

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

Cecilia Ferm Almqvist¹

¹ Södertörn University College

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article "On the ongoing need for naturalistic philosophy to interpret

what occupational science is doing" by Turnbull and Barnard is really interesting and thought provoking, not least the second part where Wilcock's definition of occupation is explored, aiming to avoid objectification of activity. My interpretation is that the path towards that second part, could be improved in the sense to guide the reader more clearly. This journal is accessible world-wide, and invite research based in and between any discipline. That put demands when it comes to clarification of context, and definition of concepts, as well as keeping a red thread throughout the text. Hence, the context of occupational science could be developed and broadened out already in the introduction. We get to know that the science is about 35 years old, but I suppose that an outsider is still not sure what it is all about. Also, the relation between occupation and health, that seem to have dominated the discipline could be elaborated upon rather early as well, so the reader actually understand that it is any (meaningful) occupation that is in focus. And as I imply, meaningfulness could be mentioned in the description of occupational science as well.

Further, occupational therapy, and how it relates to occupational science, seems to be something the reader should take for granted. Even if I am totally "at home" in the second part of the article, I had no idea what occupational therapy was, before I had to investigate the area during my reading. So please, invite the reader even to that concept. And, not least, define naturalistic philosophy, also in relation to phenomenology. You use phenomenological thinkers in the second part, but then you partly define them as naturalistic. For a phenomenologist, this is a bit confusing. As you also use naturalistic in the heading, it should be useful to get a definition of the concept before you present the aim of the philosophical investigation. You also use the concept naturalistic science, which could be explained in the same paragraph.

Another thing I would like to have early in the article is information about that you will use Arendt and Heidegger to explore the model/definition in the second part. That would give a hint on what is waiting, and where the path through the first part of the article will end. The philosophers are frequently used in investigations of practical knowledge in Northern Europe, a discipline that seem to overlap occupational science to a great extent, and to mention in the abstract and the introduction how they are used, might appeal to a broader scope of scholars. Another smaller thing is that I would recommend you to use Dewey's original works when citing concepts he developed, even if how they are interpreted in occupational science

is of great interest in an article as the current one as well.

The connection to biomedicine comes a bit surprisingly, not least for a humanist reader. That might could be introduced more thoroughly to give meaning to any reader of the article, the same with “clinical”.

I really like your idea of interpreting occupational meanings from an epistemological and an ontological perspective. The first is very well written, I just want to say that the interests you present in the end might be completed with the theme of “professional judgement” that engage a large amount of Scandinavian scholars. When it comes to ontological meaning, it is a bit harder to follow. I suggest that you start with the last sentence, and try to arrange the section in a similar way that the former one is formed. Take the reader in the hand, so to speak.

I think your conclusions are clever, and important, and that your exploration of Wilcock’s work gives meaning. If you treat my points, I think that your ambition to create a complementary perspective in occupational science will be even more stable and functional.