

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Listening to the Human Voice: Carol Gilligan

Uddipona Borah and Jahnabi Deka

¹Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy, Gauhati University, Guwahati, Assam, India

²Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, Gauhati University, Guwahati, Assam, India

Corresponding author: Dr. Jahnabi Deka, Associate Professor · jahnabideka@gmail.com

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received

30 March 2026

Revised

5 May 2026

Accepted

25 May 2026

Published

25 June 2026

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22980012>

LICENCE

© 2026 the author(s).
Published by the Internal
Quality Assurance Cell,
Bahona College, under the
Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International licence (CC
BY 4.0).

ABSTRACT

The present paper highlights Carol Gilligan's theoretical contributions to moral psychology and feminist ethics, tracing the transition from the framework of a different voice to the articulation of a human voice. The analysis highlights dominant models of moral development have traditionally prioritised a masculine, justice-oriented paradigm marginalising care, relationality, and embodiment. Building on Gilligan's broader theoretical framework, the discussion reconstructs moral development around the integration of care and justice, thought and feeling, self and relationship. The paper situates this reframing within the history of moral development and care ethics, reframes the critique of the patriarchal psychic split, and emphasises significance of the role of voice and listening in sustaining relational integrity. The main argument is that moral development attains its fullest expression when both men and women move beyond the false dichotomies imposed by patriarchal systems—separating justice from care, reason from emotion, self from relationship—and instead develop a human voice that integrates all these dimensions, enhanced and upheld through voice and listening in relational integrity.

KEYWORDS Carol Gilligan, In a Human Voice, Ethics of Care, Moral Development, Psychic Split, Voice, Relationality

HOW TO CITE

APA Borah, U., & Deka, J. (2026). Listening to the Human Voice: Carol Gilligan. ZEITGEIST, 1(2), 10–22. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22980012>

CHICAGO Borah, Uddipona, and Jahnabi Deka. 2026. "Listening to the Human Voice: Carol Gilligan." ZEITGEIST 1 (2): 10–22. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22980012>

MLA Borah, Uddipona, and Jahnabi Deka. "Listening to the Human Voice: Carol Gilligan." ZEITGEIST, vol. 1, no. 2, 2026, pp. 10–22. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22980012>

DECLARATIONS

Author declaration

The author(s) declare that the manuscript is original and unpublished; that it has not been submitted simultaneously to any other journal; that all sources used have been duly acknowledged; that the article infringes no copyright or ethical principle; and that the research complies with accepted academic and ethical standards.

Funding

The author(s) declare that no financial support or funding was received for this research, its authorship, or its publication.

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declare no conflict of interest.

Ethical compliance

Where applicable, the research complies with institutional ethical guidelines and standards concerning human participants, archival material, interviews, oral histories and fieldwork.

Use of generative AI

The author(s) declare that generative artificial-intelligence tools, if used, were employed solely for linguistic assistance and not to generate original scholarly arguments, interpretations, data or conclusions.

Peer review

This article was assessed through double-blind peer review under the editorial policies of ZEITGEIST: An Interdisciplinary Journal in Humanities and Social Sciences.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Listening to the Human Voice: Carol Gilligan

Uddipona Borah and Jahnabi Deka

¹Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy, Gauhati University, Guwahati, Assam, India

²Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, Gauhati University, Guwahati, Assam, India

Corresponding author: Dr. Jahnabi Deka, Associate Professor · jahnabideka@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present paper highlights Carol Gilligan's theoretical contributions to moral psychology and feminist ethics, tracing the transition from the framework of a different voice to the articulation of a human voice. The analysis highlights dominant models of moral development have traditionally prioritised a masculine, justice-oriented paradigm marginalising care, relationality, and embodiment. Building on Gilligan's broader theoretical framework, the discussion reconstructs moral development around the integration of care and justice, thought and feeling, self and relationship. The paper situates this reframing within the history of moral development and care ethics, reframes the critique of the patriarchal psychic split, and emphasises significance of the role of voice and listening in sustaining relational integrity. The main argument is that moral development attains its fullest expression when both men and women move beyond the false dichotomies imposed by patriarchal systems—separating justice from care, reason from emotion, self from relationship—and instead develop a human voice that integrates all these dimensions, enhanced and upheld through voice and listening in relational integrity.

