Psychology of Violence
2016, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1–7

2152-0828/16/$12.00 http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/vio0000027

INTRODUCTION

Strengths, Narrative, and Resilience: Restorying Resilience Research

Sherry Hamby
Appalachian Center for Resilience Research,
Sewanee, Tennessee

Victoria Banyard
University of New Hampshire

John Grych
Marquette University

Objective: To envision a path toward a more strengths-based approach to violence research, prevention, and intervention—a path that focuses on thriving and resilience. ***Key Points:*** Both the content and the process of research need to change if we are to transform our efforts to understand and overcome adversity. Greater focus on strengths and the achievement of well-being despite adversity is 1 important avenue; focusing on the narrative and the power of story is another important path. However, merely shifting the focus of traditional research and scholarly efforts is not enough. At another level of analysis, the field needs communication across the fragmentary subdisciplines of social science ("silo busting," as we informally call it). We must also do more to encourage experimentation and innovation with regard to research question and design, community–practitioner–researcher partnership, and approaches to dissemination. ***Implications:*** Existing challenges in innovation and experimentation call for trying new approaches. Specific suggestions for adapting conference formats are provided. The commentaries in this special section offer feasible actions that could improve violence research, including incorporating measures of well-being in addition to symptoms as outcome measures; involving a wider variety of stakeholders in research design and dissemination; taking advantage of new insights from positive psychology and narrative research; and incorporating aspects of community and culture into research, assessment, prevention and intervention.

Keywords: violence, resilience, prevention, intervention, mechanisms

This special section is the result of a meeting in Sewanee, Tennessee, that brought together violence researchers, practitioners, and community members in the spring of 2015. The goal of the meeting and this special section is to operate on two levels: to address the content of violence and resilience scholarship and the process by which we develop and share knowledge. The hope in both cases is to shift the field to a more strengths-based approach. We have adopted Tim Wilson's (2011) term *re-storying* as a key element of change at both levels. We focus on the narratives that victims, witnesses, and perpetrators need to help them overcome involvement in violence and also the "research stories" that we, as violence scholars, construct about this work. In this special section and at the Sewanee meeting, we explored three themes that offer promising directions for advancing research on violence: strengths, narratives, and resilience. To promote bridge building and "silo busting," researchers and stakeholders who seek to address violence were joined by professionals who study narrative, human development, character strengths, and positive psychology. The invited commentaries in this special section emerged from the meeting and integrate these themes in myriad ways, offering not only a critique of current work on violence but also innovative ideas for shaping the future of research, prevention, and intervention in this area.

We begin this introductory essay with some thoughts on the process side—the questions regarding how and why we believe that the field needs new approaches to facilitating the strongest science, practice, and advocacy. As one preliminary exemplar of what this might look like, we describe our first effort to convene a meeting to address process issues. The remainder of the introduction explores the innovative content that emerged from modifying the process. Table 1 presents the key points of this essay. As this one example shows, we believe there is a great deal of untapped potential human capital in psychology and related disciplines and that relatively small changes can help us access and make use of that potential.

Chapter 1: Using Research Stories to Create Spaces for Change and Innovation

We offer a brief research story in the hopes that it will help others create spaces for change and innovation and that these will

Sherry Hamby, Appalachian Center for Resilience Research, Sewanee, Tennessee; Victoria Banyard, Department of Psychology, University of New Hampshire; John Grych, Department of Psychology, Marquette University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sherry Hamby, Appalachian Center for Resilience Research, P.O. Box 3184, Sewanee, TN 37375. E-mail: sherry.hamby@acrr.us

Table 1
Key Points to Promote the Re-Storying of Research on Violence and Resilience

Key points and recommendations for changing the process of science communication:

