

Review of: "On the ongoing need for naturalistic philosophy to interpret what occupational science is doing"

Antony Puddephatt¹

¹ Lakehead University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I did learn some new questions (if not answers) about some of the different philosophical arguments surrounding occupational science from reading this article. Is an occupation best described as being, becoming, doing, or something else? Is it alienating (a kind colonized takeover of the self) or is it life-affirming by providing meaning and actualization? One question might be if modernist occupations take us over, in what other ways does modern society more generally and its specific historical moments (irrespective of specific occupation) take us over and impose roles, rules, and norms not naturally acquired? How can we decide how our being is shaped by our semi-chosen occupation, vs merely being a citizen in a modern society? Distinguishing these would seem to be important but perhaps difficult if not impossible to do, making progress difficult. Then, do occupations promote bodily health and longevity or actually harm it? I am sure everyday people know that it depends on the job and its surrounding culture more than anything about the category of occupation per se. In other words, I don't think we can adequately judge the answers without actually looking more closely at lived occupational experiences. Thus, perhaps these basic questions require empirical research to better sort this out, by transforming these philosophical issues into testable hypotheses (i.e. is not forming and testing ideas about occupations what occupational science is expected to do?). My guess is the relevancy of the ideas raised here are highly context dependent, and hence, will vary considerably across different types of occupations and status/class positions. So, what have we learned from this philosophical discussion? Anything decisive?