

## Reimagining curricula and pedagogy in occupational therapy and occupational science education: Towards epistemic justice, cultural sensitivity and inclusion

 Dave S.P. Thomas<sup>1</sup> PhD

### Affiliations:

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor  
Southampton Solent  
University,  
Southampton,  
United Kingdom

### Corresponding Author:

Dr Dave Thomas (SFHEA)  
[dave.thomas@solent.ac.uk](mailto:dave.thomas@solent.ac.uk)

### Dates:

Received: 31 July 2025  
Accepted: 26 Aug 2025

### Article citation:

Thomas, D.S.P (2025).  
Reimagining curricula and  
pedagogy in OT and  
Occupational Science  
education: Towards  
epistemic justice, Cultural  
Sensitivity and Inclusion.  
*The Human Occupation &  
Wellbeing Journal*. 1(1)  
[https://howj.org/index.php/  
howj/article/view/30](https://howj.org/index.php/howj/article/view/30)

**Conflict of interest:** The  
author declares no conflict  
of interest



Scan QR Code  
to share

## SYNOPSIS

The profession of occupational therapy and its offshoot occupational science have historically been shaped by predominantly Anglo-American and Eurocentric frameworks. These dominant paradigms have systematically marginalised diverse perspectives, especially those of Black, Indigenous, Asian, and Muslim scholars, leading to curricula that are culturally insensitive, exclusive and alienating for many students. Moreover, whiteness is treated as the norm, and structural racial issues remain largely under-researched, little debated and unaddressed. This normativity promotes epistemic injustice, an apartheid of knowledge and restricts the development of students' cultural intelligence and competence, which are essential for effective practice in increasingly diverse societies globally.

To address entrenched systemic epistemic injustice and catalyse transformative change within occupational therapy and occupational science education, the implementation of a comprehensive suite of Culturally Sensitive Curriculum (CSC) Tools is advocated. Through a range of illustrative examples, the application of the suite of culturally sensitive curriculum tools demonstrates their practical application and effectiveness across a range of contexts and disciplines.

The CSC tools have achieved significant international traction and success, having been adopted by more than 30 universities worldwide and translated into two languages. To date, the CSCS© instrument has been used to gain the perspectives of over 8,000 students, providing critical insights into the perceived cultural sensitivity and inclusivity of their curricula. Moreover, a growing number of universities have integrated the CSC Educator Self-Reflection Tool© into their academic staff development programmes, with its application now extending to more than 2,000 educators. This widespread uptake underscores the transformative potential of these instruments in advancing culturally sensitive and inclusive curricula and pedagogical practices across diverse educational contexts globally.

**Copyright:** © 2025. The Author/s. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work first published in *The Human Occupation & Wellbeing Journal* is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author/s or with their consent.

A profound paradigm shift among occupational therapy and occupational science educators, professional bodies, and regulators is required to revise curricula and teaching methods. The practical application of the CSC tools can inform strategies to make curricula and pedagogy more culturally sensitive, inclusive, and capable of addressing the complexities of intersectional educational inequalities. The goal is to cultivate future occupational therapists who are equipped to navigate and redress real-world inequities through approaches grounded in justice, cultural sensitivity, and the discipline's core values of human flourishing and equity.

## INTRODUCTION

"... 'Race' is paradoxically, both everywhere and nowhere, structuring... lives but not formally recognised... in a racially structured polity, the only people who can find it psychologically possible to deny the centrality of 'race' are those who are racially privileged, for whom 'race' is invisible precisely because the world is structured around them, whiteness as the ground against which the figures of other races – those who, unlike us are raced – appear" (Mills, 2014: p. 76).

W.E.B Du Bois famously stated the problem of this world today is the colour line, which produces a global system of racialised power in what he called *The White World* (Du Bois, 1940: 2008). For the profession of occupational therapy and occupational science, the uncomfortable and unsettling reality is that the *White World* is on display in its curriculum and pedagogy, resulting in cultural insensitivity, epistemic injustice and systemic exclusion within the discipline. This exclusion dates back to the profession's

inception, where the foundational philosophical tenets and principles underpinning both occupational therapy and occupational science were informed by White, Anglophone, capitalist, industrial, and Christian ontologies, epistemologies, and theoretical paradigms which originate from an English-speaking, and Western context (Hammell, 2015; Kantartzis & Molineux, 2011).

