Finding Your Grit to Trump Adversity in Your Career:
Getting Grittier, Growing Your Mindset and Developing Resilience

Elizabeth M. Fraley
Assistant Professor
Baylor Law School

Leah Jackson Teague
Associate Dean
Baylor Law School

Alex Linn
JD 2017
Baylor Law School

Finding Your Grit to Trump Adversity in Your Career:
Getting Grittier, Growing Your Mindset and Developing Resilience

We live in an era in which children are taught from a young age to measure their worth in grades and statistics. As a result, many find themselves ill prepared for the rigors of professional life. In a search to discover what distinguishes those who do succeed from their peers, we find a series of intangible qualities which, although difficult to "measure," play an undeniable role in professional success. Foremost among these traits is grit. Grit encompasses strength of will, perseverance, and a dedication to long-term goals, and can predict achievement in many settings.

People who demonstrate grit tend to have what is known as a "growth mindset," a belief that one can learn and grow from hard work and study, rather than accepting the limitations of innate intelligence. In 2012, Hogan studied the success of women in law firms in the AmLaw 200. The study relied on Angela Duckworth's study of grit, and Carole Dweck's work on the growth mindset. Hogan's findings "showed a very strong, statistically significant relationship between grit and success for women in BigLaw."[1] Hogan also found that successful female lawyers were more likely to have a growth mindset.[2] The project revealed that successful attorneys, those who could land the promotion or win the trial, achieved their long-term goals because they had the willpower to persevere until they reached those goals. Their growth mindset taught them that they were not confined to a role or limited to what they already knew; rather, they believed they could acquire new and necessary skills through hard work and exploration.

Grit seems like a natural quality for an attorney; law school alone requires a great deal of strength and persistence. However, statistically, lawyers lack the quality of resilience, which goes hand in hand with grit. Resilience refers to the ability to bounce back from adversity, an essential quality in the legal world where setbacks are not only common, but inevitable. Attorney and psychiatrist Dr. Larry Richard's research, however, revealed that "90% of lawyers score in the bottom half of the scale on the psychological trait called 'Resilience'. Low Resilience people tend to be relatively thin-skinned, defensive, and easily wounded by criticism, rejection or other setbacks. They don't bounce back well from adversity."[3] Practicing attorneys face criticism and even failure on a regular basis, but seem to handle it poorly, which perhaps lends itself to the rising dissatisfaction of those in the field. This dynamic raises some interesting questions for practicing lawyers, such as whether they are doomed to an unhappy career, or if they could instead acquire grit, resilience, and a growth mindset as skills rather than innate traits.

The authors submit that a crucial distinction must be made between grit and resilience, but that the two overlap and are both essential character skills for successful lawyers. Grit, simply put, is the ability to work towards long-term goals, while resilience is the ability to rebound after a setback. Gritty, resilient people are usually optimists with a strong sense that they are able, through their own actions, to positively impact their circumstances. They cope with adversity in a flexible way, often by transforming the challenge into an opportunity to grow or improve. This kind of perspective sets people up for success, and proves indispensable in the face of the challenges of the legal profession.

Lawyers serve both their clients and society as a whole in their roles as problem solvers, guardians of our democracy, and protectors of our rights and freedoms. As such, the

profession comes with significant responsibility and a number of challenges. Lawyers have the opportunity to become leaders, but to do so must internalize the lessons of grit as they face the increasingly complex demands of modern practice, while staying nimble and resilient in reacting to ever-changing and sometimes overwhelmingly difficult circumstances. Maintaining a growth mindset allows lawyers to be innovative and resourceful to serve their clients and their communities. This article endeavors to survey and describe prevailing theories of grit, growth mindset, and resilience, and approaches to acquiring and developing these traits.

GRIT

In her studies, psychologist Angela Duckworth sought to understand why some people persist and succeed while others, seemingly as capable, do not. Duckworth studied individuals with apparent innate gifts such as intelligence who nevertheless fell short of their seemingly less gifted peers. Duckworth settled upon the concept of grit as the key quality that enables individuals to overcome challenges time and again.[4] Whether defined as "perseverance and passion for long-term goals," or "the tendency to pursue long-term goals with sustained zeal and hard work,"[5] grit suggests a combined ability to see the long game while consistently playing the short game.

In a sense, "perseverance and passion for long-term goals" comes closer to a tautology than a definition. To succeed in the long run, of course you must persevere. However, deeper examination of the qualities of people with grit reflect a specific mindset which enables this perseverance despite setbacks. Two key facets of grit, related but distinct, are effort and interest. "Effort, measured using such items as 'I am diligent' and 'Setbacks don't discourage me'" reflect a person who is willing to put in the necessary work to accomplish the task.[6] "Interest measured using such items as 'I often set a goal but later choose to pursue a different one (reversed)' and 'I have been obsessed with a certain idea or project for a short time but later lost interest (reversed)'."

In addition to interest and effort, Duckworth describes gritty people as demonstrating practice, purpose, and hope.[7] Grit is focused and deliberate, a vehicle to focus on and eliminate weaknesses.[8] Rather than being defensive, gritty people demonstrate an openness (and even an eagerness) to receive constructive criticism which the gritty person views as a means to self-improvement.[9] Purpose means to these people that their work matters both to themselves and to others."[10] Hope might be better described as persistent optimism. Rather than idealistic wishing, hope comes from the knowledge that things can, in fact, improve. Moreover, the gritty person knows that he or she can have an active hand in that improvement. The perseverance inherent in grit requires hope, for one must have hope to face seemingly insurmountable challenges.[11]

The mere presence of interest does not in itself translate to grit; the interest must run deep. Gritty people develop interests, pursue them, and deepen them over time.[12] Those interests go beyond that which is merely pleasurable and amusing, tending more toward that which is perceived as meaningful and fulfilling. Indeed, a study of "motivational orientations," i.e., whether people are most motivated to seek happiness through meaningful activities, through engagement

3

with their activities, or through the pleasure they derive from their activities, found that grittier people were more likely to be motivated by meaning and engagement, and less likely to be motivated by the pursuit of immediate pleasure.[13] In other words, gritty people were willing to invest in long-term benefits, even if it delayed gratification.

Real-world studies have found that grit predicts many resilient outcomes. College students at the University of Pennsylvania were surveyed for grit, and their college grade-point averages later measured to determine whether grit predicts GPA. Despite the fact that the grittier group of students had lower average SAT scores, they outperformed their peers in class, posting higher GPAs.[14] Grit has also been shown to predict success at the rigorous Army Green Beret selection course, even when controlling for physical fitness.[15] Likewise, grit predicted successful completion of the West Point "Beast Barracks" initiation course; in fact, it was more predictive of success than a composite score which included average SAT score, high school class rank, physical fitness, and subjective expert appraisals of leadership potential.[16]

Grit not only predicted success at the collegiate level but also played a significant role in later professional achievement. Milana Hogan, while a doctoral candidate at the University of Pennsylvania, undertook a study of whether grit predicted success of women lawyers employed at BigLaw firms.[17] Combining Duckworth's grit with Carol Dweck's conception of growth mindset, Hogan found that grit was strongly related to a higher number of hours billed per year, and a more positive perception on the lawyer's part of the quality or importance of the work she is assigned.[18] In numerical terms, Hogan's findings imply that a partner classified as "very gritty" can be expected to bring in almost $300,000 more per year than one of average grit, and that a very gritty associate can be expected to bring in about $155,000 more per year than an average associate.[19] When interviewed, the successful women lawyers tended to give very grit-heavy explanations for how they succeeded in the practice of law despite ever-present adversity and challenge.[20] For example, when answering a question about self-doubt, one responded, "I don't really see any utility in that of saying oh crap I've never done this before or I don't - I don't know what to say about this. Well, it's time to think about it and figure out what to do. . . ."[21] As these examples show, grit correlates strongly with success in a tangible, measurable way.