KEYWORDS Carol Gilligan, In a Human Voice, Ethics of Care, Moral Development, Psychic Split, Voice, Relationality

INTRODUCTION

Carol Gilligan's work *In a Different Voice* marked a turning point in moral development research by challenging the traditional moral developmental framework that had privileged only abstract, universalizable principles as the highest stage of moral reasoning. Gilligan's intervention demonstrated that moral problem-solving often point up care, responsibility, and relationship—dimensions long marginalised as less mature within the traditionally accepted justice-oriented paradigm. Building on this foundation, contemporary research has moved beyond these earlier perspectives emphasising from the notion of a *different voice*¹ toward the formulation of a *human voice*. This reframing does not renounce care but instead resists the binary that once made the language of *difference* strategically significant. The word *human* signifies an

integrated moral perspective: the capacity to know and feel, to reason and relate and to claim integrity while remaining responsive to others. According to Gilligan:

...hearing the “different voice” as a human voice meant clearing away a series of impediments that stood in the way of seeing that the gender binary—the construction of human capabilities as either “masculine” or “feminine”—is not only a distortion of reality, but a cornerstone of patriarchy (Gilligan, 2023: Preface).

Gilligan’s new way of thinking from a *different voice* to a *human voice* achieves several purposes. Among these purposes challenging the patriarchy, and redefining moral development are significant. Gilligan’s framework highlights that patriarchal culture has marginalised care as a universal human capacity, rather than considering differences to natural sex distinctions. The framework emphasises care as universal human capacity. As she writes:

...gender binaries and hierarchies of a patriarchal order compromise basic human relational capacity. By splitting reason (masculine) from emotion (feminine), the mind from the body, and the self from relationships, the binaries undercut our ability to think about what we are feeling, to know what is happening in our body, to stay in touch with other people, and thus to navigate the human social world (Gilligan, 2023:16).

Gilligan’s argument moves beyond essentialist readings that once reduced the ethics of care to a sex-based distinction, re-establishing care as a fundamental human capacity disrupted by patriarchal socialisation. It also redefines moral development within a broader cultural frame, where the most pressing problem is not simply individual reasoning about dilemmas but the systemic encoding of splits between mind and body, self and other, public and private, which together silence authentic human voice (Benhabib, 1992; Noddings, 2013). The shift from *different* to *human* therefore signals both a theoretical correction and a political project, inviting us to recognise voice not as stylistic variation but as an indicator of psychological health.

THE PSYCHIC SPLIT AND THE LOSS OF VOICE

In Gilligan’s account, the ethics of care as a mode of resistance cannot be fully understood without attending to the psychic split and loss of voice that reveal the costs of silencing relational knowledge. In her book *In a Human Voice* Gilligan turns her focus to what she terms *the psychic split*—a learned separation between domains that are deeply interwoven in human experience: thinking from feeling, autonomy from connection, and power from care (Gilligan, 2023). This split, she argues, is simultaneously developmental and cultural. Developmentally, children—especially boys in patriarchal societies—are socialised to equate maturity with emotional restriction and invulnerability. They receive repeated messages that to grow up is to suppress vulnerability and dependency, to disconnect from feelings and to present the self as detached and rational. The effect is silencing. As Gilligan explains, individuals begin to censor or dismiss perceptions and feelings that might disrupt this imposed split, in that way isolating themselves from their own lived experience (Gilligan, 2023). At a cultural level, this split reflects the broader dynamics of patriarchy. Western moral and philosophical traditions have long associated rationality, autonomy and

detachment with masculinity, while relegating emotionality, care and relationality to the feminine sphere. These dichotomies are not neutral but hierarchical: the masculine-coded traits are valorised as more advanced, objective and universal, while the feminine-coded traits are dismissed as particular, subjective, or immature (Gilligan, 1982; Walker, 1984). The psychic split thus becomes both a personal and political reality, determining individuals' sense of self and how societies define legitimacy and authority.

Gilligan underscores the psychological and social cost of this silencing. As she writes, “when we teach people not to use their voices openly and authentically, we sew a veil of doubt over everything they know, which stifles their willingness to speak and confront conflict” (*In a Human Voice*, 2023, Introduction). This veil of doubt undermines confidence in one's own perceptions, creating self-censorship and conformity. It restricts individuals' ability to engage authentically with others, to express dissent or to challenge injustice. The consequence is not only a diminishment of personal integrity but also a weakening of democratic life, where open dialogue and authentic expression are essential.

