

# Psychologically Speaking

Summer 2009, Volume 3, Number 1

A newsletter from the Department of Psychology, Emory University

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- New PAIS Building
- Letter from the Chair:  
Robyn Fivush
- Opening Invitation
- Donors
- Alumni News
- New Faculty:  
Patricia Bauer, Edward  
Craighead, Joseph Manns
- Feature: Drew Westen:  
The Political Brain
- Graduate Student:  
Umay Suanda 12G
- Undergraduate Student:  
Stephanie Fengler 09C
- Feature: Linda Craighead:  
Appetite Awareness
- Request for Information



EMORY



## Psychology and Interdisciplinary Sciences Building

If you are a parent, or you voted in the last presidential election, if you have a family member or friend who suffers from Alzheimer's, schizophrenia, depression, bipolar disorder, or addictions, if you can imagine the importance of understanding how we remember, how we manage stress, or how legends are made—it's a dream come true.

In May 2009, Emory unveiled the new Psychology and Interdisciplinary Sciences (PAIS) building. Faculty and staff from the Child Study Center, Psychological Center, Cognition and Development, and Neuroscience and Animal Behavior are finally together—after years of

*continued on page 2*

[Click here to go to the Department of Psychology website.](#)



Robyn Fivush

## From the Chair

**W**e have moved. As we settle into our beautiful new building, equipped with state of the art classrooms and laboratories, we are grateful that the administration has provided such wonderful support for our department. During the past few years, various faculty and staff have worked closely with the architects

and builders, and the result is a truly visionary building that brings us all together for the first time in twenty years. We invite all our alumni and friends to join us at the official opening reception on September 25 to see what all the excitement is about.

The new building highlights the cutting edge research that faculty and students are doing at Emory. The Child Studies Center, located on the main floor, houses faculty and students studying the origins and development of language, memory, spatial cognition, number, and the self. These questions are at the heart of understanding what it is to be human, and how infants and children develop in social and cultural contexts that facilitate ways of knowing about the world and the self.

The Psychological Center located on the top floor, continues to reach out to the community to help those in need of testing, assessment, and intervention. It is also where faculty and students

are doing groundbreaking research to help understand the etiology of mental health and mental illness, including schizophrenia, depression, and psychopathy.

The Cognition Labs, on the third and fourth floors, house faculty and students examining basic questions about thought and reason in humans, nonhuman primates, and rodents (although the nonhuman primates and rodents continue to be housed at other facilities). Our comparative and cultural approach allows researchers to investigate the evolutionary origins of language, memory, and thought, and the role of culture, in shaping thought and language.

And our new Facility for Education and Research in Neuroimaging (FERN) located on the main floor offers exciting new opportunities for faculty and students to “peek into the brain” to learn how brain and behavior are interleaved in understanding and predicting how we think, how we communicate, and how we remember.

We are, indeed, in exciting times. The Department of Psychology continues to rise in the national rankings, and with good reason. Our faculty and students are doing cutting-edge research in absolutely state-of-the-art facilities. Come learn more about us at our open house on September 25 and see for yourself.

Robyn Fivush

### *New Building—continued from page 1*

being scattered across campus in sundry nooks and crannies—under one big roof. Modern classrooms and meeting spaces, research laboratories, and offices are spread out over 119,000 square feet, while the first floor is dedicated to the newly formed Facility for Education and Research in Neuroscience (FERN). The research center will feature real-time brain imaging (fMRI), electrophysiological, and psychophysiological recording equipment to explore the mysteries of human cognition, emotions, development, and brain disorders.

Robyn Fivush, Samuel Candler Dobbs Professor of Psychology and chair of the department, says, “New technologies and sophisticated methodologies are allowing us to learn things about the human brain that were just unimaginable even a decade ago.”