1. The field needs new approaches to facilitating the strongest science, practice, and advocacy.
2. This work needs to operate on two levels: to address the content of violence and resilience scholarship and the process by which we develop and share knowledge.
3. In most professional meetings, the people in the room share a discipline and a professional role, which results in them also sharing similar knowledge bases, experiences, ways of thinking, and biases. Such meetings allow for communication within a particular group but tend to reinforce narrow perspectives on particular problems and ideas about how to solve them.
4. Short talks are promising new conference formats that encourage a focus on bigger issues, more conceptual and theoretical material, and more image-intensive (instead of text-intensive) slides.
5. It takes considerable skill to organize and present a compelling short talk. This skill translates well into communicating with the media, policy makers, administrators, and others outside the research community.
6. Short talks help make the structure of meetings more egalitarian and give a voice to more attendees. They also preserve as much time on the schedule as possible for discussion, while still creating a shared body of information.
7. The alternative format allowed us to identify a key set of themes that the group, as a whole, decided was the top priorities for moving the field of violence forward and to a more strengths-based focus. Each commentary is future-oriented, offering constructive, promising paths for advancing the field.

Recommendations from the commentaries include:

8. Attend to well-being in at least as equal measure as we attend to distress (Howell and colleagues, 2016).
9. Explore the potential strengths of youth as agents of prevention work (Edwards and colleagues, 2016).
10. Drop the unfortunate spatial metaphor that suggests that culture is "further away" from behavior than are other aspects of social ecology and make culture a central focus of research (Chan and colleagues, 2016).
11. Address practitioners' needs in research partnerships, such as providing cost–benefit analyses and the service or professional benefits from collaboration on a specific study (Yuan and colleagues, 2016).
12. Go beyond the individual as the unit of analysis, because this can place too much responsibility on individuals for overcoming broad, systemic disadvantages (Shaw and colleagues, 2016).
13. Identify community processes and be careful not to disrupt these or impose culturally inappropriate interventions. Community connectedness can minimize violence and promote healing through accountability, norming, belonging, and identity (Schultz and colleagues, 2016).
14. Consider narrative as a mechanism. Different stories can intersect and/or compete, and this is one means by which different aspects of the social ecology impact one another (Pasupathi and colleagues, 2016).
15. Consider other mechanisms at work in narrative, including reappraisal of events, gaining perspective, identifying and labeling emotional responses, and creating meaning (Taylor and colleagues, 2016).

Note. These points are elaborated on in this article and in the other commentaries in this special section.

help contribute to our shared goals: better understanding of violence and greater capacity to reduce its incidence and ameliorate the impact when violence does occur. The beginning of this story starts with challenges that we and numerous others have previously identified: The violence field remains largely siloed both by discipline and by types of violence investigated (Hamby & Grych, 2013). Building bridges between researchers and practitioners is often a stated goal but one that is seldom realized. Violence research remains largely focused on individuals and faces challenges in measuring and understanding community and other aspects of the social ecology.

The existing challenges, however, are not only about *what* we do—the content of research and practice—but also *how* we do our work. In an era with overwhelming access to information and exponential increases in the volume of ideas and data, how do we manage this knowledge? There has been little discussion about how our work might change or, more pressingly, *needs* to change in light of the enormous transformations of the digital age. Although PowerPoint and other slide-generating programs have been taken up with much enthusiasm, most conferences are not that different from what they were decades and even centuries ago. In most professional meetings, the people in the room share a discipline and a professional role, which results in them also sharing similar knowledge bases, experiences, ways of thinking, and biases. Such meetings allow for communication within a particular group but tend to reinforce narrow perspectives on particular problems and ideas about how to solve them. Further, the agenda of many meetings is almost entirely comprised of one-way information transfer in the form of lectures (the "sage on a stage"), even though we know that is a relatively ineffective (and disliked) learning method, especially when used alone (Dunn, Saville, Baker, & Marek, 2013). We believe that opportunities to interact in person are more important than ever in the era of information overload; however, we also find it unfortunate that extensive efforts to bring great minds together so often leave little opportunity for those great minds to interact!

Chapter 2: Meeting on the Mountain

The goal of the 3-day meeting, held at a rural retreat center in Sewanee, a small town atop the Cumberland Plateau in southern Tennessee, was to generate new perspectives on the study and prevention of violence by bringing together people with shared concerns but different backgrounds to discuss the present and future of the field. In addition to inviting violence researchers, we invited scholars who study strengths, narrative, and resilience and practitioners, advocates, and policymakers who serve in a variety of health care and educational roles. We tried to ensure that there was enough diversity of roles, background, and training in the room to make it easy to speak about a wide range of issues, versus the more daunting scenario of being the only representative of your role or viewpoint in a more-homogeneous group.