Voice, for Gilligan is:

...something like what people mean when they speak of the core of the self. Voice is natural and also cultural. It is composed of breath and sound, words, rhythm, and language. And voice is a powerful psychological instrument and channel, connecting inner and outer worlds. Speaking and listening are a form of psychic breathing. This ongoing relational exchange among people is mediated through language and culture, diversity and plurality. For this reason, voice is a new key for understanding the psychological, social, and cultural order—a litmus test of relationships and a measure of psychological health. (Gilligan, 1993: In a Different Voice, Letter to Reader).

Voice, therefore, is not simply the ability to speak words. Rather, it represents a form of integrity in expression—a consonance between what one perceives, feels and knows internally, and what one is able to articulate publicly (Gilligan, 1982, 2023). To have a voice means to register one's lived reality in language, to be heard by others and to hear others in return. It also involves resisting the forced choices generated by split-thinking: for instance, the demand to choose between autonomy or connection, reason or emotion, power or care. When these splits are internalised, individuals become disconnected from their true voices.

In this light, Gilligan's notion of *voice* emerges as both a psychological concept and a political one. Reclaiming voice means resisting the psychic split, affirming the interdependence of thought and feeling, autonomy and connection, power and care. It entails cultivating a moral framework that values relationality and integrity rather than detachment and abstraction. By exposing how patriarchal culture enforces silences and disconnections, Gilligan insists that the restoration of voice is crucial for human flourishing and for creating a more inclusive society (Blum, 2010; Gilligan, 1982, 2023).

RADICAL LISTENING AS A METHOD

13

Gilligan in her work *In a Human Voice* lays down a method called radical listening, an approach that redefines the way we attend to voices, both spoken and unspoken. The word *radical* derives from the Latin root *radix*, meaning *root*. Such listening attends to both what is explicitly articulated but also to what is withheld and silenced. In *In a Human Voice*, Gilligan shows that listening is not only a research method but also a ethical practice. By really listening, we can notice what is left unsaid, pick up on hidden tensions, and help bring together things that were split apart. Her idea of radical listening means going deeper than just listening words, it is paying attention to the deeper meaning and unspoken dimensions in a conversation:

...radical listening is a way of listening that gets to the root of what is being said and also what is not being said. It specifies a way of tuning in to the under-voice, the conversation beneath the conversation. Radical listening holds a potential for transformation because it starts from a place of not knowing and develops the muscle of curiosity (Gilligan, 2023: 32).

Radical listening starts from a position of not-knowing and requires openness, humility and curiosity. By approaching human voices in this way radical listening becomes transformative: it not only makes visible hidden tensions and silences but also creates the possibility of connection and integration. Gilligan argues that conventional modes of listening are often shaped by dominant cultural frameworks that privilege certain voices and mute others. These frameworks tend to foreground justice, abstraction and detachment, while discounting or silencing the language of care, relationship and embodiment. Radical listening is thus a counter-practice: it resists these patterns of erasure by attuning itself to the voices that get lost in translation. It seeks to hear what remains unspoken due to fear, shame or the learned split between self and relationship. This approach underscores Gilligan's conviction that listening is not a passive act but an active ethical engagement that allows us to hear human experience in its full complexity.

The transformative feature of radical listening lies in restoring the fullness of human voice, i.e., when someone listens radically, they make space for another person to speak in ways that might otherwise be censored by cultural norms or internalised prohibitions. The act of listening itself becomes relational—it signals to the speaker that their voice matters, that the complexity of their experience can be acknowledge without being simplified or dismissed. By validating the “conversation beneath the conversation”, radical listening interrupts the cycle of silencing and reopens the possibility of dialogue grounded in authenticity and recognition.