The new PAIS building is situated near the chemistry building, and it’s just yards away from mathematics, physics, and computational sciences. The proximity of these facilities is no accident; it is part of a vision that seemingly unrelated disciplines will join forces to tackle the big challenges of this century, such as energy

needs, stem cell research, moral issues, diversity, and sustainability. David Lynn, Asa Griggs Candler Professor of Chemistry and Biology and chair of the chemistry department, says, “The interface between two seemingly divergent fields is where new discoveries are found.”

And the possibilities are endless. Marshal Duke, Candler

Professor of Psychology, expresses the view that psychology may not only merge with chemistry and other sciences, but with the liberal arts as well. He says, “The brain processes everything. Across the University, people are interested in how the brain responds to music, art, and literature. Now it’s possible to address those questions at very different levels.”

So if you’re interested in or have concerns about virtually anything

that has to do with the human community, a dream has indeed come true. In addition to amazing talent, which we’ve always boasted, we now have a beautiful facility and new tools to make even more of an impact on the future. Perhaps Jessica Alexander, a recent PhD graduate who studies learning and memory, put it best when she was asked what she thinks of the new PAIS building. She simply said, “It’s fantastic!”

**Faculty and staff from the Child Research Center, Psychology Center, and Cognition and Development are finally together—after years of being scattered across campus in sundry nooks and crannies—under one big roof.**

# You are invited!



EMORY  
UNIVERSITY

Psychology and Interdisciplinary  
Sciences Building

## OPENING CELEBRATION

Friday, September 25, 2009  
2:00–6:00 p.m.

Address: 36 Eagle Row  
Atlanta, GA 30322

For schedule of events:  
[www.psychology@emory.edu](http://www.psychology@emory.edu)

For directions to Emory campus:  
[www.psychology@emory.edu](http://www.psychology@emory.edu)

Tours of the building, ribbon cutting, and distinguished speakers: Ben Johnson, chair of the Board of Trustees; James Wagner, president of Emory University; Bobby Paul, dean of Emory College; David Edwards; Steve Nowicki; Marshall Duke; Darryl Neill; and more.

The Emory alumni, parents, friends, and faculty listed below have made generous financial contributions in support of the construction of the new Psychology and Interdisciplinary Sciences Building. Please consider joining them in support of this important project. To make your gift, please contact Jeff Prince, senior director of development for Emory College, at 404.727.4494 or [jprince@emory.edu](mailto:jprince@emory.edu). If you would like to make your gift online using the Emory secure website, please visit [www.emory.edu](http://www.emory.edu) and click on the "Make a Gift" button. However you choose to

make your gift, please clearly indicate that it is for the new Psychology and Interdisciplinary Sciences Building. All donors to the project will be recognized on a permanent display. (If you prefer not to be recognized, please include this information with your gift.)

Donors will have opportunities to help shape the future of the Department of Psychology at Emory. Look for ways to support this project in future issues of *Psychologically Speaking*.

Hallee M. Altman	99C	David M. Altman	Meredith Joy Evans	89C	Johnny D. Evans
Patricia J. Bauer		James Steven Snow	Jane A. Finn	82C	
Susan L. Bauknight	63C	John Edward Bauknight	Paul and Phyllis Fireman Foundation		
The Bellick Foundation			Marcie Leigh Galin	07C	
Suzanne Karen Blough	84C	Douglas Blough	William Allen Gentry	00C	
Marjorie Ellen Blum	73C 76G 81G	Patricia F. Brady	Nicole Missner Gerber	93C	Aaron Gerber
Thomas W. Brady			Marc S. Gold	75G	
Marcus Benjamin Brodzki	08C	Christian Becton Camfield	Sarah Jennifer Goodman	04C 07B	
Tammy Morton Camfield	890X 91C	Jill B. Chaifetz	Barbara P. Henning	710X 73C	
Capital Group Companies Inc.	HQ	Jin Kyung Choy	Rachel E. Hershenberg	06C	
Richard Chaifetz		Alan M. Dershowitz	William Lewis Holder	49C	Ann C. Holder
Samuel Sunill Choy	88C 93L	James J. Edwards Jr. 87B	Holder Construction Company		
Carolyn Cohen	73C		Susan Lee Hornstein	94C	
P. Hakan Durudogan	83C		Jennifer Deane Jackson	95C	
Amber Leigh DuVall	06C		Johnson & Johnson	MT	
Laura Starr Edwards	88C		Augustus E. Jordan Jr.	79C	Laurel M. Jordan
Seth Aric Epstein	04C		Lisa Carlyn Kaley-Isley	83C	Jonathan M. Kaley-Isley
Victoria Pepe Erat	83C		Jacob H. Kaplan	01C	
Alisa Ann Esser-Kahn	07C		Michael A. Karchmer	69G 71G	Susan N. Karchmer

