

Reflection Article/Essay

Why an Occupational Science in Latin America? Possible relationships with Occupational Therapy from a pragmatist perspective

Por que uma Ciência Ocupacional na América Latina? Possíveis relações com a Terapia Ocupacional com base em uma perspectiva pragmatista

Rodolfo Morrison^a , Carla Regina Silva^b , Ricardo Lopes Correia^c , Luciana Wertheimer^d 

^aUniversidade do Chile, Santiago, Chile.

^bUniversidade Federal de São Carlos – UFSCar, São Carlos, SP, Brasil.

^cUniversidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro – UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil.

^dAssociação Brasileira de Terapia Ocupacional, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil

How to cite: Morrison, R., Silva, C. R., Correia, R. L., & Wertheimer, L. (2021). Why an Occupational Science in Latin America? Possible relationships with Occupational Therapy from a pragmatist perspective. *Cadernos Brasileiros de Terapia Ocupacional*, 29, e2081. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2526-8910.ctoEN2081>

Abstract

This essay deals with Occupational Science from the hegemonic and (re) known history of Occupational Therapy in the world, and we ask ourselves “Why an Occupational Science in Latin America?”. For this, we present a critical perspective on Occupational Science, retrieving evidence about its institutionalization, discourses, and repercussions on the validation and identity of Occupational Therapy. With that, we verified similarities and distinctions between both disciplines, considering, above all, that the studies of and about human occupation always existed even before their creation. This allows us to affirm that there is no dependency relationship between Occupational Therapy and Occupational Science, as in the initial discourses of its creation. However, we must consider that both are complementary and not dependent and that together or separately they are directed towards social transformations. It seems to us that in the context of Latin America this understanding is not a reality, since the engendering of issues that still maintain the status of 'identity crisis' in Occupational Therapy makes it difficult to understand other mechanisms of reading about the stories and foundations of the area, such as the processes of colonization and confrontation and recognition of our epistemic bases.

Keywords: History, Knowledge, Professional Practice, Occupational Therapy.

Received on Apr. 9, 2020; 1st Revision on June 11, 2020; Accepted on July 7, 2020.



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Resumo

O presente ensaio aborda a Ciência Ocupacional com base na história hegemônica e (re)conhecida da terapia ocupacional no mundo, a partir da qual nos perguntamos: “Por que uma Ciência Ocupacional na América Latina?”. Para responder a tal questionamento, apresentamos uma perspectiva crítica sobre a Ciência Ocupacional, resgatando evidências sobre a sua institucionalização, discursos e rebatimentos à validação e à identidade da Terapia Ocupacional. Com isso, verificamos semelhanças e distinções entre ambas as disciplinas, considerando, sobretudo, que os estudos da e sobre a ocupação humana sempre existiram mesmo antes de sua criação. Isso nos permite afirmar que não há uma relação de dependência da Terapia Ocupacional com a Ciência Ocupacional, como nos discursos iniciais de sua criação. No entanto, devemos considerar que ambas são complementares e não dependentes, e que, juntas ou separadas, direcionam-se para as transformações sociais. Parece-nos que no contexto da América Latina essa compreensão não é uma realidade, visto que o engendramento das questões que ainda mantêm o *status* de “crise identitária” da Terapia Ocupacional dificulta a compreensão de outros mecanismos de leitura sobre as histórias e fundamentos da área, como os processos de colonização e de confronto e reconhecimento de nossas bases epistêmicas.

Palavras-chave: História, Conhecimento, Prática Profissional, Terapia Ocupacional.

Introduction

This essay addresses the traditional history of Occupational Science, its (re) known, approaches, and divergences in Occupational Therapy in the world, especially in Latin America. Thus, we propose a critical analysis to build a more current panorama between the disciplines, elaborated based on the answers to these questions: Why an Occupational Science? Is not Occupational Therapy dedicated to studying, knowing, investigating, and promoting occupation? How are these issues being addressed in the context of Latin America?¹

Therefore, in the first section of this article, we highlight the foundational context of Occupational Science, its origins, foundations, and definitions, together with the historical and current perspectives of the creation of an area of knowledge in Occupational Therapy. Then, we discuss the processes that constituted and constitute the visions in Occupational Science, proposing a critical perspective for the Latin American context.