Occupational therapy emerged as a formally organised professional discipline in the early twentieth century, with 1917 widely recognised as its foundational year. The occupational therapist is committed to "build[ing] the axis of good, in service to society" (Royeen, 2003, p. 610), fostering active engagement in meaningful occupations (Grady, 1992) while advancing the principles of occupational justice (Wilcock & Townsend, 2000) through the embodied process of 'doing.' Through this praxis, occupational therapists strive to promote holistic health and wellbeing by facilitating individuals' participation in occupations that they find personally meaningful, necessary, or culturally and socially mandated (WFOT, 2025). This commitment situates occupational therapy as a discipline dedicated to enabling agency and equity within the sociocultural contexts that shape human occupation. Occupational Science, the offshoot of occupational therapy was established as an independent scholarly field in 1989 (Yerxa et al., 1989). It advances the study of humans as occupational beings and explores the meaning, form and function of activities that humans engage in to fulfil their needs as 'doers.'

Despite a modest but important corpus of critical scholarship broadly addressing social justice and inclusion, and actively advocating

for the decolonization of the fields and the remediation of epistemic injustice (Hammell, 2019; Magalhães et al., 2018: 2019; Mahoney & Kiraly-Alvarez, 2019; Parkin & Johnson, 2024; Ramugondo & Kronenberg 2015; Savransky, 2017; Simaan, 2020), the moral, legal, and ethical imperatives of educational equity cultural sensitivity and inclusion remain insufficiently realised within occupational therapy and occupational science curricula.

As such, these disciplines are perceived as maintaining a "colour-blind" orientation in which the socially constructed nature of race (Omi & Winant, 1986), the foundational dynamics of racism (Coates, 2015), and the persistence of racialised inequalities and other intersectional inequalities and their profound societal ramifications are seldom foregrounded in discourse or research. This may be indicative of an epistemology of ignorance, or cognitive dysfunction in White ignorance, Charles Mills defines this as "non-knowing, that is not contingent, but in which 'race' – White racism and/or White racial domination and their ramifications – plays a crucial causal role" (Mills, 1997, p. 18). This issue is further compounded by the glaring absence of Black, Indigenous, Asian, and Muslim authors and theorists in the occupational therapy and occupational science curricula, a deficiency that not only restricts diverse representation and reinforces negative portrayals of diversity but also undermines students' ability to critically challenge systemic inequalities and inequitable power structures. Most concerning, it limits the potential for inclusive classroom interactions, and the delivery of culturally sensitive and inclusive assessments.

Occupational therapy and occupational science education like many academic

disciplines have become a contested terrain. Some describe this as a "culture war," while others rightly characterise it as a critical struggle for educational justice and equity. Amidst these contestations, students are still demanding the decolonisation of their curriculum as a means of redressing these longstanding systemic inequalities (Peters 2018; Douglas et al., 2020; Eirich et al., 2018). The discipline of occupational therapy should not be exempt from these inquisitions, because these conflicts underscore the urgent need to interrogate and transform curricula that both reflect and reproduce enduring racial inequities, positioning occupational therapy education as a pivotal front in the broader pursuit of educational justice. This necessitates more culturally sensitive and inclusive occupational therapy and occupational science curricula to meet the needs of a modern intersectionally inclusive society. So why is it that the concept of 'race', racism and racialised inequality deemed occupationally nugatory in the occupational therapy and occupational science curriculum? What does all this have to do with the pristine profession of occupational therapy?

The lack of critical engagement with concepts of race and racism in occupational therapy and occupational science dialogues and practices has been highlighted and the need for greater occupational consciousness and anti-oppressive practices in the profession have been advocated for (Ramugondo, 2018; Kronenberg, 2021; Murphy et al., 2024). Elelwani Ramugondo in her keynote to the World Federation of Occupational Therapists Congress in 2018 argued that occupational therapy, "as contextually situated practice, may be well placed to advance ... decoloniality" (Ramugondo, 2018, p. 89). Despite this, the

disciplines of occupational therapy and occupational science still exhibit a pronounced epistemic apartheid by demonstrating reluctance to fully engage with theories and knowledge systems emanating from the Global South.

An apartheid of knowledge is the process of devaluation, marginalisation and limiting of the epistemologies, cultural resources and ways of knowing of faculty and scholarship from racially minoritised backgrounds (Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Rabaka, 2010). This epistemic segregation reinforces dominant Eurocentric paradigms, thereby marginalising alternative epistemologies and perpetuating systemic inequities within the field. For people who are racialised as minorities, this hyper invisibility and erasure may promote feelings of being outsiders within (Hill-Collins, 1986) and ultimately positioning them as insiders without (Thomas, 2020). For others, such limitations significantly impede their holistic development as culturally responsive, competent, and intelligent graduates. On the other hand, when issues relating to race, racism and racialised inequality are addressed, it is typically through the scholarly interventions of individuals from racially minoritised backgrounds or their allies, rather than as a central focus of the field. For example, the work of BAMEOTUK – a pressure group of Black and minoritised ethnicity occupational therapy students, staff and educators campaigning for antiracist change in the discipline.

