Becoming A Resilient Scientist Series: An Intervention Program

H. Anna Han, Ella Ulrike Klenke, Laurie Chaikind McNulty, Annie Scheiner,
and Sharon L. Milgram

The Office of Intramural Training and Education, Office of the Director, National Institutes of Health

Author Note

H. Anna Han https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5266-2642
Sharon L. Milgram https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4835-0208

We have no conflicts of interest. The author order for second to fourth authors was determined by their last name, as they equally contributed.

We acknowledge the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (NIGMS) for providing initial funding to open the Becoming a Resilient Scientist (BRS) series to the extramural community. We appreciate the on-going support of the NIH Immediate Office of the Director, NIH Office of Research on Women's Health, NIH Sexual and Gender Minority Research Office, NIH Office of AIDS Research, NIH Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research, and other NIH Institutes and Centers. We thank Drs. Laura Koehly, Janetta Lun, Brett Pelham, and the OITE staff for valuable input on this project, and Dr. Michael Gottesman for supporting the development of well-being programs for the NIH intramural scientists. Finally, we are deeply grateful for the energy and enthusiasm of the facilitators, mentors, and trainees who participated in BRS and who continue to influence the work of the NIH OITE through their participation and feedback.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to H. Anna Han and Sharon L. Milgram. Building 2, 9000 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, MD 20894 Email: anna.han@nih.gov; sharon.milgram@nih.gov

Dedication

This paper is dedicated to the memory of Wes Beckstead (1983-2011) who greatly influenced the work of SLM in developing support structures for NIH intramural trainees.

ABSTRACT

Compared to the general population, science trainees experience significant challenges and stressors that increase negative mental health outcomes. With COVID-19, the stressors of social distancing, isolation, truncated lab time, and uncertainty about the future have all likely exacerbated the effect. Now, more than ever, practical and effective interventions are vitally needed to address the core causes of science trainee stress and to increase resilience amongst trainee populations. This paper discusses a new resilience program targeted to biomedical trainees and scientists - Becoming a Resilient Scientist Series (BRS), a 5-part workshop coupled with facilitated group discussions dedicated to increasing resilience, specifically focusing on academic and research environments. Results show that BRS increases trainee resilience (primary outcome), with reductions in perceived stress, anxiety, and work presenteeism, and increases in ability to shift and persist, self-awareness, and self-efficacy (secondary outcomes). Furthermore, participants in the program reported high level of satisfaction, would highly recommend the program to others, and perceived positive changes in their resilience skills. To our knowledge, this is the first resilience program explicitly targeted for biomedical trainees and scientists, catering to the unique professional culture and environment in which these individuals work.

Keywords: resilience, biomedical science trainees, intervention program, culture of science

Introduction

Science is hard. And this is not just a cliché or cultural myth - the data support it. In fact, science is so hard that 60% of students starting with a STEM[1] and pre-med major will change to non-STEM fields at a rate 2 times higher than other non-science fields (Frank, 2012; Drew, 2011). Grades, by the same or comparable individuals, are substantially lower in science versus non-science courses (Coe, 2008).

But science is also hard for reasons other than the topic of study. After surviving the undergraduate math and science attrition effect (see Drew, 2011), many of aspiring scientists face mental health crises in the field caused by a myriad of academic stressors. These include imposter fears[2], isolation, constant looming deadlines, navigating complex relationships with advisers, intense competition, lack of work-life balance, uncertain job prospects, and bullying and harassment. For example, a survey of 4,300 academic scientists worldwide reported that at least half struggled with self-reported depression and anxiety, and 67% reported witnessing bullying or harassment, with 43% directly experiencing either bullying or harassment (Abbott, 2020). This effect is most pronounced among graduate students and trainees who are at 6 times greater risk for depression and anxiety than the general population (Evans et al., 2018). In *Nature*'s survey (Woolston, 2019), 36% of PhD students reported seeking help for depression and anxiety that stem from their training. Almost half (45%) said their satisfaction with their PhD trajectory decreased as they progressed in their training.

With COVID-19, these negative effects were exacerbated by increased social isolation, truncated lab time, and financial stressors. In fact, in a survey of medical scientists including medical and graduate students, 23% of respondents considered leaving academia post COVID-19, due to lack of work-life balance (Matulevicius et al., 2021). This effect is even more pronounced amongst biomedical scientists (Chan et al., 2020). A survey conducted in the Netherlands during the height of the pandemic from March to May 2020 revealed that 47% of PhD trainees were at risk for psychiatric disorder, and approximately 40% experienced severe burn-out symptoms (Mattijssen et al., 2020). As Chan et al. (2020) described it "…imagine the mental resilience needed to maintain focus on solving that equally important mystery in oncology, cardiology, neuroscience, or any other field that has been put on temporary hold due to the pandemic."

Science, especially the biomedical sciences, has already been suffering a high attrition rate in PhD programs, and the attrition is even more pronounced with women and underrepresented minority (URM) trainees who have been leaving science and academia at a disproportionate rate (e.g., Grogan,

---

[1] Although the focus on Becoming A Resilient Scientist was for biomedical sciences, we embrace an inclusive and definition of sciences which includes the social sciences

[2] We use the term imposter fears instead of imposter syndrome, as the term syndrome seems to denote something is wrong with the individuals or that it is abnormal. The term imposter fears indicate what they are feeling is a fear, and normalizes the fear as something everyone can experience.

2019; Maher et al., 2020). Without practical and effective interventions to address the the stresses experienced by biomedical trainees, which exacerbate mental health crises, the field will suffer a brain drain and lose talented future scientists and potential for innovation. Now, more than ever, practical and effective interventions are vitally needed to address the core causes of biomedical trainee stress and to increase resilience amongst trainee populations.

While many of the findings, both for scientists in general and biomedical trainees in particular, raise alarms and call for immediate intervention to help those in the scientific workforce pipeline, academia's responses have been largely muted. *Inside Higher Ed* declared a mental crisis in graduate education and stated, "It is only with strong and validated interventions that academia will be able to provide help for those who are traveling through the bioscience workforce pipeline (Flahtery, 2018)." However, available interventions are lacking, and most are not validated, especially for biomedical science trainees. In fact, the results from the Graduate Student Depression and Anxiety Survey led Evans and colleagues to recommend NIH's own train-the-trainer model, where faculty, administrative and support staff are trained by mental health professionals to recognize and respond to the trainee's needs, be adapted "to help today's PhDs compete in the 'vast and ever-changing job market' (Evans et al., 2018)."

Here, we propose that to alleviate the current mental health crisis within graduate education, an effective intervention needs to address the unique challenges of academia, target the sources of depression and anxiety, and increase trainees' ability to cope with stressors and adversity. One promising approach is to provide tailored training that increases trainees' resilience. For example, a systematic review of resilience training and interventions (Joyce et al., 2018) demonstrated a large body of evidence highlighting the benefits of resilience training for mental health and well-being by mitigating the impact of stress and adversity. Additionally, in a recent study of women who are thriving in undergraduate STEM majors, resilience was identified as a common and integral trait that allowed them to succeed (Thoman et al., 2020). In exploring why trainees withdraw early from their biomedical PhD programs, Maher et al. (2017) found that self-efficacy components related to resiliency played a role (see also Diekman et al., 2017, for a borader analysis of reasons why women exit STEM majors).

