women’s patterns of everyday occupations and alcohol consumption but did not meet the inclusion criteria for this review.] Seven studies (11%) in this review used person-centred time-geographic methods (39), capturing activity patterns as a multidimensional unit with outputs in the form of graphs that illustrate the complexity of ‘everyday patterns of doing’ [(15), p. 16].

Limitations
As with all research this study has a number of limitations. The review was limited to studies of time use to the exclusion of studies of tempo and temporality of which there are many. Indeed these topics could be the focus of future scoping reviews. While many of the included studies reported affective states or states of mind associated with time use and perceived competence, value, and enjoyment in relation to time use, only those studies that examined time use and health using generic instruments with established psychometric properties were considered. While the two authors consulted throughout this scoping review process resource limitations prohibited the independent review of each of the full articles. As is the norm in scoping reviews (48) the findings from these studies were not synthesised. Therefore a review focusing exclusively on these studies would be an important contribution to the knowledge base. In addition the present review excluded studies that explored the meaning of time use. However as Pierce [(169), p.144) stated ‘occupational therapists require sophisticated understandings of both the cultural repertoire of typical activities for persons of different ages and backgrounds and the complex nature of the personally constructed and fully contexted occupational experiences’, thus necessitating both quantitative and qualitative approaches as advocated by Frank (157).

Conclusion
This scoping review extends the existing literature by mapping for the first time the extent and nature of time use research in occupational therapy and occupational science journals and the extent to which studies have explored the relationship between time use and health. Sixty-one studies were identified. Evidently time use is of enduring interest to occupational therapists and occupational scientists. Studies from Scandinavia, North America, and Australia predominate. While time use diaries were used most frequently occupational therapists and occupational scientists have developed a range of time use data collection instruments. Forty-nine studies (80%) focused on time use in clinical or defined population sub-groups. A detailed evaluation and synthesis of the evidence emanating from the small number of studies (n=10, 16%) that empirically examined time use and health is warranted. Moreover occupational therapists and occupational scientists should consider more large-scale, quantitative research into the time use and health of well populations across the life span at local and global levels. In so doing they will be able to further strengthen the core business of occupational therapy of creating health in everyday patterns of doing (15) and answer Yerxa’s (6, 155) central question of how work, rest, play, and the quotidian occupations including their patterns in time contribute to human happiness, health, and quality of life.
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Table I. Selected outputs that illustrate the central and enduring importance of time use in occupational therapy and occupational science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Output</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Conceptual models relating to time use | Temporal Adaptation [3]  
Value and Meaning in Occupations (ValMO) Model [10]  
| Selected keynote lectures on time use and everyday occupations | Law [12]  
Farnworth [9]  
Christiansen [13]  
Zemke [14]  
Erlandsson [15] |
| Literature reviews on aspects of time use | Desha & Ziviani [16]  
Eklund, Leufstadius, & Bejerholm [17]  
Barclay et al. [18]  
Pemberton & Cox [19] |
| Overviews of time use methodologies | Farnworth et al. [20]  
Holsti & Barr [21]  
Ziviani et al. [23]  
Daunhauer & Bundy-Fazioli [23]  
Hunt & McKay [24] |
| Online international discussion ‘Occupational Patterns in Time and Space’ | International Society for Occupational Science [26] |
| Selected books and book chapters | Pentland, Harvey, Lawton, & McColl [27]  
Farnworth [28]  
Ziviani, Desha, & Rodger [29]  
Harvey & Singleton [30]  
Harvey & Pentland [31] |
| Instruments | Activity Configuration [32]  
Activity in Context and Time [33]  
Caregiver’s Activity and Recording of Events Inventory [34]  
Profiles of Occupational Engagement in Schizophrenia [35]  
Modified Occupational Questionnaire [36]  
Mother’s Time Use Questionnaire [37]  
Occupational Questionnaire [38]  
Time geography [39]  
Time and Space Use Inventory [40] |
| Time use interventions | Action Over Inertia Programme [41]  
Redesigning Daily Occupations (ReDO) Programme [42]  
Lighter Living (LiLi) Programme [43] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990 – 2014</td>
<td>Not tempo or temporality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collected on a broad range of daily activities, not discrete activities in isolation</td>
<td>Not studies of meaning of time use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human time use</td>
<td>Not time use relating to service delivery, student supervision or the development of assessment tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Not theoretical or methodological papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published in peer reviewed occupational therapy and occupational science journals</td>
<td>Not book chapters / theses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Location</td>
<td>Study Reference Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>[43, 56-70]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America (USA)</td>
<td>[40, 71-80]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>[41, 81-90]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>[91-100]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom (UK)</td>
<td>[101-104]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>[105-107]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>[37, 108, 109]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>[110-112]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Population</td>
<td>Clinical Diagnosis – Enduring Mental Illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table V. Data collection instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time diaries</td>
<td>30 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Configuration/Occupational Questionnaire/Modified Occupational Questionnaire</td>
<td>11 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time geographic method</td>
<td>7 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Sampling Method</td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Time Use Questionnaire</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver’s Activity and Recording of Events Inventory</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot observations/Behavioural mapping</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile of Occupational Engagement in People with Schizophrenia [POES]</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and Space Use Inventory</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity in Context and Time [ACT]</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure I. Number of publications in the review period 1990 – 2013.

Note. 2014 is not included in this chart as the review period extended only to the first three months of the year.