Duckworth reports that subjects who show grit tend to think of their challenges and setbacks optimistically, believing that they can affect their futures and change outcomes.[22] They also tend to exhibit a growth mindset, believing that their skills and abilities can be developed over time, and that the challenges of life present opportunities for just such development.[23]

GROWTH MINDSET

Some people believe that our talents and abilities are largely innate and immutable. That thought tradition assumes that intelligence, athletic ability, and even academic performance are determined largely by heredity or other factors over which we have little control. In other words, nature supersedes nurture. President Donald Trump made headlines when he seemingly espoused a belief that it's all in the genes. On the campaign trail in July of 2016, Mr. Trump remarked, "[M]y uncle was a great professor and scientist and engineer, Dr. John Trump at M.I.T; good genes, very good genes, okay, very smart, the Wharton School of Finance, very good, very smart. . . ."[24] This is known as a fixed mindset. Those with a fixed mindset believe their strengths are

4

predetermined and that they have a certain prescribed amount of intelligence and talent.

Others believe that our skills and abilities are malleable and can be developed through dedication and effort. Dr. Trump may well have been a hardworking, diligent resilient scientist. Thomas Edison, on being asked how he felt about repeatedly failing to design a working light bulb, stated "I have not failed. I've just found 10,000 ways that won't work." While doubtless a genetically gifted scientist, Edison personified grit and resilience—both *acquired traits*. He had the growth mindset, and succeeded in large part because of it.

Author Malcolm Gladwell, in his book Outliers, studied innate talent versus effort. One fascinating point of the study: No "naturally gifted" performers emerged. If natural talent had played a role, we would expect some of the "naturals" to float to the top of the elite level with fewer practice hours than everyone else, but the data showed otherwise. The psychologists in Malcolm's study found a direct statistical relationship between hours of practice and achievement. This view is sometimes referred to as an internal locus of control –the belief that an individual has the ability to change his circumstances.

We need not resolve the question of which view is right, or whether both are partly right to study the effect of those attitudes on success. Not infrequently, both contribute to success. While attributing Dr. Trump's successes to being smart, President Trump also apparently subscribes to the ideas of Norman Vincent Peale, author of *The Power of Positive Thinking* and advocate of the notion that one's attitudes are a powerful determinant of one's outcomes.[25] As Dweck's study concluded, people with the "growth mindset" adopt more resilient behaviors and achieve better outcomes than those who adopt a "fixed mindset."

Dweck describes the fixed mindset as "believing that your qualities are carved in stone."[26] By contrast, the growth mindset is characterized by the belief that your innate traits are "just the starting point for development" and that "your basic qualities are things you can cultivate through your efforts."[27] Former POW Bill Spencer offers one interpretation of the growth mindset: "[W]e really grow and mature more during trials than during the good times. . . . [W]hen things go really bad, if we concentrate, we can learn a lot. . . . [W]e mature more when we're under an intense trial."[28] Both of these quotations demonstrate how one's frame of mind ties into their success and strength of character.

Dweck concludes that the two mindsets represent more than just a difference of opinion; they actually bear heavily on the resilience people show when faced with adversity. "The passion for stretching yourself and sticking to it, even (or especially) when it's not going well, is the hallmark of the growth mindset. This is the mindset that allows people to thrive during some of the most challenging times in their lives."[29] Those who hold the growth mindset view challenges and failure as necessary hurdles on the way to building themselves into something more than they are today.[30]

We must then wonder if people with a growth mindset actually operate differently. The fixed mindset group believe the things they do reflect their innate abilities, which are not subject to improvement. As such, they view criticism as "a threat, an insult, or an attack."[31] Likewise, effort put toward achieving a goal is viewed by the fixed mindset as very risky, because failure is

taken as proof of a lack of ability.[32] Dweck observes that the fixed mindset offers its adherents "no recipe" for overcoming failure, because failure is a commentary on how good (or bad) they are, which cannot change.[33]

These divergent mindsets have real consequences for those who hold them. When surveying students about how they would respond to receiving a disappointing grade on an assignment, receiving a parking ticket, and being snubbed by a friend, Dweck found that those of the fixed mindset anticipated they would respond by studying less in the future "because it's just not worth it," or by lashing out at others. Those with a growth mindset turned their focus on how they could remedy the problems by doing things like studying more, carefully watching for no-parking signs, and trying to work things out with their friend.[34] In short, the fixed-mindset respondents saw challenges as a reason to give up while the growth-mindset respondents saw challenges as a prompt to redouble their efforts.

Similarly, a study was conducted in which college students were given a test and were then made to believe they had done poorly on the exam.[35] They were then presented the opportunity to view the strategies used by test-takers who had done well or to view the strategies of test-takers who had done poorly. Those with a growth mindset opted to review the strategies of people who had performed well. Those with a fixed mindset, on the other hand, chose to review the strategies of people who had performed even worse than they had, in an apparent attempt to feel better by observing the failures of others.[36] Similarly, Dweck observed college students in a challenging chemistry course. She found that those with a fixed mindset began to withdraw mentally when the course became challenging, while those with a growth mindset maintained their interest in the course, offering observations like, "It's a lot more difficult for me than I thought. . . so that only makes me more determined."[37]

The fixed/growth mindset dialectic, then, has a good deal to say about resilience. Those who believe they can grow and improve in the future see challenges as a call to action and a chance to improve themselves. They reframe challenge as opportunity. Those who believe their abilities cannot be changed respond to challenge by shrinking and avoiding.

RESILIENCE

The human trait of resilience is defined by the American Psychological Association as "the process of adapting well in the face of adversity, trauma, tragedy, threats, or significant sources of stress. . . . It means 'bouncing back' from difficult experiences."[38] Bouncing back implies flexibility rather than rigidity, but not a flexibility that allows for deformation. Psychologist George Vaillant characterized resilient people as being like "a twig with a fresh, green, living core. When such a twig bends, it does not break; instead it springs back and continues growing."[39] The essential element, then, of human resilience is bending and not breaking.

Researchers examine resilience through induction and deduction. The inductive approach surveys and observes resilient people, assesses the findings, and draws broad conclusions about what makes a person resilient. When enough resilient people are surveyed and observed, accurate depictions likely result. This approach simply supplies commonsense descriptions

6

which, while useful, do not provide concrete strategies for developing this skill. The deductive approach begins with a theory and proceeds to the evidence. This approach often reveals a novel insight into how resilience works, but may not adequately consider all the contributing factors. Nonetheless, common themes emerge from both approaches. In nearly every model, resilience is characterized by optimism, flexible coping with challenges, and a belief that one's efforts to overcome those challenges can effect positive results.

Ten "Resilience Factors"

Resilience research relies on evidence gathered from people who have demonstrated this quality in their own lives, and searches for a comprehensive list of the ingredients of this trait which might lead to a "recipe" for its development. Researchers have collected some of the more common factors, and combined them into a sort of resilience theory.

