

# Occupational therapy and occupational science: building critical and transformative alliances

Debbie Laliberte Rudman

School of Occupational Therapy, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada.

**Abstract:** Occupational therapy and science are facing calls for social transformation based on the growing awareness and concern with widening occupational inequities and growing occupational injustices apparent at local and global scales. This paper addresses the potential for occupational therapy and science to form productive, critically-informed alliances that support occupation-based socially transformative work. Although acknowledging the critical turn in occupational science, which has raised awareness of problematics within the discipline and moved scholarship in directions that align with transformative work, there is a need for further radical configuration of the conditions that shape and bound occupational science to optimize its potential as a critical ally. The following five key directions should be considered as means to expand the possibilities in occupational science: deeper engagement with critical and transformative paradigms; challenging dualistic thinking; critically situating and politicizing occupation; addressing the moral and political values energizing scholarship; and questioning the *status quo* within and outside the discipline.

**Keywords:** *Social Transformation, Occupation, Occupational Justice.*

## Terapia ocupacional e ciência ocupacional: construindo alianças críticas e transformadoras

**Resumo:** A terapia e a ciência ocupacional estão enfrentando pedidos de transformação social baseados na crescente conscientização e preocupação com o aumento das desigualdades ocupacionais e as crescentes injustiças ocupacionais aparentes às escalas locais e globais. Este artigo aborda o potencial da terapia ocupacional e da ciência ocupacional para construir alianças produtivas e criticamente informadas que apoiem o trabalho socialmente transformador baseado na ocupação. Embora reconhecendo que a reviravolta crítica na ciência ocupacional aumentou a conscientização sobre as problemáticas dentro da disciplina e movimentou a produção intelectual em direções que se alinham com o trabalho transformador, argumenta-se que existe uma necessidade de configuração radical adicional das condições de possibilidade que moldam e vinculam a ciência ocupacional, para otimizar seu potencial como aliado crítico. Cinco direções-chave são consideradas como meio para expandir as condições de possibilidade na ciência ocupacional, incluindo: envolvimento mais profundo com paradigmas críticos e transformadores; desafio ao pensamento dualista; situar e politizar criticamente a ocupação; abordar os valores morais e políticos que estimulam a produção intelectual; e questionar o *status quo* dentro e fora da disciplina.

**Palavras-chave:** *Transformação Social, Ocupação, Justiça Ocupacional.*

## 1 Introduction

Since the formal naming of occupational science, its relationship to, and utility for, occupational therapy have been debated (MOLINEUX; WHITEFORD, 2011; MOLKE; RUDMAN; POLATAJKO, 2004). This paper addresses the contemporary potential for occupational therapy and occupational science to forge productive alliances that support occupation-based socially transformative work. Both occupational therapy and occupational science have immense potential to be transformative in terms of developing innovative ways of thinking about and addressing occupational injustices, as well as expanding occupational possibilities for collectives who experience various forms of marginalization (RUDMAN, 2014; POLLARD; SAKELLARIOU; LAWSON-PORTER, 2010). Indeed, there are growing bodies of work from diverse geographical locations, within both occupational therapy and occupational science, highlighting the imperative of enhancing the commitment and capacity of both to address key social problems (FARIAS; RUDMAN, 2016; GALHEIGO, 2011; GUAJARDO; MONDACA, 2017; WATSON; SWARTZ, 2004). Given this shared intent to mobilize occupation within social transformation, it is important to create spaces in which critical alliances aimed at occupation-focused social transformation can be formed. In this paper, it is argued that several key directions need to be further mobilized within occupational science so that it can effectively contribute to such alliances, particularly in relation to expanding the conditions of possibility used to conceptualize, study and address occupation.

Given the diverse use of terms within and across geographic spaces, I first clarify how key terms are conceptualized within this paper. I then describe the evolution of a critical turn in occupational science, and explicate key aspects of this critical scholarship. The need for a radical re-thinking of the conditions of possibility, that is, the key assumptions that set boundaries on how occupation is conceptualized, studied and addressed in occupational science, is then addressed. Finally, ways forward in expanding these conditions of possibility, drawn from critical, transformative scholarship, are proposed. Overall, it is argued that through radically expanding its conditions of possibility occupational science will be better positioned to ally with occupational therapy, and other key stakeholders, in addressing occupational inequities and injustices within transformative efforts.

