

THE IMPACT OF CONTINUING EDUCATION TRAINING ON LAW GUARDIAN KNOWLEDGE, EFFICACY, AND PRACTICE BEHAVIORS

Wendi Cross
Catherine Cerulli

There is an increased demand for law guardians in domestic violence cases, especially those involving child witnesses. Training is required for law guardians to meet child clients' needs. While workshops and conferences are typical venues for continuing education training, their effectiveness is unknown. This pilot study compared law guardians who attended a conference on community violence and children to nonattendees on several training outcomes. Results showed a positive impact on attendees' feelings of efficacy and intentions to carry out new practice behaviors post-conference; differences were maintained at follow-up. Limitations and implications of this pilot study are discussed.

Keywords: law guardian; training evaluation; domestic violence

INTRODUCTION

Law guardians can play a vital role in the lives of children who have witnessed domestic violence and are embroiled in the civil court system. They help navigate a complicated system and advocate for their young clients. Specialized training is central to assist law guardians in such cases, particularly given the sweeping legislative changes addressing domestic violence and the proliferation of specialized courts. This article reports findings from a pilot study that assessed training outcomes of law guardians who attended a conference on community violence and children. Specifically, the Laboratory of Interpersonal Violence and Victimization at the University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, Department of Psychiatry, compared knowledge, attitudes, and self-reported practice behaviors among attendees of a 1-day conference to a group of nonattendees to answer the question, "What impact did the training have?" While participants in the present naturalistic study are law guardians, this research has implications for training delivery and effectiveness in myriad fields because longitudinal follow-up of learning outcomes and transfer of professional development training to the workplace is rarely measured. The methods are relevant to educators who plan and evaluate professional graduate continuing education training mandated by many states for licensure. The content of the training program is, therefore, not discussed in detail.¹

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

In the United States alone, organizations in the public and private sector spend an estimated \$55 to \$200 billion annually on training activities for continuing education and professional

Correspondence: wendi_cross@urmc.rochester.edu; Catherine_Cerulli@URMC.Rochester.edu.

development (Bassi & Van Buren, 1999; Lakewood Research, 1997). Presumably, this enormous investment is justified by changes in the knowledge, attitudes, and skills of trainees as a result of the training program, as well as subsequent increases in productivity, effectiveness, profit, and organizational performance. Research on training, including theories of adult learning, models of training and transfer to the workplace, and methods of evaluating training outcomes, has exploded over the past decade (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001). The translation of that knowledge into the practice of training in real-world settings is, however, limited. For example, the training literature identifies three proximate learning outcomes—knowledge, attitudes, and skills—that can be measured to assess change pre- and posttraining. A fourth variable, the setting in which new learning is to be transferred (e.g., the workplace), has recently been found to be critical to successful changes in posttraining performance (Holton, 2003). Many professions, including the law, require continuing education. Some suggest that these training efforts must include knowledge as well as a skills-based component to practice the application of that new knowledge (Loue, 2000). Educators and sponsors rarely assess learning outcomes in training programs, however, and the value of continuing education is unclear.

The practice of law is becoming more specialized. As unique courts are implemented for issues such as domestic violence, homelessness, mental health, and substance abuse, attorneys and judges are called upon to process and adjudicate cases for which they may lack essential substantive knowledge. A judge adjudicating a mental health court may be unaware of the technicalities involved in diagnosis and treatment. Likewise, law guardians assigned to family violence cases may lack knowledge of the dynamics of family violence and its impact on children.

There is growing recognition that children exposed to violence, both community and family violence, suffer short- and long-term consequences (American Bar Association, 1994; Osofsky, 1999). The psychological, physical, and emotional toll to children has been well documented (Yates, Dodds, Sroufe, & Egeland, 2003; Wilson, Cameron, Jaffe, & Wolfe, 1989). A 2003 study noted the difference of the impact of domestic violence for boys and girls, with boys externalizing the problem and girls internalizing problems (Yates et al., 2003). Recently, studies have documented the success of, and need for, interventions with children exposed to violence (Graham-Bermann & Hughes, 2003; Prinz & Feerick, 2003; McAlister-Groves, 1999; Wilson et al., 1989). Law guardians are the children's voice in court proceedings.