The meeting was organized to encourage discussion among the approximately 70 attendees. We drew on our own past experiences

attending and organizing a wide range of meetings in an effort to reenvision the format of the conference. Researchers were invited to present a short talk in a 20 × 20 format (20 slides set on 20-s automatic advance, so each talk lasts exactly 6 min and 40 s) that served as an introduction to themselves and their work. Practitioners and community advocates participated on panels where they also spoke about their work and the key issues most on their mind for about the same period of time each. These presentations alternated with experiential activities relevant to the content of the meeting (e.g., mindfulness meditation, writing a narrative) and structured, goal-directed discussions of key questions. We also shared meals together, and all attendees stayed together at the same retreat center. These aspects also facilitated interaction and gave people who were not previously acquainted chances to interact.

A variety of short-talk formats have emerged in recent years under a variety of names, such as data blitzes, lightning talks, Ignite, and pecha kucha. The key feature that all formats have in common is that they produce very short talks by usual academic standards, usually in the 3- to 7-min range. Most of them restrict the number of slides that can be presented, and several require the slides to be set on automatic advance, like the 20 × 20 format we used (because we all know how easy it is to spend more time talking about a single slide than we originally planned). Short talks are also somewhat like TED talks, in that they encourage a focus on bigger issues, more conceptual and theoretical material, and more image-intensive (instead of text-intensive) slides. Although it has been our perception that some researchers perceive these to be less prestigious than longer talks, it takes considerable skill to organize and present a compelling short talk. It is also a skill that translates well into communicating with the media, policymakers, administrators, and others outside the research community.

At this particular meeting, we chose short talks for three primary reasons. One goal was to keep the structure of the meeting as egalitarian as possible, including giving a voice to practitioners, who are relegated entirely to an audience role at many conferences. The second purpose was to preserve as much time on the schedule as possible for discussion. A third purpose was also to balance discussion with providing a shared body of information. We have attended several meetings with extensive unstructured discussion, and these can be too diffuse to lead to concrete achievements. In this case, the shared body of information we asked people to create was their own research story—their intellectual path that led them to their key scientific insights and the work that they are focusing on today. We used the following prompt:

> We are hoping these 20 × 20 presentations will be somewhat autobiographic reflections about your work: your goals for your scholarship and/or your impact as you entered the field, your goals now, challenges you have faced and how you have dealt with them, and, especially, what you hope the (near) future holds for your own work and for the field. We want more about programs of research, advocacy, or whatever you are passionate about and less about the particulars of any one project.
>
> As you know, our themes are character strengths/virtues, narrative, and resilience. We know that many of you have had very diverse careers and encourage you to focus on the elements most relevant to our themes. We hope that the talks will help us get a sense of each other, what we might have in common, what we might learn from each other, and how together we might craft a future research, policy, and practice agenda that will advance the field.

The goal of the discussions was to identify themes that the full group felt would most enhance existing scientific efforts to increase strengths and resilience. These themes also drew on the commonalities that emerged from the presentations, which were surprisingly numerous given the highly diverse backgrounds of the presenters. The initial list of issues was long, but we worked to distill them to seven larger themes that captured the most central elements of what was discussed. We found the discussions stimulating and energizing and hope the other attendees did too.

Chapter 3: Maintaining the Momentum After the Meeting Ends

Even at the best meetings, there is the question of how to build on the accomplishments once the meeting is over. This set of commentaries partly adopts a fairly common strategy, which is organizing a group of publications around the conference theme. However, we have also gone beyond the typical approach in what we hope are significant ways. First and foremost, all of these commentaries are future-oriented, offering constructive, promising paths for advancing the field. Although some offer strong criticism of the existing state of affairs, none stop there. Second, each commentary focuses on an issue that was identified during the course of the meeting and emerged from the group discussions. Third, the authors of each commentary were people who independently chose the issue that most resonated with them. Four, the writing groups include several professionals, including high school teachers, community advocates, and therapists, who also have insights into the strengths and limitations of the knowledge base on violence but often have less access to disseminating those insights. All of these groups are novel groups of collaborators, and most of them had never worked with each other before they hammered out the outline of these articles. We believe that the result is a wider range of principles, examples, and even citations than might otherwise be encountered in such documents. Five, the initial "hammering" took place in person, with each group developing an outline before leaving the retreat that was further developed when participants returned to their homes. It is much easier to critique than to construct and envision something that improves on the existing state of knowledge. Each group has admirably taken up the charge to do just that. The result, we believe, is also an innovation—a special section of a journal that is entirely devoted to future-oriented commentaries.