Radical listening² has methodological significance in Gilligan's work. Building on the insights of *In a Different Voice*,³ the Listening Guide⁴ emphasises the multiplicity of voices that exist within individuals, including those at the margins or silenced through lack of resonance. It involves listening not only to what is spoken but also to what remains unspoken, to contradictions and to the ways voices can interrupt or silence one another. This perspective accepts that individuals often speak

indirectly or avoid expressing their true meaning. As a psychological method, the Listening Guide is sensitive to both inner psychological processes and the comprehensive sociocultural frameworks that form what can be articulated or heard. While it shares features with thematic and narrative analysis and grounded theory, it introduces distinctive *listening*.⁵ These include Listening for the *I*, which focuses on the speaker's first-person voice, and Listening for Contrapuntal Voices which attend to the interplay of multiple voices in connection with the research question. This method embodies the roles of radical listening by emphasising the polyphony within individuals rather than defining them merely as single, consistent perspective.

To listen radically to marginalised voices is to resist the hierarchies that determine whose experiences count as knowledge and whose do not. It is a practice that aligns with her broader ethics of care, situating voice, relationship and responsiveness at the centre of human interaction. By insisting on hearing the voices that dominant paradigms obscure, radical listening becomes an instrument of resistance. Radical listening offers a way of moving past the psychic splits that Gilligan identifies—splits between thinking and feeling, self and relationship, and care and power. By listening at the root, we begin to recover what has been marginalised to cultural silencing and reclaim the possibility of speaking and hearing in a human voice.

WHY ETHICS OF CARE?

Gilligan noticed that thinkers like Socrates and Freud to Kohlberg and Piaget, and more generally, in moral development theory, virtue is one, i.e., *justice*. On the other hand, *care* is considered secondary, a *supererogatory* duty. It means that if one practices *care*, it is good but not morally required, except in the case of women, where it was often expected. Therefore, Gilligan's insight was that the ethical framework itself reflects the gender binary and hierarchy: *justice* is treated as the central moral standard, while *care* is devalued or confined to women.

Gilligan resists the claim that moral orientations are biologically determined by sex. While traditional models often treat *justice* and *care* as separate modes of moral reasoning, Gilligan try to highlight that they are internally connected. Radical listening allows us to observe how perspectives of care can develop our understanding of justice, and vice versa, revealing the intertwined nature of ethical reflection and relational responsibility.

For Gilligan:

...the distinction between a justice orientation and a care orientation pertains to the ways in which moral problems are conceived and reflects different dimensions of human relationships that give rise to moral concern. A justice perspective draws attention to problems of inequality and oppression and holds up an ideal of reciprocal rights and equal respect for individuals. A care perspective draws attention to problems of detachment or abandonment and holds up an ideal of attention and response to need (Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988: 224–225).

She relates these two perspectives to different ideas of self: while care perspectives involve a relational self, justice perspectives involve a separate, autonomous self. Rather than seeing these selves as separate and distinct, Gilligan believes that they are intertwined aspects of human existence. Hekman cited, “One can only experience self in the context of relationship with others and, conversely, one can only experience relationship by differentiating other from self” (Hekman, 1995: 146). According to Gilligan, without care perspective justice perspective is incomplete. She suggests that adding care perspective helps us better understand the *truth* of human moral development. Gilligan’s aims are to provide a complete view of both men’s and women’s experiences by incorporating care perspective, which she believes reveals a fundamental truth⁶ about human development. By incorporating both perspectives Gilligan tries to provide a broader and more inclusive view of human moral development.

Gilligan argues that care orientation gives valuable understandings into the human experience, not only for women, but as a universal aspect of human moral life:

...to admit the truth of the women’s perspective to the conception of moral development is to recognise for both sexes the importance throughout life of the connection between self and other, the universality of the need for compassion and care. The concept of the separate self and of moral principles uncompromised by the constraints of reality is an adolescent ideal, the elaborately wrought philosophy of a Stephen Daedalus whose flight we know to be in jeopardy (Gilligan, 1982: 98).

Instead of treating care as an inherent trait of women, she frames it as a relational human ability that has been culturally coded as feminine under patriarchy. For Gilligan:

...patriarchy is an order of living based on a gender binary and hierarchy. To be a man, one must be masculine, not feminine, and also superior – both to man who are not perceived as real men and to women. In patriarchy, the order is: him over her, straight over gay (Gilligan, 2023:15).

Gilligan argues that care is not a secondary but a central practice of resistance to systemic injustice. For Gilligan, care is not merely about kindness or nurturance; it is a approach of resistance because it disrupts the psychic and cultural split that separates reason from emotion, self from other, autonomy from relationship, and power from care. Resisting these splits: it entails listening to silenced voices recognising that human beings are fundamentally interdependent. The ethics of care affirms this interdependence, undermining the hierarchies that rely on the denial of vulnerability and relationship.