Children exposed to family violence sometimes express preferences for living with the offending parent and blame the victim: "Many children who repeatedly hear an aggressor denigrate the survivor or allocate blame for the beatings will repeat and eventually believe those statements" (Boychuk-Spears, 2002). Due to the complexity of these cases, judges often rely heavily on law guardians' recommendations for custody and visitation decisions. Law guardians, however, may not have requisite expertise in child development or interviewing children. Clinical skills are often not required in law school education and not all states have a performance component to the bar exam (Barnard & Greenspan, 2003). Such skills may, however, prove essential in the gathering of evidence and interpretation of a child's preference for custody and visitation issues.

Nationally, 19 states currently address children witnessing violence (Cerulli et al., 2006). Some states have criminalized the behavior, including independent crimes or sentencing sanctions, while others address the issue in a civil court venue. It remains unclear to what extent law guardians can play a more substantial role in the adjudication of these cases. In New York State, the study site, judges assign law guardians to civil cases adjudicated in

both family court and supreme court venues.² Geographically, the New York State Office of Court Administration is divided into four appellate divisions composed of regions, each governing its own law guardian program. Law guardians represent child clients in cases such as family offense petitions (New York State Family Court Act [FCA] Article 8, 1997), divorces, custody and visitation (FCA Article 6, 1997), and child protective procedures (FCA Article 10, 1997). While some states require that these lawyers partner with social workers or other similarly qualified individuals trained in clinical interviewing techniques, New York State does not currently require such professional partnerships. Law guardian applicants in New York must be accepted on the panel and attend a training program on a host of relevant issues. Once these minimal prerequisites are met, law guardians are assigned cases. While law guardians have historically focused primarily on civil matters, the situation is likely to change.

Criminal court judges previously lacked jurisdiction to assign law guardians to cases involving child witnesses or victims. However, the Court of Appeals, the highest court in the state, held that police may arrest a perpetrator for Endangering the Welfare of a Child (New York Penal Law § 260.10, 2000; *People v. Johnson*, 2000) for domestic violence perpetrated in front of a child under certain circumstances. Very likely, this ruling will result in more child witnesses participating in the criminal court system. In these cases, the non-offending parent can also file a concurrent civil proceeding in the family court on behalf of him/herself and the child. Additional Court of Appeals case law has recently adjudicated the issue of whether children should be removed from the home as a result of solely witnessing domestic violence (*Nicholson v. Scoppetta*, 2004; New York State Law Digest, 2005). These removal cases are processed through family courts.

To respond to the influx of domestic violence cases that cross both civil and family court in New York, integrated domestic violence courts allow civil and criminal cases to be heard concurrently before one judge. Inclusion criteria for cases adjudicated in these new courts is determined by jurisdiction. Currently, suggested best practices are being formulated and promulgated to court officials with the expectation that personnel (including the judges and court staff) require specialized domestic violence training.

While one judge may preside over a case involving children in the new integrated courts, up to four attorneys may be assigned: a prosecuting district attorney, a defense attorney, a civil attorney for the victim, and a civil attorney for the defendant. None of these attorneys specifically represents the interest of children. Recently, the Chief Judge of New York, Judith Kaye, commissioned a panel to explore the use of law guardians and to consider the requirement for forensic evaluations of the children in these cases. Given the increasing demand for law guardians, it is especially important to ensure that they are well trained to meet the needs of the children whom they represent. Very little is known, however, about the effectiveness of continuing education workshops or professional development experiences of lawyers, including law guardians.

