Journal of Occupational Science
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rocc20

The 2010 Ruth Zemke Lecture in Occupational Science Occupational Therapy/Occupational Science/ Occupational Justice: Moral Commitments and Global Assemblages

Gelya Frank PhD [a]
[a] Division of Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy, Herman Ostrow School of Dentistry and Department of Anthropology , University of Southern California , Los Angeles , USA
Published online: 11 Oct 2011.

To cite this article: Gelya Frank PhD (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, DOI: 10.1080/14427591.2011.607792

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2011.607792

The 2010 Ruth Zemke Lecture in Occupational Science
Occupational Therapy/Occupational Science/ Occupational Justice: Moral Commitments and Global Assemblages

Gelya Frank

Twenty years have passed since occupational science was founded. It is time to reassess the relationship of occupational science to its roots in occupational therapy and also to reopen a discussion of some foundational assumptions. In particular, we need to situate the profession, occupational therapy, and the discipline, occupational science, in relation to the phenomenon of globalization. The internationalization of the post-World War II era, followed by the neoliberalism of the 1980s, began an erosion of state sovereignty that has empowered new formations in the global marketplace. New spaces exist for political action by non-state players, especially those concerned with human rights. Globalization did not set the stage for the founding of occupational science, but we can no longer look at the discipline outside the context of globalization. Globalization set the context for the transnational advocacy networks now operating that link occupational therapy with occupational science in service of a shared moral philosophy of social hope.

Keywords: Occupational science, Occupational therapy, Globalization, Human rights, Moral philosophy, Social hope

■ Gelya Frank, PhD, Professor, Division of Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy, Herman Ostrow School of Dentistry and Department of Anthropology, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, USA

■ Correspondence to: gfrank@usc.edu

Journal of Occupational Science 2012, 19(1), pp 25–35.
ISSN 1442-7591 print/
ISSN 2158-1576 online
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2011.607792

I accepted the task of delivering the Ruth Zemke Lecture in Occupational Science with appreciation of this honor and responsibility. Until very recently, I would have described myself on this occasion as an 'insider-outsider.' I was trained professionally as an anthropologist, with bachelors, masters, and doctoral degrees in anthropology from the University of California at Los Angeles. In 1982, I joined the faculty of the University of Southern California as a new assistant professor in the Department of Occupational Therapy. Not long after, under the leadership of occupational therapy scholar and educator Elizabeth J. Yerxa, the faculty embarked on an intensive project that led to the establishment in 1989 of the first doctoral program in a new subject called occupational science.

Most people are familiar with the 'insider-outsider' description as the characteristic stance of the anthropologist as a participant observer. I did not come to occupational therapy and occupational science as an anthropologist comes to a research site, however, but rather as a professional to build a career. The result for me for quite some time was a dual career, publishing in both worlds without a great deal of

connection between them. For about the past 10 years I have integrated my efforts, striving to build interdisciplinary bridges and projects that bring together anthropology, occupational therapy and occupational science.

In my situation, which may be very similar to those in the audience who have degrees in more than one discipline, the 'insider-outsider' characterization doesn't really fit. Instead, our multiple disciplinary commitments give us what could be called a "distributed professional identity" (Strathern, 2007). This sort of professional identity requires commitments of resources, use of expertise, and allocations of time and effort that vary according to disciplinary tasks and expectations. A doctoral student in occupational science might well be inspired to write a dissertation on this question because of the obvious fact—a fact that I think deserves greater attention and analysis—that nearly every scholar who considers him or herself an occupational scientist is also an occupational therapist.

After receiving the news from the Society for the Study of Occupation that I was asked to give this lecture, I began polling colleagues including former students (PhDs in occupational science, now faculty in occupational therapy departments) to ask what I should talk about. The resounding response was that I should talk about interdisciplinarity. The very term interdisciplinary raises the question, however: What does it mean to say that occupational science is itself a discipline? We can ask, further, if it is a discipline, what kind is it? What should we expect of it? How should it (and we) behave? And, while we are asking difficult questions: Is this field or discipline that we call occupational science really a science? If so, what kind of science is it or should it be? And, as we are now asking really controversial questions: What should be the relationship of occupational science and occupational therapy?