Gilligan further said that *care* must not be confined to a stereotypically feminine trait. Instead, care should be recognised as political, collective and transformative. Injustice often depends on silencing invisible perspectives of women and marginalised groups. Care becomes a practice of resistance precisely because it entails hearing and responding to those voices. (Gilligan, 2011). Resistance in this framework is not limited to confrontation but also involves truth-telling, radical listening, and the courage to acknowledge what dominant narratives attempt to suppress. By

centering care, individuals can create relational spaces where voice, recognition and connection become possible.

Gilligan's feminist contribution to this discourse lies in uncovering how justice has been partial and exclusionary, built on the denial of relational realities. A feminist ethics of care reframes morality to include what has been dismissed as subjective or secondary—emotion, embodiment, and responsibility to others. Importantly, Gilligan (2011) does not claim that women are naturally more caring, thereby avoiding essentialism. Instead, she highlights how patriarchal culture has historically assigned care to women while devaluing it, thus obscuring its significance for all human beings.

In *The Birth of Pleasure* (2002), Gilligan and Snider explain that stories about love, intimacy, and power are influenced by divisions in culture. These divisions like separating mind from body, self from others, change how relationships are seen. Important parts of human experience, such as feelings, vulnerability, and connection, are often overlooked which makes love and power look like opposites instead of things that can go together. They argue that patriarchal traditions equate maturity with the repression of vulnerability and the acceptance of tragic love stories which perpetuate cycles of domination and loss. Resistance, as Gilligan and Snider (2002) explain, involves reimagining relationships not through sacrifice or silence but through pleasure, mutual recognition and care. Gilligan's reclamation of care and pleasure can reconfigure intimate and cultural life, challenging the inevitability of hierarchical and tragic structures. Gilligan and Snider said, "humans are relational beings, born with a voice and with the desire to live not alone but in relationships" (Gilligan, 2023:18).

In practical terms, Gilligan (2011) suggests that resisting injustice through care requires creating conditions in which people can speak and be heard, where relationships are prioritised, and where policies are evaluated not merely on the basis of fairness but also in terms of their ability to sustain connection. In education, this means valuing students' voices and cultivating relational learning. In psychology, it involves addressing the wounds caused by silencing and fostering healing through recognition. In politics, it sounds for ever-changing away from control and hierarchy toward structures that support mutual responsibility. In everyday life, it requires refusing complicity with silencing and practicing radical listening.

Gilligan argues ethics of care as radical because it goes to the root of human life—our interdependence, our need for recognition and the value of *voice*. Resisting injustice, therefore, is not simply about fighting external systems of domination but also about rejecting the internalised psychic splits that inhibit care and connection. Care becomes a source of strength and a path toward transformation, offering an alternative to the silencing and domination that sustain injustice. The ethics of care emerges as both a political practice and a reorientation of cultural imagination—resistance is reimagined as an affirmation of life, relationship, and pleasure, thereby opening pathways toward a more humane and just world.

Though Gilligan recognises *justice* and *care* as two distinct ways of thinking about ethics. She is clear that neither is better than the other. When asked if the care perspective is superior, she pointed out that it is important to pay attention to care and responsibility rather than ignoring these aspects. She also thinks that it is more meaningful to see detachment as a moral concern rather than overlooking it. In other words, Gilligan claims that both perspectives are essential for a complete understanding of ethics.

GILLIGAN'S RESPONSES TO THE ESSENTIALIST CRITICS IN A HUMAN VOICE

From the 1990s onward, a significant strand of feminist scholarship raised concerns that Gilligan's framing of an *ethics of care*, even if meant as a corrective to androcentric models of moral development, risked inadvertently reinforcing essentialist views of gender. Critics argued that celebrating women's orientation to care could be read not as a challenge to patriarchal hierarchies, but as a reinforcement of traditional divisions of labour that locate women within the private, emotional and relational sphere, while leaving men to dominate the public, rational and political domains. Nancy Fraser, for example, warned that an uncritical valorisation of women's caring practices "...runs the danger of naturalizing women's subordination by revaluing precisely those traits and activities that have historically been used to justify their confinement to the domestic sphere" (Fraser, 1997: 23). From this perspective, Gilligan's ideas could be taken over by a culture that already expects women to do most of the emotional work, which might end up reinforcing, rather than reducing, gender inequality.