With respect to key terms, a broad definition of occupation, not tied to any specific classification system, is employed; that is, occupation is viewed as encompassing the wide-ranging expanse of everyday and extraordinary doings that individuals and groups engage in (RUDMAN; ALDRICH, 2017). I also emphasize understandings of occupations as actions that have transformative potential in shaping contexts as well as subjects (FRANK, 2013; BRUGGEN, 2017). Acknowledging the multiplicity of occupational therapy within and across contexts, occupational therapy is conceptualized as encompassing diverse practices addressing occupation as both means and ends, working with individuals and collectives, and addressing health, well-being, participation and justice (GARCIA-RUIZ, 2017). Occupational science is also proposed to be characterized by multiple forms and practices. It is broadly defined as encompassing diverse research efforts addressing questions and issues regarding occupation, from individual to collective levels (RUDMAN et al., 2008).

## 2 Development of a Critical 'Turn' in Occupational Science

The most widely shared narrative of the origin of the discipline of occupational science is that it was formally institutionalized and named at the University of Southern California in 1989 with the initiation of its doctoral program in occupational science (PIERCE, 2014). Although scholars focused on advancing the study of occupation existed prior to this formal naming, the establishment of a doctoral program provided an institutionalized structure for building scholarship in the discipline (MOLINEUX; WHITEFORD, 2011). As initially articulated by Yerxa et al. (1989), occupational science was to be a basic science of occupation which although not concerned with immediate applicability would provide a knowledge base to support the status, philosophical assumptions and practice of occupational therapy.

However, this formal establishment of occupational science immediately led to debate about its purpose, necessity, relationship to occupational therapy and the distinction between basic and applied science (LUNT, 1997; MOSEY, 1992). As debates expanded globally, increasing questions were raised as to whether occupational science, as it was formed within an American context and shaped within a Western epistemological frame, imposed limitations on efforts to understand the diversity of ways occupation is

understood and enacted worldwide (HAMMELL, 2011; HOCKING, 2012; MAGALHÃES et al., 2016). Indeed, soon after its emergence, another form of occupational science, arising out of the work of Ann Wilcock from Australia and Elizabeth Townsend from Canada, focused on issues of occupational justice, population health and socio-political forces began to materialize (WILCOCK; TOWNSEND, 2000). Growing out of these debates and developments, there have been calls to work against adopting a singular vision of occupational science towards understanding it as having diverse purposes and relationships with occupational therapy, and other disciplinary and professional spaces, in various contexts (RUDMAN et al., 2008).

Expanding on the work of early scholars in occupational science who pointed to the discipline's potential to address the socio-political shaping of occupational injustices and question taken-for-granted assumptions about occupation grounded in particular ideological, geographical and professional foundations (DICKIE, 1996; FRANK, 1996; JACKSON, 1998; TOWNSEND, 1997), occupational science scholars from various geographical locations have contributed to the development of 'critical' occupational science. This critical turn in occupational science, which draws on a diversity of critical theoretical underpinnings, such as Freire, Foucault, Gramsci, Bourdieu, Marx, and Black feminist thought, has emphasized the development of a socially responsive discipline aimed at enhancing awareness of occupational inequities and injustices and how these are socially and politically produced (ANGELL, 2014; HOCKING; WHITEFORD, 2012; RUDMAN, 2013). As well, it has increasingly involved calls for a transformative agenda that not only encompasses examining occupation as a means of social transformation, but also the taking up of moral and political responsibilities to engage in forms of social transformation that mobilize and address occupation (FARIAS; RUDMAN, 2016; FRANK, 2012). This critical turn has been connected to an increasing recognition of an urgent need, particularly within contemporary neoliberal times characterized by growing inequalities and increasing individualization of social issues, to actively engage with pressing societal issues and their implications for occupation (GERLACH et al., 2017).

This critical turn has spurred scholarship that has critically analyzed philosophical and theoretical underpinnings of occupational science, and smaller bodies of scholarship addressing how inequities and injustices are shaped and perpetuated (FARIAS; RUDMAN, 2016). Key characteristics of critical

scholarship evident within this growing body of work include: a questioning stance towards the '*status quo*', that is, towards taken-for-granted ways of understanding and addressing occupational and social issues within and outside of the discipline; attention to the social, political, historical, economic and cultural forces that differentially shape occupation; and examination of the ways social relations of power shape and perpetuate occupational inequities and injustices (GERLACH et al., 2017; RUDMAN, 2013). However, transformative aspects of critical work that involve embracing an activist stance and working with communities to transform structures, systems and practices that sustain inequities and injustices remain more a call than a reality (FARIAS; RUDMAN, 2016; HOCKING; WHITEFORD, 2012).