The main founding thinkers, Elizabeth Yerxa and Ann Wilcock, have been concerned about these questions from the start. And even Yerxa and Wilcock have only partial answers, despite their extremely thoughtful and penetrating responses. I expect to add just a few perspectives on how these questions have been framed. Naturally, I speak for myself, so I hope it is understood why I use the first person and sometimes refer to my own career experiences as relevant data.

There are two parts of my talk. In Part One, I springboard my comments from an impressive article in the Journal of Occupational Science offering a vision for occupational science by Debbie Laliberte Rudman, with students in her doctoral seminar at the University of Western Ontario. In Part Two, drawing on scholars of globalization and the work on transnational advocacy networks, I will consider the focus on human rights that is emerging at the intersection of the profession of occupational therapy and the discipline of occupational science. We need to consider how occupational science—perhaps despite itself—is forwarding and could help even more to promote the moral philosophy that ties, I think, the profession and the discipline.

Part I: The Disciplining of Occupational Therapy

In the first place, let me say that I am almost incapable of thinking about a discipline called occupational science without also thinking about the profession of occupational therapy. This is not because I think that occupational science should be concerned (or mainly concerned) with studying treatment and outcomes. Occupational therapy scholars ought to be capable of doing the technical studies that are needed for the profession to survive in the current healthcare market. Rather, the link between occupational therapy and occupational science that I am pointing to is concerned with the concept of occupation and its relationship to health and well-being. This conceptualization belongs not only to science but to moral philosophy, whenever we ask what is worth studying, how should it be studied, and why. Occupational science has an obligation to address such moral and political questions. In fact, some might say that the most impressive achievements of occupational science have not

been in research but in opening spaces for exploring the occupational therapy profession's concerns in moral philosophy.

Many scholars have addressed the lack of consensus in defining occupation and struggled to reconcile the implications of diverse definitions of a profession and discipline (e.g. Christiansen, 1994; Royeen, 2002). While these debates continue, occupational scientists might take satisfaction in an aside from the history of anthropology from the 1950s. According to Kroeber and Kluckhohn's (1952) survey of the anthropological literature, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, 164 definitions of 'culture' were then in use. Yet the 1950s arguably were peak years for the growth of anthropology in the academy. The lack of a single definition evidently did not hamper the discipline, but was a sign of anthropology's dynamism.

Lack of consensus and diversity among occupational science contributors brings me to Rudman's and her students' vision, which is worth summarizing before adding my own comments. They said that they commit themselves to a diverse disciplinary culture that: (1) reflects on and questions its own assumptions; (2) makes itself relevant in specific contexts; and, in their own words, (3) "will engage in a continuum of knowledge generation and action" (Rudman et al., 2008, p. 140). They see this continuum as including (but not restricted to) providing a knowledge base for occupational therapy. They are especially concerned with resisting what they call 'the default position' of supporting the status quo political and technical structures in which the occupational therapy profession currently exists.

Rudman and her students asked us to tie the production of knowledge in occupational science to "a broader conception of practice" (p. 140). In doing so, they rejected the distinction between basic and applied science as a false binary. Citing Rylko-Bauer, Singer and Van Willigen (2006), they argued that theory, critique and action need not be mutually exclusive. Instead they called for a "systematic joining of critical social theory with application" while "engaging with contemporary issues" (p. 140). By shifting the discussion away from the basic/applied dichotomy, they hoped to move occupational science scholarship in a responsible and credible manner toward ethical, political, and moral commitments. I would add that there really is no way that any science can evade such commitments. As Latour (2004) suggested: "Reality is not defined by matters of fact. Matters of fact are not all that is given in experience. Matters of fact are only very partial and, I would argue, very polemical, very political renderings of matters of concern" (p. 232).

Returning to Rudman and her colleagues, I agree so thoroughly with how they view things that perhaps Debbie Rudman should be giving this talk, not me. But I do have a critique to offer, which is to say that they focused on ideological questions (what they refer to as the disciplinary culture) that are only within the scope of what an individual scholar may choose to do or believe. In doing so, they appear to overlook the kinds of political economic factors that prompted the founding of occupational science and that continue to structure its production of knowledge. So let us start by inquiring why the new discipline was named occupational science and not something else, such as occupational studies?