The critical perspective adopted in this article is based on the pragmatic epistemology of Charles Peirce as a challenge to absolute truths of the socio-historical reality. Criticism allows the constant construction of doubts that allow the development of new, more complex, and integrated perspectives, generating new habits (Morrison, 2017). In this

¹ To make a conceptual distinction between profession and discipline, without centering on the dichotomy, we could resort to Kuhn's proposals on scientific communities and disciplinary paradigms (Kuhn, 1970). Based on these perspectives, a discipline is understood as a set of structured knowledge that allows the identification of a particular object of study, since the profession would allow the technical and practical exercise of a discipline, guided more by an applied view of knowledge. However, we consider these distinctions only as a level of didactic and abstract understanding, because we consider that in reality these distinctions merge and are not clearly identifiable, as is the case with Occupational Therapy and its relationship with Occupational Science. In theory, the first would be a profession and the second a discipline, but this would be a dichotomous and reduced form for understanding both.

sense, Pragmatism is taken in this article less as a methodology and more as an orientation axis to support the identification of the problems between Occupational Therapy and Occupational Science. It is also used for the construction of critical notes and outcomes, which are less as answers to problems and more as an understanding of complex socio-historical-cultural layers of the institutionalization processes of these disciplines. Still, it is important to consider that, in the use of the “critical perspective”, in the same sense, it does not refer to Critical Theory, but “criticism” as an attentive position, situated and contextualized in the old and new dilemmas that impose certain habits and fixed beliefs in the construction of science.

Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy have become institutionalized as areas of scientific knowledge and with very similar objects. Therefore, we urge for theories and paradigms that dimension explanations and structures regarding their objects of knowledge and, above all, as Rudman (2018) says, to find powerful ways to collaborate with the transformation of the world in the perspective of occupation.

The authors of this article defend an understanding that both Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy today, are distinct disciplines, arising from their foundational and epistemological processes, and have convergences regarding the focus on studies of occupation and possibilities for methodological, conceptual productions and mutual tools for the transformation of social reality.

This debate, in the Latin American context, has been gaining strength and importance since the 2000s, showing the efforts to elevate Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy as areas of knowledge to promote the occupation in improving the quality of different populations.

Foundational Context of Occupational Science

From the historical records, both Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy at different times, appear as disciplines interested in human occupation as a complex phenomenon. In the early 1900s, Occupational Therapy emerges as a professional interested in occupation as a means and an end to intervention with people or groups in conditions of vulnerability with the loss of qualifying and organizing their routines, as to dimensions for the participation of social life. Subsequently, in the late 1980s, Occupational Science began as a basic and interdisciplinary science focused on studies of occupation, as a unit and/or object of academic study to understand how people and groups do/produce occupations in their daily lives (Zemke & Clark, 1996).

Elizabeth Yerxa initially proposed Occupational Science. She is an Occupational Therapist and professor at the University of Southern California, the USA in a postgraduate program at the doctoral level. The context of the emergence of Occupational Science was due to the need to create and defend, at the level of other Sciences, structures and laws that could govern the intervention of Occupational Therapy, offering scientific bases and conditions to understand/explain the different ways as individuals and collectives create and produce their occupations in a given reality (Yerxa, 1990).

Thus, initially, occupation as an intervention tool for Occupational Therapy and an object of study for Occupational Science is a more normative distinction (Morrison, 2013).

By identifying and articulating a scientific basis for practice, Occupational Science can provide professionals with support for what they do, justify the meaning of occupational therapy for health, and differentiate occupational therapy from other disciplines. This may provide a new understanding of what it means to be chronically disabled in American society, allowing occupational therapists to be more effective advocates and allies for/with people with disabilities. Occupational Science can help the profession to contribute new knowledge and skills for the eradication of complex problems that affect everyone in society. But most importantly, it will provide the occupational therapist with ideas and effective approaches to practice, allowing them to do a better job with patients (Yerxa, 1990, p. 3).

This dichotomy between disciplines seems to be an answer given to the American context of adjusting the production of knowledge around the intervention object of Occupational Therapy. Throughout its development, especially from the 1950s, it was supported by the mechanistic models of Medicine, as a process of internal and, above all, external validation. As a result, there was the production of biomedical practices in physical and psychiatric rehabilitation, and functionality was prioritized over the involvement in everyday occupations, or as a disease that affected a person's life.