We conducted a national electronic journal search to retrieve articles that focused on the practice of law guardians, model curricula for addressing community and domestic violence, and measuring the effectiveness of education and training. No studies in peer-reviewed journals were located which address curricula evaluation. The current pilot study is an initial step in developing methods to examine learning outcomes and transfer of training among law guardians, and other lawyers, engaged in professional development activities. Given the paucity of research in the literature, our first question centered on the feasibility of engaging law guardians as research subjects and using empirical methods to study law.³

THE CURRENT STUDY

This pilot study takes advantage of a naturalistic study opportunity to begin to develop methods to examine learning outcomes of continuing education trainings for attorneys. We assessed the impact of the conference on measures of knowledge, attitudes, and practice behaviors among New York State Fourth Department Law Guardian Program attorneys. Conference attendees were compared to a group of nonattendees and followed for 6 months after training to assess changes in learning outcomes longitudinally. Due to the pilot nature of the study, we did not assess transfer climate following the training. Our research questions are as follows:

Research Question 1: To what extent will attorneys engage in longitudinal research on training?

Research Question 2: What impact does a 1-day conference have on attendees' self-reported knowledge, feelings of efficacy, and intended practice behaviors, compared to a group of nonattendees, immediately postconference?

Research Question 3: Is there a long-term impact of the conference at 6-month follow-up?

METHODS

SITE

The conference, entitled "Understanding Children Exposed to Community Violence: A Conference for Attorneys Committed to Children," was a typical single-day professional development training, held in a mid-sized city in upstate New York. The conference was advertised by the local law guardian program via a mass mailing and offered free to practicing law guardians.⁴ Attorneys who attended and completed the requisite paperwork received continuing education credits. The main goal of the conference was to increase law guardians' knowledge about community and domestic violence and to assist them in identifying and providing appropriate service for child clients. The conference featured four local speakers who provided information on community violence, local community statistics, evidence-based research on the impact of violence on children, and the rationale and specific strategies for interviewing children as part of the law guardian role. Speakers were specifically sought who were not attorneys to expand the type of information being provided. Each participant was provided additional reference materials including articles on the topics and copies of the presentations. Learning objectives were clearly stated in the registration packet in terms of the new information to be presented and, presumably, acquired by the participants.

The conference was primarily sponsored through Rochester Safe Start, which is part of a national demonstration project funded by the U.S. Department of Justice. Local sponsorship included the Fourth Department Law Guardian Project, the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Rochester, and a local law firm hosted the event. Safe Start's goal is to prevent and reduce the impact of exposure to violence on young children and their families. For western New York law guardians, understanding community and domestic violence and the subsequent impact on children is central to their work.⁵

SAMPLE

All conference attendees completed an evaluation that included several demographic items (e.g., years of practice, years of law guardian practice, percent of professional time

engaged in law guardian work) and conference satisfaction items (e.g., speakers, setting, refreshments) at the end of the day. Subjects were recruited for a follow-up study of conference objectives from the attendees. Eligibility criteria were that a participant was a practicing attorney, a law guardian panel member, and fluent in English. Recruiters provided informed consents approved by the University of Rochester Human Subjects Review Board to interested conference attendees, and explained that subjects in the study would receive follow-up phone call interviews. In addition, participants were entered in a lottery for a \$200.00 gift certificate as compensation for their time. Of 70 eligible participants, 41 (60%) agreed to participate in the study.

We recruited a comparison group of non-conference participants via a mail survey. The Fourth Department Law Guardian Program provided researchers with the mailing list of 800 law guardians. Names of registered conference participants were removed from the list and a computer generated random sample of 99 law guardians was created. Packets containing a letter explaining the study, consent for participation, and the conference survey of knowledge, attitudes, and practice behaviors were sent to the randomly selected law guardians. Twenty-eight law guardians returned completed surveys (a 28% return rate of eligible participants).

We contacted conference attendee participants by phone 6 months following the conference. We readministered the 15-item survey of knowledge, efficacy, and practice behaviors 6 months after the conference. The survey was slightly modified to reflect the passage of time on the Practice subscale (e.g., “*Since the conference*, I have interviewed X number of child clients”). We attempted to reach a participant five times for follow-up before discontinuing.

MEASURES

All conference attendees completed a survey that included satisfaction items and provided the following demographic information: years admitted to the New York state bar, years practiced as Law Guardian, percent of practice that is law guardian work, and previous training.