### 3 Forging Critical Alliances Between Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy

The expansion of the critical turn in occupational science and the growing calls to further embrace a transformative agenda parallel a similar resurgence and expansion within occupational therapy (POLLARD; SAKELLARIOU; LAWSON-PORTER, 2010; WILSON; MAGALHÃES, 2016). As noted by Galheigo (2011), Malfitano et al. (2014), and others (POLLARD; SAKELLARIOU, 2014; BRUGGEN, 2017), the development of such occupational therapy practices, variously labelled as social, political, critical or transformative, have a longer history in spaces of the South, but more recently have grown into a geographical dispersed movement given growing occupational, health and social inequities within and across nations. For example, Guajardo and Mondaca (2017) have indicated that "gradually, a different epistemology of occupational therapy, grounded in social and political dimensions, has started to emerge" (p. 104), while Malfitano et al. (2014) point to the imperative of building a transnational dialogue about how occupational therapy in various contexts can enable social change through occupation. These forms of occupational therapy practices take up a critical position refusing to translate social, ethical, political and cultural issues into technical matters (GALHEIGO, 2011).

Given the seemingly complementary critical and transformative movements in occupational therapy and occupational science, it appears that the discipline and profession are in a moment where it is crucial to build critical alliances to span the continuum of generating knowledge about the socio-political

production of occupational inequities and injustices to enacting practices to work against these. A similar argument was forwarded by Galheigo (2011) in her keynote address at the World Federation of Occupational Therapists Conference which addressed directions forward in addressing human rights. Galheigo contended:

In the coming decade, one of the challenges of occupational therapists and occupational scientists who work within alternate frameworks will be to foster dialogue among scholars and practitioners across borders and language boundaries (p. 65).

Similarly, Pollard, Sakellariou and Lawson-Porter (2010) forwarded that a

key core around which occupational therapy and occupational science could maintain a complementary dynamic is the exploration of political strategies and tactics to facilitate the development of social capital through opportunities for occupation (p. 650),

but cautioned that this required a more in-depth integration of critical perspectives within both. Within the next section of article, it is argued that for occupational science to be a productive ally there is need for continued critical development within the discipline to ensure that the knowledge it generates and the practices it promotes support transformative practices and avoid perpetuating situations of occupational injustice, theoretical imperialism or cognitive injustice.

#### **4 Moving Forward in Transformative Directions with Occupational Science: Time for a Radical Re-Think of Conditions of Possibility**

Although the critical turn in occupational science has advanced scholarship in directions commensurate with a transformative agenda, there is a need for further radical rethinking of the sensibility and foundations of the discipline (RUDMAN, 2014). For example, in her article addressing the moral and political responsibilities of occupational science, Frank (2012) articulated the need for a “fundamental reassessment of the foundations of occupational science” (p. 30). Pollard, Sakellariou and Lawson-Porter (2010) argued that “uncritical assertions of the value of meaningful occupation will have to be cast aside” (p. 653) in order for occupational science to meaningfully

contribute to occupational therapy becoming an agent of social change. Magalhães et al. (2016) have emphasized the imperative of opening up spaces within occupational science for diverse worldviews in order to avoid enacting colonial agendas. Such a radical re-thinking requires drawing upon critical, transformative scholarship, including its ontological and epistemological foundations, to question key assumptions about science and occupation that may continue to serve as constraints in moving forward in critical, transformative directions (RUDMAN, 2014).

Drawing on the work of Foucault (1970) on episteme, that is, the structures that underlie knowledge production in a specific context, the term conditions of possibility refers to the range of assumptions that set the starting point and boundaries for knowledge production and practice. These conditions of possibility are often taken-for-granted and implicit, so that like working inside a closed box it becomes difficult to conceptualize and see what is being studied in other ways. In turn, attempts to understand and address occupation and related concepts become anchored to, and bounded within, these starting conditions (KANTARTZIS; MOLINEUX, 2012). Although these conditions work in some contexts and for some types of practices, and have enabled the generation of a particular corpus of knowledge regarding occupation, they leave occupational science ill-equipped in other contexts and for other types of practices. In particular, the current conditions of possibility in occupational science continue to set limits on the abilities of scholars to generate knowledge that informs transformative practices of relevance and applicability within diverse contexts (FARIAS; RUDMAN; MAGALHÃES, 2016; HOCKING, 2012; RUDMAN, 2014; MAGALHÃES, 2012).