Psychiatrist Steven Southwick conducted resilience studies through interviews of three groups of people who had previously demonstrated great resilience: 1) Vietnam prisoners of war; 2) Army Special Forces instructors who had trained other soldiers in the Army's Survival, Evasion, Resistance and Escape program, and 3) civilians who went on to lead successful lives despite having been exposed to severe psychological traumas such as violent crime or child sex abuse.[40] He observed that the resilient people surveyed showed a great deal of overlap in the coping mechanisms they employed in dealing with traumatic events and their later effects.[41]

From those individuals, he identified ten "resilience factors" effective for dealing with stress or trauma.[42] Those factors were: realistic optimism, facing fear, moral compass, religion or spirituality, social support, resilient role models, physical fitness, brain fitness, cognitive and emotional flexibility, and meaning and purpose in life.[43] Among those factors, realistic optimism, facing fear, giving and receiving social support, and making use of resilient role models were present in every resilient person interviewed.[44] While all 10 factors played a role in resilience, those four factors were universally present in resilient people.

Southwick defines realistic optimism as "a future-oriented attitude involving hope and confidence," coupled with a belief that one's efforts can improve one's situation.[45] Southwick emphasizes that realistic optimists show a tendency to react to stress with active steps to solve problems rather than passive strategies focused on avoiding the source of stress, such as self-pity, denial, or resentment.[46] The connection between realistic optimism and resilience is clear: taking active steps to solve one's problems rather than shrinking from them is necessary to bounce back from adversity. Because dealing with adversity requires very active coping, Southwick calls optimism "the fuel that ignites resilience."[47] This ability to face problems without shrinking from them directly ties into the second intrinsic and universal characteristic of resilience – the ability to face fear. In a fear-based approach, the consequences of action and inaction weigh heavily on the individual.

Social support boosts resilience in at least two ways. First, it operates directly upon the person receiving social support by improving his resilience. In a study of Vietnam veterans, for example, Lynda and Daniel King found that social support, as measured by the size and complexity of the veteran's social network and the veteran's perceived level of emotional support,

7

predicted lower rates of post-traumatic stress disorder.[48] This observation seems consistent with Southwick's observation that the military men he interviewed "often deny having exceptional personal strength, sturdiness, or resilience," instead crediting their fellow soldiers for supplying whatever courage they have shown.[49] Second, and less obviously, social support operates positively on the resilience of the person giving the social support. In a study of older married couples, Stephanie L. Brown found a reduction in mortality for those who reported giving emotional support to friends and relatives.[50] Empowering others seems to be a mutually beneficial exercise.

Southwick also found his resilient interview subjects to be flexible in their thinking while managing adversity, both in the way they perceived events and the way they crafted responses.[51] This flexibility involves acceptance of circumstances that are impervious to change, but agility in conceiving and employing coping strategies.[52] Southwick credits his interviewees with a tendency to engage in "cognitive reappraisal," by which they "reframe the negative, search for opportunity in the midst of adversity, and extract positive meaning from trauma and tragedy."[53] Southwick also cites humor as an effective tool of cognitive flexibility, often involving the reframing of negative events as something positive.[54] Other researchers reinforce these aspects of resilience. Diane Coutu observed that almost all theories of resilience find that such people share three characteristics: "a staunch acceptance of reality, a deep belief. . . that life is meaningful, and an uncanny ability to improvise.[55] Overall, research indicates a strong link between adaptive thinking and resilience.

Resilience traits also serve as protective factors - attributes that operate against stressors when adversity presents itself. Psychologist Emmy Werner, in her long-term study of at-risk youth, found that those who overcame their challenging childhoods to become thriving adults typically displayed the protective factors of a positive self-image, strong social support, and an internal locus of control, or the belief that events in a person's life lie within his power to affect.[56]

Psychiatrist Maurice Vanderpol conducted interviews of Holocaust survivors and teachers of abused or neglected children to identify the protective factors that allowed them to survive and return to normal life.[57] Vanderpol found that resilient individuals were able to assess both internal and external problems that needed attention.[58] He also found they had a tolerance for their negative emotions and only a limited, healthy sense of guilt, which kept them from being swept up in others' concerns.[59] Rather than feeling shame, in which failures translate to character defects, resilient people feel moderate guilt, recognizing their mistakes as a result of their choices, which can be modified in future situations. Resilient people also showed a take-charge attitude when presented with difficult circumstances, and little sense of victimization, with the neglected children often providing care for their own parents.[60] Not only did resilient individuals show an aversion to victim status, they demonstrated a strong desire to prove that they could overcome adversities life threw at them.[61]

Whether viewed as attributes or protective factors, all of these characteristics comprise important pieces of the resilience puzzle. Identifying these common traits is important to understanding resilience. Identifying them offers relatively little insight into how resilience actually operates in practice, but studying resilient individuals offers tremendous guidance. Furthermore, such evidence allows pursuers of resilience to identify with people and learn from

their perspective on an intuitive level.

The Stoic Approach to Resilience

Admiral James Stockdale was the senior ranking officer among American prisoners of war in the so-called "Hanoi Hilton," a gruesome prisoner camp in Viet Nam, for seven years.[62] During that time, Stockdale and his fellow prisoners suffered repeated torture but managed to maintain both personal and group integrity.[63] Stockdale's recollections are instructive because they marry the *what* of resilience with the *how*, thereby explaining the mechanisms that allowed this group of men to survive with resilience.

The social support researchers have found a common resilience trait was used at the Hanoi Hilton. Stockdale's men maintained unity and supported each other through an elaborate system of communication involving taps on the walls of their cells, in essence a crude Morse Code.[64] Despite the official prohibition on communication between their cells, they created a support network, quickly welcoming in each new POW and schooling him in the tap code. Stockdale insisted that each newly-arrived POW immediately be brought into the group via the tap code and supported by the group.[65]

Not only did the POWs need to create a new communication structure, the POWs also learned that the official military Code of Conduct, which allowed them to surrender only limited identifying information to their captors, was insufficient in the face of torture. Stockdale found it necessary to create a new set of rules for prisoner conduct so they could survive their imprisonment while staying true to their country. His new system, shorthanded as BACK-US, adapted the official Code of Conduct to the reality of long-term imprisonment and torture. Its components were defined by the acronym. B stood for: don't bow in public (a way to deny their captors propaganda footage of Americans bowing in humiliation); A: stay off the air (meaning POWs must not make any statements that could be broadcast for propaganda value); C, admit no crimes; K, never kiss them goodbye (meaning do not show goodwill in order to curry favor or garner special treatment), and US, unity over self.[66]

Stockdale's system worked. When the POWs eventually returned home, an Air Force psychiatrist tasked with evaluating the POWs found that not only had they survived their imprisonment, they reported significant improvements in their lives as a result, from stronger personal relationships to improved values.[67] In a subsequent formal study, as measured against a control group of Vietnam veterans, the POWs reported improvements in their mental fitness as a result of their experience, ranging from an increase in optimism, to strengthened religious values, to greater perspective on their lives.[68]

Stockdale also explained how he not only maintained his own will but also encouraged so many others to do so. Stockdale attributed his resilience to Epictetus, a Greek philosopher of the Stoic school. Stockdale relied on Epictetus' principle that "men are disturbed not by things, but by the view they take of them," which led him to urge his comrades not to "be concerned with things which are beyond your power."[69] Epictetus' prescription of mental discipline as the key to facing adversity makes the critical distinction between outside events and the way we process or interpret them. According to Epictetus, conditions themselves cannot break you; only your own mind can.