Other feminists while echoing this concern point out that the emphasis on care could entrench the expectation that women's primary moral and social contributions lay in caregiving, relational maintenance, and empathy, while absolving men of responsibility in these domains (Tronto, 1993; Ruddick, 1989). Joan Tronto in particular argued that *ethics of care* had to be reframed in political and structural terms rather than to be celebrated as *women's voice*, to avoid reinscribing the gender binaries that feminist theory sought to dismantle. Similarly, Evelyn Fox Keller warned that appeals to women's difference could too easily slide into a form of soft essentialism, which, although well-meaning, risked portraying women as naturally more relational, nurturing, or moral, and therefore locking them into predetermined roles.

In *a Human Voice*, Gilligan while refereeing to theses critiques responds to them by saying that *ethics of care* should not be understood as a sex-based moral orientation, but as a human ability that has been systematically suppressed or devalued by patriarchal arrangements. These arrangements, she argues, operate through a series of binary splits—between reason and emotion, mind and body, self and other, public and private—that silence or marginalise relational modes of knowing. By reframing care as a human competency, rather than a "women's way of moral knowing", Gilligan seeks to undo the essentialist interpretations of her earlier work. *Care*, for her is not the property of women, but the practice of human connection, indispensable to the health of both persons and democracy. In this sense, *ethics of care* is repositioned not

as a gendered attribute but as a developmental and political resource whose suppression under patriarchal norms diminishes the moral capacities of all genders.

One of the most persistent criticisms of Gilligan's work is that despite her insistence on moving from a *different* to a *human* voice her view remains shadowed by the empirical origins of *In a Different Voice* and its association with women's moral development. Researchers have claimed that even when Gilligan explicitly rejects biological essentialism, the framing of her early work encouraged readings that seemed to reinforce the very dichotomy she sought to overcome. As Joan Tronto notes: "Gilligan's emphasis on women's ways of knowing risked reinforcing gender stereotypes, even as she was attempting to destabilize them" (Tronto, 1993:7). This concern persists into the reception of her newer work, raising the question: if Gilligan is now calling for a *human* voice, is this simply a reframing of what was once a gendered thesis?

Gilligan addresses this tension too. She holds that although her research initially focused on interviews with women, but she emphasised that the patterns she found are not about women's natural essence. Instead, they show the effects of patriarchy: boys are taught to turn away from care to become men, while girls are taught to silence themselves to be good women. The issue, then, is less about difference itself and more about the cultural rules that shape how boys and girls learn to act:

...the internalisation of the gender binary and hierarchy marks the psyche's induction into patriarchy. As a rule of thumb, when you hear a gender binary (human capabilities spoken of as either "masculine" or "feminine") and a hierarchy where the masculine is elevated over the feminine, (e.g., reason over emotion, self over relationship), you know you're in patriarchy, however it may be called (Gilligan, 2023: 82).

As she puts it, the division between thought and feeling, self and relationship is not a mark of maturity but an injury of patriarchy. She writes:

...the induction of the psyche into the gendered splits and divisions that undergird a patriarchal order of living forces a betrayal of what's right. The initiation into patriarchy shatters truth by making it impossible to live with integrity in relationship with others. Moral development then depends on resistance. As a healthy body resists infection, a healthy psyche resists moral injury (Gilligan, 2023:82–83).

Some critics like Benhabib have said that Gilligan's approach might turn important social and structural issues about gender into just psychological accounts. Yet Gilligan's response in *In a Human Voice* makes clear that her analysis is not about celebrating femininity against masculinity, but about exposing how patriarchal norms do violence to all genders—albeit in different, gender-specific ways.

The move from *different* to *human* corrects a problem in how the earlier research was framed. It de-essentialises the idea that care is something only women naturally have and shows that caring is a human capacity that every person can develop. However, society's gender norms often shape and limit how this ability is expressed in both men and women. Gilligan's critiques of essentialism are met with a reorientation. Gilligan does not deny the gendered patterns identified in her early research; rather,

she upholds that these patterns are historically contingent outcomes of patriarchal culture rather than biological facts. As she argues, the split between care and justice is not natural; it is enforced.