Resilience as an Intervention?

Resilience is a form of mental and psychological strength that enables a person to adapt and adjust to difficult or stressful situations. According to the American Psychological Association, resilience is "the process of adapting well in the face of adversity, trauma, tragedy, threats or significant sources of stress — such as family and relationship problems, serious health problems or workplace and financial stressors. It means 'bouncing back' from difficult experiences (APA)." Because of their ability to adapt, resilient individuals tend to better regulate their behaviors, have a more optimistic outlook with greater life satisfaction, maintain positive self-views. They are also less likely to be depressed and anxious (Cohn et al., 2009; Fredrickson et al., 2008; 10 Mak, Ng, & Wong, 2011). Resilient individuals are also less more to engage in presenteeism – that is, they remain fully functioning in the workplace rather than working while distracted (Thogersen-Ntoumani et al., 2017) - and they also avoid other self-defeating work behaviors (Seligman et al., 1986; Van Katwyk, Fox, Spector, & Kelloway, 2000). Importantly, resilience is malleable and can be learned and nurtured (Kim-Cohen,2007).

Although resilience training has rarely been attempted in academic settings, resilience training intervention has been shown to be effective in workplace and military settings (e.g., U.S. Army's Ready and Resilient Campaign). For example, resilience training increased positive affect and a sense of well-being while it decreased depression and anxiety (Forbes & Fikretoglu, 2018; Robertson et al., 2015). Moreover, such training has been linked to increased work performance (Robertson et al., 2015) and organizational commitment (Youssef & Luthans, 2007). An in-depth systematic review of resilience training interventions in the workplace demonstrated that such trainings generally improved personal resilience, mental health, and subjective well-being of participants, and had other tangible benefits including improved performance and improved psychosocial outcomes such as increased self-efficacy and optimism (Robertson et al., 2015). It has been estimated that the cost-savings for resilience intervention training is $1,846 per person over 8-weeks due to the reduction in stress tied to depression or trait anxiety, as well as increased presenteeism of workers (Johnson, Emmons, Rivard, Griffin, & Dusek, 2015).

Given the constant stressors and rejection faced in scientific academic settings, and the high levels of depression and anxiety experienced by graduate trainees, there is a clear need for resilience training aimed at increasing an individual's ability to adapt in the face of adversity and "bounce back," as well as decrease stress, depression, and anxiety, and other self-defeating work behaviors tailored especially to biomedical trainees.

Becoming A Resilient Scientist (BRS): The Intervention Program

The Becoming a Resilient Scientist Series (BRS) originally evolved from several standalone webinars conducted by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Intramural Training and Education (OITE) to help trainees manage stress. As the demand for these webinars increased at the start of the pandemic, the questions and responses from the trainees clearly indicated that a more cohesive and comprehensive set of lectures and intervention was needed. Thus, the BRS was created in 2020 as a step toward meeting the needs of the trainee and helping alleviate and address common stressors and increase resilience for those pursuing science.

The BRS program employs multimodal cognitive-behavioral concepts that emphasizes community, mindfulness, self-compassion, and cognitive behavioral changes – all of which are thought to increase resilience. The intervention focuses on several broad themes across all of its sessions, including the importance of learning and practicing resilience skills and the ongoing nature of resilience-building, cultural awareness, the role of ethnicity and identity in the scientific community, and the critical role of community support.The program also emphasizes the potential benefits of therapy and mental health care while acknowledging possible barriers, such as stigma, cost, and the fear of losing productive work time. The program's goal is to help participants identify and replace maladaptive coping strategies and with more adaptive behaviors that support self-efficacy and persistence in STEM fields.

The program is a series of five two-hour workshops; each workshop is followed by an optional one hour facilitated small-group discussion. The five units are separated by one- to two-week intervals, to enable trainees to learn the content, process it on their own, and explore it with their peers in the facilitated small-group discussion. Each workshop and related discussion session can be a stand-alone, but trainees who attend the entire program can refine and integrate the insights and skills they have learned as material is reintroduced and reiterated throughout the series.

The BRS contains a total of five parts, each dedicated to a topic beneficial to trainees in research and academic settings (see appendix A for a full description of each session). *Part one* lays the foundation for the program with a discussion of well-being practices, emotional literacy, and a growth mindset. Participants are introduced to concepts of resilience and wellness and learn how to effectively deal with setbacks and disappointments by building habits that promote resilience and adaptive coping. The unit describes various resilience tools such as self-care for scientists, mindfulness, the use of journaling, community support, and exploring thoughtful approaches to daily setbacks. *Part two* focuses on cognitive distortions and imposter fears, with specific strategies to combat negative self-talk and to foster a growth mindset. Importantly, the unit discusses the interplay between uncomfortable emotions and critical self-talk and ways to recognize unhelpful internal or self-messages that may distort one's view of their abilities and accomplishments. It also provides tools to generate helpful self-talk that can enhance resilience while also addressing self-talk that is unrealistically positive. *Part three* focuses on self-advocacy, assertiveness, and communication style to help navigate hierarchical academic and research environments where trainees may struggle. Trainees are guided on how to set boundaries, communicate expectations, ask for feedback, and discuss difficult issues with mentors, colleagues, and/or supervisors. This unit also stresses the influence of external messages that decrease self-confidence – while acknowledging the role of quality mentorship in combatting these external messages. This appears to be especially important for marginalized trainees who are often on the receiving end of microaggressions regarding their abilities and feelings of belonging within the research community. *Part four* focuses on why receiving feedback is challenging and offers ways to stay calm and engaged while receiving feedback so one can learn from the feedback. *Part five* highlights mentoring and how to "manage up" to maximize the mentoring relationship. It specifically discusses mentoring relationships in research environments with a focus on improving relationships with principal investigators (PIs), ways to find additional mentors, and how to clarify and communicate what the trainees need. It also provides guidance and tools on what to do when the environment is toxic. [3]

In the current paper, we evaluate the effectiveness of BRS as a resilience intervention program for biomedical science trainees who participated in the program during the COVID-19 pandemic. Given the severity of the pandemic, including widespread isolation, salient racial injustice issues, and concerns for various other mental health issues of the trainees at that time, a conscious and ethical decision was made to make the program open for all trainees who wanted to participate (vs. a waitlist). Although

[3] The first round of BRS had an additional unit on Emotions and Emotional Intelligence. However, in the subsequent sessions, the content of the session was embedded into the other five lectures to shorten the series without losing content.

each workshop in the series could function as a stand-alone, we hypothesized that those who consistently participated in the program by attending more than half of the sessions would have more chances to integrate and practice the skills they learned, and therefore, would show greater increases in the primary outcome of resilience and associated secondary outcomes compared to those attending fewer than half of the sessions. Thus, the evaluation considers a "dose" effect on the primary and secondary outcomes, rather than a comparison to a waitlist control group who did not receive the training.