The men at the Hanoi Hilton engaged in cognitive flexibility, reframing their powerlessness as prisoners into the ability to control their response to a situation they could not control. As Stockdale succinctly puts it, "No matter what the situation is, you can control your response to it."[70]

Stockdale did not credit all of his resilience to a Stoic mindset; he also emphasized the necessity of social support and explained how that operated in the POW camps. For Stockdale, in trying circumstances, the desire to give and receive support from others overwhelmed any desire to act in one's own naked self-interest.[71] Indeed, Stockdale felt the maxim "you are your brother's keeper" was his "one all-purpose idea" distilled from his imprisonment years.[72] When asked what sustained him through his POW years, he replied simply, "the man next door."[73] For Stockdale as well as the resilient people interviewed by Southwick, resilience came not only through receiving social support, but also by giving it. He drew strength from his sense of obligation and loyalty to his men.[74]

Stockdale's recipe for resilience also included a dose of realistic optimism. He emphasized that he never lost faith in the fact that he would one day make it home, and that he would in the end emerge a stronger man.[75] When Stockdale was asked who did not survive the POW experience, he responded, "Oh, that's easy. . . the optimists."[76] This seeming contradiction came to be called The Stockdale Paradox.[77] Stockdale explained the distinction between realistic optimism, which he considered necessary, and blind-eyed optimism, which he found to be fatal: "You must never confuse faith that you will prevail in the end – which you can never afford to lose – with the discipline to confront the most brutal facts of your current reality, whatever they might be."[78] So, for Stockdale, the poisonous optimism was the kind that induced hope for hope's sake, instead of hope for the sake of planning and action.

Transformational Coping through Hardiness Attitudes

Psychologist Salvatore Maddi began his inquiry into resilience as a reaction against the conventional but impractical wisdom of the 1970s which suggested avoiding stress as a key to living a longer, healthier, and happier life.[79] Maddi realized stress as an unavoidable fact of life and believed that resilient people actually seek out and engage with various stressors, finding them invigorating rather than fear-inducing.[80] To learn more about how people engage with and react to changes and stress in their lives, he initiated a long-term study of Illinois Bell Telephone managerial workers. The study sought to discover what differentiated those who thrived in stressful situations from those who did not.[81] His study hit unexpected pay dirt when a federal court ordered the breakup of the Bell Telephone monopoly in 1981. Within a year, Illinois Bell fired nearly half its workforce, with stress and change becoming the natural order of things.[82] By way of example, Maddi notes that one manager had ten different supervisors in the space of a year, and "neither they nor he knew what they were supposed to do."[83]Maddi followed the managers who remained and those who were fired over subsequent years, and found that those who exhibited attitudes he characterized as Commitment, Control, and Challenge tended to show more resilience as they navigated the Bell breakup.[84] He labeled these three attitudes together as "hardiness."[85]

Maddi describes the "hardy attitude" of commitment as "the belief that, no matter how bad things get, it is most meaningful to stay involved with the events and people in one's life, rather

than to retreat into isolation and alienation."[86] Those strong in commitment attitude "view [their] work as important and worthwhile enough to warrant [their] full attention, imagination, and effort. [They] stay involved with the events and people around them even when the going gets rough. . . seeing withdrawal from stressful circumstances as weak."[87] This description sounds much like the social support described by Stockdale and others.

The control attitude reflects "the belief that, no matter how bad things get, it is worth continuing to try to have an effect on outcomes, rather than retreating into powerlessness and passivity."[88] Those with a strong control attitude "keep trying to positively influence the outcomes of the changes going on around [them]. . . . In deciding where to apply their efforts, [they] determine which situational features are open to change and gracefully accept those outside [their] control."[89] The defining feature of this mindset, then, seems to be the internal locus of control.

Finally, the challenge attitude is "the belief that stressful changes are normal in life, and provide an opportunity to learn more, rather than being an inappropriate violation of one's right to easy comfort and security."[90] People with a strong challenge attitude "see change as opening up new, fulfilling pathways for living. . . . [They] face up to stressful changes, try to understand them, learn from them, and solve them."[91] The challenge attitude stares adversity in the face, and deems it an opportunity rather than a burden.

Having identified the three hardiness attitudes, Maddi next evaluated how they actually cause or produce resilience in the people who hold them. Through his Illinois Bell Telephone study, he observed that the hardiness attitudes allowed the resilient employees to engage in a process called "transformational coping."[92] Transformational coping, at its core, is the process of using adversity as a spur to positive action.[93] Maddi observed that the Illinois Bell employees who remained resilient and best navigated the choppy waters in which they found themselves were able to reframe their challenges as separate and apart from their personal identities, reflect in a more detached way upon their circumstances, and formulate productive plans and problem-solving steps (an echo of the guilt-shame dichotomy).[94] Transformational coping stands in contrast to the alternative, regressive coping, which involves "protecting oneself from stressful circumstances by denial and avoidance."[95]

Maddi finds that when a person demonstrates all three hardiness attitudes, they are more "courageous and motivated to take advantage of changes, however stressful they may be"; and when the individual lacks these perspectives, the person is "fearful and vulnerable, without any strength or motivation to confront stressful circumstances."[96]

Maddi's model has been borne out in other research. In a study of middle- and upper-level executives who reported stressful life events, hardiness predicted a lower likelihood of falling ill after the stressful events.[97] Similarly, a survey of general practice lawyers undergoing stressful life events found that those who showed the hardy attitude of commitment and avoided regressive coping were less likely to show symptoms of long-term strain.[98] Other studies have found similar results for the benefits of hardiness attitudes in coping with stress in populations as divergent as bus drivers, nurses, military personnel, and immigrants to the United States.[99]

Influence of Optimism on Resilience

11

In 1965, while studying a phenomenon known as "learned helplessness," psychologist Martin Seligman discovered a connection between a person's optimistic or pessimistic outlook and their willingness to give up (or not) in the face of adversity. Those who give up easily explain things to themselves in the language of pessimism, while those who continue trying to improve their situations process things in the language of optimism.[100]

The optimistic and pessimistic "explanatory styles" that Seligman uses to explain resilience are more than mere belief that the best or the worst is sure to happen. Instead, the pessimistic explanatory style frames bad events as permanent, pervasive, and personalized.[101] Permanence reflects a belief that the adversity or challenge will never get better.[102] For example, a pessimist who fails an exam may think, "I can never do well in school." Pervasiveness characterizes bad events in terms that are global in nature.[103] A pervasive explanation for failing an exam might be, "I'll never amount to anything." Personalization internalizes the causes of bad events or adversity.[104] In other words, the pessimist attributes the cause of bad events to himself, as opposed to acknowledging that they may have been caused by other people or outside forces. The optimistic explanatory style, by contrast, explains challenges and bad events as temporary (not permanent), specific (not global), and external (not personalized).

These explanatory styles exercise an influence on resilient behavior. Research has shown that those who habitually use the pessimistic explanatory style to explain adversities are more likely to fall into depression when they meet misfortune.[105] Longitudinal studies demonstrated that the pessimistic explanatory style appeared in partcipants before the development of symptoms of depression, suggesting that the pessimistic explanatory style is a risk factor for depression, not merely a symptom of it.[106] Seligman reports that those who make both pervasive and permanent assessments of their troubles "tend to collapse under pressure, both for a long time and across situations."[107] Overall, those with pessimistic explanatory styles tend to "give up in the face of failure or extreme challenge and become...passive, indecisive, depressed, and poor at problem solving -- in a sense, becoming helpless."[108]

Optimists, on the other hand, see their helplessness evaporate relatively quickly when challenged by adverse events.[109] The optimist rebounds from defeat, "picks up, and starts again."[110] In other words, optimists are resilient. Seligman posits that optimism is the key to persistence, and persistence is a key to success.[111] How do optimists do this? Optimists "tend to cope with stress by actively employing strategies to solve problems."[112] Because they see adversity as a temporary condition which can be overcome, they feel motivated to take action to improve their situations in a way that pessimists do not.