As part of the ‘critical turn in OS, there has been an explosion of critically reflexive work regarding its conditions of possibility (FARIAS; RUDMAN, 2016; RUDMAN, 2013). A very prominent critique has been that occupational science scholarship has been underpinned by individualistic assumptions, which combined with the predominance of a Western worldview, has meant that there has been a focus on understanding individual experience of and authority over occupation, resulting in under-attention to the processes through which macro-level environmental elements differentially shape occupation in ways that contribute to inequities and injustices (GALVAAN, 2015; GERLACH et al., 2017). Moreover, the Western worldview has meant that a particular model of science tied to positivist and post-positivist assumptions, such as the need for value-free research and universals, has tended to

underpin occupation-focused scholarship. This model of science has reinforced the dichotomy of science and practice, setting limits on what has come to be viewed as the legitimate role or domain of occupational science and creating tensions when attempting to address issues of occupational and social injustice (FARIAS et al., 2016; FRANK, 2012). As well, an apolitical, ahistorical approach has been dominant, so that occupations are most often understood as they appear in the here-and-now and as separate from political considerations, with a neglect of how historical conditions shape occupational possibilities, social power relations produce inequities, or how occupation itself is used as means to govern particular groups (GALVAAN, 2012; RUDMAN, 2014; KANTARTZIS; MOLINEUX, 2012). It also has been argued that given historical and contextual features of occupational science, including the dominance of English, geographical and professional roots, and its largely female composition, assumptions guiding research, particularly regarding occupations that are seen as worthy of study and those that are de-valued or neglected, have been tied to a feminized, Anglophonic and middle class view (GALHEIGO, 2011; HOCKING, 2012; KIEPEK; PHELAN; MAGALHÃES, 2014; KANTARTZIS; MOLINEUX, 2012). As well, concerns have been raised regarding the limits associated with an incorporation of an ableist lens in which able-bodiedness is taken as normative and dis-ability is viewed as inherently deficient (PHELAN, 2011; POLLARD et al., 2010).

In relation to moving in critical, transformative directions, a key concern associated with existing conditions of possibility is that they can foster individualization, including the conceptualization of social problems, like high rates of unemployment among persons with disabilities, as issues of individual adjustment, choices, or knowledge and skills deficiencies rather than structural inequalities related to social disadvantage. In turn, practices promoted through such knowledge generation often focus on changing individual's capacities or abilities to overcome their circumstances. Although such practices can be beneficial, they do not change the structural and systemic constraints, such as ableism or sanism, at the root of the occupational challenges faced by collectives. As structural constraints are not addressed, there is a risk that such knowledge and the practices it sustains may inadvertently reproduce structural arrangements that create such social problems and contribute to oppression and inequities (FARIAS et al., 2016; GERLACH et al., 2017; RUDMAN, 2013). Uncritical acceptance of these conditions of possibility can also lead to theoretical imperialism and cognitive injustice involving the promotion of particular ways of

understanding issues as universally applicable, and a failure to respect and learn from culturally diverse ways of producing, organizing and disseminating knowledge (HAMMELL, 2011; OWENS, 2017; SANTOS, 2014). As well, Farias and Rudman (2016), Farias, Rudman and Magalhães (2016) and Farias et al. (2017) have highlighted how a reliance on positivist and post-positivist assumptions risks perpetuating social and occupational injustices given that such approaches do not question how social problems have come to be framed, nor draw attention to the ways power relations simultaneously create situations of privilege and marginalization. Given that several aspects of conditions of possibility have been identified as constraining transformative possibilities, I now propose some ways forward in expanding these conditions.

## 5 Expanding Conditions of Possibility: Directions Forward

Within this section, I provide a summary of directions proposed to foster the transformative potential of occupational science and enhance its ability to work in critical alliances with occupational therapy that I have previously published within the *Journal of Occupational Science* and with colleagues in other venues (RUDMAN, 2013, 2014; RUDMAN et al., 2008; FARIAS; RUDMAN, 2016). These various publications are grounded in the writings of several critical and transformative scholars (for example, CANNELLA; LINCOLN, 2009; FREIRE, 1972; LATHER, 1986) and seek to expand conditions of possibility in occupational science. A basic argument threaded through this work is that for occupational science to fully embrace the stated intent to contribute to social transformation requires a radical reconfiguration of its sensibility, referring to the modes of thought and intellectual, emotional and ethical orientation to science and occupation that set the conditions of possibility for thinking about and doing occupational science. Such a radical sensibility can enable enhanced awareness of the socio-political processes that construct and perpetuate oppression and inequity, as well as create spaces to embrace diverse ways of conceptualizing, understanding and addressing occupation.