Attendees and a comparison group of nonattendees also completed a 15-item questionnaire that was based on a validated instrument designed to test trainees’ knowledge, attitudes/efficacy, beliefs, and intended practice behaviors following training on intimate partner violence (Gadomski, Wolff, Tripp, Lewis, & Short, 2001; Short, Fanslow, & Gadomski, 2004). We modified three subscales of the original 45-item survey and the 8-item knowledge subscale was revised to reflect content specific to the conference (e.g., “I know service providers in my area to whom I can refer clients”). The three-item attitude/efficacy subscale (e.g., “I do not feel comfortable discussing family violence with my child clients”) and the four-item practice behavior items (e.g., “I do not expect to change my approach to child clients during the next 6 months”) were similarly modified. We utilized the instrument in follow-up interviews.⁶

RESULTS

The data were coded and entered into an SPSS database. We conducted an initial analysis to test if there was a selection bias in our sample of conference attendees who agreed to participate in the research project. Using two-tailed *t* tests ($p < .05$), we compared conference attendees who agreed to be study participants to conference attendee nonparticipants on demographic variables to assess potential self-selection bias in the sample. There were

Table 1

Comparison of Demographic Variables and Learning Outcomes for Conference and Comparison Groups

	Conference Group (<i>n</i> = 41)	Comparison Group (<i>n</i> = 28)	Significance
<i>Demographic Variable</i>	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	<i>t (df)</i>
Yrs practicing attorney	16.39 (10.86)	16.71 (10.22)	-.12 (60)
Yrs Law Guardian ¹	3.13 (1.02)	3.36 (.87)	-1.00 (63)
% of cases Law Guardian ² per yr	2.20 (1.26)	1.75 (1.17)	1.50 (60)
Hours of violence training attended	9.65 (14.98)	13.81 (18.58)	-.96 (45)
<i>Dependent Variable</i>			
Knowledge	5.67 (.60)	5.32 (1.09)	1.70 (64)
Efficacy	5.98 (.84)	5.44 (.95)	2.45 (66)*
Practice	5.78 (.92)	5.03 (1.01)	3.04 (62)**

¹ categorical variable: 1 = less than 1 yr, 2 = 2–5 yrs, 3 = 6–9 yrs, 4 = 10 + yrs.

p* < .05, *p* < .01.

² categorical variable: 0 = 0, 1 = 1–25, 2 = 26–50, 3 = 51–75, 4 = more than 75%.

no statistically significant differences between the groups on demographic variables (years of practice, years of law guardian practice, percent of law guardian cases per year, hours of training dedicated to children exposed to violence). Conference study participants were therefore considered representative.

We then compared the randomly selected nonattendeé comparison group (who responded to the survey by mail) to conference study participants on the same demographic variables, using the same analysis and level of significance. Results showed that the comparison and conference groups were not significantly different on any demographic variable (see Table 1). The two groups were then compared on the study variables of interest to address Research Question 2. *t* tests were conducted to test differences on knowledge, efficacy, and practice behaviors for the two groups. Results showed that the groups differed on two of the three variables. Conference participants had statistically significantly higher scores on efficacy and practice behaviors. There was a trend for the conference group to have higher knowledge scores. Table 1 shows the results of the analyses comparing the two groups on demographic and study variables.

To answer Research Question 3, we compared study participant responses on the measure at 6-month follow-up to their responses immediately postconference. Thirty-five participants were successfully contacted and responded to the survey at follow-up. A Repeated measures one-way analysis of variance was conducted for each of the survey subscales. Results showed that there were no significant differences on participants' scores of knowledge, efficacy, or practice behaviors immediately postconference and at 6-month follow-up. Means at 6-month follow-up are: knowledge = 5.79 (*SD* = .51), efficacy = 5.97 (*SD* = .89), practice = 5.96 (*SD* = .76). Thus, conference attendees maintained a statistically significantly higher score on practice and efficacy over time.

An unanticipated finding from the follow-up surveys was the qualitative comments provided by the law guardians during the follow-up phone calls. Law guardians expressed feelings of isolation working on these cases and the need for additional resources including: more training, access to qualified mental health providers for their clients, and more information on special education issues which arise for their child clients. While a full

discussion of the impact of witnessing violence is beyond the scope of this article, it is clear that law guardians work with children whose experiences of violence at home affects their academic, psychological, and emotional functioning—and they feel ill-equipped to meet their young clients' needs.