To that end, our goals are four-folds. First, we evaluate whether indivisuals who completed more than three sessions (more than half) of the BRS exhibited significantly higher increases in resilience levels compared to those who completed less than three of the BRS sessions. Second, since the program focused on themes of adjusting and adapting to adversity, stress, increasing self-awareness, believing in one's ability to achieve goals, and other coping strategies, we expected corresponding changes on various correlates of resilience – decrease in perceived stress, depression, anxiety, work presenteeism, and increases in the ability to shift and persist during stressful events, self-efficacy, and self-awareness. Third, since the change in resilience should drive the the changes in the secondary outcomes, we hypothesized that resilience should mediate the changes in the secondary outcome measures. Lastly, we describe participants' reported satisfaction with program and whether self-reported changes differed for those completing the majority of sessions compared to those who completed fewer than half of the BRS program.

Method

Participants

Biomedical trainee participants were recruited from the NIH Intramural Research Program (IRP) and from various extramural institutions who were invited to participate in the program by the NIH's OITE. For IRP trainees, the announcement for the program was made via OITE trainee listservs, and all IRP trainees (from postbaccalaureate to postdocs) were invited to participate. The trainees from extramural institutions were recruited by their institution, various listservs, and social media, and similar to NIH trainees, ranged from undergraduate to postdocs and medical students.

Procedure

The current evaluation of the BRS program was implemented in two rounds, with the first round (BRS1) held from January to May 2021 across six sessions and the second round (BRS2) was held from September 2021 to December 2021 across five sessions. The workshop component was held once every 3 weeks for the first round (BRS1) and every 2 weeks for the second round (BRS2) via Zoom, and the small group discussions were held a week later. Trainees participated in the optional small group

discussion sessions at their institution via Zoom[4] or at one of the open sessions hosted at NIH via Zoom. Small discussion sessions were led by trained facilitators with a discussion guide.

Each webinar session had, on average, 363 attendees, with an additional 350 watching the recording[5]. In addition, on average, 371 trainees attended the small group discussion sessions.

Prior to the start of the first BRS session, all participants who logged into the webinar were asked to complete a pre-program survey assessing current resilience levels (primary outcome) and secondary outcomes, such as perceived stress, anxiety and depression levels, work presenteeism, their current ability to shift and persist during stressful events, self-awareness, and self-efficacy (see measures below). Following completion of the BRS program, all participants who attended at least one workshop received an email with a link to the post-program survey. The post-program survey was identical to the pre-program survey but also included questions regarding program satisfaction, self-perceived changes, how many workshops were attended, demographics, and open-ended comments. The average length of time between pre- and post-survey was four months, and the post-survey was open for 6 weeks after the conclusion of the series.

Measures

Program Participation

Consistent Participant. At the post-program assessment, participants reported on the workshops they attended. Those who participated in more than three workshops were classified as "consistent attenders," having attended more than half of the BRS program sessions; otherwise, participants were classified as "inconsistent attenders."

Primary Outcome

Resilience. Resilience was measured by the 10-item Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC-10; Davidson, 2003). Participants were asked to rate the frequency (1='not true at all' to 5='true nearly all the time') in which they endorsed resilience related thoughts, beliefs, or behaviors in the last month (e.g., "I am able to adapt when changes occur"). In the current study, the items had good internal consistency with Cronbach's α =.83 (pre-program assessment) and .87 (post-program assessment).The ten items were averaged to create a score from 1-5, where higher scores indicate greater resilience.

Secondary Outcomes

In the interest of time, most secondary outcomes were assessed using abbreviated versions of well-validated measures of distress, well-being, and work engagement.

Perceived stress. Perceived stress was measured by a subset of 4 items from the 10-item Perceived Stress Scale (PSS; Cohen et *al., 1983*) that focused on the control aspects of stress. Participants were

[4] A small number of extramural institutions required the small groups; however, attendance were not recorded.

[5] The number that watched the recording is a best estimate. The webinars were conducted over zoom and required pre-registration and the registration link also served as link to the webinar video. Zoom does not account for who pre-registered and watched the video after the live webinar.

asked to rate the frequency in which they experience stress-related feelings and thoughts ("how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life") in the past month. Participants used a scale ranging from "never" (=1) to "very often" (=5). In the current study, the four items had acceptable internal consistency with Cronbach's α =.73 (pre-program assessment) and .77 (post-program assessment).The four items were averaged to create a score from 1-5, where the higher number indicates greater perceived stress.

Anxiety Levels. Anxiety was measured by a subset of 3 items from the 7-item Generalized Anxiety Disorder Scale (GAD-7; Spitzer, Kroenke, Williams, & Löwe, 2006), that focused on non-physical symptom items. Participants were asked to rate the frequency in which they experienced various anxiety symptoms ("Not being able to stop or control worrying") in the past two weeks on a scale ranging from "not at all" (=1) to "almost every day" (=4). In the current study, the items had good internal consistency with Cronbach's α =.76 (pre-program assessment) and .77 (post-program assessment). The three items were averaged to create a score from 1-4, where the higher number indicates greater anxiety levels.

Depression Levels. Depression was measured by a subset of 4 items of the 9-item Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9; Kroenke, Spitzer, & Williams, 2001) that focused on general non-clinical depressive symptoms. Participants were asked to rate the frequency in which they experienced various depressive symptoms ("feeling down, depressed, or hopeless") in the past two weeks on a scale ranging from "not at all" (=1) to "almost every day" (=4). In the current study, the items had good internal consistency with Cronbach's α =.81 (pre-program assessment) and .79 (post-program assessment). The four items were averaged to create a score from 1-4, where the higher number indicates greater (non-clinical) depression levels.

Presenteeism. Presenteeism was measured by the 6-item Job Stress Related Presenteeism Scale (JSRP; Gilbreath & Frew, 2008). Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they had engaged in thoughts or behaviors related to presenteeism ("I'm unable to concentrate on my job because of work-related stress") on a scale ranging from "never" (=1) to "all the time" (=5). In the current study, the items had good internal consistency with Cronbach's α =.83 (pre-program assessment) and .85 (post-program assessment).The six items were averaged to create a score from 1-5, where the higher number indicates greater job stress-related presenteeism.

Shift and Persist. The ability to shift and persist during stressful times was measured by the 14-item Shift-and-Persist Scale (Chen, McLean, & Miller, 2015). Participants were asked to rate the extent to which various statements describe them ("When something stressful happens in my life, I think about what I can learn from the situation") on a scale of "not at all" (=1) to "a lot"(=4). In the current study, the items had good internal consistency with Cronbach's α =.82 (pre-program assessment) and .82 (post-program assessment). Excluding 6 distractor items, four items were average to create a shift sub-scale score from 1-4, and four items were average for a persist sub-scale score from 1-4. The higher scores indicate a greater ability to shift and/or persist during stressful times.