Chapter 4: Innovative Ideas in Strengths, Narrative, and Resilience

The themes at the center of these commentaries reflect our intention to expand the boundaries of traditional research on violence and to create connections among the silos that have developed in the violence field. Scholarship on strengths, narrative, and resilience has informed a variety of disciplines, but these constructs have only recently begun to be explored in earnest with regard to violence. We have chosen the themes of strengths, narrative, and resilience because of the exciting work that is being done in these areas, which suggests considerable potential for

helping the field of violence scholarship address some of its greatest challenges (Leff et al., 2015; Malti, McDonald, Rubin, Rose-Krasnor, & Booth-LaForce, 2015; Nguyen-Feng et al., 2015; Sabina & Banyard, 2015; Yuan, Belcourt-Dittloff, Schultz, Packard, & Duran, 2015). These themes include questions about understanding victims and their recovery, understanding risk and protective factors for perpetrators, expanding our vision beyond intervention to innovations in prevention, and looking beyond the individual and the family to other aspects of the social ecology. These topics showcase some of the thorny issues for our field (silos between topics and disciplines, challenges in making connections between researchers and practitioners, knowledge management and dissemination) and bring to the forefront potential solutions. Within these themes, several commentaries remind us that key areas of strength may be overlooked. Some remind us of the need to define strengths as more than the abilities of individuals and suggest new ways of thinking about community. Other commentaries focus on narratives as a method for capturing strengths as well as a method for promoting resilience.

Howell et al. (2016) address the value of a strengths-based approach to violence research directly and urge the violence field to attend to well-being in at least as equal a measure as we attend to distress. They remind readers that well-being is a multidimensional construct that includes empowerment, happiness, and satisfaction with one's life. They argue that indicators of well-being are linked to a variety of positive outcomes including physical health, relationships, and engagement with work and community. They also note that activities that promote well-being are reinforcing. They call for research that examines the impact of augmenting prevention or intervention activities with strategies known to increase well-being. Beyond this content-focused goal for our field, they also call for changes in how we do our work—a greater focus on measuring well-being alongside symptomatology in our research, and funding work that highlights resilience. They also suggest system-level policies that might promote well-being as well as individual prevention or therapeutic strategies.

Edwards, Jones, Mitchell, Hagler, and Roberts (2016) discuss strengths and resilience in relation to the relatively untapped potential strengths of youth themselves as agents of prevention work. They note that effective violence prevention strategies are still few in number. They argue that prevention limitations to date may be due in part to programs developed by adults who try to resonate with adolescents, and they offer a roadmap for research to inform strategies for engaging youth as collaborative partners in prevention design and delivery. In keeping with the themes of this section that focus not only on what we do and study but how we structure our participation in the field, Edwards and colleagues include information from interviews with youth about prevention efforts so that they become participants in the commentary.

Several of the commentaries chose to emphasize community as the element that is most absent from current efforts to bolster strengths and promote resilience. Indeed, community is so absent from much of our work on violence, adversity, and resilience that even though several of the commentaries focused on this piece, they each took up a unique aspect of this challenge.

Chan, Hollingsworth, Espelage, and Mitchell (2016) raise an issue that needs far more attention: the question of mechanisms operating at the outer layers of the social ecology. Exactly how do broader social networks, including peers, communities, societies and cultures, influence individual behavior and impact individual psychology? Chan et al. move beyond the usual disciplinary silos and turn to foundational work in community psychology that has compared human ecology to that of other biological ecosystems. The four concepts of interdependence, adaptation, cycling of resources, and succession (Kelly, 1968) are not as well known outside of community psychology as Bronfrenbrenner's (1977) seminal model but have the potential to help us advance our understanding of processes as well as patterns. Further, Chan et al. also make a case for greater focus on culture as a primary aspect of the social ecology, not only as a way to better understand adversity and resilience but also as a locus of intervention.

