

---

# Pro Rege

---

---

Volume 11 | Number 3

Article 11

---

March 1983

## In a Different Voice (Book Review)

Gloria Goris Stronks

*Dordt College*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro\\_rege](https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege)

---

### Recommended Citation

Stronks, Gloria Goris (1983) "In a Different Voice (Book Review)," *Pro*

*Rege*: Vol. 11: No. 3, 31 - 32.

Available at: [https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro\\_rege/vol11/iss3/11](https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege/vol11/iss3/11)

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the University Publications at Digital Collections @ Dordt. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pro Rege by an authorized administrator of Digital Collections @ Dordt. For more information, please contact [ingrid.mulder@dordt.edu](mailto:ingrid.mulder@dordt.edu).

the essence of God," "emptiness emptied of itself," "a circumference-less circle," "a center on a field of emptiness," a realm of "knowing unknowing" which leads to "pure thoughtlessness" and "utter speechlessness."

The probing question has been put to Christian participants in this encounter, whether "their view of God . . . is Christian enough?" (p. 143)—and not only their view of God, but also their views of creation, man, sin, redemption and all the rest. Waldenfels, while interjecting critical comments, quarries his Christian theological building-blocks for this foundational project largely from the teachings of mystics (Eckhart), existentialists (Heidegger), monists (Tillich), and generally those contemporary thinkers who reflect the current revolt against Barth's theology of transcendence. In his Biblical appeal he turns to the *kenosis* doctrine (Philippians 2:5-8)—the "self-emptying" act of God in the incarnation. From this passage he concludes that "in Jesus of Nazareth the self-emptying of God and the self-emptying of man coincide" (p. 158).

Gilligan, Carol. *In A Different Voice*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1982. Reviewed by Gloria Stronks, Associate Professor of Education.

"It is obvious," writes Virginia Woolf in *A Room of One's Own*, "that the values of women differ very often from the values which have been made by the other sex. Yet, it is the masculine values that prevail." In her book, *In a Different Voice*, Carol Gilligan, associate professor of education at Harvard, indicts psychologists and sociologists from Freud to Kohlberg for having built developmental theories of human life on observations of men's lives only. Readers of *Harvard Educational Review* and *Psychology Today* who have come to appreciate Gilligan's scholarly style in carefully working out her thesis concerning women's development will welcome this continued research into that area.

The "different voice" which the author describes is not a voice of gender but of theme. Gilligan works with the assumption that the way people talk about their lives is of significance and that the language which they use reveals the world as they see it. On the basis of her interviews she concludes that women view the world in a different way than men do, and that this difference in view originates from and is shaped by the different experiences which males and females have. Given that for both sexes the primary caretaker during the first three years is usually female, the dynamics of gender identity formation will be different for girls than for boys. Girls experience themselves to be like their mothers, and this attachment fuses with the process of identity formation. Boys and mothers tend to view each other as opposites, causing boys to move toward separating themselves from the attachment, and this separation encourages a more emphatic individuation. Gilligan cites Chodorow's studies which show that girls emerge from

This style of East/West interchange involves two conflicting kinds of "logic." Western questions, let alone answers, hardly make sense within the framework of an Eastern mentality. It is therefore valid to wonder whether the so-called points-of-contact can yield an agreed-upon meaning.

Yet there seem to be some subtle forms of structural analogy between a Buddhist paradox and the Christian gospel—for example, on the Biblical teaching that the way to find one's life is to lose it (Matthew 10:39). Perhaps this should not surprise us. For Buddhists and Christians both live in the same world, which is God's world, and which he still upholds by his perserving and redeeming grace. His Word impinges itself upon all men alike. Yet, on the response side, Buddhist thought is so permeated with the distorting effects of its heavy dialectic as to set it on collision course with the historic Christian faith. Waldenfels' book, while overloading the notion of solidarity, underplays the reality of the antithesis.

this period with a basis for empathy which boys do not have. Girls have a stronger bias for experiencing another's needs or feelings as their own. Consequently, relationships are viewed differently by women than by men. Since masculinity is defined by boys through separation, males tend to have difficulty with relationships and intimacy. Since issues of feminine identity do not depend on the achievement of separation from the caretaker, girls grow up with lives embedded in social interaction and personal relationships but tend to have difficulty with individuation. These differences affect the way males and females view all areas of life.