The reasons for the cultural insensitivity of the occupational therapy and occupational science curriculum are too lengthy to list here. Neither is it the intention. Instead, the aim of this paper is to proffer a set of culturally sensitive curriculum (CSC) tools as

instruments to transform occupational therapy and occupational science education and aligning it with a technologically informed and intersectionally inclusive future. Such a future prepares graduates to adapt and thrive in a changing world as future-ready professionals capable of developing inclusive, intersectional solutions to real-world challenges.

First, the author's positionality is situated within this discourse in solidarity with Thomas and Quinlan's call for educators to establish their positionality and proximity to inequity and inequality. Subsequently, the conceptual underpinnings that inform culturally sensitive curriculum scholarship and the theoretical constructs that underpin its transformative potential will be elucidated. Then, illustrative examples of the application of the range of culturally sensitive curriculum tools will be presented to demonstrate their practical application and effectiveness. Building on this analysis, targeted recommendations will be for integrating such tools into the OT and occupational science curricula to foster greater cultural sensitivity and inclusivity. The conclusion then offers reflective insights and a call to action, urging the profession to reimagine and reconstruct its curricular frameworks in pursuit of epistemic justice and genuine inclusivity.

### Positionality

Educators [senior leaders and professional, statutory regulatory bodies (PSRBs)] must begin their journey towards educational justice by asking themselves questions about their own positionality and connection to inequity and inequality. (Thomas and Quinlan, 2024).

The potential of endeavours towards educational justice in occupational therapy

and occupational science education lies in how one foregrounds their positionality in relation to the structural inequities and inequalities that they seek to redress. Masking one's intentions in other ways will be disingenuous, giving undue power to biases, stereotypes and seemingly neutral statistics, when in fact the true success to address those inequalities rests on the theories and positionalities used to interpret and create solutions, whether implicitly or explicitly.

The author (He/Him) is an Associate Professor for Inclusive Curriculum and Academic Lead for Learning and Teaching at Southampton Solent University, UK. As a Jamaican, born in a former British colony, British Philanthropist and Occupational Therapist who previously sat on the Board of the Royal College of Occupational Therapists for England and currently sit on the Board of the National Windrush Museum in England. His research is broadly in the areas of learning, teaching, curriculum development and student engagement in higher education. He specialises in research on occupational and educational justice, including ways in which culturally sensitive curricula can equitably promote greater student engagement, more rewarding educational experiences, and optimum outcomes. He is also a specialist in educator development, supporting educators to critically reflect on their curricula and teaching practices in order to make them more culturally sensitive and inclusive.

As a Jamaica born in a former British colony, he undertook his formative education through to the tertiary level, then subsequently pursued and successfully completed most post-secondary academic qualifications offered within the UK education

system including a bachelor's degree, a master's degree and a PhD. Through these transnational educational trajectories, he gained first-hand insight into curricular landscapes frequently marked by cultural insensitivity and exclusionary philosophical, theoretical, and pedagogical orientations. His experiences in UK higher education have rendered particularly salient the pervasive influence of Anglo-American/ Eurocentric paradigms, which often marginalise other epistemologies and paradigms and constrain the cultivation of genuinely culturally sensitive and inclusive learning environments.

Throughout his educational journey, he witnessed how such curricula systematically marginalised learners by undermining their cultural identities, eroding their sense of belonging, and impede their capacity to flourish both academically and personally. These experiences highlighted the profound effect of epistemic exclusion and the debilitating impact of structural inequalities that limits the holistic development of all students. These inequalities ignited his commitment to promote educational justice and contribute to the reimagining of curriculum and pedagogy in occupational therapy and occupational science that genuinely reflect, respect, and celebrate the richness of the collective human experience.

### **Culturally Sensitive Curriculum (CSC) tools: Conceptual underpinnings**

The CSC scholarship is informed by the tenets of the much-critiqued critical race theory (CRT) (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). CRT offers a robust 'race'-focused intellectual and socio-political foundation that enables the interrogation of the how race and racism coalesce and operate structurally and

experientially to undermine the involvement in education by people who have been racialised as minorities. This enriches the scholarship's capacity to promote transformative justice and educational equity.

