



## Open Research Online

### Citation

Graffin, Neil (2024). 'Two versions of the American Dream': Well-being and unhappiness in the law school and legal profession: The work of Lawrence Krieger and Kennon Sheldon. In: Newman, Daniel ed. *Leading Works on the Legal Profession*. Routledge, pp. 64–76.

### URL

<https://oro.open.ac.uk/85547/>

### DOI

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003253778-6>

### License

(CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0) Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

### Policy

This document has been downloaded from Open Research Online, The Open University's repository of research publications. This version is being made available in accordance with Open Research Online policies available from [Open Research Online \(ORO\) Policies](#)

### Versions

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding

# **‘Two versions of the American Dream’: Wellbeing and unhappiness in the law school and legal profession: The work of Lawrence Krieger and Kennon Sheldon**

## **The Work**

The issue of wellbeing within the legal profession initially arose out of research in the United States and Australia. In the United States, it was found in 1986 (Kellner et al., 1986) that law students tend to be more depressed than the general population, and it has been documented that there are several issues affecting members of the legal profession including, for example, depression (Krieger, 1998, Schlitz, 1999, Buchanan et al., 2017), as well as alcohol and drug abuse (Bergin and Jimmieson, 2014, Krill et al, 2016). In Australia, Kelk et al. found that ‘law students and members of the legal profession exhibit higher levels of psychological distress and depression than community members of a similar age and sex’ (Kelk et al, 2014). This chapter will consider the research of Professor Lawrence Krieger and Professor Kennon Sheldon, two American academics, who have worked together or separately, in assessing and creating leading works on issues of wellbeing in the law school and the legal profession in the United States. It will assess their body of work, which has developed and been built upon over time, rather than a single piece of work.

Professor Lawrence S. Krieger is currently a Clinical Professor of Law at Florida State University College of Law, a position he has held since 1991. Prior to this, Professor Krieger worked in legal practice, including positions as the Senior Enforcement Attorney and Chief Legal Trial Counsel at the State of Florida Department of Banking and Finance. Outside of the issues relevant to this paper, Krieger has conducted further research in legal education, with a focus mostly on clinical legal education. Professor Kennon Sheldon works at the Department of Psychology in the University of Missouri. Sheldon’s publication record is prolific, and he has been named as one of 20 most cited social psychologists in the world in the *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin* in 2010, as well as one of 20 most productive social psychologists in the world in 2008 in *Dialogue*, the official newsletter of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology. Given the substantial body of research conducted by Sheldon, outside of the issues of wellbeing in the law school and the legal profession, it is best to summarise Sheldon’s own summary of his research which provides that he studies motivation, goals, and well-being, from both a self-determination theory and a positive psychology perspective.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> [Home | Ken Sheldon's Website, University of Missouri](#)

Running through the core of the work of Sheldon and Krieger is a critique of both the cultures of the law school and the legal profession in how they encourage students or lawyers to value extrinsic goals, such as high grades, wealth, fame, or power, at the expense of encouraging individuals to value intrinsic communitarian values, or a healthy and balanced life. An emphasis on external goals, they argue, leads to unhappiness and poor wellbeing, whereas lawyers who value intrinsic values are happier and much better adjusted in life. This work has been influential in numerous fields, in legal education, but also in disparate areas of academia where the intrinsic/ extrinsic distinction is explored. Alongside this, Sheldon and Krieger have used the theory of self-determination theory (SDT) to explore how happiness can be obtained within the workplace. This will be explored further as the chapter progresses.

## **The Context**

It is difficult to pinpoint when law student and legal professional wellbeing became issues of concern and academic enquiry. However, it can be said with a degree of certainty that academia in the United States led the way in uncovering issues. For early examples of US studies of issues relevant to law student wellbeing, James Hedegard published work in 1979 which considered the interests, attitudes, and personality traits amongst first-year law students, and assessed how these changed over the course of their first year of legal education (Hedegard, 1979). Kellner et al in 1986 assessed distress in medical students and law students where it was found that law students reported significantly more depression and anger-hostility and less contentment and feelings of friendliness, considering themselves more distressed in the third year of their studies (Kellner et al., 1986). Benjamin et al also looked in 1986 at how the role of legal education impairs the maintenance of emotional wellbeing on students (Benjamin et al., 1986). On issues of wellbeing amongst qualified legal professionals, later research in the US indicated that drug and alcohol abuse was at a high rate amongst attorneys (Benjamin et al., 1990, Allan, 1997).