Other research confirms that those with pessimistic explanatory styles show little resilience in the face of challenge. In one study of entering college freshmen, students with a pessimistic explanatory style earned worse grades than those with an optimistic explanatory style, even when controlling for SAT scores and diagnosable levels of depression.[113] In a study of life insurance salesmen, an occupation rife with repeated failure and rejection, agents with an optimistic explanatory style proved more productive and were retained longer than those with a pessimistic explanatory style.[114] Seligman's measure predicted retention and sales as well as the industry's then-current test for sales aptitude.[115] More alarming, a longitudinal study of male Harvard graduates showed that explanatory style powerfully predicted negative

health measures between the ages of 45-60, even when controlling for initial health at age 25.[116] Seligman believes that optimists are more likely to follow medical advice and care for themselves physically, due to their strong belief that their actions can influence their health outcomes.[117] While less scientific, optimism research retroactively predicted nine out of the ten presidential elections from 1948 to 1984 based on the optimism or pessimism shown in the candidates' nomination acceptance speeches.[118]

The optimistic explanatory style motivates people to reframe their challenge as opportunity, and to overcome and improve their lives. The pessimistic explanatory style, on the other hand, offers no hope, and therefore no reason to engage in resilient actions when adversity presents itself.

Lawyers' Resilience or the Lack Thereof

Lawyers pose a special resilience challenge and concern in practice. In 2006, The Wall Street Journal reported that 37% of new associates at large law firms quit within three years.[119] In a survey of 12,825 employed attorneys published in 2016, 20.6% screened positive for "hazardous, harmful, and potentially alcohol-dependent drinking,"[120] nearly double the 11.8% rate for a broader sample of highly-educated workers.[121] In addition, 28% reported mild or higher levels of depression, and 23% reported mild or higher levels of stress.[122] Both those who had sought treatment and those who did not seek treatment reported "not wanting others to find out they needed help" and "concerns regarding privacy or confidentiality" as major impediments to seeking treatment.[123] Lawyers also rate higher than the general population in the incidence of heart disease.[124] These statistics paint a picture of a proud but secretive group, suffering from significant pathology, unwilling to seek help and with poor resilience.

Dr. Larry Richard reports that lawyers consistently score poorly on measures of resilience.[125] The problem appears to start in law school. In a study of the effect of optimistic and pessimistic explanatory styles on law school performance, an unexpected result emerged: contrary to the typical pattern in which optimism predicts higher school performance, optimism was found to predict lower law school GPAs.[126] That is, "the poor 'C' law students tend to be optimists while the higher achievers are non-optimistic."[127] A profession whose top graduates are known to be pessimists cannot expect to find its members robustly resilient.

Another problem for lawyer resiliency is low "decision latitude" – the number of choices one has. Occupations which combine high pressure with low decision latitude present a special risk of low morale, depression, and poor physical health.[128] Low decision latitude is likely a special problem for young lawyers. The zero-sum game nature of much of the practice of law, in which one party's gain is another's loss, is also potentially destructive. Zero-sum game participants tend to end up "anxious, angry, and sad."[129]

Since happiness and resilience are related, increased resilience can lead to a more satisfying professional and personal life for lawyers. In a 2011 study, leaders who rated themselves high on a happiness scale scored in the "incredibly resilient" range on the inventory twice as often as do leaders who rate themselves low on the happiness scale.[130]

The need for improvement in lawyer resilience is clear. However, solutions specific to the

13

unique burdens of the practice of law are sparse. Research suggests that lawyers burdened by the zero-sum game might boost their happiness and resilience by moving toward a positive-sum area of practice, such as creating positive value by facilitating business transactions.[131] The traditionally vituperative area of family law has found a more positive niche with collaborative family law, where the structure of the divorce or custody dispute is governed by rules which require cooperation and which include counselors, financial advisors and others whose goal is to preserve the family and its assets rather than have a "winner" in the litigation. Others who wish to build resilience may profit from the section that follows.

METHODS OF BUILDING GRIT AND RESILIENCE

The theories behind resilience and descriptions of resilient people illustrate quite clearly the qualities inherent in such individuals, but do not necessarily teach how to develop the skill. Because resilience training is a sought-after service, even academic researchers are quite protective of their intellectual property and speak only in generalities about how they actually conduct their courses in resilience. As such, we have collected a series of concrete techniques which have been shown to create and improve resilience.

Mindfulness

Observing that resilient people tend to be optimistic, spiritual, in touch with reality, or high in self-esteem does not provide much of a recipe for resilience. No one would recite a list of butter, sugar, flour, and eggs and expect a child to know how to bake a cake, especially if the child does not have the ingredients in hand and does not know how to get them. Building resilience based on the observed properties of resilient people may work to some degree, but the difficult lies in the translation of these characteristics into action. Southwick observes that optimism and pessimism are "contagious," and therefore recommends surrounding oneself with optimists and avoiding pessimists when possible.[132] He also recommends building resilience by choosing one or two of the identified resilience factors and habitually practicing them, and then later adding others to the practice.[133]

Imitation is by no means the only way to develop resilience. Surrounding yourself with resilient people is a good start. Much can be learned in any work environment from emulating successful habits and behaviors of others. The mindfulness aspect of being aware of optimistic thinking and consciously choosing to apply it can, like any intentional act, act on the mind and help create a more resilient attorney. Much as a smoker can choose to stop when reaching for a cigarette, so can the pessimistic thinker stop the freight train of negative thoughts and choose to replace it with a different method of thinking. For this reason, yoga, meditation and other mindfulness techniques prove useful in building resilience. All focus on having one's mind clear, learning to acknowledge a negative thought without dwelling on it, and choosing to either move it out of the mental space or replace it with a positive thought. This type of practice also reduces stress, teaches calming breathing techniques, and allows some autoregulation of the pessimistic brain/stress cycle.

14

Transformational Coping: Training For Hardiness

For Salvatore Maddi, the key to resilience training lies in the development of transformational coping skills, which manifest themselves in the embracing of adversity as a problem to solve and active planning and execution of solutions.[134] Maddi suggests exercises intended to develop habits of transformational coping and decrease the tendency to engage in regressive coping. Regressive coping is characterized either by the avoidance and denial of challenges or catastrophic reactions to challenges.[135] The three key behaviors in Maddi's model of transformational coping are 1) broadening perspective; 2) deepening understanding; and 3) creating and acting on a plan.[136] Broadening perspective involves the cognitive reframing of a problem as a challenge or potentially even an opportunity for growth. A lawyer who loses a hearing might think "that was a battle, not the war" in a broadened perspective exercise. Deepening one's understanding explores features of the problem that are not immediately apparent. What was it that came out of the lost hearing? A need to come up with a different strategy or a different trial theme? Was there poor rapport and communication with the judge? Was the other side right on the law, and the lawyer made a poor choice to fight the requested relief rather than agree to the motion? Finally, creating and acting on a constructive plan to deal with the problem looks at what was learned and then finds tools to change the outcome. You cannot make the same mistake twice; the second time around, the mistake becomes a choice. As such, coming up with a plan to deal with the problem adds a volitional, internal locus of control for dealing with the adversity.