Here is my version of that story: The founding articles in Occupational Therapy and Health Care (Yerxa et al., 1990) and the American Journal of Occupational Therapy (Clark et al., 1991) are artifacts of conversations and debates that took place in founding the doctoral program in occupational science. The USC faculty was comprised of occupational therapists and a sprinkling of non-occupational therapists. Among us were holders of doctorates in education, child development, educational psychology, anthropology, and other fields. Administrators, scholars at other universities, clinical leaders, and so forth—all with diverse doctoral credentials, clinical experience, intellectual interests, and political agendas—were also consulted. Thus, while making the case for a new discipline focused on

occupation, Yerxa et al. (1990) wrote: "Occupational science is, of course, interdisciplinary. It is a synthesis of ideas from other disciplines which have something to say about occupation, share a humanistic view of the human and preserve the 'aliveness' of the living human system" (p. 5).

I can recall some of our debates in the mid-1980s concerning the proposed doctoral program and discipline, especially about what we should name it—occupational science or occupational studies. At the time, calling it occupational studies seemed to me more true to the nature and scope of the proposal. But I yielded to the urgent argument that calling the new discipline occupational science could increase its chance of acceptance as a doctoral program in the university. Yerxa et al. (1990) went on to say: "New sciences are often developed by building on previous work in other sciences and integrating it in fresh ways to address new questions. No science existing today can, of itself, explain occupation" (p. 5).

Thus the case for a new science was made, while the political economic context was as follows: The top administration at USC was seeking to downsize and eliminate academic departments and programs that did not have doctoral-level faculty and were not seen to be producing knowledge appropriate to a Carnegie Research I institution. A department such as occupational therapy, no matter how well-regarded, could not survive solely on the strength of educating a professional workforce. The university's curriculum committee that initially reviewed our proposal for the doctoral program sent it back without approving it. Our documents characterized occupational therapy as a profession in search of a discipline. The faculty redoubled its efforts to make the case for a new basic science that could support the practice profession of occupational therapy.

The basic/applied science distinction was a familiar trope that we used to disarm potential critics in the physical and biological sciences who served as gatekeepers all the way up from the curriculum committee to the provost (a chemical engineer). But as Calvert (2006) pointed out, the idea of basic science, which replaced the 19th century term pure science, actually has never been well specified. Its use has been mainly rhetorical, especially in the post-World War II era, as a boundary marker meant to justify the dedication of funds to professions for what has actually been a wide spectrum of activities that on the surface cannot be consistently distinguished as basic or applied. With regard to the profession of medicine in the 20th century, an historian of medicine has noted: "It was the *language* of science, the rhetoric and imagery of science, more than its clinical payoff that initially propelled the remarkable elevation of the profession" (Warner, 2004, p. 768).

This is precisely what happened in making the case for calling the new discipline 'occupational science'. The applied/basic rhetorical strategy worked like a charm, one might say, because so many occupational scientists have since spent so much effort trying to define what *is* scientific about occupational science. Meanwhile, in the physical sciences, the older hierarchical model of moving from basic science to applied science is being replaced (Klein, 1996). Disenchantment with the basic/applied model may have many sources, but certainly there is a crisis leading away from the modernist faith in expertise, rational planning, technical solutions and social engineering. So, have occupational scientists somehow fallen under the spell of a kind of word magic when striving to develop an expert, modern, basic science of occupation?

The focus on university settings is crucial here, because it would certainly be possible to invent something called occupational science or occupational studies simply by publishing articles. But to develop an academic discipline takes departmental resources and the opportunity to develop a curriculum and train new generations of scholars. The key point here is that, for the past century, disciplinary structures have become the force that controls the knowledge system in the modern university; and disciplines are identified with and through university departments (Klein, 1996).

For 20 years, the departmental structures within which occupational science has been identified, and from which it draws its professional firepower, have belonged to occupational therapy. Occupational therapy's hard-won footing in the university thus must not be underestimated or undervalued by occupational science.

At the same time, boundary crossing among disciplines, observers of interdisciplinarity argue, has become almost the defining characteristic of work in the academy. Yet most interdisciplinarity is hidden because it is *already located* in work that is done within departments or in the careers of individual faculty (Klein, 1966). This interdisciplinarity, which exists mainly in faculty collaborations and the borrowing of ideas and methods, is more pervasive than at first would appear if looking only at officially sanctioned interdisciplinary centers and institutes. Such interdisciplinary centers that periodically crop up in universities typically exist without dedicated faculty lines and only ephemeral funding.