As an outgrowth of Critical Legal Studies, the scholarship of CRT emerged in the mid-1970s as an intellectual movement rooted in American jurisprudence scholarship built on the early work of Derrick Bell (1980), Kimberlie Crenshaw (1991), Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995), Richard Delgado (1998), and others to illuminate the intersection of 'race', racialised inequalities and educational inequality. Contrary to popular belief, in CRT scholarship, racism is *"not acts of individuals, but the larger, systemic, structural conventions and customs that uphold and sustain oppressive group relationships, status, income and educational attainment...[Hence], the terms Black and White are not meant to signal individuals or group identity. Rather, they indicate a particular political and legal structure rooted in the ideology of White [Anglo-American/European] supremacy and the global impact of colonialism"* (Taylor, 2016, p. 3).

CRT has a short history in education. In a previous study, Thomas and Quinlan (2024) argued that racism is structurally embedded within the curriculum and pedagogy, with whiteness assumed as the normative standard. Moreover, ostensibly 'race'-neutral policies, strategies, and practices function to perpetuate educational inequalities. This underscores the imperative for robust analytical tools such as the CSC tools capable of elucidating the complex ways in which 'race' and racialisation inform and structure the everyday lived experiences of people who are racialised as minorities.

Additionally, such tools are essential for facilitating critical self-reflection among educators regarding their own positionality and relational proximity to systems of inequity and inequality, thereby equipping them to enact meaningful redress within their educational practice.

The CSC tools are built on three specific CRT inspired scholarships (Bryan-Gooden *et al.*, 2019; Holgate 2016; Ladson-Billings 1995) that enabled the conceptualisation of the constructs used in CSC tools. There are currently two CSC tools; the Culturally Sensitive Curriculum Scales (CSCS)© and the Culturally Sensitive Curriculum (CSC) Educator Self-Reflection Tool©. Educators are encouraged to use the CSCS© as a means of enabling students to rate the extent to which they perceive their curriculum of their program as culturally sensitive and inclusive. Specifically, how students' curricular experiences can negatively impact them, especially racially minoritised students. Gaining awareness of the ways in which students encounter marginalisation and exclusion through their curricular engagement is essential however, such recognition alone falls short of effecting meaningful redress or structural transformation. Upon gaining awareness of students' perspectives on cultural sensitivity and inclusion within their curriculum, educators are encouraged to engage with the Culturally Sensitive Curriculum (CSC) Educator Self-Reflection Tool©. This tool facilitates critical examination of their curricula and pedagogical practices, enabling the development of a targeted SMART action plan to guide both curricular enhancement and their own professional growth and development.

The CSC tools have achieved significant international traction and success, having



been adopted by more than 30 universities worldwide and translated into two languages. To date, the CSCS© instrument has been used to gain the perspectives of over 8,000 students, providing critical insights into the perceived cultural sensitivity and inclusivity of their curricula. Moreover, a growing number of universities have integrated the CSC Educator Self-Reflection Tool© into their academic staff development programmes, with its application now extending to more than 2,000 educators. This widespread uptake underscores the transformative potential of these instruments in advancing culturally sensitive and inclusive curricula and pedagogical practices across diverse educational contexts globally. To date, only one occupational therapy program has engaged with the tools.

### **The Culturally Sensitive Curriculum Scales (CSCS)©**

The curriculum – what is taught and how it is taught – is fundamental to students' educational experiences. Research has found that culturally sensitive curricula are associated with students' higher interest in their programs (Quinaln et al., 2004). The CSCS-R© builds on the original groundbreaking CSCS© (Thomas, 2022). It is a survey instrument that enables students to rate the cultural sensitivity of their curricula. Cultural sensitivity of curricula means the extent to which attitudes, teaching methods and practice, teaching materials, curriculum, assessments and theories relate to, affirm and respect diverse cultures, identities, histories, and contexts (Thomas, 2022; Thomas and Quinlan, 2023).

The CSCS survey facilitates an understanding of the extent to which students perceive their curricula as representing diversity; whether people of

diverse ethnicities are portrayed in stereotypical or negative ways in their curriculum; whether they are encouraged to challenge power; their experiences of inclusivity in classroom interactions; and the extent to which the assessments that they undertake are culturally sensitive and inclusive. Academics can use the CSCS© to quickly gather perceptions from all their students. This allows them to document strengths and weaknesses in their own practices from students' perspectives, track changes from one cohort to another as they introduce changes and monitor experience gaps between student groups. Using the CSCS to systematically document students' perspectives of their curriculum, will help academics see the problems to be addressed. Systematically documenting students' experiences of engagement with their curriculum is a vital step in promoting culturally sensitive and inclusive curricular transformation.