Chan et al. (2016) critique the classic visual image of the social ecology, which puts culture at the outermost ring and can give the impression that culture is "further away" from behavior than other aspects of the ecology. Their important critique calls for putting culture at the center. As they note, culture is what gives meaning to any given behavior in any given setting. Many—if not virtually all—behaviors would be impossible to interpret without knowing the cultural context. Many of their examples reflect the particular problems with many existing approaches in communities that are marginalized in the United States.

Yuan et al. (2016) chose to focus on the issue of community as well, though their focus was more on communities of researchers and practitioners and how to better bring them together so that the strengths of communities are better understood by researchers and so that research and practices are used to their best advantage to advance prevention and intervention efforts. As with other authors, they opted to model new patterns of communication, reaching out to community advocates for help in crafting the commentary. They organized their thinking around four principles that resulted from this process: (1) community workers value and use research, (2) academic-community partnerships are the gold standard for mutually beneficial and culturally responsive research, (3) research should be collaborative from the beginning to the end of a research project, and (4) dissemination should be multifaceted and relevant to communities where the work is done or will be applied. We found the greatest insight from some of the specific examples of these principles. For example, the community professionals expressed a desire to see more cost–benefit analyses and a clearer up-front understanding about ways that the findings of a specific study can improve service models. The community professionals also wanted clearer benefits from the process of participating in research. We found it thought-provoking to think about providers' needs to document that they are improving their job performance and to consider how research partnerships might contribute to that legitimate professional need.

Shaw, McLean, Taylor, Swartout, and Querna (2016) also adopt a critical lens as they explore the concept of resilience and the lack of attention to community-level factors. Shaw et al. focus on one master narrative that they argue has underrecognized problems—the American narrative of individual redemption and achievement. Although these are often narratives of hope that provide inspiration or even guidance for overcoming adversity, as Shaw et al. note, the individual narrative of resilience also has a dark side. An excessive focus on the individual as the unit of analysis can also put too much blame on specific individuals for broad, systemic injustices and disadvantages and too much responsibility on these individuals to overcome them. Shaw et al. discuss the methodological

challenges inherent in adopting a more community-oriented approach. As they note, one of the reasons that so much research focuses on the individual unit of analysis is because so many of our research methods, from surveys to classic inferential statistics, are designed for that unit of analysis. They suggest greater use of techniques such as community-based participatory research, social network analysis, and multilevel modeling.

Schultz et al. (2016) also caution about the harm that can arise from misuse or inattention to community factors. Especially for communities that do not identify as part of a majority or dominant culture, it can be all too easy for outsiders to suggest (or, worse, mandate) interventions that cause more disruptions than healing. They emphasize community connectedness as the path forward and provide specific examples about community connectedness in American Indian and Latino communities. Like several other commentaries, they also call for an analysis that goes beyond simple associations and begins to unpack the mechanisms at work. In the case of community connectedness, they point to accountability, community norming, belonging, and identity as processes through which communities can minimize violence and promote healing when violence does occur.

Pasupathi, Fivush, and Hernandez-Martinez (2016) offer a framework for understanding the relations between different layers of the social ecology, a theme that was prominent in each and every commentary. Their framework focuses on different levels of narrative: the intrapersonal, or stories people tell themselves; the interpersonal, the sometimes-competing stories that people tell each other; and the collective, the stories that are much of the substance of shared cultural identities. The intersections, including areas of overlap and disagreement, provide one mechanism through which different layers of the social ecology become intertwined and have causal impacts on one another—a mechanism that is seriously understudied in most mainstream violence research.

Although we concur that more nuance would improve the field, another challenge is highlighted by Pasupathi et al. (2016)—using these data to craft master narratives that are complex but not so complex they do not get used. On the cautionary side, we note that many of these commentaries, perhaps especially those that focused on the need for more involvement with communities, ask for more of researchers. Unfortunately, many of these recommendations involve fairly time-intensive demands that are not valued at many universities. We believe that one key need to advance the field is to think about ways to change the evaluation and rewards systems at universities, such as changing tenure and promotion requirements. For example, universities could require every researcher to have a community or practitioner partnership as a requirement for tenure.