First, deeper engagement with critical and transformative paradigms is key to developing a radical sensibility and transformative potential. In contrast to positivist and post-positivist scientific paradigms which separate out knowledge production and application, focus on the search for universal 'truths', and value an objectivist researcher stance

(FARIAS et al., 2016), critical and transformative paradigms offer up very different ideals and visions of the roles of researchers and scientific disciplines in contributing to the resolution of social problems (MERTENS, 2010). Based on a conceptualization of research as a resource for social change (MILLS, 1959), researchers operating in these inter-related paradigms consciously work against social structures and systems that result in oppression, and take up an ethical responsibility to engage with communities, disrupt what has come to be seen as inevitable, and work towards social transformation (DENZIN; GIARDINA, 2009). Such research counters what Freire named fatalism, that is, an acceptance of the discursive message that there is nothing that can be done to change reality even when it is tragic in its implications (ROSSATTO, 2004). Research is conceptualized as a form of praxis that seeks to inter-connect research and action towards re-building practices, systems, relations and structures in ways that support human rights (FRASER; NAPLES, 2004). Moreover, research plays a crucial role in imagining new forms of societal organization and emancipation through dialogue and collaboration (DENZIN, 2002). As such, in integrating critical and transformative paradigmatic assumptions, occupational science can move forward in its vision of being a resource for social transformation that opens up spaces for imagining and enacting different ways of researching, addressing and doing occupation.

Moving in critical, transformative directions also involves challenging dualistic thinking (RUDMAN, 2014). Dualistic thinking, which is a common form of thinking embedded in post-positivist approaches to research, separates issues into two categories as exclusive and exhaustive terms; for example, objective and subjective, scientists and practitioners, or facts and values. In turn, such categories can come to be seen as oppositional, knowledge generation can become focused on characteristics that delineate each, and particular categories can become designated as more valuable. Rather than seeing such categories as absolute dichotomies, critical scholarship aims to see them as expressing tensions that scholars should strive to integrate (CHRISTIANS, 2011). Within occupational science, authors have pointed to an array of dualisms which constrain scholarship, such as qualitative and quantitative, individuals and environments, and art and science (CUTCHIN, 2012; FRANK, 2012). As one example, the dichotomy of basic science and applied science has permeated debates regarding occupational science and its relationship to occupational therapy since the discipline was formally named. This division had been used in efforts to demarcate the boundaries between the domains of occupational science

and occupational therapy research, attempting to construct a dividing line and protect the domain of each (RUDMAN et al., 2008). However, critical scholars contend that this dichotomy can be counter-productive in that a dialectic interplay between various forms of knowledge production can serve to bridge artificial divides between 'theoretical' and 'practical' questions and concerns (RYLKO-BAUER et al., 2006). With respect to critical, transformative scholarship, the basic-applied dichotomy, and other inter-related dualisms, need to be challenged and new ways to creatively bridge such dualisms are required.

A key aim of critical and transformative scholarship is to connect the everyday to larger political and economic questions, and to reveal how inequities and injustices are socially and politically produced (MUMBY, 2004). Exemplars of critical, transformative scholarship that connect everyday occupation to larger social, political, historical and other types of forces exist in occupational science. As one example, in their qualitative case study, Cloete and Ramugondo (2015) drew on critical occupational science to address alcohol consumption during pregnancy amongst females living in poverty in rural South Africa. Their analysis examines the interplay of historical, cultural, economic and socio-political factors that shape what they come to frame as 'imposed occupations' through structural entrenchment, including that of drinking alcohol during pregnancy. As another example, work by Rivas-Quarneti, Movilla-Fernández and Magalhães (2017) engaged critical occupational science and epistemologies of the South in a participatory study on immigrant women from Latin America living in Spain in the context of economic crisis and the domestic work sector. Their findings address the impact of structural violence on occupations and raise awareness of occupational struggles to survive, the ways in which occupation can be oppressive, and how occupation is used to resist. In addition, they present an action agenda toward occupational justice generated through dialogue with their participants. It is important to build on these emerging foundations within critical occupational science and take up a range of methodologies that enable moving forward in critically situating and politicizing occupation. Situating occupation involves viewing occupation as always inseparable from contextual conditions and social forces, while politicizing occupation encompasses addressing power relations that present barriers to occupations for particular types of collectives and individuals. Situating and politicizing occupation involves, for example, examining how possibilities for occupation are differentially created in relation to social conditions such as gender, age, and ability

status; how governing and the creation of difference occurs through occupation; and how occupation can both perpetuate and resist relations of power (ANGELL, 2014; RUDMAN, 2013; RUDMAN; HUOT, 2013).

Moving forward in critical, transformative directions in occupational science also involves addressing the moral and political values that shape and energize research. Critical scholars deviate from the espoused objectivity of science embedded in positivist and post positivist paradigms and argue that all science involves acting morally and politically (CANNELLA; LINCOLN, 2009). As stated by Farias et al. (2016),

critical practitioners and researchers assume that the type of knowledge being sought in critical research is far from being value-free or universally true, and therefore consider it essential to conduct ongoing interrogation of their political or moral stance, ideology and positionality... (p. 237).

With occupational science, scholars have raised questions regarding the extent to which occupational scientists have been seduced by the notion of objectivity, and have challenged scholars seeking to engage in transformative work to articulate their moral and political positions as well as standpoints on what they mean by justice, rights and other values that frame their work (FRANK, 2012; MAGALHÃES, 2012).