Therefore, in the early years of Occupational Science, the search/rescue for the “real” foundations of human occupation became an emerging issue. However, this did not necessarily produce a validation or notion of identity for Occupational Therapy, even in the USA. This is because, since its foundation, Occupational Therapy has already been based on a body of knowledge about the occupation as a phenomenon, and its use as an intervention in several realities (Gordon, 2002).

In our perspective, this understanding justified the foundation of Occupational Therapy as a new profession and not just a technique that could be used by other professions. Eleanor Clarke Slagle already understood the importance and specificity of having a profession that promoted the good use of time and well-being by the occupation, and, therefore, already understood the limits that defined her identity (Slagle, 1934a).

Thus, it is possible to understand Occupational Science as another discipline, different from Occupational Therapy. However, it appeared almost in overlap to offer basic structures and laws to explain occupational realities, within a traditional scientific system. It propagated a unique political discourse for the time, that, before Occupational Science, Occupational Therapy did not produce knowledge and had no identity, or that it would have lost it in its object of intervention (Frank, 2012).

From our point of view and contextualized in literature and pragmatism, especially in the first years of the foundation of Occupational Science published by Yerxa (1990), the understanding of the spread of the unique discourse refers to the argument that the creation of this new science would promote responses to a “gap” in knowledge in Occupational Therapy, above all, to supply the absence of primary bases to justify, explain and conduct the occupational reality of different populations, in the same way, inserting occupation as a possible determinant of states and conditions of health. This initial argument produced, in a way, waves of social representations about Occupational Therapy, disregarding part of the knowledge-centered on the occupation that drove its

foundation, from its antecedents at Hull-House until 1917, with the foundation of the National Society for the Promotion of Occupational Therapy, with Slagle (Morrison, 2017), and the complex notion of interdisciplinarity in the formation of the scientific object of knowledge in occupation.

Thus, understanding that knowledge is built out of nothing and that new idea is based on criticisms of previous perspectives (Kuhn, 1970), the truth will always be in constant transformation, as proposed by the Pragmatist Philosophy.

In this same direction, Mary Reilly, recognized by occupational scientists as the precursor of Occupational Science, inaugurated the studies of Occupational Behavior from the constitutive principles of Occupational Therapy. In this way and due to the context, the most current Occupational Science has recovered the initial foundations proposed by Meyer, Slagle, and other important historical characters of the time, rethinking their theories for today (Kielhofner, 2009). It has also sought to focus on the relationship between occupation and health (initially), eradicating complex problems that affect society, providing new knowledge about the occupation, and providing new theoretical tools to occupational therapists (Yerxa, 1990).

Thus, in our analysis, we do not consider that the foundation of Occupational Science disregarded the entire history of Occupational Therapy, but probably ignored the epistemic complexity of building an object of knowledge, simplifying it in technical rationality versus basic discipline, inspiring it according to the model of the natural sciences and justifying the arguments in the structure and political and systematic tension of Postgraduate Studies in the political-socio-cultural context of the USA at that time (Frank, 2012; Morrison, 2013).

After all, it is an area full of struggles and disputes, so there are different strategies and epistemic-political devices for the evidence or invisibility also in the social life of Sciences (Bourdieu, 2004). Based on pragmatism, as argued by Morrison (2017), in the construction of a science, the knowledge that had repercussions in practice and accepted among their peers is considered valid. Therefore, an understanding of the totality of an object must consider its effects on moving reality. This often implies forgetting previous knowledge, resulting in a posture that places the object of knowledge as unique and original.

Returning to Occupational Science, its development has not been the same worldwide. In Latin America, for example, these epistemological constructions coexist with a production that does not refer only to the occupation, but also to other senses and meanings based on other technical-scientific understandings and logics (Simó et al., 2016; Trujillo Rojas et al., 2011; Núñez, 2019). Such understanding produces a polyphonic, polysemic discourse² and a series of terms are used to show the doings and the construction of knowledge in Occupational Therapy, and human and daily activities, which stand out among the most widely used constructs in Brazil (Lima et al., 2013; Salles & Matsukura, 2013; Poellnitz, 2018; Poellnitz & Silva, 2019).