To practice and master transformational coping, Maddi recommends a three-step process of handling stressful events or circumstances. The process begins with listing life stressors, rating each one on a scale of one to seven in magnitude, and then classifying each as either acute (a transient condition) or chronic (an ongoing problem).[137]

The second step requires reflecting on the stressful circumstance in order to gain perspective on the nature of the problem.[138] The first part of this step involves a technique called "situational reconstruction," in which one describes the problem fully, imagines alternative scenarios in which outcomes could be better or worse, and ultimately strives to place the problem in its proper perspective.[139] Suggested perspective include realizing that the problem is not as bad as it could be, realizing that the problem is of limited time duration, realizing that the problem is one faced by many people, and coming to the conclusion that the problem has feasible solutions. Having done that, the next move is to evaluate one's own contributions to the problem, whether interpersonal misunderstandings contribute to the problem, and whether the problem is outside of one's control, and therefore must be accepted.[140]

Having evaluated the problem more deeply, the third step requires fashioning and executing a plan of action to resolve or improve the situation. This involves setting a goal for the plan, identifying the actions that can lead to that goal, and adjusting the plan as the steps are carried out and real-world feedback is received.[141]

Hardiness training has been administered and studied, and has shown real results in the research. Maddi's proprietary hardiness training was shown in a study of management employees to improve measured levels of hardiness (attitudes of commitment, control, and challenge) and

reported levels of job satisfaction and social support, while reducing incidences of long-term elevated stress levels.[142] In another study, hardiness training was administered to college students over an 11-week course.[143] Those receiving the training course showed improvements in both their measured levels of hardiness and their GPAs, compared to a control group.[144]

Gaining Grit: Deliberate Practice

Perhaps because grit is a relatively new field of study, or perhaps because it is defined by properties rather than methods, the recommendations on how to develop grit are sparse. Angela Duckworth, the pioneer researcher of grit, asserts that grit can be intentionally cultivated.[145] However, her recommendations for how to do so are similar to those of researchers of the observed traits of resilient people: having identified the traits of people with grit, Duckworth recommends practicing those traits. In short, if you want to gain grit, Duckworth recommends acting more like gritty people act. We have compiled a short list of more recommendations for the development of grit below.

The first recommendation is to engage in deliberate practice, focused on improving on specific weaknesses and achieving specific goals, as discussed above. Then, having achieved the goal or addressed the weakness, the method is to start again.[146] This cycle allows for continued growth and development, and with practice becomes a habit. Further, one should seek and find a purpose. To find such purpose, one should identify an interest, observe the behavior of another person who demonstrates purposefulness (especially in the context of that interest), and then obtain the insight that one's personal efforts can actually make a difference.[147] Similarly, Duckworth recommends improving grit by associating with others who demonstrate grit, observing that people often conform to the behaviors of other people with whom they associate.[148] Duckworth also recommends building grit by taking steps to build an optimistic explanatory style and a growth mindset, which are discussed in sections below. With practice, these strategies can become a way of life, reframing and reshaping an individual's course in life. For lawyers, these techniques can prevent stagnation and despondency, and ultimately contribute to a successful career.

Growth Mindset: Believing

Growth mindset, like grit, is a relatively new field of study. However, the field has already yielded some concrete recommendations for how a person who tends toward a fixed mindset can shift his thinking toward growth, which will naturally lead her to gritty and resilient behaviors.

The primary tool for developing a growth mindset is, simply, to audition the mindset in practice.[149] That is, Dweck recommends meeting challenges with an active effort to conceive of them in a growth framework. This process includes addressing challenges by thinking about learning from them, and even imagining the brain growing and improving by dealing with adversity.[150] Asking practical questions like "What can I learn from this experience?" can help cultivate this framework.

This approach has some support in the research. Doctoral student Jason Bergen showed that people of fixed and growth mindsets could be manipulated into altering their mindsets, at

least in the short term, by reading articles advocating for either a fixed or growth mindset.[151] It therefore appears that reminding oneself of one's bias toward a fixed mindset and practicing trying on a growth mindset may be effective. This concept ties back into the mindfulness practice mentioned earlier. The more mindful you are of your thought processes, the easier it becomes to intentionally shift your thinking patterns.

Learned Optimism: Know Your A-B-Cs

If, as Martin Seligman posits, pessimistic explanatory style is the barrier to resilience, then optimistic explanatory style is the gateway to resilience. But how can the habitual pessimist become an optimist, or at least enough of one to enjoy the benefits of optimism? Seligman proposes a program called "learned optimism," in which pessimists recognize and do battle with their pessimistic explanatory styles. Learned optimism attempts to rid the pessimist of the burdens of his negative explanatory style by teaching a new skill set to use when explaining events to himself in his own mind.[152]

The first step in this process is to recognize the causal chain between adversity, beliefs, and consequences, or A-B-C.[153] Under this model, adversity causes beliefs, which lead to consequences. The key insight is to recognize that, much like in Epictetus' conception discussed above, it is not outside adversity that results in negative consequences, but rather the beliefs we form about the adversity in our own minds.[154] Therefore, if a pessimist can learn to change his beliefs about the problems confronting him, he can also learn to change the consequences, including his actions and the results he obtains in the world.[155] The overall notion is that the pessimist's problem comes not from the reality that life is throwing him more challenges than the rest of us, but rather from the filter of his own beliefs, which cast things in such a negative light that he feels paralyzed and incapable of responding resiliently.

One effective technique involves physically listing the beliefs one holds associated with a particular challenge. Making a written list both simplifies the seemingly abstract web of ideas, and forces a degree of self-assessment in the face of that adversity. Simply put, the exercise forces the individual to be honest with themselves about what limiting or negative beliefs they bear, and to assess the consequences of those beliefs.

The pessimist must first identify the A-B-C chains that typify his reactions to adversity.[156] Next, we add a D to the chain, typically disputation. Disputation is the process of arguing with the beliefs one habitually forms regarding adversity.[157] The disputation approach takes four typical forms: evidence, alternatives, implications, and usefulness. The first is a simple demand for evidence supporting the pessimistic belief. Because the negative beliefs formed by the pessimists after adversity are often inaccurate or based on little evidence, the act of demanding evidence challenges the habit of forming negative beliefs.[158] A second option is a search for alternative causes or explanations for the adverse event.[159] Disputation of implications is designed to challenge catastrophic beliefs extrapolated from non-catastrophic events.[160] Finally, the usefulness inquiry questions the pessimistic belief on the grounds that, even if true, it may be of no use at the present moment.[161] An example of a potentially-true belief that might not be useful would be the conviction of a student walking into an exam room that he is sure to fail the test. In that case, holding firm to that conviction may well diminish his performance and increase his odds of failure. In such a

scenario, the recommended approach is the other D, distraction. If a belief is possibly true but certainly of no immediate use, the prescribed approach is to think of something else by whatever means necessary.[162] Our student wracked by fear of failure would do better distracting himself by reciting the things he does know rather than fearing the ones he does not.

Seligman's methods to improve explanatory style have been researched and found to improve both that style and other measures of mental wellbeing. One study designed to measure depression prevention in schoolchildren provided training in the A-B-C-D method.[163] The study showed significant improvement in the children's mental health on a number of levels. Children given the training program showed lower levels of moderate to severe depressive symptoms and more optimistic explanatory styles immediately after the study and at six-month intervals for two years thereafter.[164] Similar results were found in a separate study of college students provided training in improving explanatory style: both depression and anxiety symptoms and explanatory styles improved compared to a control group.[165]

Most significantly, the U.S. Army instituted its Master Resilience Training program in 2009 to teach a set of resilience skills, centered on the A-B-C-D model of improving explanatory style.[166] Evaluation of the program showed a resulting increase in measures of optimism, adaptability, and coping amongst those offered the training.[167] The training also reduced substance abuse diagnoses.[168] Clearly, this technique and others like it are demonstrably valuable tools for cultivating grit and resilience.