### **The Culturally Sensitive Curricula (CSC) Educator Self-Reflection Tool©**

This section draws in part from the recently published volume *Culturally Sensitive Curricula Scales: Researching, Evaluating and Enhancing Higher Education Curricula*, edited by Thomas and Quinlan (2024). Academics often express considerable interest in using the CSCS© to gain the perspectives of their students in relation to the extent to which their curriculum is culturally sensitive and inclusive. Nevertheless, they often state that they want more explicit guidance to bridge the gap between gathering students' responses and making changes in their curriculum and teaching practices. Hence, the CSC Educator Self-Reflection Tool© (Quinlan and Thomas, 2024) was created to help higher education teachers identify where they can

make changes that make their curricula more culturally sensitive.

The CSC Educator Self-Reflection Tool© (see Quinlan and Thomas, 2024) is based on the 27 CSCS© survey items from a revised version of the original CSCS-R© (Quinlan, Thomas and Hayton *et al.*, 2024). The items are grouped into 6 dimensions: *Diversity Represented*; *Negative Portrayals*; *Positive Depictions*; *Challenge Power*; *Inclusive Classroom Interactions*; *Culturally Sensitive Assessments*. Together, these items form a reflective framework

In using the tool, academics are instructed to: (a) self-assess the extent to which their curriculum addresses each of the 27 CSCS-R© items; (b) reflect on their curriculum's strength and weaknesses; and then to (c) construct an action plan – based on their self-assessment – outlining specific steps they will take to make their curricula more culturally sensitive and inclusive, how they will engage students in shaping or evaluating curricular changes, in what timeframe and, outlining the resources and skills they will need to support them. The CSC Educator-Self-Reflection Tool© is most effective when used in conjunction with the CSCS© whereby strengthening the influence of students' voices in curricular reform.

### **Informing Occupational Therapy and Occupational Science Curricula: Illustrative case examples of integration and practical application of the Culturally Sensitive Curriculum (CSC) Tools**

A revised version of the CSCS© was translated into Dutch and administered to undergraduate students at a university of applied sciences in eastern Netherlands.

Additionally, to increase lecturers' awareness of where and how they can make changes that will make their curriculum and teaching practices more culturally sensitive and inclusive, and specific steps they can make to do so, Lecturers completed a revised version of the CSC Educator Self-Reflection Tool© translated into Dutch. Lecturers were then invited to participate in a 5-workshop *Culturally Sensitive Curriculum Masterclass Series*© that explored a range of topics including: causes of differences in student experiences and outcomes; inclusion in the classroom; design thinking for culturally sensitive curriculum; and the role of Artificial Intelligence in promoting cultural sensitivity and inclusion in the curriculum. Changes in lecturers' perceptions of their preparedness to promote cultural sensitivity and inclusion were assessed over the course of the 5-workshop masterclass series. Initially, lecturers reported that they were not sufficiently ready to promote inclusion due to a lack of confidence, ability, knowledge and skill. Following engagement in the *Culturally Sensitive Curriculum Masterclass Series*© lecturers reported improvement in their confidence, knowledge and understanding of culturally sensitive and inclusive curriculum and ability to develop such curriculum and teaching practices. They also reported the development of a community of practice where colleagues engaged in knowledge exchange and information sharing in relation to cultural sensitivity and inclusion in their curriculum.

Clare Walsh and colleagues (2024) detailed their use of the CSCS© to inform a holistic institutional strategy aimed at eliminating the ethnicity degree awarding gap at a public research-intensive university in South Yorkshire, England. The ethnicity degree



awarding gap in UK universities highlights disparities in degrees awarded between White student and their racially minoritised counterparts. To date, no university can claim to have found a solution to the pernicious, multicausal problem. Dimensions of the CSCS© informed approaches to develop staff and students 'racial literacy; curricular and pedagogy; and develop and sustain culturally sensitive environments for learning – such as work-based learning (practice placements). While Walsh and colleagues' work extended across the university, special mention should be made of the influence of the CSCS© in supporting the development of cultural sensitivity on practice placements. Nightingale and colleagues (2022) found that discrimination on practice placements affects the quality of the students' experience and outcomes. Walsh and colleagues' work highlighted that developing racially literate practice placement providers proved effective in addressing and mitigating against discrimination on practice placements.