There is a lot more going on at the boundaries of disciplines than at these centers, and new vocabularies have emerged to describe the "trading zones of interaction" including hybrid communities and professional roles (Klein, 1996, p. 2). This is true of occupational science, which beneath the label of a science and a discipline has been engaged in interdisciplinary activity from its inception. Disciplinarity and interdisciplinary in occupational science need to be seen as existing in relationship to one another. It would be misguided to think that we are facing a choice of one or the other.

I would like to contend, also, that occupational science appears to have functioned at least as much to keep departments of occupational therapy alive and vibrant in the university, as to contribute new knowledge. Perhaps this is as it was intended. The discipline was established only *in part* to create a distinctive knowledge base. The article by Clark et al. (1991) mentions "fulfillment of the demand for doctoral-level faculty members in colleges and universities" (p. 300) in occupational therapy departments as first among the anticipated contributions of the new science.

So let us look at the demographics of the work force in occupational therapy and occupational science. Only 5.8% of occupational therapists work in academia (AOTA, 2010, p. 8). In actual numbers, this amounts to about 6,000 individuals (based on 104,500 jobs in occupational therapy according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics for 2008). Let us approach these facts in terms of distributed identities and time allocation (Strathern, 2007). Of those occupational therapists who work in academia, half of their time (49.5%) goes to an activity labeled teaching while only ten percent (10.1%) goes to something labeled research. The future of occupational science looks to me as if it will continue for some time to be tied to occupational therapy departments, but with its resources divided disproportionately in favor of the profession not the discipline. So one task of occupational science, in my view, is to pave the way for occupational therapy when it tries to expand beyond what Rudman et al. (2008) referred to as the profession's 'default position.'

Critical histories of the profession provide clear accounts of the *disciplining* of occupational therapy by more powerful forces (Kielhofner & Burke, 1977; Gritzer & Arluke, 1989). We find social movements and political reforms trumped by military and medical authority, as well as the enforcement of gender and racial hierarchies (Frank & Zemke, 2009). Demands for reductionist scientific evidence-based practice are tied to the fee-for-service infrastructure of insurance reimbursement (Starr, 1982), partly to assure quality but also to defend against liability and insurance claims. But now, in a Foucauldian twist, occupational science seems to be disciplining itself through an estrangement from occupational therapy's reformist and humanitarian impulses.

The key question, in my mind, is not should occupational science be more interdisciplinary. We should ask rather: Which interdisciplinary contributions will be acknowledged? And what

kinds will be frustrated and frozen by narrower views of what a science ought to do? The dream of a pure science appears exhausted. For the moment—and I think we need to think of moments—I would put my money on participating in interdisciplinary and transnational approaches to global problems. To do this it will be necessary to confront the moral philosophy that is core to both the profession and discipline. That is what I'd like to address now, if briefly, in Part Two of my talk.

Part II: Globalization, Human Rights, and Occupational Justice

The social upheaval called globalization appears to be at least as volatile as the industrialism of the early 20th century, in which the profession of occupational therapy was founded, but on a more complex scale and across national borders. Globalization, which was built upon internationalization yet has distinctive characteristics, set the frame in which the occupational therapy profession has begun widely to claim jurisdiction in humanitarian crises. We are seeing a discourse of human rights and practices in occupational therapy and occupational science related to the decline of socialism and the welfare state, the rise of neoliberalism, wars and genocide, refugeeism, chronic unemployment and underemployment, food insecurity, environmental degradation, epidemics and natural disasters, gender oppression, disability oppression, terrorism, racism, and colonialism.

A Position Statement on Human Rights was ratified by the World Federation of Occupational Therapists Council in 2006. A member of the WFOT International Advisory Committee on Human Rights described the statement as a set of principles identifying "how the right to occupation can be abused" (Bryant, 2010, p. 5). Is there such a thing as 'a right to occupation?' In what sense is the right to occupation viable or actionable? What larger contexts and frameworks does it depend on? What does it mean when the WFOT advisory committee member further asserts that "occupational therapists are equipped to work for occupational justice" (p. 5). What equipment is actually needed? And in order to do what?