One program incorporating numerous resilience training strategies is "Transforming Lives Through Resilience Education," offered by Mary Steinhardt of the University of Texas. A condensed version of this course is available to the public online, and gives a glimpse into the otherwise-guarded methods of resilience training.[169] The full classroom course involved four two-hour sessions.[170] The first session included training in active coping strategies, planning, positive reframing, and acceptance, designed to help students overcome challenges.[171] The second session encouraged "taking responsibility, defined as owning one's power to choose and create."[172] The third employed the above-discussed Seligman model for combating pessimistic explanatory style.[173] The final session focused on social support as a resilience asset, and on adapting a habit of "self-leadership" that provides active but compassionate leadership, perspective, and vision.[174]

Steinhardt studied the results of the course. The results showed that the students improved on conventional measurements of resilience, coping strategies, protective factors, and had lower symptoms of depression and perceived stress when compared to a control group.[175] The online modules are worth the two-hour investment to get a flavor for how resilience training courses are run.

CONCLUSION

As we have discussed, a distinction exists between grit and resilience, although they overlap tremendously. Grit is the ability to work towards long-term goals, which requires resilience, or the ability to bounce back from adversity. These qualities, although seemingly intangible, have been widely measured and studied and part of a growing field of research. As it turns out, both of these qualities are far more predictive of success than inherent qualities such as

18

intelligence.

Grit requires a combination of effort and interest, leading to a commitment strong enough to carry an individual through to their desired end. One major component of grit is the growth mindset, or the willingness to view challenges as opportunities and the belief that one's actions have an impact on outcomes. This empowering sense of an internal locus of control helps develop grit.

Resilience theories and methods vary widely, but some areas of broad agreement emerge. First, resilience is about flexibility in coping with adversity. Second, resilience in every formulation is characterized by an optimistic approach to problems. Finally, resilience only exists in people who believe they can better their circumstances by their own efforts.

Importantly, grit and resilience are not inherent qualities, but rather character skills which can be cultivated by anyone. With some intentionality and effort lawyers can develop resilience, become bolder in their grittiness and grow in openness to new experience and opportunities. Although resources offering techniques for their development are somewhat scarce, with practice, emulation of people who possess these traits, and self-exploration, anyone can learn these skills and apply them to their own experience. These are the pathways to success in the practice of law and beyond over the course of one's entire life.

[1] Milana Hogan and Katherine Larkin-Wong, *Grit &Mindset, Implications for women lawyers*. 98Women Lawyers Journal 2 (2013).

[2] *Id.* From that work, Hogan and Larkin-Wong created a toolkit that has been presented and used by lawyers throughout the country to help lawyers succeed. https://www.americanbar.org/groups/women/initiatives_awards/grit/toolkit.html

[3] Larry Richards, *Building Lawyer Resilience.* http://www.lawyerbrain.com/our-services/building-lawyer-resilience

[4] Angela L. Duckworth & Christopher Peterson, *Grit: Perseverance and Passion for Long-Term Goals,* 92 Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 1087, 1087 (2007).

[5] Katherine R. Von Culin, Eli Tsukayama, & Angela L. Duckworth, *Unpacking Grit: Motivational Correlates of Perseverance and Passion for Long-Term Goals,* 9 The Journal of Positive Psychology 306, 306 (2014).

[6] *Id.*

[7] Angela L. Duckworth: Grit: The Power of Passion and Perseverance (2016), Ch. 5.

[8] *Id.*

[9] *Id.,* at Ch. 7.

[10] *Id.* at Ch. 5.

[11] *Id.*

[12] *Id.,* at Ch. 6.

[13] Von Culin, *supra* note 5.

[14] Duckworth, *supra* note 4, at 1093.

[15] Duckworth, *supra* note 7, Ch. 1.

[16] *Id.*

[17] Milana L. Hogan, *Non-Cognitive Traits That Impact Female Success in BigLaw,* Unpublished doctoral dissertation (2013).

[18] *Id.,* at 117-119.

[19] *Id.,* at 118.

[20] *Id.,* at 101-116.

[21] *Id.,* at 108.

[22] Duckworth, *supra* note 7, Ch. 9.

[23] *Id.*

[24] Valerie Strauss, *President Trump Is Smarter Than You. Just Ask Him,* Washington Post, February 9, 2017, retrieved at https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2017/02/09/president-trump-is-smarter-than-you-just-ask-him/

[25] James Barron, *Overlooked Influences on Donald Trump: A Famous Minister and His Church,* New York Times, September 5, 2016, retrieved at https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/06/nyregion/donald-trump-marble-collegiate-church-norman-vincent-peale.html

[26] Carol S. Dweck, Mindset: The New Psychology of Success (2006), Ch. 1.

[27] *Id.*

[28] *Id.*

[29] *Id.*

[30] *Id.*

[31] *Id.,* at Ch. 3.

[32] *Id.,* at Ch. 2.

[33] *Id.*

[34] *Id.,* at Ch. 1.

[35] A. David Nussbaum & Carol S. Dweck, *Defensiveness vs. Remediation: Self-Theories and Modes of Self-Esteem Maintenance,* 34 Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin 599 (2008).

[36] *Id.,* at 603.

[37] Dweck, *supra* note 85, at Ch. 2.

[38] American Psychological Association, *The Road to Resilience,* retrieved at http://www.apa.org/helpcenter/road-resilience.aspx

[39] George E. Vaillant, Aging Well (2002), *as quoted in* Steven M. Southwick, Resilience: The Science of Mastering Life's Greatest Challenges (2012), 6.

[40] Steven M. Southwick, Resilience: The Science of Mastering Life's Greatest Challenges (2012), 8-11.

[41] *Id.* at 11.

[42] *Id.*

[43] *Id.*

[44] *Id.*

[45] *Id.* at 21.

[46] *Id.* at 28.

[47] *Id.* at 21.

[48] Lynda A. King, Daniel W. King, et al., *Resilience-Recovery Factors in Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Among Female and Male Vietnam Veterans: Hardiness, Postwar Social Support, and Additional Stressful Life Events,* 74 Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 420, 430 (1998).

[49] Southwick, *supra* note 40, at 96.

[50] Stephanie L. Brown et al., *Providing Social Support May Be More Beneficial Than Receiving It: Results From a Prospective Study of Mortality,* 14 Psychological Science 320 (2003).

[51] Southwick, *supra* note 40, at 141.

[52] *Id.*

[53] *Id.* at 147.

[54] *Id.* at 150-152.

[55] Diane Coutu, *How Resilience Works,* Harvard Business Review, May 2002.

[56] Emmy E. Werner, *High Risk Children in Young Adulthood: A Longitudinal Study From Birth to 32 Years,* 59 American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 72, 80 (1989).

[57] Maurice Vanderpol, *Resilience: A Missing Link in Our Understanding of Survival,* 10 Harvard Review of Psychiatry 302 (2002).

[58] *Id.* at 303.

[59] *Id.*

[60] *Id.* at 304.

[61] *Id.*

[62] Peter Fretwell, Lessons From the Hanoi Hilton: Six Characteristics of High-Performing Teams (2013), Preface.

[63] *Id.*

[64] *Id.* at Ch 1.

[65] *Id.*

[66] *Id.* at Ch.5.

[67] *Id.* at Introduction.

[68] *Id.*

[69] *Id.* at Preface.