The CSCS© was integrated as a dialogic tool to operationalise the end-of-module evaluation methodology of a postgraduate occupational therapy program at a public research-intensive university in the Uxbridge area of London. Using the four dimensions of the original CSCS© (Thomas, 2022) in a focus group discussion, students were invited to critically reflect on their curriculum with respect to the extent to and ways in which diversity was represented; the extent to which diversity was portrayed positively; their curriculum's capacity to provoke critical thought in challenging exclusionary power structures and taken-for-granted assumptions; and the degree to which it facilitates the development and maintenance of learning environments that support

inclusive classroom interactions. Students' perspectives were then used to inform the development of the module's curriculum.

Due to the long history of racial discrimination in the discipline of psychology (Augoustinos, 2009), the CSCS© tools were leveraged to promote racial equality and inclusion. Husbands and Birkett (2024) use of the CSCS© informed actions that led to the development of a comprehensive toolkit designed to advance their institution's efforts to decolonise the psychology curriculum and to deepen collective understanding of the imperatives underpinning curricular decolonisation. This initiative simultaneously provided robust evidence of their commitment to equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI), fulfilling key requirements in the process of attaining British Psychological Society (BPS) accreditation

Taken together, these vignettes highlight the potential of the CSC tools to strengthen curricula and pedagogy in the disciplines of occupational therapy and occupational science as a sustainable means of redressing its culturally insensitive and exclusionary curriculum and pedagogy.

### Implications for practice

There is a striking call by staff and students globally for education to consider different cultural traditions, customs, histories and contexts as a means of guaranteeing success for all students. The disciplines of occupational therapy and occupational science are not exempt from these imperatives, neither should they be. There are many ways to make curricula and pedagogy more culturally sensitive and inclusive. Some are outlined in Thomas and Quinlan's (2024) book. Others have been highlighted briefly here. The measurement

scales for cultural sensitivity of HE curricula (CSCS©); the framework that helps educators identify cultural insensitivities, understand their negative effects on students, and determine specific curricular and pedagogical improvements along with a timeline for implementation (Culturally Sensitive Educator Self-Reflection Tool©); and the developmental program to support educators to develop the necessary confidence, knowledge, skills and abilities to improve the cultural sensitivity of their curriculum and teaching practices (Culturally Sensitive Curriculum Masterclass Series©) together form a powerful set of culturally sensitive curriculum tools and developmental approach.

These tools can make a significant and unique contribution to enabling purposeful and sustainable action towards transforming the occupational therapy and occupational science curriculum and pedagogy to make them culturally sensitive and inclusive to serve a modern society. Occupational therapy and occupational science educators, PSRBs, and various regulatory bodies should consider using these tools to enhance the profession of occupational therapy and occupational science. Equally, in addressing policy deficiencies occupational therapy and occupational science regulators are strongly encouraged to consider mandating that all educators embark on continuous professional development aimed at improving their cultural sensitivity and inclusion and that of their practices as a mandatory aspect of their registration.

**Acknowledgements:** I express sincere gratitude to the students and educators who have contributed to the development of the suite of Culturally Sensitive Curriculum (CSC) tools. I also stand in solidarity with

those who are invested and interested in promoting educational justice. And those who are not yet convinced, I encourage you to commence your journey. The future depends on it. Umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu – we are who we are through others.

## CONCLUSION

Occupational therapy and occupational science scholarship remain limited, restricting students' potential to fully develop and succeed within evolving educational landscapes. To effectively prepare occupational therapy professionals capable of engaging diverse communities and advocating for occupational justice, occupational therapy and occupational science education must critically expand its ontological and epistemological frameworks beyond dominant Anglo-American and European paradigms. This expansion calls for a comprehensive reconfiguration of curriculum design, assessment practices, and pedagogical approaches to promote epistemic justice and genuine cultural sensitivity and inclusion. The disciplines of occupational therapy and occupational science stand to gain significantly from integrating this suite of CSC tools into their educational infrastructure. The traditional notions of "Doing, Being, and Becoming" must be critically revisited through historical and political lenses, expanding towards an ecology of occupation-based practices. Establishing culturally sensitive and inclusive curricula is an essential first step toward identifying and dismantling systemic inequities embedded within occupational therapy and occupational science education. "The integrity of our profession is in your hands, I bid you Godspeed in your work" (Eleanor Clarke Slagle, as cited in Bing 1981, p. 516).