These are questions that occupational science can and ought to address with the help of companion disciplines such as law, philosophy, politics, economics and anthropology. First, we need empirical research in this dynamic area to address how occupational justice and other human rights claims actually arise and operate; we need to the ability to analyze the utility of such claims in the broader context of human rights and global transformations (Goodale, 2007; Hajjar, 2004; Merry, 2011; Nielsen, 2004). Second, we need to reassess foundational assumptions to go deeper than the often stalemated debates over the legitimacy of qualitative versus quantitative methods. Debates over methodology cannot substitute for a more fundamental reassessment of the foundations of occupational science. The foundations of occupational science are in pragmatism; it is a tradition that runs from Jane Addams and John Dewey through Eleanor Clarke Slagle, Mary Reilly and Elizabeth Yerxa—(Breines, 1985; Metaxas, 2010; also Frank & Zemke, 2009).

Pragmatism is not the only possible foundation that has been claimed for occupational science (Wilcock, 2006). But pragmatism has in fact provided a moral philosophy that occupational therapy and occupational science share (Cutchin & Dickie, in press; Frank & Zemke, 2009). Richard Rorty (2007) noted:

> Pragmatism puts natural science on all fours with politics and art. It is one more source of suggestions about what to do with our lives.... Dewey thought that we should not try to ground our choices among alternatives such as these on knowledge of what human beings 'really' are.... Philosophy, he insisted, 'is [not] in any sense whatever a form of knowledge.' It is, instead, 'a social hope reduced to a working program of action, a prophecy of the future' (p. 917).

A spate of recent books has made us all aware of a world movement among occupational therapists with one foot in the clinic or community and one foot in the academy (Kronenberg, Pollard, & Sakellariou, 2010; Kronenberg, Simó-Algado, & Pollard, 2005; Pollard, Sakellariou, & Kronenberg, 2009; Watson & Swartz, 2004). Occupational science has a responsibility to clarify further what possible relationship a profession like occupational therapy can have to social justice, humanitarianism, and human rights (Galheigo, 2010; Hammell, 2008). Such clarification will take place in an interdisciplinary arena of empirical research and intellectual critique. We need to do a better job of understanding the global processes and the role of NGOs (non-governmental organizations) as vehicles for practice (Barnett, 2010; Keck & Sikkink, 1999).

Concepts of *social justice* have long figured in the world's major religions (Glenn, 2007). The concept of *humanitarianism* is usually attributed to the founding of the International Committee of the Red Cross in 1863. It was the result of efforts by a Swiss businessman, Henry Dunant, whose Christian sensibilities were touched by witnessing the carnage at an Italian village 2 years earlier, left by the French and Austro-Hungarian armies (Barnett, 2011). But the idea of *human rights* is secular and recent, arising after the first and second world wars from efforts to build an international legal regime.

The Nuremburg tribunal, among the first significant efforts, was intended to prevent future genocides and the kinds of atrocities witnessed in World War II. This was followed by the creation of the United Nations in 1946, the passage of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, and the four Geneva Conventions of 1949 (Hajjar, 2006). As the Nobel-prize winning organization *Médecins sans Frontières* (Doctors without Borders) had to recognize in its decisions concerning the provision of relief during the Rwandan genocide in 1994, humanitarianism can no longer truly maintain its appearance of neutrality and impartiality (Barnett, 2010; Fassin, 2007). So the practice of human rights in occupational therapy needs empirical research, comparative data, critical reflection, and political analyses for types of professional action that transcend *both* traditional professional ethics and traditional social science (cf. Pollard, Sakellariou, & Kronenberg, 2009; also Leibing, 2010).

Let us go now to the concept of globalization. To some, globalization appears identical to internationalism (Johnson, 2002). But that is a naïve view. It is also, as Inda and Rosaldo (2008) argued, more than an intensification of global interconnectedness. Geographer David Harvey (1989) described the key features of globalization as time-space compression, in which distance and time no longer appear to be major constraints on the organization of human activity. Globalization operates through unprecedented, lightning-quick *networks* (Castells, 2009) and *assemblages* (Latour, 2004) through which information, resources, and social actors flow. An open-membership online discussion through the month of October 2010, on the topic, no less, of 'Time and Space' is a ready-made example. The discussion, sponsored by the International Society of Occupational Scientists (ISOS), was guest-moderated by Ruth Zemke, an American posting from Canada, where this lecture in her name was presented.