[70] *Id.* at Foreword.

[71] James B. Stockdale, *The Melting Experience,* National Review (December 25, 1981), 1534, 1536.

[72] *Id.* at 1535.

[73] *Id.* at 1536.

[74] *Id.* at 1537.

[75] Jim Collins, Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap. . . and Others Don't (2001), 85.

[76] *Id.*

[77] *Id.* at 83.

[78] *Id.* at 85.

[79] Salvatore R. Maddi, *The Story of Hardiness: Twenty Years of Theorizing, Research, and Practice,* Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research (Summer 2002), 173, 173.

[80] *Id.*

[81] *Id.* at 174.

[82] *Id.*

[83] *Id.*

[84] *Id.*

[85] *Id.*

[86] Salvatore R. Maddi et al., *Hardiness Training Facilitates Performance in College,* 4 The Journal of Positive Psychology 566, 567 (2009)

[87] Salvatore R. Maddi & Deborah M. Khoshaba, Resilience at Work: How to Succeed No Matter What Life Throws at You (2005), 18.

[88] Maddi, *supra* note 86.

[89] Maddi, *supra* note 87.

[90] Maddi, *supra* note 86.

[91] Maddi, *supra* note 87, at 18-19.

[92] Maddi, *supra* note 87 at 19.

[93] *Id.*

[94] *Id.*

[95] Maddi, *supra* note 79, at 180.

[97] Suzanne C. Kobasa, *Stressful Life Events, Personality, and Health: An Inquiry Into Hardiness,* 37 Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 1, 8 (1979).

[98] Suzanne C. Kobasa, *Commitment and Coping in Stress Resistance Among Lawyers,* 42 Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 707, 714 (1982).

[99] Maddi, *supra* note 79, at 178.

[100] Martin E. P. Seligman, Learned Optimism (1990), 40.

[101] *Id.* at 43-44.

[102] *Id.,* at 44.

[103] *Id.,* at 46.

[104] *Id.,* at 49.

[105] Christopher Peterson & Martin E.P. Seligman, *Causal Explanations as a Risk Factor for Depression: Theory and Evidence,* 91 Psychological Review 347, 369 (1984).

[106] *Id.*

[107] Seligman, *supra* note 100, at 49.

[108] Jason M. Satterfield & Martin E. P. Seligman, *Military Aggression and Risk Predicted by Explanatory Style,* 5 Psychological Science 77, 77 (1994).

[109] Seligman, *supra* note 100, at 45.

[110] *Id.,* at 207.

[111] *Id.,* at 101.

[112] Southwick, *supra* note 40, at 28.

[113] Christopher Peterson & Lisa C. Barrett, *Explanatory Style and Academic Performance Among University Freshmen,* 53 Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 603, 605 (1987).

[114] Martin E. P. Seligman & Peter Schulman, *Explanatory Style as a Predictor of Productivity and Quitting Among Life Insurance Sales Agents,* 50 Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 832, 837 (1986).

[115] *Id.*

[116] Christopher Peterson, Martin E. P. Seligman, & George E. Valliant, *Pessimistic Explanatory Style Is a Risk Factor for Physical Illness: A Thirty-Five-Year Longitudinal Study,* 55 Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 23, 25 (1988).

[117] Seligman, *supra* note 100, at 173.

[118] *Id.,* at 187-190.

[119] Ashby Jones, *The Third-Year Dilemma: Why Firms Lose Associates,* Wall Street Journal, January 4, 2006, retrieved at http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB113571843977932357

[120] Patrick R. Krill, Ryan Johnson, & Linda Albert, *The Prevalence of Substance Use and Other Mental Health Concerns Among American Attorneys,* 10 Journal of Addiction Medicine 46, 46 (2016).

[121] *Id.,* at 50.

[122] *Id.,* at 51.

[123] *Id.,* at 50.

[124] Todd D. Peterson & Elizabeth W. Peterson, *Stemming the Tide of Law Student Depression: What Law Students Need to Learn From the Science of Positive Psychology,* 9 Yale Journal of Health Policy, Law, and Ethics 357, 358 (2009).

[125] Dr. Larry Richard, *Resilience and Lawyer Negativity,* retrieved from http://www.lawyerbrainblog.com/2012/09/resilience-and-lawyer-negativity/

[126] Jason M. Satterfield, John Monahan, & Martin E. P. Seligman, *Law School Performance Predicted by Explanatory Style,* 15 Behavioral Sciences and the Law 95, 100 (1997).

[127] *Id.*

[128] Martin E. P. Seligman, Paul R. Verkuil, & Terry H. Kang, *Why Lawyers Are Unhappy,* 23 Cardozo Law Review 33, 41-42 (2001-2002).

[129] *Id.,* at 47.

[130] Allison, E., & Reeves, D. (2011). Renewal coaching field guide: How effective leaders sustain meaningful change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

[131] *Id.,* at 49.

[132] Southwick, *supra* note 40, at 34.

[133] *Id.,* at 170.

[134] Maddi, *supra* note 87, at 85.

[135] *Id.,* at 92.

[136] *Id.,* at 87-89.

[137] *Id.,* at 108-110.

[138] *Id.,* at 110.

[139] *Id.,* at 110-116.

[141] *Id.,* at 124-128.

[142] Maddi, *supra* note 79, at 176-177.

[143] Maddi, *supra* note 86, at 569.

[144] *Id.,* at 574.

[145] Duckworth, *supra* note 7, Ch. 5.

[146] *Id.,* at Ch. 7.

[147] *Id.,* at Ch. 8.

[148] *Id.,* at Ch. 12.

[149] Dweck, *supra* note 26, Ch. 2.

[150] *Id.*

[151] *See* Ying-yi Hong et al., *Implicit Theories, Attributions, and Coping: A Meaning System Approach,* 77 Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 588, 594 (1999).

[152] Seligman, *supra* note 100 at 207.

[153] *Id.,* at 211.

[154] *Id.*

[155] *Id.,* at 233.

[156] *Id.,* at 211.

[157] *Id.,* at 218.

[158] *Id.,* at 221.

[159] *Id.,* at 221-222.

[160] *Id.,* at 222.

[161] *Id.,* at 223.

[162] *Id.,* at 217-218.

[163] Jane E. Gillham et al., *Prevention of Depressive Symptoms in Schoolchildren: Two-Year Follow-Up,* 6 Psychological Science 343, 344 (1995).

[164] *Id.,* at 345-346.

[165] Martin E. P. Seligman, Peter Schulman, & Alyssa M. Tryon, *Group Prevention of Depression and Anxiety Symptoms,* 45 Behavior Research and Therapy 1111, 1119 (2007).

[166] Karen J. Reivich, Martin E. P. Seligman, and Sharon McBride, *Master Resilience Training in the U.S. Army,* 66 American Psychologist 25 (2011); *The Comprehensive Soldier and Family Fitness Program Evaluation. Report #4: Evaluation of Resilience Training and Mental and Behavioral Health Outcomes* (2013), at 6-7.

[167] *Comprehensive Soldier and Family Fitness Program, supra* note 162, at 18.

[168] *Id.,* at 19.

[169] https://resilience.education.utexas.edu/index.html

[170] Mary Steinhardt & Christyn Dolbier, *Evaluation of a Resilience Intervention to Enhance Coping Strategies and Protective Factors and Decrease Symptomatology,* 56 Journal of American College Health, 445, 447 (2008).

[171] *Id.*

[172] *Id.*

[173] *Id.,* at 447-448.

[174] *Id.,* at 448.

[175] *Id.,* at 450.