As a final direction, critical, transformative work emphasizes questioning what has come to be seen as the 'status quo', that is, what has come to be taken-for-granted as the way things are or have to be (CANNELLA; LINCOLN, 2009). Questioning the status quo, which involves working to step outside the dominant structures and modes of thought in which scholars themselves are embedded, is a challenging, on-going, dynamic process (RUDMAN; DENNHARDT, 2015). One key strategy to engage in this questioning process forwarded by critical scholars is to continuously work to make the unfamiliar more familiar and treat the familiar as a source of astonishment (GANE; BACK, 2012). For example, this would involve pushing scholarship in occupational science beyond occupations that are socially sanctioned or normative within dominant societal groups (KIEPEK et al., 2014), and questioning long-standing assumptions about occupation that have become factoids that circulate through our literature (POLLARD et al., 2010). Such exploration and questioning is vital to enhance openness to diverse ways of knowing and doing, as well as to embracing democratized, participatory practices that involve working with collectives experiencing marginalization

(FARIAS et al., 2017). As well, intercultural dialogue and translation is essential to create new possibilities for knowing and doing, but this must be done in ways that avoid perpetuating relations of power in which particular ways of knowing and doing are positioned as more legitimate (SANTOS, 2014). Thus, challenging the status quo is an on-going process that requires continued engagement in critical reflexivity as individuals and amongst collectives, and a "permanent exercise of cultural sensitivity, political awareness and self-awareness" (GALHEIGO, 2011, p. 60).

## 6 Conclusion

The key aim of this paper has been to forward a particular vision for the relationship between occupational science and occupational therapy based on forging critical alliances committed to occupation-based socially transformative work. This paper has focused on directions within occupational science that can optimize its potential as a critical ally, arguing that further radical reconfiguration of the sensibility of critical occupational science is required. Directions forward to expand conditions of possibility that shape occupational science scholarship were proposed. Working as critical allies can provide a solid foundation for occupational therapy and occupational science to collaboratively expand partnerships, with collectives experiencing marginalization, other disciplines, and diverse stakeholders, aimed at enacting a shared vision of supporting human flourishing through occupation.

## References

- ANGELL, A. M. Occupation-centered analysis of social difference: Contributions to a socially responsive occupational science. *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 21, n. 2, p. 104-116, 2014.
- BRUGGEN, H. V. Mind the gap, addressing inequalities in health through occupation-based practices. In: SAKELLARIOU, D.; POLLARD, N. *Occupational therapies without borders: Integrating justice with practice*. London: Elsevier, 2017. p. 411-423.
- CANNELLA, G. S.; LINCOLN, Y. S. Deploying qualitative methods for critical social purposes. In: DENZIN, N. K.; GIARDINA, M. D. *Qualitative inquiry and social justice: Towards a politics of hope*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, 2009. p. 53-72.
- CHRISTIANS, C. G. Ethics and politics in qualitative research. In: DENZIN, N. K.; LINCOLN, Y. S. *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. Los Angeles: Sage, 2011. p. 61-90.

