

Review of: "A preliminary investigation of what occupational science is doing"

Terry SH Au-Yeung¹

¹ Cardiff University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In this article, the authors present a thoughtful exploration of Wilcock's model of occupation and its connection to survival, health, and the coloniality of being. However, there are a few areas where the discussion falls short, which I would like to address in this review.

Firstly, the authors do not provide a clear definition of what constitutes 'naturalistic' or 'natural' in the context of occupation. This lack of clarity hinders our understanding of the main argument and raises questions about the validity of the proposed approach to occupational science.

Secondly, the article seems to over-philosophize the concept of occupation, without paying sufficient attention to the practical application of occupational science in occupational therapy. While the theoretical exploration of occupation is essential, readers may find it challenging to grasp the real-world implications of the presented ideas without a more explicit connection to occupational therapy practice.

Lastly, the authors propose a holistic understanding of occupation but fail to elaborate on what this would entail for occupational science in a practical sense. The term 'holistic' is left ambiguous and might be misinterpreted as encompassing everything about life. A more precise explanation of the concept, along with examples of how a holistic approach would impact the field of occupational science, would have been beneficial for readers.

In conclusion, while the article offers an intriguing examination of Wilcock's model and the potential for a complementary perspective in occupational science, it lacks clarity in some key areas, particularly regarding the definition of 'naturalistic,' the connection to occupational therapy, and the practical implications of a holistic approach to occupation.