Two commentaries focus more specifically on narrative and its potential to reform our thinking about violence. Both discuss narrative as process as well as content. Pasupathi et al. (2016) offer a narrative on narrative. They focus on sharing narratives and the intersections and evolutions that result. More than most scientific articles, Pasupathi et al.'s not only talks about narrative but also *offers* one—a conversation among three unique and differently situated researchers and humans and how their similarities and differences enhance their knowledge and our own. As they note, narratives are "always in the process of being negotiated, contested, negated and confirmed" (p. 49). If we want to do a better job exploring, understanding, and overcoming violence, then we need to pay more attention to these processes. What scientific voices are privileged over others and why? What elements of "science" are not really scientific at all but part of the academic paradigm of the social sciences? How do the conventions of the prevailing paradigm both enhance and detract from our efforts to study, prevent, and treat violence? As they note, narratives around violence are particularly likely to be contested. They argue that simply allowing multiple narratives is not sufficient. There must be a process that recognizes multiple perspectives and yet still achieves the "good story, the story that helps people to move on . . . complex, not easily resolved, and not unitary" (p. 50). They suggest that working consciously to maintain complexity, in opposition to the human tendency to simplify stories, is one avenue toward telling more helpful stories about violence.

Taylor, Jouriles, Brown, Goforth, and Banyard (2016) also focus on narrative and the promise it may hold for improving prevention. They consider the essential question: Why are narratives good for people? This is a topic that still needs scientific study, but it seems most likely that several processes are at work, including reappraisal of events, gaining perspective, and identifying and labeling emotional responses. Some authors think that narrative operates as a form of exposure and can minimize avoidant tendencies after stressful events. Many of these are self-regulatory processes, one of the three main elements of the Resilience Portfolio Model (Grych, Hamby, & Banyard, 2015). However, people are increasingly recognizing that narrative can help with another resilience portfolio domain as well: meaning making. Narratives that focus on value and priorities can help people develop a sense of purpose and meaning in addition to improving self-regulation. The Laws of Life Essay is one example of a narrative program that is associated with greater meaning making as well as increased self-regulation (Banyard, Hamby, & Grych, 2015).

Like Howell et al. (2016), Taylor et al. (2016) are also optimistic that short programs can have notable impacts on well-being. Narrative probably has the most impressive evidence base of all of the existing brief programs. Most narrative programs involve no more than an hour or two of writing time, and still there is evidence of effects months or even years later (Pennebaker & Chung, 2007, 2011). Even narrative programs of under 10 min total duration have shown some positive impact (Burton & King, 2008). As Taylor and colleagues' commentary indicates, a narrative does not have to be on trauma (unlike the original Pennebaker paradigm, 1997) in order to enhance well-being; narratives can also focus on strengths.

Chapter 5: Ongoing Questions and Challenges

We can make progress on the two challenges facing violence scholarship: improving our process for creating and disseminating scientific knowledge and improving the quality of that scientific knowledge. Early endeavors have led to some promising successes that we hope can be further developed. In that regard, we would also like to acknowledge the challenges we encountered. One we already mentioned—that some attendees thought the short talks were more elementary than longer talks, when in fact the opposite is true. On that note we share a quote from Woodrow Wilson, when asked about his speech preparation techniques:

> "That depends on the length of the speech," answered the President. "If it is a ten-minute speech it takes me all of two weeks to prepare it; if it is a half-hour speech it takes me a week; if I can talk as long as I want to it requires no preparation at all. I am ready now."

In our original schedule we adopted the widely used term *fish bowls* for the practitioner panels. The idea is to flip the usual audience–speaker roles. However, although we still endorse that goal and note that many researchers said that hearing from the practitioners was some of the most moving and memorable moments of the conference, in the end we found the *fish bowl* term somewhat counter to our efforts to make the meeting more egalitarian and will not use it again. The format, however, worked well. Slide-intensive presentations are part of academic culture but not part of most practitioner settings. Many practitioners had never spoken before such a large group and said they appreciated both the opportunity and sharing the stage with their colleagues.

