



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL  
by European Scientific Institute



**Paper: “Field Philosophy as a Disruptive Practice: Between Philosophical Legitimacy and Methodological Divergence”**

**Submitted: 22 January 2026**

**Accepted: 17 June 2026**

**Published: 30 June 2026**

Corresponding Author: Adou Josias Nyamike

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n17p63

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jozsef Zoltan Malik  
Budapest Metropolitan University, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Dragica Vujadinovic  
University of Belgrade, Serbia

Reviewer 3: Blinded

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement to the authors and editors of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published, or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name: József Zoltán Málík	
University, Country: Budapest Metropolitan University, Budapest, Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 21.05.2026.	Date Review Report Submitted: 04.06.2026.
Manuscript Title: Field Philosophy as a Disturbing Practice: Philosophical Legitimacy and Methodological Divergence	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0224/26	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
------------------	--

<b>1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>The title accurately reflects the manuscript’s central concern with the legitimacy and methodological specificity of field philosophy. The notion of a “disturbing practice” effectively captures the author’s argument that field philosophy challenges established disciplinary norms and conventional understandings of philosophical work. The title is intellectually engaging and generally representative of the article’s content. However, readers unfamiliar with the emerging field may not immediately grasp the precise meaning of “disturbing practice,” and the title could perhaps signal more explicitly the article’s broader concern with interdisciplinarity, public engagement, and philosophical legitimacy.</i></p>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>The abstract offers a coherent overview of the article’s objectives, theoretical positioning, methodological approach, and principal conclusions. It successfully introduces the distinction between field philosophy and empirical social science while emphasizing concepts such as reflexivity, co-construction, and actor engagement.</i></p> <p><i>Nevertheless, several conclusions appear already settled within the abstract rather than presented as arguments developed throughout the article. Concepts such as empowerment, durability, and transformation are introduced as established outcomes of field-philosophical practice, whereas the article itself remains primarily conceptual. A more cautious formulation distinguishing aspirations from demonstrated outcomes would strengthen the scholarly balance of the abstract.</i></p>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>The manuscript is generally well written and readable. The argument unfolds in a coherent manner, and the language remains accessible despite the conceptual nature of the topic. Nevertheless, the text contains a number of stylistic and editorial inconsistencies. There are occasional formatting irregularities, punctuation issues, duplicated periods, inconsistent spacing, and several expressions that could benefit from linguistic refinement. While these issues do not substantially hinder comprehension, a careful proofreading would improve the overall presentation and professionalism of the manuscript.</i></p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>Given the conceptual nature of the article, the methodological section is generally transparent and appropriate. The author clearly states that the study is based on philosophical interpretation and conceptual reconstruction rather than empirical investigation.</i></p> <p><i>The two-stage analytical strategy is presented coherently, and the interpretative approach is well aligned with the article’s objectives. The distinction between conceptual clarification and empirical inquiry is maintained throughout the manuscript.</i></p> <p><i>At the same time, greater methodological precision would strengthen the argument. The notion of a “cross-reading” remains somewhat underdeveloped, and readers may reasonably</i></p>	

<i>ask why the selected authors were chosen, how representative they are of the broader field, and which alternative intellectual traditions were excluded from consideration.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>The article presents a coherent and internally consistent argument. The analysis successfully identifies several defining characteristics of field philosophy, including its reflexive orientation, its challenge to disciplinary norms, its emphasis on situated engagement, and its distinction from empirical social science.</i></p> <p><i>The discussion of philosophical legitimacy and disciplinary marginalization is particularly interesting and contributes meaningfully to ongoing debates regarding the role of philosophy in contemporary research environments.</i></p> <p><i>However, some findings occasionally appear as normative assertions rather than conclusions emerging from systematic analysis. The manuscript repeatedly associates field philosophy with empowerment, actor autonomy, transformation of meaning, durable impact, and socially relevant outcomes. While these claims are theoretically plausible and consistent with the literature under discussion, they remain largely assumed rather than demonstrated. As a result, certain conclusions appear more aspirational than analytically established.</i></p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>The conclusions are broadly consistent with the argument developed throughout the article. The manuscript successfully defends the legitimacy of field philosophy as a distinct philosophical practice and persuasively argues that philosophical relevance need not be reduced to instrumental utility.</i></p> <p><i>At the same time, the conclusions occasionally extend beyond what the conceptual analysis alone can demonstrate. Assertions regarding transformation, empowerment, and long-term social impact would benefit from a more cautious formulation acknowledging their normative and aspirational character.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, the concept of “perturbation,” which occupies a central position in the title and argument, could be developed more fully. Greater conceptual precision would strengthen the originality and analytical depth of the article.</i></p>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>The bibliography includes many of the key contributors to the field and provides a solid foundation for the discussion. The references are relevant, up to date, and generally well integrated into the argument.</i></p> <p><i>Nevertheless, the reference base remains somewhat intellectually homogeneous. The manuscript would benefit from stronger engagement with literature on public philosophy, pragmatism, participatory research, action research, and knowledge co-production. Additional critical perspectives questioning the assumptions and promises of field philosophy would also improve the balance of the discussion.</i></p>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

### Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. **Clarify the criteria used for selecting the authors included in the conceptual reconstruction.**  
The manuscript would benefit from a more explicit justification of why these particular authors were chosen and how representative they are of the broader field-philosophy tradition.
2. **Engage more explicitly with criticisms of field philosophy and competing conceptions of philosophical practice.**  
The discussion currently relies primarily on authors who share broadly similar assumptions. Greater engagement with critical perspectives would strengthen the analytical balance of the article.
3. **Distinguish more carefully between normative aspirations and demonstrated outcomes.**  
Concepts such as empowerment, reflexivity, transformation, actor autonomy, and social relevance are frequently presented as outcomes of field-philosophical practice. The manuscript should clarify whether these are normative goals, evaluative ideals, or empirically established consequences.
4. **Address the relationship between field philosophy and existing traditions of participatory inquiry.**  
The article would benefit from a more explicit discussion of how field philosophy differs from, or overlaps with, action research, participatory research, engaged scholarship, and related approaches. This would help clarify the originality and distinctiveness of the proposed framework.
5. **Further elaborate the concept of “perturbation”.**  
Since perturbation occupies a central place in both the title and the argument, the manuscript should provide a more precise conceptual account of how perturbation differs from critique, intervention, disruption, or public engagement.
6. **Strengthen the discussion of philosophical legitimacy by addressing objections from more traditional philosophical perspectives.**  
Readers may reasonably question what distinguishes field philosophy from forms of applied social inquiry. Addressing potential objections from more traditional philosophical traditions would strengthen the manuscript’s central argument concerning legitimacy.
7. **Expand the dialogue with pragmatism, participatory research, and knowledge co-production literature.**  
These literatures address many of the themes discussed in the article and could provide useful points of comparison as well as additional theoretical depth.

8. **Consider including a brief illustrative example of field philosophy in practice.** Although the article is primarily conceptual, a short example could help readers better understand how the proposed framework operates in concrete situations.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**