It is possibly unsurprising that issues of wellbeing were first noticed in the United States due to the prevalence of long working hours that are often associated with the corporate culture there, which have increasingly become part of the culture of the legal profession in the United Kingdom and elsewhere. Sheldon and Krieger's contributions to the oeuvre were not at the beginning of the recognition of the issue. However, the influence of their work in this area is undisputed. The contribution of the work of these researchers has led to greater awareness of wellbeing within the law school and legal profession within the last 25 years, providing a bedrock through which legal scholars in this area have grounded their own research and developed it with respect to their own specialist areas or jurisdictions. Working together as legal academic and psychologist has allowed for a greater insight into issues affecting legal professionals from interdisciplinary perspectives – from that of the lawyer, and that of the clinician.

## **The Significance**

The significance of the work of Sheldon and Krieger can be seen across several articles, each of which takes a look at the issue of wellbeing in law from a different perspective. Some aspects of their methodological approach are developed as their work develops, for example, through enhancing the breadth of how they use SDT in later research. This

section will seek to provide an overview of the different contexts they situate their research and will assess how it develops through their whole body of work.

Lawrence Krieger's first article on the issue of wellbeing in the law school and legal profession, which is sole authored, is a thoughtful and personally reflective piece on his experiences as a law student, litigation attorney, and legal education clinician. Entitled 'What we're not telling law students - and lawyers - that they really need to know: some thoughts-in-action toward revitalizing the profession from its roots' (Krieger, 1998) the article considers what Krieger feels many learn from the culture of the law school and how that contributes to the culture of the legal profession today. In rooting experiences of lawyer wellbeing in the law school, Krieger identifies that the issue with lawyer wellbeing is one of identity which then has the capacity to shape the field of the legal profession. He is dissuaded that a lack of lawyer wellbeing is caused by factors such as a dearth of good job opportunities, because when job opportunities were at their best, lawyer dissatisfaction was low. Krieger posits that law students and legal professionals place emphasis on external/extrinsic symbols and not on internal qualities and considers that this leads to unhappiness. In the law school, this includes high marks in exams, or being 'top of the class'. He contends that law schools actively encourage students to focus on external symbols of prestige and they bring these qualities with them into their careers. Later in life, extrinsic goals are symbols of power and wealth.

Krieger argues that law students and lawyers need to better appreciate that honours and high achievement are only valuable in the context of a balanced and happy life. This is a point picked up by others. Nancy Soonpaa, for example, in her publication 'Stress in Law Students: A Comparative Study of First-Year, Second-Year, and Third-Year Students' argues that 'law students with an intrinsic motivation to become lawyers are happier than those with extrinsic motivations' (Soonpaa, 2003). Krieger's article becomes a manifesto on this point, and he argues for a more humane legal education which places emphasis on internal qualities, including defining success in terms that are personally manageable and achievable, and to consider that levels of professionalism will probably improve if law students live full and happy lives. He additionally argues that law students need to be respectful and caring to their peers.

Krieger also argues in this article, which is a point which has been made elsewhere, particularly by those who advocate for legal curricula to take better account of emotions (James, 2008, Jones, 2018), that many law students are expected to silence their personal ethics in favour of objective rational reasoning. This is not a phenomenon specific to legal study, but is more closely associated with it than many other disciplines. This can have an impact on wellbeing as students feel unable to connect emotionally with the content they are learning and are thereby often not engaging with their intrinsic values. They prize cold objective rationality as a key skill of being a lawyer ('thinking like a lawyer'), and this follows them into legal practice. More of this will be discussed below.