- CLOETE, L. G.; RAMUGONDO, E. I drink: mothers' alcohol consumption as both individualized and imposed occupation. *South African Journal of Occupational Therapy*, Hatfield, v. 45, n. 1, p. 1-8, 2015.
- CUTCHIN, M. The art and science of occupation: nature, inquiry and the aesthetics of living. *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 20, n. 4, p. 286-297, 2012.
- DENZIN, N. K. Social work in the seventh moment. *Qualitative Social Work*, United States, v. 1, n. 1, p. 25-38, 2002.
- DENZIN, N. K.; GIARDINA, M. D. Qualitative inquiry and social justice: towards a politics of hope. In: DENZIN, N. K.; GIARDINA, M. D. *Qualitative inquiry and social justice: Towards a politics of hope*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, 2009. p. 11-52.
- DICKIE, V. Craft production in detroit: spatial, temporal and social relations of work in the home. *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 3, n. 2, p. 65-71, 1996.
- FARIAS, L. et al. Reclaiming the potential of transformative scholarship to enable social justice. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, Canada, v. 16, n. 1, p. 1-10, 2017.
- FARIAS, L.; RUDMAN, D. L. A critical interpretive synthesis of the uptake of critical perspectives in occupational science. *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 23, n. 1, p. 33-50, 2016.
- FARIAS, L.; RUDMAN, D. L.; MAGALHÃES, L. Illustrating the importance of critical epistemology to realize the promise of occupational justice. *OTJR: occupation, participation and health*, Thousand Oaks, v. 36, n. 4, p. 234-243, 2016.
- FOUCAULT, M. *The order of things: an archaeology of human sciences*. London: Tavistock/Routledge, 1970.
- FRANK, G. Crafts production and resistance to domination in the 20th century. *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 3, n. 2, p. 56-64, 1996.
- FRANK, G. Occupational therapy/occupational science/occupational justice: moral commitments and global assemblages. *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 19, n. 1, p. 25-35, 2012.
- FRANK, G. Twenty-first century pragmatism and social justice: Problematic situations and occupational reconstructions in post-civil Guatemala. In: CUTCHIN, M. P.; DICKIE, V. A. *Transactional perspectives on occupation*. New York: Springer, 2013. p. 229-244.
- FRASER, N.; NAPLES, N. A. To interpret the world and to change it: An interview with Nancy Fraser. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, New York, v. 29, n. 4, p. 1103-1124, 2004.
- FREIRE, P. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 1972.
- GALHEIGO, S. M. What needs to be done? Occupational therapy responsibilities and challenges regarding human rights. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, Australia, v. 58, n. 2, p. 60-66, 2011.
- GALVAAN, R. Occupational choice: the significance of socio-economic and political factors. In: WHITEFORD, G. E.; HOCKING, C. *Occupational science: society, inclusion and participation*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. p. 152-162.
- GALVAAN, R. The contextually situated nature of occupational choice: marginalized young adolescents' experiences in South Africa. *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 22, n. 1, p. 39-53, 2015.
- GANE, M.; BACK, L. C. Wright Mills 50 years on: the promise and craft of sociology revisited. *Theory, Culture & Society*, Los Angeles, v. 29, n. 7/8, p. 399-421, 2012.
- GARCIA-RUIZ, S. Occupational therapy in a globalized world. In: SAKELLARIOU, D.; POLLARD, N. *Occupational therapies without borders: Integrating justice with practice*. London: Elsevier, 2017. p. 185-193.
- GERLACH, A. J. et al. Expanding beyond individualism: Engaging critical perspectives on occupation. *Scandinavian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, London, v. 25, n. 1, p. 35-43, 2017.
- GUAJARDO, A.; MONDACA, M. Human rights, occupation therapy and the centrality of social practices. In: SAKELLARIOU, D.; POLLARD, N. *Occupational therapies without borders: Integrating justice with practice*. London: Elsevier, 2017. p. 102-108.
- HAMMELL, K. W. Resisting theoretical imperialism in the disciplines of occupational science and occupational therapy. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, London, v. 74, n. 1, p. 27-33, 2011.
- HOCKING, C. Occupations through the looking glass: Reflecting on occupational scientists' ontological assumptions. In: WHITEFORD, G. E.; HOCKING, C. *Occupational science: society, inclusion and participation*. West Sussex: Blackwell, 2012. p. 54-68.
- HOCKING, C.; WHITEFORD, G. E. Introduction to critical perspectives in occupational science. In: WHITEFORD, G. E.; HOCKING, C. *Occupational science: society, inclusion and participation*. West Sussex: Blackwell, 2012. p. 3-7.
- JACKSON, J. Is there a place for role theory in occupational science? *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 5, n. 2, p. 56-65, 1998.
- KANTARTZIS, S.; MOLINEUX, M. Understanding the discursive development of occupation: Historico-political perspectives. In: WHITEFORD, G. E.; HOCKING, C. *Occupational science: society, inclusion and participation*. West Sussex: Blackwell, 2012. p. 38-53.
- KIEPEK, N.; PHELAN, S.; MAGALHÃES, L. Introducing a critical analysis of the figured world of occupation. *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 24, n. 1, p. 403-417, 2014.
- LATHER, P. Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review*, Cambridge, v. 56, n. 3, p. 257-277, 1986.
- LUNT, A. Occupational science and occupational therapy: negotiating the boundary between a discipline and a