*continued on page 4*

**Donor List**—continued from page 3

Lisa Picken Kestler	00G 05G	Jeremy Kestler		Adam H. Rogers	92C 96M	Stephanie Fireman Rogers 92C
Sonya Marisa Khilnani	90C	Kirti S. Khilnani		Heidi Gutman Rosenfarb	92C	Jason Bennett Rosenfarb 91C 94L
Clemmie Baker King	79C			Eric J. Rothchild	78C	Susan B. Rothchild
Penny Koommoo-Welch	00C	Ryan S. Welch		Cherilyn Leigh Rowland	95C	
Jill Prigerson Langberg	79C	Jonathan Langberg		John Salamone	81G 83G	
Nancy E. Leckie	92C	Sean W. Leckie		Sandler Family Philanthropic Fund		
Wendy Lowensten-Sandler	82C	Neil Jeffrey Sandler		David M. Schwartz	80C	Karen A. Schwartz
Kris R. Ludwigsen	69G 72G			Marc Scott Schwartzberg	83C	
Lynda Sallach Madison	81G	James Kalab Madison 82G 83G		Jerel Eric Slaughter	94C	Nicole Yuan Slaughter
Sara Elizabeth Mannie	83G			Richard Petri Smith	61G	Sara Wings
Robert L. Mapou	81G 85G	Michael J. Zufall		Jodi Lobovits Sokoloff	98C	Rob Sokoloff
Tina P. McGinley	900X 92C	Gerry McGinley		David Gordon Tanner	940X 96C	Andrea Carson Tanner 95C
John Myles McKee	47C	Susan P. McKee		Kim Krinsky Valdes	88G 89G	Luis F. Valdes
Kate J. McRoskey	97C			Rebecca Dopkins Vallas	06C	
Stephen W. Mester	79C	Michele J. Mester 81C		Beth Anne Volin	75C	Gary Charles Wainer 75C
Joseph John Moran	73G	Barbara B. Moran 73G		Deborah Joy Walder	99G 02G	
Debra Match Morse	85C	Chalmers I. Morse		Jeffrey Mark Warsaw	07C	
Barbara V. Murphy		David T. Murphy		Briarly Carson White	99C	
Sondra Hope Nuzzolo		Ralph Michael Nuzzolo		Virginia Blythe Wickline	02C 06G	Adam Wickline
Jennifer P. Peluso	95G 98G			Ronald E. Wismar	71G 74G	
Jonathan Rhoads Pennock		Margo Hoff Pennock		Daniel Alan Wojnilower	83G 85G	Pamela Kerin Wojnilower 83G 87G
Stephanie Grace Puleo	78C			Alexandra D. Zagoloff	04C	
Allison Levi Rabin	96C	David J. Rabin		Stephanie Michele Zinn	96C	Andrew Philip Zinn 97C
Alvin Ricks		Cheryl Ricks				

## Alumni News

**SANDRA R. BATES 85C** is an assistant professor of radiology at Emory. She graduated from Georgetown University School of Medicine in 1990, completed a residency in radiology at the Medical College of Wisconsin in 1997, and was awarded a fellowship at the University of Virginia in 1998. She is married with two children and lives in Atlanta.