Thus, Occupational Science can have different names, depending on the region in which it was created or in the process of institutionalization (Magalhães et al., 2019). Predominantly in English-speaking countries, it is called Occupational Science, with

² This does not mean that in the Anglophone literature the concept of occupation is not polysemic. This statement refers to its use in practice and in the usual discourses of Latin American occupational therapy.

“occupational” being politically associated with the idea of occupation as a specific object of study and different from the concepts arising from Geography, Sociology, and Anthropology as studies of mobility, appropriation, and use of land and/or social space; and, Occupation Science, as used mostly in Latin America, but without any precise or institutionalized conceptual dimension.

Although occupational therapists study research and use Occupation Science in Latin America, the only scientific association that brings together scholars and professionals from around the occupation studies is the Sociedad Chilena de Ciencias de la Ocupación (SoChCO), initiated by occupational therapists from Chile in 2006. Since its creation, SoChCO has been working to define constructs that guide the understanding of occupation in the Chilean context, especially for the social aspects that determine the Latin American reality and developing research to support the strengthening of discipline, as well as the production of knowledge for an Occupational Therapy based on occupation (Álvarez et al., 2007).

The factors that contributed and contribute to the incorporation of Occupational Science in the Latin American context are still not very evident, but, without a doubt, one of them is the identity validation as a definition of the object and scientific-social scope/recognition (Morrison et al., 2017).

For a better understanding, we need to contextualize the beginning of Occupational Therapy. When it was instituted in the 1950s in Latin America, the profession was institutionalized under the sieve of the reductionist paradigm experienced in the American context. Conditional on biomedical and functional fundamentals, it was technically focused on the demands of medical “rehabilitation” services (Monzeli et al., 2019; Cardinalli, 2017; Testa, 2012; Soares, 1991).

In this way, “functional activity” or “therapeutic activity” began to be applied as an occupational therapeutic method and valued for its resources, and not necessarily for the initial constructs on occupation while being involved in social life. Thus, we will verify that the identity (object) of Occupational Therapy in Latin America is born in a context of crisis, and that, throughout its development, it will change its meaning, which will certainly change the entire historical course of the profession (Morrison, 2018). One of the inheritances promoted in this path is related to the lack of understanding that many occupational therapists have about their profession, their specificity, methods, techniques, or approaches that do not differ, for example, from other professions. Thus, the official version of the American Occupational Science seems at some point, to be in the Latin American context as one that will also rescue *Occupational Therapy from this crisis* and try to look for a “central axis of its identity”.

This statement imposes divergences and misunderstandings propagated on the relationship between Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy in Latin America, considering, above all, the delay and resistance to the international debate on this issue (Magalhães et al., 2019), and the difficulties we have put into the debate and confront our epistemic structures for the understanding of Latin American Occupational Therapy.

We observe an expected process in addition to Occupational Therapy as it is a region systematically explored by the colonists of the global North, in the past and the present, which greatly dilute the ability of Latin America to think about itself, producing a functioning “disbelief” about their ability to be.

In this case, even in the “eternal” identity-colonizing crisis of Latin American Occupational Therapy, occupational therapists made many technical-epistemic investments, who began to institute different ways of doing Occupational Therapy. Many of them displaced from the dominant and colonizing axis, recognizing Occupational Therapy also as an area of knowledge, responsible for producing practices and knowledge for urgent problems located in the Latin American region and the world, although the processes of silencing and repression are undeniable towards the production of resistance to hegemonic epistemic models. There is also the reproduction of these models without necessarily their critical uses, contextualized for Latin American reality and in a constant clash of the field in a subservient way.

Thus, the idea of the object of a discipline (or profession) must contemplate not only the essentialist and isolated search of the questions and structures of a nucleus but also the analysis of the transformations of the historical-social processes that, due to convergences and conflicts, question the production of the object of knowledge (Padúa & Feriotti, 2013).

In this sense, we need to consider the process of historical, political, and cultural development of a scientific discipline, as it is read, interpreted, and incorporated in a given time and space, based on epistemic and social situations by the researchers, professionals, and interlocutors.

Occupational Therapy was Born as an Area of Knowledge about Human Occupation

The historical (re) construction, which highlights the origin of Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy as scientific disciplines that focus on studying occupation, start before the 1980s.