Self-Efficacy. The belief in one's ability to achieve their goals in the face of adversity was measured by the 8-item New General Self Efficacy Scale (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). Participants were asked to indicate their agreement with statements such as, "I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges," on a scale from "strongly disagree" (=1) to "strongly agree" (=5). In the current study, the items had good internal consistency with Cronbach's α =.89 (pre-program assessment) and .89 (post-program assessment).The eight items were averaged to create a score from 1-5. The higher scores indicate greater self-efficacy or the belief that one can overcome obstacles and achieve goals.

Self-Awareness. The awareness and reflection of one's internal states with attention to learning and self-awareness at work were measured by a subset of items from the Self-Awareness Outcomes Questionnaire (SAOQ; Sutton, 2016), specifically the reflective self-development (RSD) and proactive at work (PRO) subscales. Because BRS focused on self-development and being proactive at work, the other subscales, acceptance and emotional costs, were not included as it may not be relavent to increased resilience. Participants were asked to rate the frequency in which they endorse statements such as "I focus on ways of amending my behavior that would be useful" on a scale of "never" (=1) to "almost always" (=5). In the current study, the items had good internal consistency with Cronbach's α =.85 (pre-program assessment) and .87 (post-program assessment). Each subscale item was averaged to create a score from 1-5. The higher scores indicate greater self-awareness and reflection of oneself and self-awareness at work.

<u>Post Program Questions: Program Satisfaction, Perceived Changes, and Demographics</u>

Program Satisfaction. During the post-program survey, participants were asked to evaluate the BRS program with respect to overall satisfaction, likelihood they would recommend the training to a friend or colleague, and whether they found the program valuable on 5-point likert scales.

Self-Perceived Changes. To assess self-perceived changes, participants were asked during the post-program survey if they had become more resilient, better scientists, managed conflict and stress better, and if they had gained important skills on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1-5 (e.g., "Since participating in the resilience series, I have become more resilient in my work and/or life."). Furthermore, participants assessed their perceived knowledge on how to be a resilient science before and after participating in the program.

Demographic characteristics. To asses program's impact on different demographic groups, participants self-reported their gender identity and race/ethinicty (See NIH - All of Us Research Program, 2023) . The gender identity options were man, woman, nonbinary, transgender, other, and prefer not to say. The race/ethnicity options were White, Asian, Black/African-American, Hispanic/Latino/Spanish, American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Island, other, and prefer not to say. For both measures, participants could select more than one option, and those who selected multiple race/ethnic identities were coded as multi-racial and those who selected categories other than man and woman were coded as other.

Overview of Analyses

All analyses were conducted using SPSS. Prior to addressing study aims, we assessed whether there observed differences across trainee populations (i.e., NIH intramural trainees and extramural trainees) and BRS round (i.e., BRS1 and BRS2). There were no differences observed with regards to consistent participation, primary and secondary outcomes, and program satisfaction/perceived changes. Thus, data were collapsed across trainee populations and BRS round.

To address aims 1 and 2, we matched pre-and-post surveys and conducted a paired sample t-test to assess pre-program changes in resilience (primary outcome) and secondary outcomes at the post-program assessment. Furthermore, an independent sample t-test was used to explore the impact of consistent and inconsistent attendance on primary and secondary outcomes at the post-program assessment.

To address aim 3, we conducted a bootstrapped mediational analyses (Preacher & Hayes, 2004) to test indirect effect of consistent and inconsistent attendance on the secondary outcomes mediated by resilience.

To address aim 4, we constructed descriptive statistics for program satisfaction assessments and reported the percent rating the program 'good' (=3) to 'excellent' (=5). Independent t-tests were conducted to assess differences in program satisfaction and self perceived changes following program completion between those who attended the program workshops consistently and those who were inconsistent attenders.

Given the attrition of females and underrepresented minorities in science, we further explored how trainee's gender and race may influence the effects of BRS as an ancillary analysis.

Results

Participant characteristics

A total of 625 trainees completed the post-program survey across the two rounds of BRS[6]. There were 440 females (70.4%), 154 males (24.6%), and 31 other/unknown (4.9%) gender. Two hundred and ninety-five trainees identified as white (47.2%), 313 minority/multiracial (49.4%), and 22 did not specific their race or ethnicity. Of those, using a unique self-guided ID, we were able to match up a total of 341 participants with their pre-and post-program surveys (216 in Spring 2021; 125 in Fall 2021). In the pre-and-post matched sample, there were 255 females (74.8%), 75 males (22%), and 11 other/unknown (3.3%). One hundred ninety-five trainees identified as white (57.%), 142 as minority/multiracial (41.6%), and 4 (1.2%) did not specify their race or ethnicity. [7]

---

[6] Three participants who identified as a facilitator or faculty were removed from the analysis as the goal of this study was to look at the impact of the program on science trainees.

[7] Because we do not know the exact demographics makeup of the community of the trainees we are recruiting from, we are unable to tell if the demographics in our sample is representative. However, if we infer from

Aim 1: Change in resilience pre- to post- BRS program

To address aim 1, we conducted a paired sample t-test to assess pre-program changes in resilience at the post-program assessment. As predicted, there was a significant increases in RISC-10 resilience scores pre vs. post BRS program participation, (M_{pre} = 2.49 vs. M_{post} =2.80, $t(342)=12.87$, $p<.001$, $d=0.70$), such that participants resilience increased post BRS participation.

Unsurprisingly, the matched pre-and-post sample had less than 14% individuals who attended 3 or less sessions and coded as "inconsistente attenders." To explore the effect of consistente vs. inconsistent attendance on resilience more robustly, we used the post-program only sample and conducted an independent sample t-test to assess whether the resilience score differed for those who attended the BRS program consistently as compared to those who inconsistent attenders. As expected, we observed significantly higher RISC-10 resilience scores for consistent attenders (M=2.82, SD=.50) vs. inconsistent attenders (M=2.69, SD=.52), $t(623)=2.51$, $p=.012$, $d=0.26$) (see Table 1).

Aim 2: Change in stress, self-efficacy, self-awareness, and persistence

With respect to secondary outcomes in the pre-and-post matched sample, we observed a signifant decrease in perceived stress, anxiety, and depression and an increase in participants' self-perceived ability to shift and persist, self-efficacy, self-awareness related to reflective self-development, and being proactive at work (see Table 1). This suggests that those who consistently attend BRS from the start of the series are seeing signficant changes in all secondary outcome measures.

