ances are deceiving, for behind the frolic the authors address serious questions in their attempt to understand the nation’s leisure and play habits. Of course the major historical considerations of class, ethnicity and gender and their implications for who could and could not play and at what, are interwoven through the essays — what contemporary social history book with intellectual intent does not consider this triumvirate? But also included are the issues of industrialization, urbanization, consumerism and commercialism, religion and gender identities. The subjects of the essays through which these issues are examined are an eclectic mix as even a cursory glance down the title list reveals: roller skating, children’s games, stereographs, photography, angling, rifle shooting, resorts and immigrant German culture provide the means for “furthering the ... interpretation of the history of leisure pursuits and children’s play.” If all this seems a little much in a volume of two hundred and sixty two pages, of which two hundred and twenty six is text (including 141 pictures) perhaps it is. Certainly, it leaves the reader wondering about the rationale for the selection of these essays and the common strands of historical inquiry that usually bind such compilations together.

Grover, in her useful introduction, struggles to provide the book with a sense of cohesiveness, suggesting that many of the essays deal with play as “the culturally mandated cure for bodily and psychological stress.” She astutely observes that both the regeneration of the workforce and the spiritual salvation of a rapidly evolving population were among the motives of those who advocated appropriate leisure pursuits. Her assertion smacks of social control theory. While the book cannot be simply categorized as such, the essays suggest the potentialities for the analysis of play based on conflict and the inequality of groups and their access to resources and power. Also significant as a unifier are the authors’ implicit refutation of guru Johan Huizinga’s definition of play. Huizinga, whose spirit is invoked briefly in the introduction, believed that play was voluntary, free “... in fact freedom,” and was distinct from ordinary life. The essays reveal the limitation of this definition and demonstrate that the complexities of play defy absolute definition.

As with all collections of essays the level of analysis, depth of research and quality of writing varies, but generally they reflect preparation and presentation above and beyond symposium reprints. Particularly good and appropriate as the opening piece is Glenn Uminowicz’s study of Ocean Grove and Asbury Park, resorts that received a middle-class Protestant stamp of approval for their morally acceptable means of physical and spiritual regeneration. This reviewer’s favourite, Colleen Sheehy’s examination of the growing popularity of angling among middle and upper class men, provides insight into the Victorian preoccupation with “manly” leisure time pursuits. Also notable is Donald Mrozek’s short concluding essay which, despite its length encapsulates many of the themes found throughout the book. Unfortunately, space limitation precludes individual review of the essays, but to those interested in social history it can be assured that Grover’s wish, that the reader find much pleasure in the book, will come true.

Tony Joyce
Queen’s University


This book is preceded by Carol Gilligan’s influential work, In a Different Voice (1982). In a Different Voice, which received great popular acclaim, was Gilligan’s critique of the androcentric bias of psychological theory and research that deemed inferior the moral development of females compared to the moral development of males. Whether one considers Freud’s concept of penis envy or the story of Adam and Eve, females will be defined as deviant when normative standards for human behavior are based on male models. Gilligan argued that women’s development relative to men’s is indeed different but not deficient.
Based on three interview studies, she concluded that men approach moral issues with an orientation toward justice and rights, and women with an orientation toward care and responsibilities. Despite the validation that Gilligan's book provided women, feminist scholars criticized her work for lacking scientific rigor, romanticizing “separate spheres” dualism, and ignoring that a different voice may have arisen not from essential femaleness but from women's subordinate position in the social hierarchy. Furthermore, gender differences in moral reasoning have not been found when examined systematically by other psychologists. Critics feared that Gilligan's assertion of women's different moral voice would be used to justify unequal treatment of women. In fact, in the bestselling Backlash (1991), Susan Faludi included a section titled “Carol Gilligan: Different Voices or Victorian Echoes?” in which she stated, “Very much against her will, Gilligan became the expert that backlash mass media loved to cite.” (331)

In Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Psychology and Girls' Development, Gilligan and her co-author, Lyn Mikel Brown, avoid the contentious issue of gender differences by focusing their book exclusively on the female experience. The study described in the book is one of a series conducted by the Harvard Project on Women's Psychology and Girls' Development. This study, conducted over a five year period, included nearly 100 girls between the ages of seven and eighteen from the Laurel School, a private day school for girls in Cleveland, Ohio. In defense of their advantaged sample, the authors explain, “We do not claim that these girls are representative of girls in general, but that their voices are worth listening to and taking seriously.” (16-17)

Meeting at the crossroads between childhood and adolescence are the girls at Laurel School and the women from Harvard who have come to Cleveland to learn from the students' experiences. The central theme of the book is the relational impasse, the crisis of connection, experienced by girls at the edge of adolescence, who learn that they are expected to silence their own voices for the sake of conflict-free, idealized relationships. The book describes not only the development of the students but the growth of the authors and their collaborators as they struggle with conflicts between their professional training as researchers and their desire to create authentic relationships with the girls whom they study.