Krieger also identifies how students and professionals can grow a greater understanding of what makes them happy, drawing on Maslow's hierarchy of needs.<sup>2</sup> For those that experience diminished levels of wellbeing, it may be that they are not able to

---

<sup>2</sup> Maslow identifies a hierarchy of needs with physiological needs at the bottom (e.g., water, food) and in ascending order, safety needs, love and belonging, esteem, and at the top of the hierarchy self-actualisation.

avail of the higher-level needs – for example, they are not able to self-actualise – which relates to being able to achieve one’s potential and be creative. This may happen when a person’s environment is very controlled, meaning that they have limited autonomy. Later in the article Krieger makes suggestions, drawn from his own approach to legal pedagogy, to enable better psychological working methods in the law school where Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is accounted for. This can be achieved in legal education, according to Krieger, by incorporating materials which encourage creativity, self-reliance, and the expression of personal beliefs. This emphasis on student autonomy permeates much of the work Sheldon and Krieger later produce.

Sheldon and Krieger then embarked on their first piece of empirical work on legal education which resulted in ‘Does legal education have undermining effects on law students? Evaluating changes in motivation, values, and well-being’ (Sheldon and Krieger, 2004).<sup>3</sup> It presents a longitudinal evaluation of the wellbeing of law students in two schools. In one part of the study (study 1) students were assessed across three years in one school. In the second part, (study 2) scores concerning the wellbeing of students were assessed at the start of their first year and then at the end. In this research they applied SDT, which they would go on to use and develop in later work.

Study 1 found that whereas the students appeared to be ‘quite happy and healthy’ and ‘relatively ‘normal’ from the outset, their wellbeing and happiness declined when studying law. Study 1 found that by the end of the year students ‘evidenced large declines in positive affect and life satisfaction, and large increases in negative affect, depression, and physical symptomology’ (Sheldon and Krieger, 2004, p. 280). They also experienced a decline in intrinsic values. This decline in wellbeing and intrinsic values was constant during years 2 and 3 of their study. This, the authors hypothesise, supporting Krieger’s previous assessment from his earlier article, is because students began to decreasingly endorse intrinsic values, moving away from community service values, and emphasising appearance and image values.

Study 2 replicated the important findings of study 1, although there was not the same decline in community values found. The authors hypothesised that because the study 2 group contained more older and part-time students, who were more broadly integrated into the community, and therefore were more likely to have embedded intrinsic values. A concerning observation was discussed in the study: Sheldon and Krieger noted that students with intrinsic motivations and values tended to do well academically; however, their performance may have led to a shift towards emphasising external attributes and prizing high-prestige career preferences after performing well, which then had the potential to lead to declining wellbeing. Therefore, doing well academically could lead to a shift in the value-base for the student.

In ‘Institutional denial about the dark side of law school, and fresh empirical guidance for constructively breaking the silence’ which was published in 2002, Krieger sole-authors an article which seeks to describe the (then) recent psychological research on the components of happiness and life satisfaction within the law school, and beyond

---

<sup>3</sup> The empirical work took place before the publication of ‘Institutional denial about the dark side of law school, and fresh empirical guidance for constructively breaking the silence’ (Krieger, L. S. 2002. Institutional denial about the dark side of law school, and fresh empirical guidance for constructively breaking the silence. *J. Legal Educ.*, 52:112.), however, the article for this was published afterwards in 2004.

into the legal profession. Within it, Krieger draws on some of the findings from Sheldon and Krieger's first empirical study. These will not be touched upon here as they have been discussed above. However, of interest here is the emphasis that Krieger places on his conviction that law schools are neglecting the mental wellbeing of their students. This is a theme which is present in his early work, but further developed in this article.

This article begins by citing the experience of students in Harvard Law School from a separate study published by Dolovich (Dolovich, 1998). In it, Harvard Law School is described as the pinnacle of success both from inside and outside the legal profession, and, as such, it suggests that we would expect an optimistic and enthusiastic student cohort. Instead, Dolovich notes:

“Far from brimming over with personal and intellectual self-confidence, by the second year, a surprising number of Harvard Law students come to resemble what one professor has called "the walking wounded": demoralized, dispirited, and profoundly disengaged from the law school experience. What's more, by third year, a disturbingly high number of students come to convey a strong sense of impotence and little inclination or enthusiasm for meeting the world's challenges head on.” (Dolovich, 1998, p. 2027.)