Another set of critiques interrogates whether Gilligan's notion of *human voice*, while presented as a universal corrective, carries with it the normative assumptions of Western moral psychology. Critics have asked whether Gilligan's emphasis on voice, framed through the first-person assertion of "I," risks reinstalling the very individualism it seeks to overcome. The question, then, is whether Gilligan's *human voice* can truly be heard across diverse normative worlds, or whether it inadvertently reasserts the liberal subject under the guise of relationality.

Gilligan attempts to guard against this critique by stating that *voice* is not an isolated assertion of autonomy but rather a mode of relational presence. Gilligan emphasises that her claim is not for a universal form of expression, but for a universal capacity that takes different forms. As she notes, Voice names a human capacity, not a prescription for speech. It is the ability to register experience honestly in a relational context, which may be enacted in many cultural idioms (Gilligan, 2023).

Thus, while Gilligan's reframing from *different* to *human* seeks to overcome essentialism that care is naturally linked to women and justice is naturally linked to men. However, it doesn't fully address how ideas about care and human voice might be understood, expressed, or functional across different cultures with varying social norms and expectations. Do ideas about reclaiming one's voice work the same way in cultures that value interdependence over individual self-assertion, or where individuals are not treated as fully independent moral agents? As Benhabib notes, "...the problem of universality cannot be evaded; it must be negotiated through a dialogue across difference" (Benhabib, 2002: 23).

CONCLUSION

The movement from a *different voice* to a *human voice* signifies more than a theoretical adjustment; it represents a profound shift in how we understand moral development, social relations, and democratic life. By rejecting the binaries that once confined psychological and philosophical discourse—justice versus care, reason versus emotion, self-versus relationship—Gilligan articulates a framework that insists on integration rather than division. The idea of a human voice both looks back, recognising the important critiques of justice-centered moral development, and looks forward, imagining a future where the ability to speak, listen, and remain whole becomes the basis of human flourishing.

Rejoining what was split is therefore not a matter of resolving an academic debate but of engaging in a collective project of cultural and political repair. It requires unlearning the habits of patriarchal socialisation that treat vulnerability as weakness, relationality as dependence, or care as secondary to justice. It challenges institutions to recognise that silencing is not neutral but corrosive, undermining both personal

well-being and social trust. And it reminds us that democracy itself rests on the delicate but powerful practice of voice—of people who can tell the truth about their lived experiences and listen carefully to the truths of others.

Gilligan's *non-essentialist* spirit is prominent through her emphasis on listening to *human voice*:

...I was not an essentialist. Rather, the gendering of care and caring as “feminine,” together with the fact that I heard the voice of care ethics as a feminine voice, alerted me to the construction of gender as a binary (either masculine or feminine) and a hierarchy (privileging the masculine) (Gilligan, 2023:8–9).

Human voice is thus less a destination than an orientation, an ongoing commitment to integrity, mutual recognition and interdependence. It does not ask us to choose sides in a long-standing opposition between care and justice, or between reason and emotion, but to grow into a more capacious way of being human—one that affirms our capacity to know and feel, to claim our own integrity while remaining open to the needs of others. “... The human voice is a voice of resistance, and care ethics is an ethics of liberation” (Gilligan, 2023:110). In this sense, moral development is redefined as the practice of living *truthfully* within relationships, and democratic renewal becomes inseparable from the recovery of human voice. The invitation, then, is not only to revisit past debates but to take up the urgent work of speaking, listening and acting in ways that affirm our shared humanity.