In an interesting discussion of their methodology, Brown and Gilligan recount their abandonment of an experimental design following the discovery that the design was incompatible with the goal of the research: “We had come to the school to understand more about girls' responses to a dominant culture that is out of tune with girls' voices and for the most part uninterested in girls' experiences, which objectifies and idealizes young women and at the same time trivializes and denigrates them, and yet unwittingly we set into motion a method of psychological inquiry appropriated from this very system.” (10) They felt that the standardized procedures required by the scientific method were causing withdrawal and distrust among the girls, preventing the interviewers from “following girls to the places they wished to go.” (11) Unlike other psychologists who strive to reconcile experimental methodology and statistical analyses with compassion and respect for human participants in research, Brown and Gilligan decided to discard the structured interview protocol and the experimental and control groups in favor of a voice-centered, relational approach. Looking to clinical, literary, and feminist theory, they developed a “Listener's Guide,” a method for carefully reading and listening for different themes in interview text.

The authors' departure from a traditional research paradigm is further characterized by their refusal to view the girls as “subjects” (i.e., objects of scientific study) and by their disinterest in suppressing their emotions surrounding the research process in the name of objectivity. The regard that Brown and Gilligan have for the opinions of the individuals who participate in their research is exceptional. When presenting their findings at a national conference the authors realized that they missed the girls. Gilligan then went back to the school to tell the girls how their words
were affecting others and to ask them how they wanted to be involved as the work was presented to the public.

Most of Meeting at the Crossroads is devoted to following individual girls over time, analyzing changes in their voices as they enter adolescence. Again and again the authors see the girls at a relational impasse. When they are young the girls take for granted the ability to speak freely and to be heard, as well as the possibility of open conflict and disagreement within relationships. At times they feel anger, they refuse to take no for an answer, they demand respect. But as they pass from girlhood to womanhood they become confused. They confront unattainable images of perfect (selfless) women and perfect (inauthentic) relationships. The confident voices of self-knowledge give way to repetition of the phrase “I don’t know.” In a section intriguingly titled “Jessie: The Tyranny of Nice and Kind,” interviews reveal the gradual replacement of the voice of self with “the foreign voice-overs of adults.” (86) By the time she is eleven Jessie has learned that she is to maintain unsatisfying relationships, suppress her feelings, and remain silent in the face of disagreement.

Rather than risk conflict that might lead to isolation or even violence, the young women learn to silence themselves in the service of relationships. They give up the authentic relationships they have known for idealized relationships with forced happy endings. The same girls who used to “blow the whistle on relational violations,” (44) (e.g., when others would interrupt them, ignore them, or hurt their feelings) confront at adolescence the relational struggles of adult women: “the desire for authentic connection, the experience of disconnection, the difficulties in speaking, the feeling of not being listened to or heard or responded to empathically, the feeling of not being able to convey or even believe in one’s own experience.” (5)

Brown and Gilligan do provide interviews with some girls who manage to continue their whistle-blowing as they grow older. Anna, for example, transforms from being “really, really shy and quiet” (193) into someone who is not afraid to ask questions about God, violence, and privilege in front of her religious classmates, and into someone who wants to give “the best Senior Speech in the world in terms of shocking people.” (194) Others do not fare as well, such as Liza, who distances herself from her female friends, remains with an emotionally abusive boyfriend, and develops an eating disorder. Unfortunately, the authors fail to explore a critical question: Why are some of these young women more vulnerable or more resilient than others as they come of age within a misogynistic culture? In addition to gender, what characteristics and life experiences influence the development of each of these girls in a particular direction?

The authors note that in listening to the girls they began to learn once again what they had come not to know. In developing resonant relationships with the girls, the women came to “reclaim lost voices and lost strengths” and “to strengthen girls’ voices and girls’ courage.” (6) Brown and Gilligan believe that female resistance to the loss of self and relationship is profoundly political. Even readers of Meeting at the Crossroads who disdain qualitative research or who disdain research in general can take up their own methods and heed Brown and Gilligan’s call to join the resistance. To paraphrase Lorraine Hansberry (To Be Young, Gifted, and Black, 1989, 222), the acceptance of our present condition is the only action that discredits us before our children.

Sharon Danoff-Burg
University of Kansas


A Class Apart is probably best described as a gay history book for the coffee-table. It is comprised mainly of beautifully reproduced photographs taken by Montague Glover, a British amateur photographer and homosexual. The pictures were taken during the period from about 1918 to the 1950s. They are supplemented with text written by James Gardiner who discovered the private photographs at