Morrison addressed epistemological pillars for the initial formation of Occupational Therapy in his doctoral thesis, based on a feminist perspective. The author contributed to the history of Occupational Therapy by revealing the invisibility of extremely important women, little mentioned and recognized, given the evident imposition of gender that crosses the history of humanity. Thus, there is a whole body of knowledge and theories associated with them, based on the occupation that was not considered by the official history of Occupational Therapy (Morrison, 2014).

Although we have some authors who punctuate about this (Breines, 1986; Gordon, 2002), there still seems to be no current importance on the subject and this is for several reasons. We consider that the main one is related to the way to understand knowledge always “ahead”, that is, to consider the construction of knowledge from the present, hierarchizing the knowledge in a way that the current always looks better than the previous one. This process devalues and, often, directs history, before knowing or considering it in a longitudinal socio-historical context. Another associated issue refers to a hegemonic view of history that considers the construction of knowledge in a synchronous, unique, and linear way.

In this sense, the historicity and the “external-social” conditions of the generation of the same knowledge are denied; that is, in the pragmatist sense, to build a state of a fixed belief that does not doubt itself and constitutes itself as a habit-belief that replicates in a non-reflective and permanent way, without questioning its bases (Morrison, 2017).

Thus, over time, the paradigms in and of the profession have been transformed to respond to certain contextualized demands in socio-historical processes, composing, in multiple ways, the different fields of forces that constitute them (Bourdieu, 2004).

The hegemonic and reproduced history of Occupational Science reports its beginning with the question “what is occupation?”, “How do people occupy themselves?” in the search for building convergences in the relationship between occupation and health. However, this was already said years ago with the works of Slagle (Morrison, 2014). Almost 70 years after the birth of Occupational Therapy in the United States, Occupational Science still questions “what is an occupation”, and still often considers it as a recent issue for occupational therapists.

When we return to the history of Occupational Therapy and its initial or foundational ideas such as Moral Treatment, the Arts and Crafts Movement, Pragmatism, or Mental Hygiene (Breines, 1986; Morrison, 2017; Quiroga, 1995), occupational therapists, some doctors and architects are beginning to reflect on how doing and/or occupations can improve people's health and quality of life. However, it is not just the “simple doing”, they talked about a prolonged doing with meaning and that was important to the person and that should guide the intervention of the occupational therapist (Meyer, 1977; Slagle, 1922, 1934a).

Therefore, the occupation comes to be understood as a treatment, like a disease prevention, as an educational process, and as a tool for social participation. Studies, reflections, and analyzes of occupation become the epistemic and instrumental basis of Occupational Therapy, not being different perspectives, and deconstructing the idea of basic and applied science.

For example, Eleanor Clarke Slagle stressed that the use of occupations in the treatment of illnesses or with people with disabilities was not a new idea, but rather, conscious planning and the development of a progressive program based on rest, play, work and exercise, that is, an occupational program (Slagle, 1922, 1934a, 1934b). The *balance* or occupational balance was one of the principles of Occupational Therapy since the balance in the involvement in occupations helps in the establishment of health and well-being.

Slagle (1934b) also considered that there was a “vital energy” that stimulated the performance of occupations, except that, in the case of psychiatric patients, that energy was “disorganized” or changed into a “nervous energy” (Gordon, 2002), according to Slagle (1934b), producing disordered and irruptive behaviors. Also, “doing for the sake of it” might not correspond to that energy, because it could be considered as an expression of “mere excitability”. Therefore, it justified handling by an occupational therapist.

In this way, Slagle (1934b) explains that the therapeutic value of an exercise is recognized in connection with medical treatments, but these would be monotonous or very formal and uninteresting to patients. However, Occupational Therapy would recognize the meaning of the mental attitude that people take for their disease and would try to make that attitude healthier, providing activities adapted to the individual capacities of each patient, trying to divert their attention from their problems, or seeking ways to solve them. Thus, occupation takes on a special and differentiated value from doing, placing activities in the everyday context (Slagle, 1934b).

Thus, the conception of the activity with a purpose, meaning, occupational balance, reflections on occupation, research on occupation, and many other ways of studying and investigating human occupation did not appear only from the eighties, but, since the beginning of the foundation and institutionalization of Occupational Therapy.

