

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

Mapheyeledi Motimele¹

¹ University of Cape Town

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the article: [The ongoing need for naturalistic philosophy to interpret what occupational science is doing](#).

Abstract:

Unsure why the question "Which knowledge counts and for what end is necessary?". Occupational science as a science of doing, allows for the relationship between persons and their contexts to emerge. Depending on the situation or the 'doing' investigated (within context), both forms of knowing, subjective and empirical may be relevant. Analysis in occupational science requires that one consider these perspectives in terms of how they influence and impact the other in real life situations rather than (theoretically) compare their individual value. The 'basic aporia' referred to is unclear and I am hoping will be fleshed out in the body of the article. In short, knowledge is not either/or, but a consideration or interplay of both (qualitative and quantitative) when it comes to occupational science. Lastly, why the focus on only phenomenological knowledge as experiential knowledge? what about other forms of qualitative inquiry?

The abstract could also contain more information about the body of the article to show how the questions raised will be addressed.

Body of the article:

I enjoyed this article and could see what the authors were advocating for. However it may be useful to work with real-life data sets to show how this claims present themselves and the conflicts that may arise in application/practice. This will support the relevance of the article.

The authors ask very relevant questions about occupation and occupational science that require occupational scientists to consider what their core philosophy is and how this influences/impacts what they do and how they understand what humans do as occupational beings. I would suggest first engaging with the various meanings of occupation to show how these may influence what occupational scientists do. The understanding/interpretation of which will influences the (perceived) role.

It would be helpful to give examples to support claims, e.g. 'the coloniality of being' and 'the coloniality of occupation'. These terms also need to be considered within the 'coloniality of knowledge' and the 'coloniality of power' to support the tensions you have outlined. The colonial matrix of power has to be considered as a whole to offer a more accurate

representation of developments that may affect your argument, i.e. do the work that you are advocating for to show the value of such inquiry.

Decolonial theory recognises the 'zone of non-being' (Fanon), may be helpful to include this in your critique to show how the philosophy of occupation is rooted within coloniality and disrupts the positive connotation of doing, being, becoming... etc. for colonized peoples.

Overall, a lot of content was packed into this paper and I sometimes found myself asking what the author's main points were. Clarifying this and adding this to the abstract will help the reader determine the value of the article and identify what they gain from engaging with it. The conclusion is a better representation of what the article is about.