The online ISOS conversation included academics and practitioners from all over the world. Virtual access was free and inclusive; no travel was needed. Participation was informal and spontaneous. The conversation displayed a high level of intellectual and scholarly contributions. Personal reflections were not excluded and the relationships were resolutely non-hierarchical. Harvey (1989) argued that time-space compression takes place in discrete phases of short and concentrated bursts, rather than in a smooth linear fashion. The ISOS conversation exemplified a burst of globalized scholarship, extending the occupational science and occupational therapy community as a global network. Global networks such as this one have potentialities beyond compression of time and space. These potentialities, which we will explore next, lie in the political arena.

Sociologist Saskia Sassen (2008) argued that contemporary globalization was made possible by an erosion of sovereign state prerogatives. This process began with the new internationalism of the World War II era, but reached a tipping point in the 1980s. The economic reforms of the Thatcher-Reagan era resulted in "privatization, deregulation, and marketization of public functions" and "the associated rise in the number and power of specialized regulatory agencies within the executive that took over what were once oversight functions in the legislature" (p. 1). This agenda, known as *neoliberalism* and based on faith in the free market, was promoted by the superpowers of the United States and Great Britain. Yet the neoliberal agenda actually diminished the roles and powers of sovereign nations to govern commerce within their territorial borders. An unintended consequence of these changes, Sassen noted, has been the emergence of "denationalized forms of citizenship," "the ascendance of human rights," and new forms of "transnational identities" and "experiences of membership" (p. 23).

The globalized 'network society' (Castells, 2009) has opened and allowed new spaces for political action by non-state players exchanging ideas, resources, and information at intersecting nodes. Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink (1998) referred to these as *transnational advocacy networks*, defined as "those relevant actors working internationally on an issue, who are bound together by shared values, a common discourse, and dense exchanges of information and services" (p. 2). While transnational advocacy networks (TANs) mobilized on behalf of social transformations in the past, such as the 19th century abolitionist movement, contemporary TANs are novel in that they have greatly expanded the ability of nontraditional political actors to gather and deploy information strategically. They operate in a way that creates "new issues and categories and to persuade, pressure, and gain leverage over much more powerful organizations and governments" (Keck & Sikkink, 1998, p. 2).

Transnational advocacy networks thus act as moral entrepreneurs to transform the terms and nature of debates (Becker, 1963). We are seeing this kind of framing in occupational therapy and occupational science as a new vocabulary of human rights emerges from the interface of the profession and discipline, right at the bridge or boundary where academics and practitioners meet. Nothing exemplifies this interface as much as the work on occupational justice by Elizabeth Townsend, with whom I share the podium at this joint conference of the Society for the Study of Occupation and the Canadian Society for Occupational Science. Townsend's work since the 1980s has led to a Framework of Occupational Justice (FOJ) (Stadnyk, Townsend, & Wilcock, 2010). The FOJ is conceived to include four conditions of occupational *injustice*—occupational imbalance, occupational deprivation, occupational marginalization, and occupational alienation. New terms such as these are changing the debate in the occupational therapy profession, and occupational science must take the next step of studying empirically, critically analyzing, and facilitating the utility of these ideas, as they are increasingly put into practice to claim human rights in global contexts.

Transnational advocacy networks work to influence policy outcomes. Keck and Sikkink (1998) emphasized that the tactics of such advocacy networks include information politics, symbolic politics, leverage politics and accountability politics. They define *information politics* as "the ability to quickly and credibly generate politically usable information and move it to where it will have the most impact" (p. 16). *Symbolic politics* refers to the ability "to call upon symbols, actions, or stories, that make sense of a situation for an audience that is frequently far away" (p. 16). *Leverage politics* allows members of the network to access more powerful actors in order to influence a situation. *Accountability politics* refers to "the effort to hold powerful actors to their previously stated policies or principles" (p. 16).

My crystal ball is as cloudy as anyone's. But I'll wager my money on the transnational advocacy

networks that occupational therapy and occupational science have begun to form as they make use of these and other tactics. I hope that scholars in the Society for the Study of Occupation will take a place, front and center, to frame the moral philosophy, conduct empirical research, synthesize relevant information, and work with interdisciplinary colleagues and ideas in human rights arena—to help identify what works, what doesn't, and what else might be accomplished.

Let me leave you with some final questions: What if occupational science were seen as just a moment in the history of occupational therapy? What if it were understood not primarily or only as a science, but also an expression of moral philosophy in the pragmatist tradition? If so, then I think we would have a better understanding of the profession and discipline in contemporary global contexts as experiments in social hope.