Krieger notes that this is not a problem confined to Harvard, but is confirmed consistently in empirical studies (Krieger, 2002, p. 114). For example, he cites work of Dammeyer and Nunez (Dammeyer and Nunez, 1999) which reports anxiety levels amongst law students to be comparable to a psychiatric population. Krieger then begins to discuss why law schools are in ‘institutional denial’ about these issues. He identifies ‘suspect constructs’ that are part of the institutional make-up of the law school that legal teachers encourage or permit as part of the law school culture. These include the belief that success in the law school is demonstrated by high grades, as well as the view that the worth of a person and their happiness depends on their place in a hierarchy of academic success and the attainment of (at least one view of) the American dream. Under this belief, it is considered that what is good in work and in life is defined by financial affluence, influence, and recognition. Krieger also discusses how law schools make students work exceptionally hard for the attainment of their grades. All of these extrinsic goals, therefore, create a highly pressurised environment for law students.

Krieger also discusses how law schools foster a culture of ‘thinking like a lawyer’. This notion of ‘thinking like a lawyer’ links to the previous discussion of how law schools prize analytical reasoning, rather than allowing students autonomy to consider their emotions. However, Krieger goes further in that he argues that thinking like a lawyer, and thinking primarily with accordance to legal rights, is fundamentally negative; it is critical, pessimistic, and depersonalising. Krieger argues that it is a dangerous paradigm as it is often prized as a superior way of thinking (Krieger, 2002, p. 117). The notion of ‘thinking like a lawyer’ has received a lot of scholarly attention – both prior and subsequent to the work of Sheldon and Krieger in this area, albeit not all of it in negative terms.<sup>4</sup> When used in a critical sense, such as in the work of Elkins (Elkins, 1995), we are reminded that there is no such thing as a value-free education, but yet we teach law students that they are not

---

<sup>4</sup> For example, Frederick Schauer's work ‘Thinking Like a Lawyer: A New Introduction to Legal Reasoning (Harvard University Press, 2009) is a book which examines as a subject legal thinking and reasoning and assesses the argumentative methods of lawyers and judges, rather than critiques this mode of thinking.

engaged in moral discourse. Teaching law in this way can lead to personality changes in law students and legal professionals which may not be positive, such as an argumentative mindset, which although is useful in an adversarial courtroom, may diminish skills in finding common ground.

The next work to be discussed is an empirical study conducted by Sheldon and Krieger, the findings of which are presented in the article 'Understanding the negative effects of legal education on law students: a longitudinal test of self-determination theory' (Sheldon and Krieger, 2007). In this study, Sheldon and Krieger again apply SDT, but develop further how it is used as a methodological approach to assessing wellbeing. They explain that while SDT was used in the first study, it did not consider two other important components – psychological need satisfaction and the nature of the social context (Sheldon and Krieger, 2007, p. 884 ). In this article, Sheldon and Krieger use an integrated model of 'thriving' based on SDT and apply it to two studies. The study conducted uses a different set of data from their research in 2004, but the setting is the same. Law school 1 was the scene for the first study in 2004, but the group matriculated a year later. The Law school 2 sample was employed in study 2 in 2004, but this is year 3 data which had not previously been reported.

Sheldon and Krieger explain that according to SDT the development of positive motivation is forwarded or impeded by the characteristics of the social environment. Within this social context, it is suggested that where the authority provides autonomy support and acknowledges initiative and self-direction, then the psychologically positive intrinsic motivations of the subordinates are established or enhanced. This emphasis on the positive aspects of autonomy, as discussed previously, are a prevailing aspect to Sheldon and Krieger's work.