Table 1: Pre-and-post program matched sample changes

Measure	Pre BRS Mean (SD)	Post BRS Mean (SD)	T-test, Cohen's d
Resilience (RISC-10)	2.47 (.57)	2.80 (.53)	$t(340)=13.42$, $p<.001$, $d=0.73$
Perceived Stress (Modified PSS)	1.99 (.67)	1.53 (.68)	$t(340)=11.94$, $p<.001$, $d=0.65$
Anxiety (Modified GAD)	2.60 (.75)	2.28 (.72)	$t(340)=9.56$, $p<.001$, $d=0.52$
Depressions (Modified PHQ)	2.23 (.79)	1.97 (.71)	$t(339)=7.29$, $p<.001$, $d=0.40$
Work Presenteeism (JSRP)	2.53 (.69)	2.31 (.67)	$t(339)=6.39$, $p<.001$, $d=0.35$
Shift & Persist	2.92 (.68) 3.11 (.59)	3.22 (.62) 3.37 (.58)	$t(339)=9.90$, $p<.001$, $d=0.54$

demographics of the broader scientific trainee community, females and minority trainees are well presented in our sample (see NSF, 2002).

			t(339)=8.39, *p*<.001, *d*=0.45
Self-Efficacy	3.85 (.60)	4.07 (.53)	*t*(338)=8.03, *p*<.001, *d*=0.44
Self-Awareness: Proactive at Work & Reflective Self-Development	3.64 (.53) 3.79 (.54)	3.83 (.53) 3.99 (.50)	*t*(338)=6.46, *p*<.001, *d*=0.35 *t*(338)=8.34, *p*<.001, *d*=0.45

Table 1: Pre-and-post matched sample changes

Similiarly, in the post-program sample, the consistent attenders were significantly lower in perceived stress, and higher ability to persist, self-efficacy, self-awareness related to reflective self-development. We saw marginal decreases in depression, self-awareness related to being proactive at work (see table 2). However, we did not see differences in anxiety, work presenteeism, or the ability to shift during stressful events.

Table 2: Post-program scores by consistent vs. inconsistent attenders

Measure	Consistent Attenders Mean (SD)	Inconsistent Attenders Mean (SD)	T-test, Cohen's d
Resilience (RISC-10)	2.82(.50)	2.69 (.52)	*t*(623)=2.51, *p*=.012, *d*=0.26
Perceived Stress (Modified PSS)	1.53(.67)	1.76 (.68)	*t*(622)=3.14, *p*=.002, *d*=0.33
Anxiety (Modified GAD)	2.25(.71)	2.30 (.76)	*t*(622) < 1, *p*=NS
Depression (Modified PHQ)	1.96 (.79)	2.08 (.79)	*t*(622)=1.66, *p*=.098, *d*=0.17
Work Presenteeism(JSRP)	2.28 (.65)	2.37 (.66)	*t*(622) <1.5, *p*=NS
Shift & Persist	3.23 (.59) 3.40 (.57)	3.20 (.62) 3.27 (.73)	*t*(622) < 1, *p*=NS *t*(622)=2.06, *p*=.039, *d*=0.21
Self-Efficacy	4.11 (.52)	3.95 (.60)	*t*(621)=2.72, *p*=.007, *d*=0.28
Self-Awareness: Proactive at Work & Reflective Self-Development	4.04 (.50) 3.85 (.53)	3.89 (.59) 3.75 (.59)	*t*(622)=1.81, *p*=.070, *d*=0.19 *t*(622)=2.70, *p*=.007, *d*=0.28

Table 2: Post-program scores by consistent vs. inconsistent attenders

Aim 3: Mediation of resilience on consistent/inconsistent attendance and secondary outcomes

Mediational analyses based on 5,000 bootstrapped samples using bias-corrected and accelerated 95% confidence intervals (see Preacher & Hayes, 2004; Preacher et al., 2007) was conducted to test resilience (RISC-10) as a mediator of the relationship between attendance and secondary outcomes (See Figure 1). In these analyses, mediation is significant when confidence intervals for the indirect effect do not include 0. As expected, resilience fully mediated depression, the ability to persist, self-efficacy, and perceptions of being proactive at work as well as reflective self-development components of self-awareness (See Tables 3 and 4). It also partially mediated perceived stress. These results indicate that the increase in resilience by consistent attenders also account for the various secondary outcomes, including reduction in perceived stress, depression, and the increase in the ability to persist during stressful times, self-efficacy, and self-awareness.



Figure 1: Mediational pathway between consistent vs. inconsistent attendance, resilience, and secondary outcomes

Mediation Estimates				
Secondary Outcome	Total Effect	Direct Effect	Indirect Effect CI (lower 95%, upper 95%)	Mediation type
Perceived stress	(TE=-.109, SE=.035, *p*=.002)	(DE=-.063, SE=.029, *p*=.033)	(-.12, -.02)*	Partial
Depression	(TE=-.060, SE=.036, *p*=.098)	(DE=-.022, SE=.033, *p*=.505)	(-.07, -.01)*	Full
Persist	(TE=.064, SE=.031, *p*=.039)	(DE=.027, SE=.027, *p*=.325)	(.007, .069)*	Full
Self-efficacy	(TE=.064, SE=.031, *p*=.039)	(DE=.035 SE=.022, *p*=.113)	(.006, .076)*	Full
Self-awareness: Proactive at Work	(TE=.050, SE=.028, *p*=.070)	(DE=.009 SE=.22, *p*=.694)	(.009, .074)*	Full
Self-awareness: Reflective Self-Development	(TE=.072, SE=.026, *p*=.007)	(DE=.035 SE=.022, *p*=.117)	(.007, .066)*	Full

Table 3: Mediation Estimates

Table 4: Path Estimates				
Path	Estimate	SE	CI lower, upper 95% CI	p
(Consistent vs. inconsistent) attendance → Resilience	.065	.026	(.014, -.116)	.012
Perceived stress				
Resilience → Perceived stress	-.701	.046	(-.799, -.611)	<.001
Attendance → Perceived stress	-.063	.029	(-.121, -.005)	.033
Depression				
Resilience → Depression	-.579	.051	(-.678, -.480)	<.001
Attendance → Depression	-.022	.033	(-.086, -.043)	.505
Persist				
Resilience → Persist	.570	.042	(.487, .653)	<.001
Attendance → Persist	.027	.027	(-.027, .081)	.325
Self-Efficacy				
Resilience → Self-efficacy	.648	.034	(.581, .715)	<.001
Attendance → Self-efficacy	.035	.022	(-.008, .079)	.113
Self-awareness: Proactive at work				
Resilience → Proactive at work	.634	.034	(.570, .704)	<.001
Attendance → Proactive at work	.009	.022	(-.035, .052)	.694
Self-awareness: Reflective Self-Development (RSD)				
Resilience → RSD	.566	.034	(.498, .634)	<.001
Attendance → RSD	.035	.022	(-.009, .079)	.117

Table 3: Mediation Path Estimates

Aim 4: Program satisfaction and self-perceived changes on post-program survey

Most of the participants rated the program good to excellent overall (M=4.43, SD=0.75; 97.9% ≥ 3), found the program valuable (M=4.60, SD=0.68; 98.0% ≥ 3), and would recommend it to a friend or a colleague (M=4.71, SD=0.61; 98.5% ≥ 3). Almost all of these satisfaction scores hovered around the top of the scale point at 5. There was also a significant increase in self-reported knowledge of how to become a more resilient scientist compared to before the program, (t(610)=51.39, p<.001; d=2.08; M_{change}=2.42, SD_{change}=1.16).