## REFERENCES

- Bell, D. (1980). Brown vs. Board of Education and the Interest Convergence Principle. *Harvard Law Review* 93:518–533.
- Bernal, D.D. & Villalpando, O. (2002). An Apartheid of Knowledge in Academia : The Struggle Over the “Legitimate ” Knowledge of Faculty of Color. *Equity and Excellence in Education* 35:169–180.
- Bing, R. K. (1981). Occupational therapy revisited: A paraphrastic journey [Eleanor Clarke Slagle Lectureship]. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 35(8), 499–518. <https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.35.8.499>
- Bryan-Gooden, J., M. Hester, & L. Peoples. (2019). *Culturally responsive curriculum scorecard*. New York: Metropolitan Centre for Research on Equity and the Transformation of Schools, New York University. Retrieved from <https://docs.steinhardt.nyu.edu/pdf/s/metrocenter/atn293/ejroc/CRE-Rubric-2018-190211.pdf>
- Coates, T.-N. (2015). *Between the World and Me*. Melbourne Victoria. The Text Publishing Company.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Delgado, R. and Stefancic, J. (1998). Critical Race Theory: Past, present and future. *Current Legal Problems* [Online] 51:467–491. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/clp/51.1.467>.
- Douglas, T.-R.M., Shockley, K.G. & Toldson, I. eds. (2020). *Campus Uprisings: How Student Activists and Collegiate Leaders Resist Racism and Create Hope*. Teacher College Press.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. (1940). *Dusk of Dawn*. The Oxford W.E.B. Du Bois. Oxford University Press.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (2008). *The souls of Black folk* (B. H. Edwards, Ed.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1903)
- Eirich, A. et al. (2018). *Decolonising whiteness: White voices in Rhodes Must Fall*. In: Chantiluke, R., Kwoba, B. and Nkopo, A. eds. *Rhodes Must Fall: The Struggle to Decolonise the Racist Heart of Empire*. Zed Books, pp. 103–135.
- Grady, A. P. (1992). Occupation as a vision. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 46(1), 29–36. <https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.46.1.29>
- Hammell, K. (2019). Building globally relevant occupational therapy from the strength of our diversity. *World Federation of Occupational Therapists Bulletin* 75:13–26.
- Hammell, K. W. (2015). Respecting global wisdom: Enhancing the cultural relevance of occupational therapy's theoretical base. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 78(11), 718–721. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308022614564170>
- Hill-Collins, P. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought. *Social problems* 33: S15–S32.
- Holgate, H. (2016). *Development and initial validation of a culturally responsive classroom climate scale* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Purdue University. [https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/open\\_access\\_theses/855/](https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/open_access_theses/855/)
- Husbands, D., & Birkett, J. (2024). *Decolonising the Psychology Curriculum: A Toolkit Approach*. In: Thomas, D.S., Quinlan, K.M. (eds) *Culturally Sensitive Curricula Scales*. Palgrave Studies in Race, Inequality and Social Justice in Education. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57688-1\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57688-1_5)
- Kantartzis, S., & Molineux, M. (2011). The influence of Western society's construction of a healthy daily life on the conceptualisation of occupation. *Journal of Occupational Science*, 18(1), 62–80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2011.566917>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Towards a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Education Research Journal*, 32, 465–491. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1163320>
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47–68.