NOTES

- ¹ The different voice as articulated by Gilligan, emerges as powerful force of resistance, and an insistence on staying connected and, most importantly, staying connected with women but she was careful to recognize that this voice which could also belong to men: This voice was one of care and responsibility, of concern and connection with other people, and Gilligan claims that it stems from a self which is intrinsically related to other people. It is a voice that, according to Gilligan, Kohlberg consistently underrated because his theory of moral reasoning accentuates, and therefore limits its investigations to, a voice of justice and, by implication, considers a mature self to be autonomous and capable of abstract reasoning. (Larrabee, 1993: 4)
- ² Radical listening, as Gilligan develops it, is a way of attending not merely to what is spoken but also to what is withheld, silenced, or expressed indirectly. It seeks to uncover the “conversation beneath the conversation,” enabling researchers to perceive tensions and contradictions in voice (Gilligan, 2023).
- ³ In *A Different Voice* (Gilligan, 1982) challenged Lawrence Kohlberg’s justice-based model of moral development by introducing an ethics of care, foregrounding relationships, responsibility, and context as vital to moral reasoning. These insights provided the foundation for later methodological innovations like the Listening Guide.
- ⁴ The Listening Guide is a voice-oriented psychological approach that seeks to understand a person’s inner world through the ways in which that world is expressed in speech and relationships. Rather than treating voice simply as a means of transmitting information, the method considers it an important medium through which subjective experiences, emotions, relationships, and aspects of the self become perceptible. Its application is therefore not restricted to a particular group or context, since individuals communicate their inner

experiences through diverse forms of expression. At the same time, a person's voice is shaped by multiple influences, including bodily experience, personal history, language, culture, and relationships with others. These influences contribute to the particular character of an individual's voice and reveal the complex ways in which personal and social experiences become embedded in the self. Accordingly, the Listening Guide approaches voice as multidimensional and relational, attending to the different and sometimes contrasting voices that may emerge within an individual's account. The method employs a series of analytical steps through which the researcher listens closely to these voices and their interrelations, thereby developing a deeper understanding of the speaker's subjective and relational world (Gilligan, Spencer, Weinberg, & Bertsch, 2006)

⁵ The methodological innovation of the Listening Guide lies in its systematic series of listening, each designed to illuminate different dimensions of a participant's voice and experience (Gilligan, Spencer, Weinberg, & Bertsch, 2006)

⁶ Gilligan's claim that truth refers that the care perspective uncovers a basic insight into human development—namely, that relationships, emotions, and responsibility to others are central to human growth, not secondary or marginal concerns.

REFERENCES

- Blum, L. A. (2010). *Gilligan and Kohlberg: Implications for moral theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Benhabib, S. (1992). *Situating the self: Gender, community, and postmodernism in contemporary ethics*. Routledge.
- Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the "postsocialist" condition*. Routledge.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (2011). *Joining the resistance*. Polity press.
- Gilligan, C. (2015). The Listening Guide method of psychological inquiry. In S. Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of multimethod and mixed methods research inquiry* (pp. 143–162). Oxford University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (2023). *In a human voice*. Polity press.
- Gilligan, C. Lyons, N. & Hanmer, T. (Eds.). (1990). *Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard School*. Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C. & J, Attanucci. (1988). Two Moral Orientations: Gender Differences and Similarities. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 34 (3), 223–237.
- Gilligan, C. Spencer, R. Weinberg, M. K. & Bertsch, T. (2006). On the Listening Guide: A voice-centered relational method. In Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber, Patricia Leavy (Ed), *Emergent methods in social research*. Sage Publications.
- Hekman, Susan J. (1995). *Moral Voices, Moral Selves*. The Pennsylvania State University Press
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on moral development, Volume I: The philosophy of moral development*. Harper & Row.
- Larrabee, M. J. (1993). *An Ethics of Care: Feminist and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Routledge Chapman and Hall, Inc.

Noddings, N. (2013). *Caring: A relational approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). University of California Press. (Original work published 1984).

Tronto, J. C. (1993). *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. Routledge.

Received	Revised	Accepted	Published
30 March 2026	5 May 2026	25 May 2026	25 June 2026

HOW TO CITE

APA Borah, U., & Deka, J. (2026). *Listening to the Human Voice: Carol Gilligan*. ZEITGEIST, 1(2), 10–22. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22980012>

CHICAGO Borah, Uddipona, and Jahnabi Deka. 2026. “Listening to the Human Voice: Carol Gilligan.” ZEITGEIST 1 (2): 10–22. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22980012>

MLA Borah, Uddipona, and Jahnabi Deka. “Listening to the Human Voice: Carol Gilligan.” ZEITGEIST, vol. 1, no. 2, 2026, pp. 10–22. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22980012>

© 2026 the author(s). Published by the Internal Quality Assurance Cell, Bahona College. Open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence: use, sharing and adaptation are permitted in any medium provided the original work is cited.