To support the development of autonomy (perceived autonomy support), individuals must be (a) given choices, (b) be given meaningful rationales where choices cannot be given, and (c) the authority must show that he or she appreciates the point of view of the subordinate (Sheldon and Krieger, 2007, p. 884). Turning to enhanced psychological need-satisfaction, Sheldon and Krieger argue this is increasingly important under SDT, recognising that it helps to explain the positive and negative effects of the social context. Sheldon and Krieger state that within the social context (a) people need to feel they are good at what they do, or at least have the capacity to become good at it (competence), (b) that they would choose to do what they are working on (autonomy), and (c) they are relating to others in the process (relatedness) (Sheldon and Krieger, 2007, p. 885).

Sheldon and Krieger discuss particular cultural differences between the two schools, which enables them to make judgments regarding how the experiences of the law schools psychologically affect the students within them. Law school 1, when hiring faculty, was much more concerned about scholarly production (research) than teaching. Law school 2 placed greater emphasis on law practice and public service experience (Sheldon and Krieger, 2007, pp. 885-886). Law school 2 was also felt to be more focused on student concerns and provided more choice and rationale for decisions they made. It invested more time in teacher training courses and practical skills courses. Law school 1, in comparison, was more invested in the teaching of legal theory. Sheldon and Krieger

concluded that Law school 2 was much more focused on autonomy support for students (Sheldon and Krieger, 2007, p. 886).

It was observed the different approaches from the schools had an effect on student wellbeing. In Law School 1 where the faculty was judged to give less autonomy support, which then impacted on competence and relatedness, the students had declining needs satisfaction and therefore wellbeing. In Law School 2 where there was much more of an emphasis on autonomy and support, subjective wellbeing was higher, but importantly so was graded performance and self-determined motivation to pursue a legal career. Sheldon and Krieger conclude that to maximise learning and emotional adjustment, law schools need to focus on enhancing student feelings of autonomy. They suggest that law schools would benefit from re-evaluating their priorities, placing more emphasis on teaching, teacher training, as well as lawyering (particularly where public service is involved). They also suggest that skills training should be embraced more fully, with a distancing from the more theoretical aspects of legal education (Sheldon and Krieger, 2007, p. 894).

In the next study to be discussed here 'Service job lawyers are happier than money lawyers, despite their lower income' (Sheldon and Krieger, 2014), Sheldon and Krieger conducted a quantitative empirical study using an online survey which was sent to members of the Bar Associations of four states, two in the southern US, one in north-central US, and one in north eastern US. This study compared 1414 'Money' (extrinsic) lawyers, 1145 'Service' (intrinsic) lawyers and 3415 'Other lawyers' as to their income, values, wellbeing and drinking behaviour. Again, in the vein of much of Sheldon and Krieger's work the focus is on the values that individuals hold and how this affects their wellbeing and other psychologically healthy attributes – specifically relating to intrinsic versus extrinsic values. They extend their previous work to the legal profession to focus more directly on what values lawyers hold. Summing up the article, it seeks to answer a central question: 'Are there really jobs that provide people with less money and more happiness?' or, conversely, 'Are there jobs that provide people with more money and less happiness?'

Referencing Kasser's influential work 'The High Price of Materialism' (Kasser, 2003) Sheldon and Krieger argue that the distinction between those that value intrinsic values versus extrinsic goals reflects two very different versions of the American dream: a wealth/ fame ideal, in which Americans, through work, can obtain wealth power and influence, and a progressive/ communitarian ideal where Americans can work to develop their full creative potential (Sheldon and Krieger, 2014, p. 220). Sheldon and Krieger consider how these ideals are reflected across the legal profession, holding that the extrinsic v intrinsic ideal is readily apparent. They consider that on one hand, money jobs within the profession are viewed to be highly lucrative and prestigious, such as work within corporate firms, torts and malpractice work, commercial law, or in areas of business or securities-related law. On the other hand, service jobs include public defenders, prosecutors, legal aid lawyers, and public agency lawyers – these jobs are considered to focus on the service of others and cultures of a shared community are evident in the workplace.