**KATHRYN (“KC”) CONLEY 05C** completed an MA in psychology at Teachers College, Columbia University in 2007, and entered the PhD program in counseling psychology at Virginia Commonwealth University. She says, “Warm thank you to Dr. Duke, Dr. Nowicki, and Dr. Bliwise for their support and guidance!”

**ANASTASIA DIMITROPOULOS 95C** completed her postdoctoral training at the Yale Child Study Center in New Haven, Connecticut. She is currently an assistant professor of psychology at Case Western Reserve in Cleveland, Ohio.

**MARY GRESHAM 74M** has been in clinical practice in Atlanta for twenty years. She developed a program called The Money School for Women. She says, “I continue to be grateful to Marshall Duke for helping me get through my thesis when I was stuck.”

**WM. LEWIS HOLDER 49C** says, “The department served me well back in the late 1940s. I was a psychology major and a premed minor and the psychology program actually prepared me better for med school and my eventual career as a child psychiatrist.” He is retired and resides in Cocoa, Florida.

**BONNIE KLEIN-TASMAN 00PHD** was promoted to associate professor with tenure in the Department of Psychology at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

**ROBB MAPOU 85PHD** is board certified in clinical neuropsychology in Silver Spring, Maryland. About David Freides, who retired in 2007 after forty years with the department, he says, “David was my graduate adviser and mentor, and he had a major impact on the direction of my career in neuropsychology.”

**MARGARET DEE MCGARITY 69C** is a chief judge of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the eastern district of Wisconsin. She was appointed in 1987 and reappointed in 2001. She was a coauthor of Collier’s Family Law and the Bankruptcy Code and Marital Property Law in Wisconsin. She writes and speaks about the relationship between family and bankruptcy law.

**FRANK A. ROWE JR. 71C** serves as the director of training in the psychology department of Hartgrove Hospital in Chicago.

**STEPHANIE SHEPARD 93C** received a PHD in 2003 from the University of Oregon. She is now an assistant professor at Brown University in the Center for the Study of Human Development and the Department of Psychiatry and Human Behavior. She was awarded a career development award from the NIH to support her research on the prevention of conduct problems in high-risk youth.

**RANY THOMMEN 04C** completed an MEd in autism and developmental disabilities and her board certification in applied behavior analysis from the University of Texas at Austin in 2005. Currently she’s working as a board certified behavior analyst and codirecting the Bluebonnet Trails Autism Program in Round Rock, Texas.

## New Faculty



Patricia Bauer

### Patricia Bauer

Patricia Bauer received a PhD from Miami University in 1985 and was a postdoctoral fellow at the University of California, San Diego from 1985 to 1989. She was on the faculty of the Institute of Child Development at the University of Minnesota from 1989 to 2005.

After two years in the Department of Psychology and Neuroscience at Duke University, she joined the faculty of Emory University in 2007. She serves as senior associate dean for research in the Emory College of Arts and Sciences and is the Asa Griggs Candler Professor of Psychology. Her research focuses on the development of memory from infancy through childhood, with special emphasis on the determinants of remembering and forgetting; and links between social, cognitive, and neural developments and age-related changes in autobiographical or personal memory.

### Edward Craighead

Edward Craighead received a doctorate from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1970. Beginning in 1970, he rose through the academic ranks to become professor of psychology in 1979 at Pennsylvania State University, where he served for many years as director of clinical training. He became a professor of psychiatry and behavioral sciences at Duke University Medical



Edward Craighead

Center in 1986 and was also professor of psychology and director of clinical training. In 1995, he moved to the University of Colorado at Boulder where he was professor, director of clinical training, and department chair from 2003 to 2006. In 2006, he moved to Emory University where he is a professor of psychology and professor of psychiatry and behavioral sciences. At Emory, he holds the J.

Rex Fuqua Chair and is the director of the Child and Adolescent Mood Program (CAMP). His research focuses on cognitive behavioral models of major depression and bipolar disorders in adults and adolescents.