Some hierarchical differences crept into the format despite our efforts. Most of the practitioners, educators, and advocates were from the local area, and we observed that most of them had difficulty carving out three full days in their schedule. As a result, most attended only part of the conference. In contrast, although we also heard from long-distance attendees that it was hard to make the space in their schedule, they had to in order to attend. Thus, this also meant that more researchers than practitioners attended the full conference, and in the future we would like to think of ways to avoid that dichotomy. We also had more trouble persuading policymakers to attend than any other group, although several participated. For reasons we do not entirely understand, it was much easier to convince researchers and practitioners that the meeting would be time well spent.

As a careful reader might note, although we are pleased to note that several practitioners, administrators, and educators are included in the authorship of the commentaries, a much higher percentage of researchers participated (almost all of the researchers vs. a minority of other stakeholders joined a commentary). In our experience, publications can lend gravitas to people who do not devote themselves primarily to scholarship, but in the future it would be worth considering, as Yuan et al. (2016) do, what would better incentivize a wider range of stakeholders to participate in the scholarship and dissemination process. We believe more extensive partnering and better inclusion of all stakeholders can lead to faster scientific progress and quicker uptake of scientific innovations.

Finally, with regard to the specific suggestions in the commentaries themselves, we note that fully implementing many of them would require substantial resources, in both financial and human capital. Many professionals who address violence already feel stretched thin and struggle for resources. This may be one of the greatest commonalities across the settings of academia, health care, education, government agencies, foundations, and elsewhere. Some of the suggestions here still have a frustratingly small evidence base, and no doubt complications and challenges would emerge in their implementation. Still, others are "lower hanging fruit," and we remain optimistic that progress on some fronts would help generate a willingness to invest these other forms of capital.

Chapter 6: Conclusions and Next Steps

We and the authors of these commentaries are sharing the details of our efforts to enhance violence scholarship in the hope that they might be useful to others. We are happy to report that we have seen increasing evidence of experimentation in communication and bridge building in a variety of settings where violence scholars and practitioners congregate. In October 2015, the National Institutes of Health hosted a meeting on elder abuse that was designed to facilitate uptake of innovations in other violence research by elder abuse researchers and practitioners. That meeting was structured much like the Sewanee meeting, with short talks (in their case, 5 min for five slides) followed by longer discussion periods. They are also hoping to prepare a special issue of a journal that is guided by their key questions. The 2016 Society for Prevention Research conference will include the 20 × 20 format. Some of these alternatives were first tried at the University of New Hampshire conference on family violence and youth victimization, and we hope to continue exploring alternative communication strategies at a new series of meetings called Resilience Con, the first of which will be in July 2016.

The commentaries in this special section offer documentation about what can be accomplished by restructured conferences. They also offer a roadmap for the further restorying of resilience research. All of these commentaries suggest numerous productive paths for future research that have the potential to lead to true innovation and not just further incremental work. They offer concrete suggestions for creating and assessing well-being, develop specific steps for improving prevention and intervention, call for better recognition of the role of communities, guide those interested in more-meaningful community–research partnerships, and testify to the power of narrative for transforming not only traumatic experiences but also our most profound scientific challenges. We have found ourselves returning to many of the points made here numerous times since we first read these commentaries and hope that they will likewise inspire other readers to take a fresh look at the science of violence.

References

Banyard, V., Hamby, S., & Grych, J. (2015). *Health effects of adverse childhood events: Identifying promising protective factors*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Appalachian Research Center.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist, 32,* 513–531. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.32.7.513

Burton, C. M., & King, L. A. (2008). Effects of (very) brief writing on health: The two-minute miracle. *British Journal of Health Psychology, 13,* 9–14. http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/135910707X250910

Chan, W. Y., Hollingsworth, M. A., Espelage, D. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2016). Preventing violence in context: The importance of culture for implementing systemic change. *Psychology of Violence, 6,* 22–26. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/vio0000021

Dunn, D. S., Saville, B. K., Baker, S. C., & Marek, P. (2013). Evidence-based teaching: Tools and techniques that promote learning in the psychology classroom. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 65,* 5–13. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ajpy.12004