One way attorneys meet their professional development needs is to seek mentorship. In our sample, eight law guardians had practiced law for less than 5 years, and of these 6 stated that they wished they had a senior attorney with whom to case conference. For those who practiced for more than 5 years ($n = 34$), 25 indicated a willingness to provide case conferencing to more junior attorneys. Thus, while there is a sense of isolation among these attorneys, there is a willingness to seek and provide support to overcome those barriers. Finally, an overwhelming majority (86%) of the attorneys stated that they believe children who witness violence should have a law guardian assigned to represent their interests in court.

DISCUSSION

Sponsors of conferences and other continuing education trainings typically survey participants about their satisfaction with the training (e.g., the speaker, the room, audio visuals). Training evaluations less frequently measure the knowledge objectives or training content. The use of reactive measures of satisfaction provide important feedback for the educators, but do not answer questions such as, "Did participants' knowledge increase as a result of the training?" In fact, there is little evidence that measures of satisfaction are related to knowledge transfer or attitude change (Ruona, Leimbach, Holton, & Bates, 2002). One way to address the question of knowledge transfer is to assess declarative or factual knowledge prior to and following a training program. Multiple follow-up assessments can further establish if the new knowledge is maintained, fades, or is enhanced over time.

Trainee attitude is another learning outcome that is useful to assess. Attitudes often predict behavior and changes in attitudes are often an implicit, if not explicit, goal of training. Self-efficacy is the belief in one's ability to perform specific tasks and is one measure of attitudes (Bandura, 1977). Research demonstrates that self-efficacy is a powerful predictor of skill development and use of newly acquired skills in the workplace (Davis, Fedor, Parsons, & Herold, 2000). Trainees with high levels of self-efficacy feel confident that they can successfully use new learning. For example, law guardians who report confidence in their abilities to implement new learning about interviewing children may be more likely to do so compared to those who report feeling less confident in their abilities to perform the complex skill. Thus, changes in attitudes, including particularly enhanced feelings of self-efficacy, are an important learning outcome that has potential to predict the transfer of new learning to the workplace.

Skill development and implementation of new skills are more difficult to define and measure. Training research and education indicates that multiple opportunities for practice with expert guidance and feedback are necessary for skill development or enhancement (Ford, Smith, Weissbein, Gully, & Salas, 1998). Methods for studying skill, such as behavioral observation, are time consuming and costly. Consequently, there is a paucity of research on skill as a learning outcome in the training literature. Global self-assessments of skill (e.g., "On a scale of 1–7, I would rate my skill at interviewing children as _") do not provide objective information of posttraining implementation. Quantifiable self-reports, however, can yield more useful information about the transfer of skills into the workplace (e.g., "I spent _ minutes interviewing my last child client."). Repeated measures of practice can help

assess trainees' ability to sustain or enhance new behaviors and provide information on the need for additional boosters or the need for more intensive skill training.

Recently, training and human resource development researchers have focused on the importance of understanding the work environment or transfer climate in the success or failure of transfer of training to the workplace (Holton, Bates, & Ruona, 2000). A training program may be well designed and implemented, and participants may feel efficacious as a result of the training, but the transfer climate (e.g., supervisor and/or colleague support, time, and other resources) may inhibit the application of new practice behaviors or skills in the workplace. Thus, the context of the trainee's work life is an important factor in whether or not the training is ultimately used as intended. Investigators are beginning to develop measures of the transfer climate (e.g., Learning Transfer System Inventory; Holton et al., 2000), but these instruments are not yet part of standard training evaluations.