Joseph Manns

### Joseph Manns

Joseph Manns received a BA from Santa Clara University and completed a PhD at the University of California, San Diego in 2002. He did a postdoctoral fellowship at Boston University from 2002 to 2007. His research focuses on electrophysiological recording in rats performing memory tasks and has addressed how

activity in the hippocampus allows us to encode and retrieve specific information about individual items.

### *Appetite Awareness—continued from page 8*

less eating that you don't enjoy or excessive eating for pleasure or comfort. Self-monitoring means writing down aspects of behaviors that you observe in yourself. It is a well-established technique that is the most powerful psychological strategy available when a person is motivated to change his/her own behavior. Eating is cheap, legal, and easily accessible, so other (especially punitive) techniques to help limit your eating are less effective. No one else can watch you all the time, and others typically can't control what you eat. Self-monitoring forces you to pay close attention to what and when you eat, and to acknowledge that you are making a conscious decision each time you start or stop eating. Some people have difficulty noticing their hunger, while others don't realize quickly enough that they are "full," or that they will feel full in just a few minutes. People learn to check in with their stomach before, during, and after eating to start identifying the physical cues. I may even encourage people to put their hand on their stomach to check or to wear a fairly snug belt until they are able to notice when they first start to feel full.

**Q.** How does this program differ from other eating programs?

**A.** The primary difference is the type of monitoring. Traditional programs have individuals monitor the times, types, and amount

of food they eat. AAT believes that eating will feel more normal and more positive (less deprivation) if you mostly eat the type of food you want and focus more on hunger and fullness. Initially we discourage people from writing down the foods themselves so they can focus just on the amounts that end up feeling good in their stomach. Later on, individuals may monitor food in addition to hunger and fullness, but maintaining a clear boundary on fullness remains the primary focus. We do this so that even when people eat higher calorie or "treat" foods, they do not overeat or binge.

The second major difference is the emphasis on finding one's positive motivation to stop at moderate fullness. Thus, we ask people to pay close attention to enjoying food while they eat and to stop eating while their stomach is still feeling quite comfortable. This positive motivation reduces the tendency to focus on feeling deprived or that you can't have what you want. Stopping at moderate fullness is not viewed as a punishment, but as a way to enjoy food and still enjoy how you feel afterwards. This is an eating strategy that people can maintain, while diets ultimately end up feeling so aversive that people go off them. Using your stomach to make your eating decisions becomes easier the longer you do it because you discover that you actually feel better physically and psychologically.



Drew Westen

**Drew Westen:**

# The Political Brain

**D**rew Westen received a BA at Harvard University, an MA in social and political thought at the University of Sussex (England), and a PhD in clinical psychology at the University of Michigan, where he subsequently taught for six years. For several years he was chief psychologist at Cambridge Hospital and associate professor at Harvard Medical School. His major areas of research are personality disorders, eating disorders, psychotherapy effectiveness, adolescent psychopathology, political psychology, and the interface of psychodynamics and neuroscience. He is an occasional commentator on NPR's All Things Considered, and his holiday song, "Oy, to be a Goy on Christmas," still airs on the radio in New York during the holiday season.

Westen is the author of three books and more than 150 articles, including *The Political Brain: The Role of Emotion in Deciding the Fate of the Nation*. He worked as a consultant to the Democratic Party during the recent presidential campaign.

The following is an excerpt from a blog written by Westen and posted on the Huffington Post website on November 17, 2008. To read the blog in full, go to [huffingtonpost.com](http://huffingtonpost.com).