Analysing the wellbeing of these two different groups of professionals, Sheldon and Krieger find that service job lawyers evidenced higher aggregate wellbeing, lower negative affect, and drank alcohol less and less frequently than their counterparts who worked in



money jobs (drinking alcohol is considered a maladaptive coping mechanism and therefore is an indicator of poor wellbeing). Their conclusion is that because service jobs provide workers with a sense that they are making a difference, they tend to be happier individuals. Sheldon and Krieger also note that whereas the money jobs paid more, this does not correlate to greater happiness, proving the old adage that 'money does not buy you happiness'. At the same time, they recognise that money jobs were prized by law students, implying that this is a problem.

There is a lot within the work of Sheldon and Krieger across these different articles, and this section can only provide a summary of it. The author is limited by word count and may have missed other points another author would have felt appropriate to include. Therefore, this author encourages readers to invest time to reading the original texts where there is greater breadth of analysis on these issues.

## The Legacy

Confined to law schools, it is unlikely that Sheldon and Krieger's first empirical work 'Does legal education have undermining effects on law students? evaluating changes in motivation, values, and well-being' (Sheldon and Krieger, 2004) has had direct influence outside the confines of academia, or in the practice of legal education. However, the work is cited regularly within the discipline of the study of wellbeing in law, or within the discourse of law and emotion. It is not work which is often subject to criticism in a field where findings are more often reaffirmed, rather than subject to empirical or theoretical critique, but others have applied it to their own jurisdictions within (e.g., Organ, 2010, Daicoff, 2012) or outside (e.g., Larcombe et al., 2013, Jones and Graffin, 2020) the United States. In addition, the wider conceptual approach they take to exploring the distinction between extrinsic goals or intrinsic values has been applied in other disparate fields, for example, in a psychological study on the costs of American corporate capitalism (Kasser et al., 2007) or in relation to participation in exercise and other physical activity (Sebire et al., 2008). Their application of self-determination theory is also referenced in other disciplines such as in organisational studies (Deci et al., 2017), psychology (Ryan and Moller, 2017), or human resource management (Chang and Shih, 2019).

As academics have engaged with the law school and the profession in different jurisdictions on issues of wellbeing, they have relied on the work of Sheldon and Krieger. This is evident where scholars have argued that legal curricula places too much emphasis on cold rationality at the expense of emotion, as discussed above, and where the cultures of the law school or legal profession have been criticised for encouraging unhealthy working practices. The growth in concern in issues in wellbeing in law, as evidenced across Sheldon and Krieger's work, has led to large-scale research into, at least, the legal profession. For example, the Life in the Law Survey conducted by LawCare in 2020/21 in the UK (LawCare, 2021), the Junior Lawyer's Division of the Law Society Resilience and wellbeing survey report 2019 conducted in the UK (Junior Lawyer's Division, 2019) the International Bar Association Mental Wellbeing in the Legal Profession: A Global Study 2021 (IBA, 2021), or *Courting the Blues: Attitudes towards depression in Australian law students and lawyers* conducted in 2009 (Kelk et al., 2009). That is not to say that their work has led to these pieces of research (although in some it is referenced), but that their work has been influential within the overall field in advancing our understanding of the issues facing lawyers, which has led to greater calls for research and action on issues of wellbeing.

Although Sheldon and Krieger's work has given us a deeper understanding of issues facing the law school and profession, it might be argued that it does not come full circle in throwing light on the issues facing those that work within the law school themselves – legal educationalists – and their role in providing a space for healthy teaching and study of law. Krieger or Sheldon do not appear to consider in detail that legal academics are products of the law school itself. This is a gap that has been left unexplored but is a crucial component in understanding these issues. Legal educationalists have been part of the law school field at some point themselves and have been indoctrinated in the cultures within it. They are as much a product of the law school as legal professionals, and whereas some might be more reflective of the issues within the school given their place in it, others might see their roles as custodians of the culture of the school. Others may not be aware of things being able to be any different or may consider it impossible to change existing structures within a school. This may be particularly difficult with somewhere with high prestige like Harvard as discussed in 'Institutional denial about the dark side of law school...', where there could be a conservative risk-management approach when considering changes that could affect a law school's brand. An institution with high prestige may not feel any need to risk anything which may be perceived to 'downgrade' that status.