- Magalhães, L., Farias, L., Rivas-Quarneti, N., Alvarez, L., & Malfitano, A. P. S. (2019). The development of occupational science outside the Anglophone sphere: Enacting global collaboration. *Journal of Occupational Science*, 26(2), 181–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2018.1530133>
- Magalhães, L., Nayar, S., Pizarro, E. P., & Stanley, M. (2018). Extending the paradigm: Occupation in diverse contexts. *Journal of Occupational Science*, 25 (4), 445–449. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2018.1528846>
- Mahoney, W., & Kiraly-Alvarez, A.F. (2019). Challenging the status quo: Infusing non-Western ideas into occupational therapy education and practice. *The Open Journal of Occupational Therapy* 7:1–10. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.15453/2168-6408.1592>.
- Mills, C. (1997). *The Racial Contract*. Cornell University Press.
- Mills, C. (2014). *The Racial Contract*. Cornell University Press.
- Murphy, R., Park, K., Billock, C., Becerra-Culqui, T., Perkins, N. A., & Bains, R. (2024). Confronting Systemic Racism in Occupational Therapy: A Mixed Methods Study. *The Open Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 12(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.15453/2168-6408.2167>
- Nightingale, J., Parkin, J., Nelson, P., Masterson-Ng, S., Brewster, J., Labinjo, T., Akoakoh, D., Lomas, D., Silih, L., and Harrop, D. (2022). Multiple stakeholder perspectives of factors influencing differential outcomes for ethnic minority students on health and social care placements: a qualitative exploration. *BMS Medical Education*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.116/s12909-021-0370-3>
- Omi, M. & Winant, H. (1986). *Racial Formation in the United States*. Routledge.
- Parkin, R. A., & Johnson, K. R. (2024). Interrogating whiteness: Critical reflections on occupational science scholarship and social responsibility. *Journal of Occupational Science*, 32(1), 22–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2024.2312996>
- Peters, M.A. (2018). *Why is my curriculum white? A brief genealogy of resistance*. In: Arday, J. and Mirza, H. S. eds. *Dismantling Race in Higher Education: Racism, Whiteness and Decolonising the Academy*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 253–270.
- Quinlan, K. M., & Thomas, D. S. P. (2024). The Culturally Sensitive Curricula Educator Self-Reflection Tool as a step toward curricular transformation. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2024.2338218>
- Quinlan, K.M., Thomas, D.S.P., Hayton, A. et al. (2024). Promoting students' interest through culturally sensitive curricula in higher education. *High Educ* 88, 1331–1351 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01172-z>
- Rabaka, R. (2010). *Against Epistemic Apartheid: W.E.B Du Bois and the Disciplinary Decadence of Sociology*. Lexican Books.
- Ramugondo, E. (2018). Healing work: intersections for decoloniality. *World Federation of Occupational Therapists Bulletin* 74:83–91.
- Ramugondo, E.L. and Kronenberg, F. (2015). Explaining collective occupations from a human relations perspective: Bridging the individual-collective dichotomy. *Journal of Occupational Science* 22:3–16.
- Royeen, C. B. (2003). Chaotic occupational therapy: Collective wisdom for a complex profession. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 57(6), 609–624. <https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.57.6.609>
- Savransky, M. (2017). A decolonial imagination: Sociology, anthropology and the politics of reality. *Sociology*, 51(1), 11–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038516656983>
- Simaan, J. (2020). Decolonising occupational science education through learning activities based on a study from the Global South. *Journal of Occupational Science* 27:432–442.

- Taylor, Edward (2016). *Foundations of critical race theory in education: An introduction*. In: Taylor, E, Gillborn, D. and Ladson-Billings, G. eds. *Foundations of Critical Race Theory in Education*. Second. Routledge
- Thomas, D. (2020). Belonging for 'Outsiders Within', A Critical Race Perspective on Whiteness as a Means of Promoting the 'Insider Without' Syndrome. *Encyclopedia of Teacher Education* [Online]:1–5. [https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F978-981-13-1179-6\\_372-1.pdf](https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F978-981-13-1179-6_372-1.pdf)
- Thomas, D. S. P., & Quinlan, K. M. (2023). Reimagining curricula: Effects of cultural (in)sensitivity of curricula on racially minoritised students' engagement. *Studies in Higher Education*, 48(2), 283–298. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2022.2134332>
- Thomas, D. S. P., & Quinlan, K. M. (Eds.). (2024). *Culturally sensitive curricula scales: Researching, evaluating and enhancing higher education curricula*. Palgrave MacMillan. <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-031-57688-1>
- Thomas, D. S.P. (2022). *An investigation into the cultural sensitivity of the curriculum: Its impact on students' engagement in higher education*. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) thesis, University of Kent. (doi:[10.22024/UniKent/01.02.94817](https://doi.org/10.22024/UniKent/01.02.94817)) (KAR id:[94817](https://kar.kent.ac.uk/94817))
- Walsh, C., Kay, H., Salih, I. (2024). *Enhancing Academic Development Work to Eliminate the Ethnicity Degree Awarding Gap: Integrating the CSCS into Institutional Plans*. In: Thomas, D.S., Quinlan, K.M. (eds) *Culturally Sensitive Curricula Scales*. Palgrave Studies in Race, Inequality and Social Justice in Education. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57688-1\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57688-1_6)
- Wilcock, A.A. and Townsend, E. (2000). Occupational terminology interactive dialogue. *Journal of Occupational Science* 7:84–86.
- World Federation of Occupational Therapists. (2025). *About occupational therapy*. WFOT. Retrieved from <https://wfot.org/about/about-occupational-therapy>
- Yerxa, E. J., Clark, F., Frank, G., Jackson, J., Parham, D., Pierce, D., Stein, C., & Zemke, R. (1989). An introduction to occupational science: A foundation for occupational therapy in the 21st century. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*, 6(4), 1–17. [https://doi.org/10.1080/J003v06n04\\_04](https://doi.org/10.1080/J003v06n04_04)