- profession. *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 49, n. 2, p. 56-61, 1997.
- MAGALHÃES, L. et al. *The development of occupational science outside the Anglophone sphere: enacting global collaboration*. SSO: Portland, 2016.
- MAGALHÃES, L. What would Paulo Freire think of occupational science? In: WHITEFORD, G. E.; HOCKING, C. *Occupational science: society, inclusion and participation*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. p. 8-19.
- MALFITANO, A. P. S. et al. Social occupational therapy: Conversations about a Brazilian experience. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, Ottawa, v. 81, n. 5, p. 298-307, 2014.
- MERTENS, D. M. Transformative mixed methods research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, Los Angeles, v. 16, n. 6, p. 469-474, 2010.
- MILLS, C. W. *The sociological imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- MOLINEUX, M.; WHITEFORD, G. Occupational science: genesis, evolution and future contributions. In: DUNCAN, E. A. S. *Foundations for practice in occupational therapy*. Sydney: Elsevier, 2011. p. 243-253.
- MOLKE, D.; RUDMAN, D. L.; POLATAJKO, H. J. The promise of occupational science: a developmental assessment of an emerging academic discipline. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, Ottawa, v. 71, n. 5, p. 269-280, 2004.
- MOSEY, A. C. Partition of occupational science and occupational therapy. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, Rockville, v. 46, n. 9, p. 851-853, 1992.
- MUMBY, D. K. Discourse, power and ideology: unpacking the critical approach. In: GRANT, D. et al. *The Sage handbook of organizational discourse studies*. Los Angeles: Sage, 2004. p. 237-258.
- OWENS, L. Our professional existence is political: Critical reflections on 'seeing white' in occupational therapy. In: SAKELLARIOU, D.; POLLARD, N. *Occupational therapies without borders: integrating justice with practice*. London: Elsevier, 2017. p. 194-202.
- PHELAN, S. Constructions of disability: A call for critical reflexivity in occupational therapy. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, Ottawa, v. 78, n. 3, p. 164-172, 2011.
- PIERCE, D. Occupational science: a powerful disciplinary knowledge base for occupational therapy. In: PIERCE, D. *Occupational science for occupational therapy*. Thorofare: Slack Inc, 2014. p. 1-10.
- POLLARD, N.; SAKELLARIOU, D. The occupational therapist as a political being. *Cadernos Brasileiros de Terapia Ocupacional*, São Carlos, v. 22, n. 3, p. 641-662, 2014.
- POLLARD, N.; SAKELLARIOU, D.; LAWSON-PORTER, A. Will occupational science facilitate or divide the practice of occupational therapy? *International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation*, London, v. 17, n. 1, p. 648-654, 2010.
- RIVAS-QUARNETI, N.; MOVILLA-FERNÁNDEZ, M. J.; MAGHALHÃES, L. Immigrant women's occupational struggles during the socioeconomic crisis in Spain: Broadening occupational justice conceptualization. *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 2, p. 1-13, 2017.
- ROSSATTO, C. A. *Engaging Paulo Freire's pedagogy of possibility: from blind to transformative optimism*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2004.
- RUDMAN, D. L. Embracing and enacting an occupational imagination: occupational science as transformative. *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 21, n. 4, p. 373-388, 2014.
- RUDMAN, D. L. Enabling the critical potential of occupational science: Problematizing the individualizing of occupation. *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 20, n. 4, p. 298-313, 2013.
- RUDMAN, D. L. et al. A vision for occupational science: Reflecting on our disciplinary culture. *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 15, n. 3, p. 136-146, 2008.
- RUDMAN, D. L.; ALDRICH, R. Occupational science. In: CURTIN, M.; EGAN, M. *Occupational therapy for physical dysfunction*. Boston: Elsevier, 2017. p. 17-27.
- RUDMAN, D. L.; DENNHARDT, S. Discourse analysis: using critical discourse analysis to situate occupation and occupational therapy. In: NAYAR, S.; STANLEY, M. *Qualitative research methodologies for occupational therapy and occupational science*. New York: Routledge, 2015. p. 137-154.
- RUDMAN, D. L.; HUOT, S. Conceptual insights for expanding thinking regarding the situated nature of occupation. In: CUTCHIN, M. P.; DICKIE, V. A. *Transactional perspectives on occupation*. New York: Springer, 2013. p. 51-64.
- RYLKO-BAUER, B.; SINGER, M.; WILLIGEN, J. Reclaiming applied anthropology: its past, present and future. *American Anthropologist*, Pennsylvania, v. 108, n. 1, p. 178-190, 2006.
- SANTOS, B. D. S. *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. Boulder: Paradigm publishers, 2014.
- TOWNSEND, E. Occupation: potential for social and personal transformation. *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 4, n. 1, p. 18-26, 1997.
- WATSON, R.; SWARTZ, L. *Transformation through occupation*. London: Whurr Publishers, 2004.
- WILCOCK, A.; TOWNSEND, E. Occupational terminology interaction dialogue. *Journal of Occupational Science*, London, v. 7, p. 84-86, 2000.
- WILSON, J.; MAGALHÃES, L. Can critical inquiry differ from criticism? A dialogue with current occupational science and occupational therapy schools of inquiry. *Cadernos Brasileiros de Terapia Ocupacional*, São Carlos, v. 24, n. 3, p. 639-638, 2016.
- YERXA, E. J. et al. Occupational science: the foundation for new models of practice. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*, London, v. 6, n. 4, p. 1-17, 1989.