It is implicit in the work that legal teachers are willingly ignoring the needs of their students. However, there is much less of an emphasis on the competing demands that legal teachers may be under, due to large workloads, other professional responsibilities regarding advancing knowledge through research, and administrative demands. This is not to say that things cannot be different, it is merely a recognition that there is a missing piece from the jigsaw overlooked and that legal academics may also be dispirited from their own experiences, and this may feed into how they approach teaching. There is a dearth of academic literature which seeks to look at this issue, but there is some. For example, James et al (James et al., 2020) conducted national surveys of UK and Australian legal academics in 2017, exploring law teachers' perceptions of their wellbeing and of their experience of stress at work. In these surveys law teachers expressed frustration about their working conditions and the impact on their wellbeing, including participants describing that they were feeling they were being pulled in too many directions. Richard Collier argues that there is a connection between poor wellbeing of academics and the 'neo-liberal' marketized university, including an intensification of metrification and audit, calculative competition arising from new forms of performance management, the feeling of being constantly monitored and assessed, and long working-hours, amongst other issues (Collier, 2020). While the work of Stevens et al and Collier helps to give us a fuller picture of the law school, Sheldon and Krieger's work on self-determination theory is also again useful here in shedding a light on what might be perceived to be an erosion of the autonomy of law teachers, and it is useful to consider how this might affect the happiness and wellbeing of these professionals. Greater autonomy and less performance management may lead to happier and more creatively productive teachers and researchers, Sheldon and Krieger may well argue.

Moving forward, it would be enlightening to see an application of Sheldon and Krieger's theory on the extrinsic v intrinsic dichotomy to law teachers to see if similar results might be replicated. Is there a similar division in the legal academy between academics focused on extrinsically orientated goals versus intrinsic motivations? For example, in universities where there are pressures for highly ranked research in league tables, are academics less happy than what they would be where less pressures exist? Is the continued assessment of the legal academics through performance tables affecting their wellbeing, and might this have the opposite effect than what it is seeking to achieve

by making them produce less-quality work? Might this be impacting on the wellbeing of law students, and feeding into the legal profession? This is a future for the work of Sheldon and Krieger.