However, many English-language studies have advanced in the “critical turn” of Occupational Science, as Rudman (2018) argues, understanding the constitution and effects of occupation by political, economic, cultural, and social forces, in particular colonial and imperialist values of the Global North. Still, in Latin America, this debate does not seem to have taken on a sufficient proportion to allow dialogue and alliances in studies and research on the international stage, as pointed out by Magalhães et al. (2019).

The authors in a survey conducted with occupational therapists from non-English-speaking countries on the incorporation of Occupational Science in their countries found that issues related to the language barrier, mostly English, the linguistic translation of constructs and concepts based on cultural values hampered access and knowledge production in Occupational Science. Contradictorily, 37% of the participants mentioned that “several people” in their countries considered the statement that Occupational Science was already incorporated into Occupational Therapy long before it was formally recognized in the USA.

Thus, why do the precepts of human occupation spread as new in the context of Latin America? Why, taking Brazil as an example, do the majority and hegemonically use the notion of activity? Why do Latin American occupational therapists question what Occupational Science is? It is necessary to retake the moment and the historical contradictions, immersed by the reductionist perspective of the profession, product of the Great Wars in Europe and North America, the change of the scientific paradigm, and the existing (colonizing) tensions and barriers in the production of knowledge about the occupation between Occupational Therapy and Occupational Science. It is also necessary to recognize Occupational Therapy as a broad and plural discipline that has produced different ways of thinking and doing its practices and building knowledge, which is why it is recognized as a profession in different sectors and fields of activity, with all courses and life cycles, in the most different contexts and issues.

The discourse to understand the profession and its concepts are directed towards a biomedical understanding reproduced for many decades. Some questions returned to gain strength in the 1960s to expand the way of understanding the profession. In the 1970s and 1980s, a lot of research began to resume discussions about occupations such as those promoted by Yerxa, Nelson, Zemke, Clarke, among others, that will reconsider the origin of Occupational Science (Kielhofner, 2009). However, it does not seem to be a new way of delimiting the field of study of occupation or producing it as a new field, but mainly it aims to resume forgotten perspectives, concepts, and practices (Morrison et al., 2016).

Thus, the criticism here about the historical centrality of occupation in the identity constitution of Occupational Therapy “lost” in the late 1970s and “rescued” by Occupational Science in the late 1980s, does not claim to say that Occupational Science has always been present in Occupational Therapy, since, again, there were occupational perspectives as central to the discipline since its foundation. Also, to some extent, there was the fundamental importance of Occupational Science in pointing out the problem

and promoting more systematic and in-depth studies on the human occupation. Of course, this is not the only way to systematize or to deepen studies on the human occupation.

Therefore, we can remember that in the 1970s, in many countries, the biomedical model of Occupational Therapy began to be questioned, and then, we have different results from the production of more social practices and conceptions, especially in Occupational Therapy from the countries of the Global South, Latin America (South America, North America - Mexico and Central America) and Africa, which, motivated by their specific socio-historical and political issues in these regions, designed another body for Occupational Therapy (Guajardo et al., 2015; Simó et al., 2016; Monzeli et al., 2019).

Saying that Occupational Science was not born as such in the 1980s does not mean that it does not exist. Occupational Science exists, it can be very valid and useful for Occupational Therapy; however, it seems to be a mistake to be understood as Occupational Therapy itself. Understanding it as a discipline derived from it, a part of it, or something directly associated with it is a better option.

Final Considerations

In this essay, we debate the similarities and divergences between Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy. We consider that they are different disciplines, instituted by specific socio-historical-cultural processes. Therefore, they deserve attention, above all, in the incorporation of their foundations in the Latin American context to identify the ways of validating the areas, the construction of professional identity, social reach, and diffusion of representations and discourses. Furthermore, although Occupational Science has been understood as a “new discipline” on the study of human occupation, it has always existed since Occupational Therapy was created, and, it should be said, even before its foundation.

Finally, we ask: Why an Occupational Science in Latin America? For the development of any knowledge and professional area, its bases need to be flexible and broad enough to promote more complex understandings and interventions in social reality. In this sense, Occupational Science collaborates with Occupational Therapy, deepening studies on human occupation, and Occupational Therapy collaborates with Occupational Science in translating responses to the demands of everyday life that require methods and approaches for the production of well-being.