An example of the way in which research in life development may be biased to exclude a description of the development of females is found in Piaget's stages of cognitive and moral development. Piaget was clearly aware of the fact that girls and boys play differently, with boys demonstrating a strong regard for and appreciation of the rules of the game and girls regarding a rule as worthwhile only so long as the game repays it or so long as the rule does not damage the relationships of the players. Piaget recognized that girls are more tolerant in their attitudes towards rules and more easily reconciled to innovations, but he considered that this hampered their legal sense and therefore considered moral development to be at a lower stage in girls than in boys. His description of cognitive and moral development, then, followed the pattern seen in boys.

This bias of equating child development with male development is a characteristic not only of Piaget's research but of the research of many other developmental theorists, according to Gilligan. Lever's work

assumes that the male model is the better one since it fits the requirements for modern corporate success. In contrast, sensitivity and concern for others has little market value and can even impede professional success. There is an implication that if a woman does not want to be dependent on a man, she will have to learn to play like a boy and think like a man.

It is Gilligan's belief that this penchant of development theorists to project a masculine model goes back at least to Freud (1905), who built his theory of psychosexual development around the experiences of the male child. Erikson's chart of life-cycle stages follows the male model, even though he says in an aside that for the female it is a bit different. When Horner found that women exhibited anxiety concerning competitive achievement, she identified this anxiety as a fear of success. Gilligan suggests that women may feel this anxiety because they have a heightened awareness of the great emotional costs of success achieved through competition. They know something is rotten where success is defined as having better grades or making more money or having more authority than everyone else. "We might," says Gilligan, "begin to ask not why women have conflicts about competitive success but why men show such readiness to adopt and celebrate a rather narrow vision of success."

Part of the problem is that some of the theorists have used male informants only and therefore are left with information which excludes the experiences of females. Kohlberg's well-known six stages of moral judgment from childhood to adulthood are based on his original sample of 84 boys whose development he followed for a period of 20 years. The very traits by which women have found their identity, a bias for experiencing another's needs and feelings as their own, when measured by Kohlberg's scale, will exemplify the third stage of the six-stage sequence, making women appear to be deficient in moral development. Gilligan says that Kohlberg's problem, as presented, calls for a conception of morality as fairness and ties moral development to

the understanding of rights and rules rather than centering it on responsibilities and relationships. Women who respond to the problem presented by Kohlberg often try to change the rules to preserve the relationships. Men, according to Gilligan's research, abide by the rules and thereby depict relationships as easily replaced.

It is difficult to say that women and men view the world differently without suggesting a "better than" or "worse than" element. Gilligan tries very hard to highlight a distinction between the two modes of thought and to focus on interpretation rather than to represent a generalization about either sex. But it is very difficult for her to retain that focus. The report of her own research into the areas of identity and moral development in the early adult years, the decision-making study, and the rights-and-responsibilities study, lead the reader directly to such generalizations. The problem with these generalizations is that individuals seem to vary so far from the norm. But that is the problem with any developmental theory. If one keeps in mind that Gilligan is attempting to point out what is missing in the account of human development by analyzing the group left out in the construction of theory, the generalization seems less binding.

This is an important book in that it begins to answer questions raised by other life-cycle theorists. Levinson, in *The Seasons of a Man's Life*, concludes that, "Close friendship with either a man or a woman is rarely experienced by American men. We need to understand why friendship in adult males is so rare, and what consequences this deprivation has for adult life." This understanding might be found in Gilligan's recognition of the line missing from current depictions of adult development, a failure to describe the progression toward a maturity of interdependence. The reality of separation has long been recognized by developmentalists. Inclusion of the reality of continuing connection, rather than an assumption of the necessity for separation, could lead to a changed understanding of human development.