**T**o understand what happened in November and December 2007 and again in September and October 2008 requires an understanding of what ultimately moves voters: the emotions that motivate virtually all human behavior. In October of 2007, the Obama who had tried to win the traditional Democratic way—by focusing on the relative merits of his ten-point plans, using language that was often more nuanced than moving—was running neck-in-neck with John Edwards for second place. The reality is that there wasn't much difference between his ten-point plan and those of his rivals. But there was an enormous difference between him and his rivals when he chose to use it in a capacity to inspire that we see only four or five times a century in American history. In November of 2007, the Obama who had captured the imagination of the nation with his 2004 address in the Democratic Convention (and rekindled that imagination on a blustery day in Springfield in early 2007 with an awe-inspiring address announcing his candidacy for the presidency) reemerged at the Jefferson-Jackson Dinner in Iowa and never looked back.

**Obama beat Hillary Clinton the same way he beat John McCain: by out-inspiring them, boxing them into the role of the candidate against hope and defining himself as the candidate of change in a year in which Americans wanted nothing more desperately than to put our nation on a different track.**

**Voters are neither rational nor irrational (although at times they can be both). They vote with their values as well as their interests, and a good candidate and a good message appeals to both.**

Obama found hope, and he began to inspire it again.

Although for months pundits continued to frame the race as a battle between Obama and "the Clintons," the reality was that it was more like a contest between Bill Clinton (or JFK or FDR) and Hillary Clinton—a candidate with an extraordinary capacity to inspire versus a candidate with many gifts except that one. No doubt, the capacity to organize and mobilize people was

one of the decisive factors in the election of 2008. But that capacity itself was dependent upon not only the skills of the Obama team but upon the rare personal qualities of Obama himself. For the next several months, many political commentators called for Obama to move beyond his message of "change" and toward the approach to campaigning that has been the downfall of Democratic politicians for generations; peppering voters with facts, figures, and policy positions

and assuming they will make a rational choice between bundles of plans. But we don't choose any of the important people in our lives that way, whether our spouses or our presidents. Obama beat Hillary Clinton the same way he beat John McCain: by out-inspiring them, boxing them into the role of the candidate against hope and defining himself as the candidate of change in a year in which Americans wanted nothing more desperately than to put our nation on a different track.

But hope and inspiration, by themselves, are not enough to win the White House. No one has ever won the presidency without making a case against his opponent, and no one has ever won who failed to address attacks from the other side (as Michael Dukakis and John Kerry would now be the first to acknowledge). As I argued in *The Political Brain*, Democrats' ambivalence

about aggression has been as much their downfall in prior elections as their irrational commitment to rationality—their belief that good ideas sell themselves, irrespective of the way they are presented and by whom. If the Obama of November and December 2007 began to channel voters' hopes, the Obama of

September and October 2008 began to channel and address not only their hopes but their fears—about the economy, about John McCain, and ultimately about himself.

Voters are neither rational nor irrational (although at times they can be both). They vote with their values as well as their interests, and a good candidate and a good message appeals to both.

*continued on page 7*



*Graduate Student*

## Umay Suanda 12G

**S**umarga (Umay) Suanda 12G grew up in West Java, Indonesia, received a BA from Wesleyan University, and is in his second year of the doctoral program, working with Laura Namy, associate professor of psychology. A year ago, Umay won a graduate research fellowship from the National Science Foundation. He is interested in how young children acquire language, in particular how they learn words. His research focuses on the nature and development of words and how they relate to other forms of symbolic communication (such as gestures), and the learning mechanisms children bring to bear in acquiring words.

Recently, Suanda and Namy conducted a study comparing the processes underlying two-year-old children’s learning of words and symbolic gestures (similar to baby signs). Using eye-tracking and behavioral methods, Suanda and Namy captured both an implicit and explicit measure of learning. What they found was that when children learned symbolic gestures, they relied on creating simple associations between the sign and object. Such a basic mechanism could not, however, fully explain children’s learning of words. This suggests that by two years of age, children’s word learning is guided at least in part by other mechanisms such as the understanding of communicative context and speaker intent. In his master’s thesis, Suanda continues to investigate the relationship between words and gestures by examining the relative status they play in younger word learners’ (eighteen-month-olds) early vocabularies.