We must consider that both are complementary and not dependent, and that, together or separately, they are directed towards social transformations. However, it seems to us that in the context of Latin America this understanding is not a reality, since the engendering of issues that still maintain the status of “identity crisis” in Occupational Therapy makes it difficult to understand other mechanisms of reading about the stories and fundamentals of the area, such as the processes of colonization and confrontation and recognition of our epistemic bases.

Thus, as pragmatism proposes, social transformations only take effect when one doubts the certainties that we assume as static truths (fixed states of belief). One possibility to improve our discipline lies in constant questioning and action as a central element, that is: we have to put old and new beliefs into practice. Therefore,

Occupational Science can contribute to our work if we allow introducing it into our daily practice, but properly in a critical, situated, contextualized and pertinent to our problems and realities, so urgent and complex.

References

- Álvarez, E., Gómez, S., Muñoz, I., Navarrete, E., Riveros, M. E., Rueda, L., & Valdebenito, A. (2007). Definición y desarrollo del concepto de ocupación: ensayo sobre la experiencia de construcción teórica desde una identidad local. *Revista Chilena de Terapia Ocupacional*, 7(1), 76-82.
- Bourdieu, P. (2004). *Os usos sociais da ciência: por uma sociologia clínica do campo científico*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP.
- Breines, E. (1986). *Origins and adaptations: a philosophy of practice*. New Jersey: Geri-Rehab.
- Cardinali, I. (2017). *Conhecimentos da terapia ocupacional no Brasil: um estudo sobre trajetórias e produções* (Dissertação de mestrado). Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos.
- Frank, G. (2012). The 2010 Ruth Zemke lecture in occupational science occupational therapy/occupational science/occupational justice: moral commitments and global assemblages. *Journal of Occupational Science*, 19(1), 25-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2011.607792>.
- Gordon, D. (2002). *Therapeutics and science in the history of occupational therapy* (Thesis). University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
- Gujardo, A., Kronenberg, F., & Ramugondo, E. L. (2015). Southern occupational therapies: emerging identities, epistemologies and practices. *South African Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 45(1), 3-10.
- Kielhofner, G. (2009). *Conceptual foundations of occupational therapy practice*. Philadelphia: FA Davis.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lima, E. M. F. A., Okuma, D. G., & Pastore, M. D. N. (2013). Atividade, ação, fazer e ocupação: a discussão dos termos na terapia ocupacional brasileira. *Cadernos de Terapia Ocupacional da UFSCar*, 21(2), 243-254.
- Magalhães, L., Farias, L., Rivas-Quarneti, N., Alvarez, L., & Malfitano, A. P. S. (2019). El desarrollo de la ciencia ocupacional fuera del ámbito anglófono: promoviendo la colaboración global. *Journal of Occupational Science*, 26(2), iii-xv. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2018.1551048>.
- Meyer, A. (1977). The philosophy of occupation therapy. Reprinted from the Archives of Occupational Therapy, Volume 1, pp. 1-10, 1922. *The American journal of occupational therapy: official publication of the American Occupational Therapy Association*, 31(10), 639-642. PMID: 341715.
- Monzeli, G., Morrison, R., & Lopes, R. E. (2019). Histórias da terapia ocupacional na América Latina: a primeira década de criação dos programas de formação profissional. *Cadernos Brasileiros de Terapia ocupacional*, 27(2), 235-250. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4322/2526-8910.ctoao163>.
- Morrison, R. (2013). ¿Por qué necesitamos mirar hacia atrás? Volviendo a lo esencial: un enfoque epistemológico al “árbol de la terapia ocupacional”. *Revista Electrónica de Terapia Ocupacional Galicia, TOG*, 10(18), 1-28.
- Morrison, R. (2014). *La filosofía pragmatista en la terapia ocupacional de Eleanor Clarke Slagle: antecedentes epistemológicos e históricos desde los estudios feministas sobre la ciencia* (PhD thesis). Universidad de Salamanca, España.
- Morrison, R. (2017). *Terapia ocupacional y pragmatismo. Contribuciones teóricas para la práctica*. Santiago de Chile: Editorial Universitaria.
- Morrison, R. (2018). O que une a terapia ocupacional? Paradigmas e perspectivas ontológicas da ocupação humana. *Revista Interinstitucional Brasileira de Terapia Ocupacional*, 2(1), 182-203. <https://doi.org/10.47222/2526-3544.rbto12699>.
- Morrison, R., Gomez, S., Henny, E., Tapia, M. J., & Rueda, L. (2017). Principal approaches to understanding occupation and occupational science found in the Chilean Journal of