As expected, compared to inconsistent attenders, consistent attenders reported significantly higher ratings of the BRS program, value, and were more likely to recommend the program to a colleague or a friend. Moreover, those who attended consistently were more likely to report that their perceived resilience had increased, that they gained important skills that help with school or home, and that they developed a greater ability to manage stress and conflict. However, we did not see a difference in their self-percieved ability to become a better scientist.

Table 5: Self-perceived changes for consistent vs. inconsistent attenders			
Perceived change (higher numbers = greater)	Consistent Attenders Mean (SD)	Inconsistent Attenders Mean (SD)	T-test, Cohen's d
Perceived changein self-reported resilience	4.23 *(*.78)	4.15 *(*.93)	*t*(609)=3.55 *p*<.001, *d*=.38
Gaining important skills that help with work/home	4.48 *(*.70)	4.04 *(*.91)	*t*(610)=5.55 *p*<.001, *d*=.59
Ability to managing Stress	4.12 *(*.78)	3.81 *(*.88)	*t*(611)=3.56 *p*<.001, *d*=.38
Ability to manage conflict	4.11 *(*.79)	3.81 *(*.89)	*t*(610)=3.52*p*<.001, *d*=.38
Become a better scientist	3.80 *(*.87)	3.69 (.90)	*t*(611)<1.5*,* NS
Rating of the series	4.48 (.69)	4.15 (.93)	*t*(614)=4.29, *p*<.001, *d*=.46
Value	4.66 (.61)	4.32 (.86)	*t*(611)=4.77, p<.001, *d*=.51
Likely to recommend	4.74 (.57)	4.54 (.75)	*t*(614)=3.21, *p*<.001, *d*=.34

Table 5: Self-perceived changes between consistent vs. inconsistent attenders

Ancillary Analyses: Impact of the Trainee Demographics

Because BRS had high proportion of trainees from diverse backgrounds, we explored whether there is a differential effect of BRS by race/ethnicity (dichotomized as white vs. non-white trainees, N=295 and 305 respectively). Although we did not find a significant differences in the pre-and-post matched measures on race/ethnicity, we found significant differences in self-percieved ratings in the post-survey for ethnicity. For example, two-way betweeen group analyses of self-perceived resilience change (gaining important skills; the ability to manage stress and conflict; and the ability to become a better scientist) on race/ethnicity by attendance revealed no significant interactions (all ps >.1) but signfincant main effects (all ps<.01), albeit moderate to small effect sizes. The results are presented in Table 6. There were no significant effects of gender.

Table 6: Self-perceived changes between White vs. Non-white trainees

Perceived change (higher numbers = greater)	White trainees Mean (SD)	Non-white trainees Mean (SD)	Main effect, Partial eta squared (η_p^2)
Perceived change in self-reported resilience	4.04 (.79)	4.32 (.75)	$F(1,596) = 19.03$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2 = .031$
Gaining important skills that help	4.35 (.79)	4.47 (.71)	$F(1,597) = 9.60$, $p=.002$, $\eta_p^2 = .016$
Managing Stress	4.00 (.79)	4.15 (.79)	$F(1,598) = 5.68$, $p=.002$, $\eta_p^2 = .010$
Managing Conflict	3.98 (.82)	4.16 (.79)	$F(1,597) = 7.08$, $p=.008$, $\eta_p^2 = .012$
Become a Better Scientist	3.61 (.85)	3.96 (.87)	$F(1,598) = 11.71$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2 = .019$ *(main effect of attendance is NS)*

Table 6: Self-perceived changes between White vs. Non-white trainees

Conclusion

The results show that the BRS is clearly effective as an intervention program with a moderate to large impact on the trainees. In addition to being rated highly, the program appears to increase resilience, self-efficacy, and self-awareness. For those who completed both pre-and-post program measures, BRS improved participants' self-perceived ability to shift and persist, self-efficacy, and self-awareness while decreasing self-reported anxiety, depression, perceived stress, and presenteeism. After the intervention, participants reported that they were better managing stress and conflict, that they found what they learned valuable, and that they had become more resilient.

As expected, we saw greater effects among those who attend more sessions indicating that the program is effective and is especially beneficial for those who consistently attended (i.e., "higher dose"). In the post-program survey only sample, consistent attenders showed increased resilience, ability to persist, self-efficacy, proactive and reflective self-development components of self-awareness, and saw decreases in perceived stress and marginal decrease in depression. We found that the program's impact of resilience fully mediated its effects on depression, ability to persist, self-efficacy, and self-awareness, and particially mediated perceived stress. This hints at the underlying mechanism that the increase in resilience is driving the corresponding changes on the secondary outcomes. We speculate that percieved stress may only be partially mediated by resilience, because BRS had another important component – a sense of community and that the trainees are not alone. In fact, in our comment section,

the most frequently mentioned comments were that the trainees were glad that they are not alone or that their experiences are not unique. Part of the mechanism driving the reduction in perceived stress may not only be from the increase in resilience but also from a sense of relief or comfort that the experience is shared by others (see Neff, 2003). That sense of not being alone may also reduce feelings of shame which may further improve one's ability to ask for help and work on building effective coping strategies. Furthermore, those who attended more than half also found the program more valuable and were more likely to recommend to their friend or colleague; however, it should be noted that those who attended less than half still rated the series highly, found it valuable, and likely to recommend it to a friend or a colleague.

Although BRS seems to be beneficial for all trainees taken together, it seems to have been especially beneficial for non-white trainees. Compared to white trainees, non-white trainees self-reported and perceived much greater changes in their perception of resiliency, gained important skills that help them in their work and home, learned to manage stress and conflict better, and reported that they become a better scientist as a result, despite not showing greater changes in resilience measures. We speculate that, similar to not being alone effect noted above, that nonwhite trainees may find comfort in knowing that their experiences and challenges are shared and recognized by others. BRS explicitly address the challenges that marginalizied trainees face in science and research community – especially the role of bias, microaggression, stereotype threat, and how it can lead to attributional ambiguity (see Crocker et al., 1991) These findings indicate that BRS could be an important and effective tool in retaining diverse trainees in biomedical science.

It appears that BRS can fill a critical void that currently exists in the biomedical training community. It is empowering trainees to effectively deal with the stressors of academics and research by giving them a sense of agency and the best strategies and tools to cope with those stressors, as well as setbacks and other adversities. It is a step towards reducing the mental health crisis amongst trainees in biomedical sciences, and when scaled up, could provide a large benefit, and help prevent attrition of trainees in science.

Discussion

The BRS series is a program designed to help trainees struggling with stressors and raise their resilience during a time when the alarm bells started sounding regarding the graduate mental health crisis in science and when the pandemic was exacerbating that effect. The program was an attempt at meeting the crucial needs of the trainees, and helping them alleviate and address common stressors, providing them with coping skills, and ultimately increasing resilience for those pursuing biomedical science. And it appears that the program is successful at meeting those goals and is addressing the needs of the trainees and improving their well-being.