Suanda is also interested in the development of other forms of human cognition. This interest has led him to collaborate with Stella Lourenco, assistant professor of psychology, on projects investigating the development and nature of numerical and other quantitative representations in early infancy.



*Undergraduate Student*

## Stephanie Fengler 09C

**S**tephanie Fengler is a member of the Emory Class of 2009, graduating summa cum laude with degrees in psychology and international studies. She was president of Psi Chi, the psychology honor society, and a member of the Pi Sigma Alpha and Phi Beta Kappa honor societies. Fengler was among Emory’s 100 Senior Honorary and listed in Who’s Who among Students in American Colleges and Universities. Fengler served as the senior resident adviser to the Clairmont Campus and Volunteer Emory halls. Her work with Volunteer Emory connected her with a myriad of local service opportunities including: MyHouse, a center for abused infants and toddlers, Café 458, a Samaritan House of Atlanta restaurant benefiting the homeless, and the DeKalb Rape Crisis Center, a hotline providing services to DeKalb residents impacted by sexual assault.

Sherryl Goodman was Fengler’s primary undergraduate mentor. Fengler served as a research assistant in the Goodman lab, engaged in research on the vulnerabilities and protective factors to depression. In addition to gathering behavioral, neurophysiological, and neuroendocrine measures of infants of depressed mothers, the Goodman lab continues to develop and test a form of mindfulness-based cognitive therapy tailored for pregnant women. In conjunction with the lab, Fengler defended an honors thesis investigating the mechanisms that influence sensitive responsiveness in depressed mothers’ interactions with their infants. She was particularly interested in how depression, infant temperament, stress, and social support influence previously depressed mothers’ capacity to provide sensitive care. Fengler will pursue a PhD in child clinical psychology at the University of Washington in the fall.

*Drew Westen—continued from page 6*

Candidates and campaigns needn’t choose between reason and emotion. A good message is one that draws peoples’ attention, gives them pause to reflect on what has happened and what we need to do, and moves them to act.

Candidates can incite and channel both the hopes and concerns of the electorate without wallowing in the gutter of demagoguery. Barack Obama would have been derelict in his duty as a candidate if he had not made clear that John McCain’s answer to the collapse of the economy—radical deregulation—was also the cause of it. Like other mammals, we evolved both positive and negative emotions for a reason, and the reasons are not redundant. In recent history, bad candidates have won elections by demagoguing fear and hate, but good candidates have lost elections by failing to elicit negative emotions about candidates who should have made the electorate anxious or angry. Just as reason versus emotion represents a false antinomy that has hamstrung Democratic and progressive thinking strategy and messaging for decades, so does positive versus negative campaigning. You can lie by offering false hope (e.g., promising to lower taxes dramati-

cally while balancing the budget) just as you can lie by offering false fears.

Messages matter. Compelling narratives, carefully crafted one-liners, and pithy phrases are no substitute for carefully thought out policy positions if you want to govern well. But carefully thought out policy positions are no substitute for compelling narrative, carefully crafted one-liners, and pithy phrases that capture the essence of your values of vision if you want to govern at all.

## Psychologically Speaking

Department Chair  
**Robyn Fivush**

Editor  
**Lisa Allen**

Graphic Designer  
**Michael Hooten**

Opinions contained within *Psychologically Speaking* do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Psychology at Emory University.

Send inquiries to:  
Editor  
Emory University  
Department of Psychology  
Mailstop 2045-001-1AA  
36 Eagle Row  
Atlanta, GA 30322  
Phone: 404.727.7565  
Fax: 404.727.0372



**Linda Craighead**

**Linda Craighead:**

# Appetite Awareness

Linda Craighead received a PhD in clinical psychology from Pennsylvania State University in 1976. Her early research focused on the treatment of obesity, including the use of appetite suppressants, supervised exercise, and dietary changes. Her most recent research centers on the phenomenon of binge eating. She has taught and conducted research at Penn State, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Duke University Medical Center, and the University of Colorado. She joined Emory University August 2006 and is a professor of psychology and psychiatry and the director of clinical training. Craighead is also an eating disorder specialist at the Emory University Counseling Center.