- Occupational Therapy (2001-2012). *Occupational Therapy International*, 2017(4), 1-11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2017/5413628>.
- Morrison, R., Guajardo, A., & Schliebener, M. (2016). Conferencia: debates y reflexiones para una Ciencia de la Ocupación crítica y social. Diálogos para comprender la ocupación humana. *Revista Argentina de Terapia Ocupacional*, 1(2), 40-58.
- Núñez, C. M. V. (2019). South occupational therapies: a proposal for its understanding. *Cadernos Brasileiros de Terapia Ocupacional*, 27(3), 671-680. <https://doi.org/10.4322/2526-8910.ctoARF1859>.
- Padúa, E., & Feriotti, M. (2013). *Terapia ocupacional e complexidade. Práticas multidimensionais*. Curitiba: Editora CRVed.
- Poellnitz, J. C. V. (2018). *Atividade, cotidiano e ocupação na terapia ocupacional no Brasil: usos e conceitos em disputa* (Dissertação de mestrado). Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos.
- Poellnitz, J. C. V., & Silva, C.R. (2019). Sobre a linguagem: sentidos para uso de termos e conceitos. In C. R. Silva (Org.), *Atividades humanas e terapia ocupacional: saber-fazer, política, cultura e outras resistências* (pp. 80-96). São Paulo: HUCITEC.
- Quiroga, V. (1995). *Occupational therapy: the first thirty years, 1900-1930*. Bethesda: American Occupational Therapy Association.
- Rudman, D. (2018). Occupational therapy and occupational science: building critical and transformative alliances. *Cadernos Brasileiros de Terapia Ocupacional*, 26(1), 241-249. <https://doi.org/10.4322/2526-8910.ctoEN1246>.
- Salles, M. M., & Matsukura, T. S. (2013). Estudo de revisão sistemática sobre o uso do conceito de cotidiano no campo da terapia ocupacional no Brasil. *Cadernos de Terapia Ocupacional da UFSCar*, 21(2), 265-273. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4322/cto.2013.028>.
- Simó, S., Guajardo, A., Oliver, F. C., Galheigo, S., & García-Ruiz, S. (2016). *Terapias ocupacionales desde el Sur. Derechos humanos, ciudadanía y participación*. Chile: Editorial UACH.
- Slagle, E. C. (1922). Training aides for mental patients. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 1(1), 11-18.
- Slagle, E. C. (1934a). The occupational therapy programme in the State of New York. *The Journal of Mental Science*, 80(331), 639-649.
- Slagle, E. C. (1934b). Occupational therapy: recent methods and advances in the United States. *American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation*, 13(5), 289-298.
- Soares, L. B. T. (1991). *Terapia ocupacional: lógica do capital ou do trabalho?* São Paulo: Editora Hucitec.
- Testa, D. (2012). Aportes para el debate sobre los inicios de la profesionalización de la terapia ocupacional en Argentina. *Revista Chilena de Terapia Ocupacional*, 12(1), 72-87. <https://doi.org/10.5354/0719-5346.2012.22054>.
- Trujillo Rojas, A., Sanabria Camacho, L., Carrizosa Ferrer, L., Parra Esquivel, E., Rubio Viscaya, S., Uribe Sarmiento, J., & Méndez Montaña, J. (2011). *Ocupación: sentido, realización y libertad. Dialogos ocupacionales en torno al sujeto, la sociedad y el medio ambiente*. Bogotá: Editorial Universidad Nacional de Colombia.
- Yerxa, E. J. (1990). An introduction to occupational science, a foundation for occupational therapy in the 21st century. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*, 6(4), 1-17.
- Zemke, R., & Clark, F. (1996). *Occupational science: the evolving discipline*. Philadelphia: FA Davis Company.

Author's Contributions

Rodolfo Morrison elaborated the conception of the text. All authors contributed to the production and analyses. The author Carla Regina Silva and the author Ricardo Lopes Correia carried out the final review. All authors are responsible for the article and approved the final version of the text.

Corresponding author

Ricardo Lopes Correia
e-mail: toobiis@gmail.com

Section editor

Ana Paula Serrata Malfitano