Acknowledgements

An earlier version of this talk was presented at a joint conference of the Society for the Study of Occupation: USA (SSO:USA) and the Canadian Society of Occupational Scientists (CSOS), October 14-16, 2010, at the Ivey Spencer Leadership Centre, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario. The conference theme was Redefining Boundaries and Bridges in Occupational Science. My appreciation goes to Elizabeth Francis-Connolly, Nancie Furgang, and Elizabeth Townsend for discussing ideas and reading drafts and to Clare Hocking for her editorial guidance. I appreciate helpful conversations with Nancy Bagatell, Pamela Block, James Charlton, Susan Coppola, Virginia Dickie, Emily Furgang, Sandra Galheigo, Rachel Hall-Clifford, Esther Huecker, Moses Ikiugu, Sharon Kaufman, Frank Kronenberg, Annette Leibing, Signian McGeary, William Morgan, Diane Parham, Melissa Park, Margaret Perkinson, Doris Pierce, Nick Pollard, Elelwani Ramagundo, Charlotte Royeen, Debbie Laliberte Rudman, Dikaios Sakellariou, Ruth Segal, Kit Sinclair, Yda Smith, Patty Stutz-Tanenbaum, John White, and Ruth Zemke. I thank the Graduate Program in Occupational Therapy, University of New Mexico, and its chairperson Diane Parham, for housing me as a visiting scholar in 2009-2011. I also wish to thank the Albert Schweitzer Institute, Quinnipiac University, and its director David Ives, for providing conversations and a place to complete this version of my talk for publication during a visit to the Pavarotti School and Fundácion Rigoberta Menchú Tum, San Lucas Toliman, Guatemala.

REFERENCES

American Occupational Therapy Association. (2010). Surveying the Profession: 2010 AOTA Workforce Study. *OT Practice*, September *13*, 8–11.

Barnett, M. (2011). *Empire of humanity: A history of humanitarianism*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Becker, H. S. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: The Free Press.

Breines, E. (1985). *Origins and adaptations: A philosophy of practice*. Lebanon, NJ: Geri-Rehab.

Bryant, W. (2010). Global voices, local lives: Human rights and occupational therapy. *WFOT Bulletin*, *62*(1), 5–6.

Calvert, J. (2006). What's special about basic research? *Science, Technology & Human Values*, *31*(2), 199–220.

Castells, M. (2009). *The rise of the network society: The information age: Economy, society, and culture* (Vol. I, 2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell-Wiley.

Christiansen, C. (1994). Classification and study in occupation: A review and discussion of taxonomies. *Journal of Occupational Science: Australia*, *1*(3), 3–20.

Clark, F. A., Parham, D., Carlson, M. E., Frank, G., Jackson, J., Pierce, D., . . . Zemke, R. (1991). Occupational science: Academic innovation in the service of occupational therapy's future.

American Journal of Occupational Therapy, *45*(4), 300–310.

Cutchin, M., & Dickie, V. (In press). *Transactional perspectives on occupation*. New York: Springer.

Fassin, D. (2007). Humanitarianism as a politics of life. *Public Culture*, *19*(3), 499–520.

Frank, G., & Zemke, R. (2009). Occupational therapy foundations for political engagements and social transformation. In N. Pollard, D. Sakellariou, & F. Kronenberg (Eds.), *A political practice of occupational therapy* (pp. 111–136). Edinburgh, UK: Elsevier/Churchill Livingstone.

Galheigo, S. M. (2010, May). *Keynote lecture: What needs to be done? Occupational therapy responsibilities and challenges regarding human rights*. World Federation of Occupational Therapists, Santiago, Chile.

Glenn, H. P. (2007). *Legal traditions of the world: Sustainable diversity in the law* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goodale, M. (2007). Locating rights, envisioning law between the global and the local. In M. Goodale & S. E. Merry (Eds.), *The practice of human rights: Tracking law between the global and local* (pp. 1–38). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gritzer, G., & Arluke, A. (1989). *The making of rehabilitation: A political economy of medical specialization, 1890-1980*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hajjar, L. (2004). Human rights. In A. Sarat (Ed.), *The Blackwell companion to law and society* (pp. 589–604). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Hammell, K. W. (2008). Reflections on well-being and occupational rights. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, *75*(1), 61–64.

Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Inda, J. X., & Rosaldo, R. (Eds.). (2008). *The anthropology of globalization: A reader* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Johnson, D. G. (2002). Globalization: What is it and who benefits? *Journal of Asian Economics*, *13*, 427–439.

Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Kielhofner, G., & Burke, J. (1977). Occupational therapy after 60 years: An account of changing identity and knowledge. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, *31*, 675–689.

Klein, J. T. (1996). *Crossing boundaries: Knowledge, disciplinarities, and interdisciplinarities*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Kroeber, A. L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions*. New York: Meridian Books.

Kronenberg, F., Pollard, N., & Sakellariou, D. (Eds.). (2010). *Occupational therapists without borders: Towards an ecology of occupation-based practices*. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone/Elsevier.

Kronenberg, F., Simó Algado, S., & Pollard, N. (Eds.). (2005). *Occupational therapy without borders: Learning from the spirit of survivors*. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone/Elsevier.

Latour, B. (2004). Why has critique run out of steam? From matters of fact to matters of concern. *Critical Inquiry*, *30*(2), 246–248.

Leibing, A. (2010). Looking over the neighbor's fence: Occupational therapy as an inspiration for (medical) anthropology. *ETHOS: Journal of the Society for Psychological Anthropology*, *38*(2), 1–8.

Merry, S.E. (2011). Measuring the world indicators, human rights, and global governance. *Current Anthropology*, *52*(SUPPL. 3), S83–S93.

Metaxas, V. A. (2000). Eleanor Clarke Sagle and Susan E. Tracy: Personal and professional identity and the development of occupational therapy in Progressive Era America. *Nursing History Review*, *8*, 39–70.

Nielsen, K. (2004). The work of rights and the work rights do: A critical empirical approach. In A. Sarat (Ed.), *The Blackwell companion to law and society* (pp. 63–79). Oxford: Blackwell.

Pollard, N., Sakellariou, D., & Kronenberg, F. (Eds.). (2008). *A political practice of occupational therapy*. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone/Elsevier.

Rorty, R. (2007). Dewey and Posner on pragmatism and moral progress. *University of Chicago Law Review*, *74*, 915–927.

Royeen, C. (2002). Occupation reconsidered. *Occupational Therapy International*, *9*(2), 111–120.

Rudman, D. L., Dennhardt, S., Fok, D., Huot, S., Molke, D., Park, A., & Zur, B. (2008). A vision for occupational science: Reflecting on our disciplinary culture. *Journal of Occupational Science*, *15*(1), 136–146.

Rylko-Bauer, B., Singer, M., & Van Willigen, J. (2006). Reclaiming applied anthropology: Its past, present, and future. *American Anthropologist*, *108*(1), 178–190.

Sassen, S. (2006). *Territory, authority, rights: From medieval to global assemblages* (Updated ed.) Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stadnyk, R., Townsend, E. A., & Wilcock, A. (2010). Occupational justice. In C. Christiansen & E. A. Townsend (Eds.), *Introduction to occupation: The art and science of living* (2nd ed., pp. 329–358). Thorofare, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Starr, P. (1982). *The social transformation of American medicine: The rise of a sovereign profession*. New York: Basic Books.

Strathern, M. (2007). Interdisciplinarity: Some models from the human sciences. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, *32*(2), 123–134.

United States Department of Labor, Occupational Therapists. (2010). *Occupational outlook handbook* (11th ed.). Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos078.htm#emply

Watson, R., & Swartz, L. (Eds.). (2004). *Transformation through occupation*. London: Whurr.

Warner, J. H (2004). Grand narrative and its discontents: Medical history and the social transformation of American medicine. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, *29*(4-5), 757–780.

Wilcock, A. A. (2006). *An occupational perspective of health* (2nd ed.). Thorofare, NJ: Slack.

World Federation of Occupational Therapists. (2006). *Position statement on human rights*. Retrieved from www.wfot.org/office_files/Human%20Rights%20Position%20Statement%20Final%20NLH%281%29.pdf

Yerxa, E. J., Clark, F., Frank, G., Jackson, J., Parham, D., Pierce, D., ... Zemke, R. An introduction to occupational science: A foundation for occupational therapy in the 21st Century. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*, *6*(4), 1–18.