Craighead is the author of numerous articles on obesity, eating disorders, and appetite awareness. Her book, *The Appetite Awareness Workbook: How to Listen to Your Body and Overcome Binge Eating, Overeating, and Obsession with Food*, is a practical guide for using hunger and fullness cues to make more effective decisions about eating.

Linda Craighead sat down for a conversation with *Psychologically Speaking*.

**Q.** In *The Appetite Awareness Workbook* you state that we are all ideal eaters as babies, but by the time we become adults, most of us have learned to overeat. How does this happen?

**A.** Babies' natural biological systems work very well to regulate their eating because they only get to make decisions about when and how much to eat. They eat when they are hungry, and they stop as soon as they feel satisfied—that is, unless overeager caretakers offer them too much, too often. Babies do not typically stuff themselves because they do not naturally find the sensation of overfullness positive. If they do get too full, they usually spit up. However, once a variety of high-fat, high-sugar foods are introduced, children start making decisions about food more purely on the basis of taste (what they want) than on their internal signals of hunger and fullness (what they need). In a plentiful food environment like ours, taste is not the most effective way to make decisions about eating. Using taste as your primary guide will encourage you to eat high calorie foods and often to eat too much of them—because these foods still taste good even when you aren't hungry. Thus, by adulthood most of us have learned to overeat. Appetite Awareness Training (AAT) teaches you to go back to making decisions about eating based primarily on your stomach internal cues (hunger and fullness), so you are less likely to overeat or eat when you aren't hungry.

We believe we should be able to pretty much have whatever we want (or at least what we can afford), so many people feel deprived and unhappy when it turns out they can't eat whatever they want and still look like they want to look.

**Q.** You say the eating culture in this country is toxic in that it imposes an ultra-thin ideal, yet promotes and encourages the development of obesity. Explain how this paradox contributes to eating disorders and obesity.

**A.** This eating culture is toxic because it is hard to feel good about either your eating or your body. Our culture promotes rich, heavy eating as a primary pleasure and social activity. We believe we should be able to pretty much have whatever we want (or at least what we can afford), so many people feel deprived and unhappy when it turns out they can't eat whatever they want and still look like they want to look. The ultra-thin ideal ensures that most people will feel dissatisfied even at a healthy weight, so they believe they should be dieting even if they don't actually do it. Thus, people are rarely happy about their

eating or weight. Negative emotions encourage emotional eating regardless of their cause. Feeling hopeless to look like you want sets off some negative thinking patterns that encourage people to try drastic methods to lose weight (anorexia), to give up trying to control their eating (binge eating and obesity), or to alternate between the two strategies (bulimia).

**Q.** Are some people more likely to develop eating disorders than others?

**A.** Yes, girls and young women are the most at risk because they are the most vulnerable to societal pressures to be ultra thin. Individuals who base their self-worth largely on their appearance rather than other qualities (i.e., personality, intelligence, kindness) are more at risk because they are more likely to resort to unhealthy strategies to achieve their goals. Individuals who are highly perfectionistic are at more risk because they are more likely to set an unrealistic goal weight and never feel satisfied with their weight.

**Q.** Are there cultural differences?

**A.** Cultural differences used to be much stronger as some cultures (or subcultures) were less supportive of the thin ideal. In most of history, extreme thinness was a sign of illness or poverty, so was not desirable. With global TV, movies, and the Internet, the thin ideal has become an ever more pervasive and negative influence.

**Q.** In *The Appetite Awareness Workbook*, you attempt to show people how to identify physical cues for hunger as a way of controlling eating patterns. Can you explain how this is done?

**A.** Self-monitoring is the key whether your problem is mind-

*continued on page 5*