- Allan, R. B. 1997. Alcoholism, drug abuse and lawyers: Are we ready to address the denial. *Creighton Law Review*, 31(1), 265-278.
- Benjamin, G. A., Darling, E. J. & Sales, B. 1990. The prevalence of depression, alcohol abuse, and cocaine abuse among United States lawyers. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 13(3), 233–246.
- Benjamin, G. a. H., Kaszniak, A., Sales, B. & Shanfield, S. B. 1986. The role of legal education in producing psychological distress among law students and lawyers. *American Bar Foundation Research Journal*, 11(2), 225-252.
- Chang, Y.-Y. & Shih, H.-Y. 2019. Work curiosity: A new lens for understanding employee creativity. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29(4), 100672.
- Collier, R. 2020. Reflections on the UK Experience of Legal Academic Wellbeing and the Legal Professions: Moving Across Silos. . M. Legg, P. Vines, & J. Chan (Eds.), *The Impact of Technology and Innovation on the Wellbeing of the Legal Profession* Intersentia.
- Daicoff, S. S. 2012. Expanding the lawyer's toolkit of skills and competencies: Synthesizing leadership, professionalism, emotional intelligence, conflict resolution, and comprehensive law. *Santa Clara L. Rev.*, 52795.
- Dammeyer, M. M. & Nunez, N. 1999. Anxiety and depression among law students: Current knowledge and future directions. *Law and Human Behavior*, 23(1), 55-73.
- Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H. & Ryan, R. M. 2017. Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. *Annual review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior*, 419-43.
- Dolovich, S. 1998. Note: Making Docile Lawyers: An Essay on the Pacification of Law Students.
- Elkins, J. R. 1995. Thinking Like a Lawyer: Second Thoughts. *Mercer L. Rev.*, 47511.
- Hedegard, J. M. 1979. The impact of legal education: An in-depth examination of career-relevant interests, attitudes, and personality traits among first-year law students. *American Bar Foundation Research Journal*, 4(4), 791-868.
- Iba 2021. Mental Wellbeing in the Legal Profession: A Global Study International Bar Association
- James, C. 2008. Lawyers' wellbeing and professional legal education. *The Law Teacher*, 42(1), 85-97.
- James, C. G., Strevens Sfhea, C. & Field, R. 2020. Law Teachers Speak Out: What do Law Schools Need to Change. *Wellbeing in a Changing World: The Impact of Technology and Innovation on the Legal Profession, Intersentia (2020), ANU College of Law Research Paper*, (20.26).
- Jones, E. 2018. Transforming legal education through emotions. *Legal studies*, 38(3), 450-479.
- Jones, E. & Graffin, N. 2020. *Mental Health and Wellbeing in the Legal Profession*, Policy Press.
- Junior Lawyer's Division, T. L. S. 2019. *Resilience and wellbeing survey report 2019* [Online]. Available: <https://communities.lawsociety.org.uk/Uploads/b/y/k/resilience-wellbeing-survey-report-2019.pdf> [Accessed 5 December 2019].
- Kasser, T. 2003. *The high price of materialism*, MIT press.
- Kasser, T., Cohn, S., Kanner, A. D. & Ryan, R. M. 2007. Some costs of American corporate capitalism: A psychological exploration of value and goal conflicts. *Psychological Inquiry*, 18(1), 1-22.
- Kelk, N., Luscombe, G., Medlow, S. & Hickie, I. 2009. *Courting the Blues* [Online]. Available: <https://cald.asn.au/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/BMRI-Report-Courting-the-BluesLaw-Report-Website-version-4-May-091.pdf> [Accessed 15 December 2019].
- Kellner, R., Wiggins, R. J. & Pathak, D. 1986. Distress in medical and law students. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 27(3), 220-223.

- Krieger, L. S. 1998. What we're not telling law students-and lawyers-that they really need to know: Some thoughts-in-action toward revitalizing the profession from its roots. *Journal of Law and Health*, 13(1), 3-46.
- Krieger, L. S. 2002. Institutional denial about the dark side of law school, and fresh empirical guidance for constructively breaking the silence. *J. Legal Educ.*, 52112.
- Larcombe, W., Tumbaga, L., Malkin, I., Nicholson, P. & Tokatlidis, O. 2013. Does an improved experience of law school protect students against depression, anxiety and stress?: An empirical study of wellbeing and the law school experience of LLB and JD students. *Sydney Law Review, The*, 35(2), 407-432.
- Lawcare 2021. Life in the Law LawCare.
- Organ, J. M. 2010. What do we know about the satisfaction/dissatisfaction of lawyers-a meta-analysis of research on lawyer satisfaction and well-being. *U. St. Thomas LJ*, 8225.
- Ryan, R. M. & Moller, A. C. 2017. Competence as central, but not sufficient, for high-quality motivation. *Handbook of competence and motivation: Theory and application*, 216-238.
- Sebire, S. J., Standage, M. & Vansteenkiste, M. 2008. Development and validation of the goal content for exercise questionnaire. *Journal of sport & exercise psychology*, 30(4).
- Sheldon, K. M. & Krieger, L. S. 2004. Does legal education have undermining effects on law students? Evaluating changes in motivation, values, and well-being. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 22(2), 261-286.
- Sheldon, K. M. & Krieger, L. S. 2007. Understanding the negative effects of legal education on law students: A longitudinal test of self-determination theory. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 33(6), 883-897.
- Sheldon, K. M. & Krieger, L. S. 2014. Service job lawyers are happier than money job lawyers, despite their lower income. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 9(3), 219-226.
- Soonpaa, N. J. 2003. Stress in Law Students: A Comparative Study of First-Year, Second-Year, and Third-Year Students. *Conn. L. Rev.*, 36353.