However, some may wonder if the beneficial changes in this intervention program were mainly driven by the changes in the pandemic stressors and time. The BRS1 started before the COVID-19 vaccine was available and at the height of the period during the pandemic when trainees were grappling with

uncertainty and isolation and ended during the potentially more hopeful period of the pandemic when vaccines started becoming available. Although this alternative explanation cannot be ruled out completely, if this were the case, BRS2 should not show the same results. BRS2 started as the vaccines were becoming widely available and the pressures of the pandemic had started easing. Yet we did not see any differences between BRS1 and BRS2. This strongly suggests that the BRS intervention effectiveness is not just due to the effects of the pandemic (i.e., effects of history) and that it is more likely that the intervention is targeting the needs of the trainees.

Another alternative explantion for the result could be that the participants who were consistent attenders were inherently different at baseline. In order to rule out this explantion, we conducted pre-program measure differences between consistent vs. inconsistent attenders on all primary and secondary measures. We did not find any significant pre-measure differences (all ps>.2). Therefore, it appears that both consistent and inconsistent attenders were equivalent on our primay and secondary measures at the baseline (at the beginning of the program) and the program attendance or dosage effect is seemingly driving the effect. On the other hand, we cannot say for sure that those who attended all of the sessions and those who misse done or more were identical in all possible ways. Thus, acknowledging our ethical concerns, future studies might compare the efficacy of this intervention with that of other interventions. It would also be useful to see if the program had a robust effect if it were made mandatory (assuming that this could be ethically done). Finally, it would be useful to distinguish exactly which aspects of this complex intervention were most crucial to its apparent success. After all, this was a multi-part intervention, and it would be possible to decompose it in future studies.

Although the program is largely successful, there was significant attrition. In both rounds of BRS, we started with approximately 600 trainees, and by the end of session, we had approximately 250 trainees in attendance. We speculate that there are two reasons for this. First is the time commitment and pressure from others to work while in the lab during the workday. As the attrition occurred, we reached out to a subset of trainees, querying why they stopped attending. Many trainees mentioned that the time commitment interfered with lab work commitments, and they chose to prioritize lab work. Some said their PI/supervisor did not support them attending a webinar during the day when they should be focused on lab work. This highlights the potential benefits of making resilience training a required element of the curriculum as we continue to work toward cultural change in science. Many trainees were hesitant to commit three to six hours per month to improving their resilience because of fears that participation would interfere with their lab work. We need to change the culture of long hours and complete dedication to lab work to also emphasizing the importance of self-care and self-improvement. After all, one must be well to do well.

The second possibility for attrition is motivation. Although many trainees were excited to start, they may have lacked the motivation and commitment to complete the entire series. Hence, it is possible that only the motivated trainees completed the program and benefited from it. Nevertheless, this explanation for attrition does not undermine the effectiveness of the BRS program. The social psychological literature on behavior and attitude change state that one needs to be willing (i.e., motivated) and able first before any actual changes can occur (e.g., theory of planned behavior; Ajzen,

1991). The effectiveness of BRS is likely driven by providing the tools and the skills the trainees need to implement and make the changes. Those who are willing and able are more likely to practice those skills and see corresponding changes in their resilience. Our data hint that this could be the case – those who attend more than half of the sessions (likely more motivated and committed) report more benefits than those who attend less than half. Furthermore, our pre-and-post sample group demonstrated the greatest positives changes in all secondary outcomes, and they were also the group who attended the majority the BRS sessions. In fact, while we saw changes in anxiety, work presenteeism, and the ability to shift during stressful times in our pre-and-post matched-sample, we did not find the corresponding changes between consistent and inconsistent attenders on post-program only sample. It is possible that these varibles require consistent effort and motivation to improve. Hence, it is unlikely that any intervention program, no matter how effective, will have a large impact on those who are unmotivated and unwilling to change.

Nevertheless, the BRS has shown that it can be an effective intervention and could be an important and effective tool for all trainees as they navigate the unique challenges of the biomedical academic settings. Furthermore, it appears that diverse trainees can especially benefit from the program. BRS is the first resilience intervention program to address the unique needs of biomedical trainees, has demonstrated that it is effective and has the potential to retain a talented biomedical workforce while nurturing a group of resilient future scientists. It may be also be an important component of solving the mental health crisis in biomedical sciences and sciences in general.

References

References

Abbott, A. (2020). Huge survey reveals pressures of scientist's lives. *Nature*, *577*(7791), 460-461.

American Psychological Association. (2020, Feb 1). *Building your resilience*. APA. https://www.apa.org/topics/resilience/building-your-resilience

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(2), 179-211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Carr, W., Bradley, D., Ogle, A. D., Eonta, S. E., Pyle, B. L., & Santiago, P. (2013). Resilience training in a population of deployed personnel. *Military Psychology*, *25*(2), 148-155. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0094956

Chan, C., Oey, N. E., & Tan, E. K. (2020). Mental health of scientists in the time of COVID-19. *Brain, behavior, and immunity*, *88*, 956. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2020.05.039

Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62-83. https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810141004

Chen, E., McLean, K. C., & Miller, G. E. (2015). Shift-and-persist strategies: Associations with socioeconomic status and the regulation of inflammation among adolescents and their parents. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 77(4), 371–382. DOI: 10.1097/PSY.0000000000000157

Coe, R. (2008). Comparability of GCSE examinations in different subjects: an application of the Rasch model. *Oxford Review of Education*, *34*(5), 609-636. DOI: 10.1080/03054980801970312

Cohen, S., Kamarck, T. O. M., & Mermelstein, R. O. B. I. N. (1994). Perceived stress scale. *Measuring stress: A guide for health and social scientists*, *10*, 1-2.

Cohn, M. A., Fredrickson, B. L., Brown, S. L., Mikels, J. A., & Conway, A. M. (2009). Happiness unpacked: Positive emotions increase life satisfaction by building resilience. *Emotion*, 9(3), 361-368. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0015952

Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of health and social behavior*, 385-396. https://doi.org/10.2307/2136404

Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson resilience scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and anxiety*, *18*(2), 76-82. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/da.10113

Crocker, Jennifer; Voelkl, Kristin; Testa, Maria; Major, Brenda (1991). "Social stigma: The affective

consequences of attributional ambiguity". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60 (2),* 218–228. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.60.2.218.