Edwards, K. M., Jones, L. M., Mitchell, K. J., Hagler, M. A., & Roberts, L. T. (2016). Building on youth's strengths: A call to include adolescents in developing, implementing, and evaluating violence prevention pro-

grams. *Psychology of Violence, 6,* 15–21. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/vio0000022

Grych, J., Hamby, S., & Banyard, V. (2015). The resilience portfolio model: Understanding healthy adaptation in victims of violence. *Psychology of Violence, 5,* 343–354. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039671

Hamby, S., & Grych, J. (2013). *The web of violence: Exploring connections among different forms of interpersonal violence and abuse*. New York, NY: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5596-3

Howell, K. H., Coffey, J. K., Fosco, G. M., Kracke, K., Nelson, S. K., Rothman, E. F., & Grych, J. H. (2016). Seven reasons to invest in well-being. *Psychology of Violence, 6,* 8–14. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/vio0000019

Kelly, J. G. (1968). Towards an ecological conception of preventive interventions. In J. Carter (Ed.), *Research contributions from psychology to community mental health* (pp. 75–99). New York, NY: Behavioral Publications.

Leff, S. S., Paskewich, B. S., Waasdorp, T. E., Waanders, C., Bevans, K. B., & Jawad, A. F. (2015). Friend to friend: A randomized trial for urban African American relationally aggressive girls. *Psychology of Violence, 5,* 433–443. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039724

Malti, T., McDonald, K., Rubin, K. H., Rose-Krasnor, L., & Booth-LaForce, C. (2015). Developmental trajectories of peer-reported aggressive behavior: The role of friendship understanding, friendship quality, and friends' aggressive behavior. *Psychology of Violence, 5,* 402–410. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039685

Nguyen-Feng, V. N., Frazier, P. A., Greer, C. S., Howard, K. G., Paulsen, J. A., Meredith, L., & Kim, S. (2015). A randomized controlled trial of a Web-based intervention to reduce distress among students with a history of interpersonal violence. *Psychology of Violence, 5,* 444–454. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039596

Pasupathi, M., Fivush, R., & Hernandez-Martinez, M. (2016). Talking about it: Stories as paths to healing after violence. *Psychology of Violence, 6,* 49–56. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/vio0000017

Pennebaker, J. W. (1997). Writing about emotional experiences as a therapeutic process. *Psychological Science, 8,* 162–166.

Pennebaker, J. W., & Chung, C. (2007). *Expressive writing, emotional upheavals, and health*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Pennebaker, J. W., & Chung, C. (2011). Expressive writing: Connections to physical and mental health, *Oxford handbook of health psychology* (pp. 417–437). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Sabina, C., & Banyard, V. (2015). Moving toward well-being: The role of protective factors in violence research. *Psychology of Violence, 5,* 337–342. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039686

Schultz, K., Cattaneo, L. B., Sabina, C., Brunner, L., Jackson, S., & Serrata, J. V. (2016). Key roles of community connectedness in healing from trauma. *Psychology of Violence, 6,* 42–48. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/vio0000025

Shaw, J., McLean, K. C., Taylor, B., Swartout, K., & Querna, K. (2016). Beyond resilience: Why we need to look at systems too. *Psychology of Violence, 6,* 34–41. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/vio0000020

Taylor, E., Jouriles, E. N., Brown, R., Goforth, K., & Banyard, V. (2016). Narrative writing exercises for promoting health among adolescents: Promises and pitfalls. *Psychology of Violence, 6,* 57–63. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/vio0000023

Wilson, T. (2011). *Redirect: The surprising new science of psychological change*. London, United Kingdom: Penguin.

Yuan, N. P., Belcourt-Dittloff, A., Schultz, K., Packard, G., & Duran, B. M. (2015). Research agenda for violence against American Indian and Alaska Native women: Toward the development of strength-based and resilience interventions. *Psychology of Violence, 5,* 367–373. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038507

Yuan, N. P., Gaines, T. L., Jones, L. M., Rodriguez, L. M., Hamilton, N., & Kinnish, K. (2016). Bridging the gap between research and practice by strengthening academic-community partnerships for violence research. *Psychology of Violence, 6,* 27–33. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/vio0000026