Diekman, A. B., Steinberg, M., Brown, E. R., Belanger, A. L., & Clark, E. K. (2017). A Goal Congruity Model of Role Entry, Engagement, and Exit: Understanding Communal Goal Processes in STEM Gender Gaps. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 21(2),* 142–175. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868316642141

Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D. W., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2010). New well being measures: Short scales to assess flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social indicators research*, *97*(2), 143-156. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9493-y

Drew, C. (2011, Nov 4). *Why science majors change their mind: it's just so darn hard.* The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/06/education/edlife/why-science-majors-change-their-mind-its-just-so-darn-hard.html?_r=2

Evans, T. M., Bira, L., Gastelum, J. B., Weiss, L. T., & Vanderford, N. L. (2018). Evidence for a mental health crisis in graduate education. *Nature biotechnology*, *36*(3), 282. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.4089

Flahtery, C. (2018). Mental Health Crisis for Grad Students. *Inside Higher Ed.* https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/03/06/new-study-says-graduate-students-mental-health-crisis

Forbes, S., & Fikretoglu, D. (2018). Building resilience: The conceptual basis and research evidence for resilience training programs. *Review of General Psychology, 22(4*), 452-468. https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000152

Frank, A. (2012, February). *Science: It's Really, Really Hard, And That's Something To Celebrate*. National Public Radio. https://www.npr.org/sections/13.7/2012/02/14/146857164/science-its-really-really-hard-and-thats-something-to-celebrate

Fredrickson, B., Cohn, M., Coffey, K., Pek, J., Finkel, S., & Judd, C. M. (2008). Open hearts build lives: Positive emotions, induced through loving-kindness meditation, build consequential personal resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(5), 1045-1062. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013262

Gibbs Jr, K. D., Basson, J., Xierali, I. M., & Broniatowski, D. A. (2016). Decoupling of the minority PhD talent pool and assistant professor hiring in medical school basic science departments in the US. *Elife*, *5*, e21393. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.21393

Gilbreath, B., & Frew, E. J. (2008). The stress-related presenteeism scale [measurement instrument]. Pueblo, CO: Hasan School of Business, Colorado State University.

Grogan, K. E. (2019). How the entire scientific community can confront gender bias in the workplace. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, *3*(1), 3-6. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-018-0747-4

Johnson, J. R., Emmons, H. C., Rivard, R. L., Griffin, K. H., & Dusek, J. A. (2015). Resilience training: a pilot

study of a mindfulness-based program with depressed healthcare professionals. *Explore*, 11(6), 433-444. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.explore.2015.08.002

Joyce, S., Shand, F., Tighe, J., Laurent, S. J., Bryant, R. A., & Harvey, S. B. (2018). Road to resilience: a systematic review and meta-analysis of resilience training programmes and interventions. *BMJ open, 8(6),* e017858. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.explore.2015.08.002

Kim-Cohen, J. (2007). Resilience and developmental psychopathology. *Child and adolescent psychiatric clinics of North America*, *16*(2), 271-283. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chc.2006.11.003

Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. L., & Williams, J. B. (2001). The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. *Journal of general internal medicine*, *16*(9), 606-613. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1525 1497.2001.016009606.x

Mak, W. W. S., Ng, I. S. W., & Wong, C. C. Y. (2011). Resilience: Enhancing well-being through the positive cognitive triad. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58*, 610-617. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025195

Maher, M. A., Wofford, A. M., Roksa, J., & Feldon, D. F. (2020). Exploring early exits: Doctoral attrition in the biomedical sciences. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, *22*(2), 205-226. https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025117736871

Mattijssen L, Van Vliet N, Van Doorn T, Kanbier N, Teelken C. PNN PhD Survey: Asking the relevant questions. Mental wellbeing, workload, burnout, research environment, progress of the PhD project, considering to quit. Promovendi Netwerk Nederland. 2020.

Matulevicius, S. A., Kho, K. A., Reisch, J., & Yin, H. (2021). Academic medicine faculty perceptions of work-life balance before and since the COVID-19 pandemic. *JAMA network open*, 4(6), e2113539-e2113539. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.13539

National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine. (2007). *Beyond bias and barriers: Fulfilling the potential of women in academic science and engineering*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/11741

National Science Foundation (2001). Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering. https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/srvygradpostdoc/

Neff, K. D. (2003). Self-compassion: An alternative conceptualization of a healthy attitude toward oneself. *Self and Identity, 2,* 85–101.

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior research methods, instruments, & computers*, 36, 717-731. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03206553

Robertson, I., Cooper, C., Sarkar, M., & Curran, T. (2015). Resilience training in the workplace from 2003 to 2014: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 88*(3), 533-562. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12120

Seligman, M., Schulman, P., & Sarason, I. G. (1986). Explanatory style as a predictor of productivity and quitting among life insurance sales agents. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*(4), 832-838. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.50.4.832

Sheltzer, J. M., & Smith, J. C. (2014). Elite male faculty in the life sciences employ fewer women. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *111*(28), 10107-10112. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1403334111

Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B., & Löwe, B. (2006). A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. *Archives of internal medicine*, *166*(10), 1092-1097. DOI: 10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092

Sutton, A. (2016). Measuring the effects of self-awareness: Construction of the Self-Awareness Outcomes Questionnaire. *Europe's journal of psychology*, *12*(4), 645. http://dx.doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v12i4.1178

Thogersen-Ntoumani, C., Black, J., Lindwall, M., Whittaker, A., & Balanos, G. (2017). Presenteeism, stress resilience, and physical activity in older manual workers: A person-centred analysis. *European Journal of Ageing, 14(*4), 385-396. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10433-017-0418-3

Thoman, S. E., DiBona, T., Abelar, J., & Robnett, R. D. (2020). STEMing from scholarship and resilience: A case study focusing on US undergraduate women who are thriving in STEM. *International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology*, *12*(1), 122-151.

Van Katwyk, P. T., Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Using the Job-Related Affective Well-being Scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5 ,* 219 –230. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.2.219

Woolston, C. (2019). PhDs: the tortuous truth. *Nature*, *575*(7782), 403-407.

Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2007). Positive organizational behavior in the workplace: The impact of hope, optimism, and resilience. *Journal of management*, 33(5), 774-800**.** https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307305562

APPENDIX A

Session titles and Descriptions

Part I. An Introduction to Resilience and Wellness –
We all experience setback and disappointments in science, work and life. In this webinar we will look at seven key elements of resilience with a focus on building habits that promote healthier responses and resilient behaviors in the face of set-back in educational and work environments.

Part II. Exploring our Self-Talk: Cognitive Distortions and Imposter Fears –
We tell ourselves stories about what is happening to us and around us. In this webinar we will explore how our self-talk is generated and look at ways our self-talk can either help us be more resilient or how it can hurt us and hold us back. We will look at two important elements of our self-talk, cognitive distortions and imposter fears and explore ways to recognize internal messages and input from others that distorts our views of our abilities and accomplishments.

Part III. Self-Advocacy and Assertiveness for Scientists -
We all need to develop the skills needed to be assertive and to advocate for ourselves, especially in hierarchical environments where we sometimes feel we do not have a voice. In this webinar, we will discuss how to set boundaries, communicate expectations, ask for feedback and discuss difficult issues with friends, mentors, colleagues and supervisors.

Part IV. Developing Feedback Resilience –
We all need feedback to grow and learn but we often become defensive and are unable to learn from the feedback we receive, even if it is delivered well. In this webinar, we will talk about why receiving feedback is so difficult and explore ways to stay calm and engaged when receiving feedback. We will also talk about giving feedback in a calm and assertive way so that our voice can be heard.

Part V. Managing Up to Maximize Mentoring Relationships –
We all need mentors to support and encourage us throughout our educational and career journey. In this webinar, we will talk about the mentoring relationship in research environments with a focus on improving your relationship with your PI, finding mentors and on improving communication and interpersonal interactions. The webinar will help clarify what you need from your supervisors and mentors and address how to get what you need from these important interactions.