Our first research question reflected the paucity of literature on learning outcomes and transfer of training for attorneys. We were fundamentally interested in assessing the feasibility of conducting research on the impact of continuing education training experience for law guardians who are in high demand to practice in ways in which law school does not prepare them. In this study, 60% of eligible participants agreed to a longitudinal follow-up study following a 1-day conference on children and violence. Moreover, 28% of nonattendees completed a measure for research purposes in response to a random mail survey. Although these numbers are small in absolute terms, the proportion of attorneys willing to participate in the current study suggests that larger-scale, more comprehensive studies are indeed feasible.

In this naturalistic study, we found that a 1-day conference had a positive impact on attendees' learning outcomes immediately postconference. Compared with the sample of nonparticipants, conference attendees reported feeling more efficacious about working with children experiencing community violence. They also reported significantly more positive intentions to carry out practice behaviors that were consistent with the conference goals. These findings indicate that a single-day conference has some impact on key learning outcomes that have been shown in other studies to predict future performance. The two groups, however, reported similar knowledge about community violence and children. This is an interesting finding because one of the main goals of the conference was to enhance knowledge about community violence. One reason the groups may not differ on this variable is that the items did not assess declarative knowledge (such as a test of the content delivered by speakers), but asked respondents to rate the degree of their knowledge about specific domains (such as their knowledge about community services). A more content-specific assessment of knowledge may have revealed greater differences between the groups.

The significantly higher scores on efficacy and practice behaviors among conference attendees were maintained 6 months after the conference. This suggests there may be an enduring impact of the conference on these variables and that a typical single-day conference has the potential to enhance attitudes and practice behaviors. A competing explanation for the consistent scores 6 months following the conference is that participants may have been cued to recall and reflect on the content of the conference which influenced their responses to the survey. Repeated administration of measures to the comparison group may help to tease out the effects of repeating the survey instrument on participant responses. In addition, it is important to note that, although the groups' means were significantly different and maintained at follow-up, they may not reflect clinically meaningful differences.

Taken together, the finding that the conference participants reported greater efficacy and more positive practice behaviors than nonattendees and that these differences were maintained

over time is important. Attorneys committed to working on community and domestic violence issues, such as law guardians, often work for not-for-profit or government agencies. The time and financial limitations faced by attorneys in these positions is likely the reason that workshops and single-event trainings are the community training standard. Given the time constraints of attorneys to participate in training events and the field's standard for continuing professional development, the single-day conference is likely to remain in the legal field. This pilot study's finding of a positive and potentially enduring positive effect of a 1-day conference provides some initial evidence that this type of continuing education has some merit.

Our naturalistic study has several limitations in addition to those addressed above. For one, we based our survey on a previously validated measure of knowledge, efficacy, and practice behaviors used to assess learning outcomes in professionals attending training in domestic violence (Short et al., 2004). This is the first adaptation of the measure for law guardian training, and only one subscale (Knowledge) has high internal reliability. Additional measurement development is required and planned for future studies. Second, the follow-up administrations of the survey were conducted by phone whereas the initial administration was conducted in person with pencil and paper. Method variance, therefore, may have influenced the responses among research participants at follow-up in unknown ways.

The current study did not directly assess skill or transfer of training as learning outcomes. We cannot conclude, therefore, that participants' skills with children improved or that their law guardian behavior changed on the job. However, specific skills were not practiced during the training and skill development was not a goal of the conference. Future trainings that purport to teach skills should measure target behaviors pre- and posttraining, and longitudinally. Participants' self-reports of practice may be a proxy for transfer of training, but standardized measures (e.g., Learning System Transfer Inventory; Holton et al., 2000) were not administered. There are many obstacles and facilitating factors which are not related to the quality of the training or the knowledge or motivation of the training participant, but which contribute to the success or failure of transfer of training to the job. A measure of these factors would be useful to understand the cost-effectiveness of future trainings. For future studies, interviews with the clients, or their parents, may provide additional perspectives on the impact of training on law guardian practice.

Despite the limitations of this pilot study, the conceptual framework and methodology reported contributes an initial step for future research to the literature. Within the legal field, questions such as "Does continuing education training result in new knowledge and skills?" will only be answered with time and energy dedicated to evaluating training efforts. Additionally, educators involved in training attorneys may want to enhance curriculum to include case scenarios, role plays, and discussions with senior attorneys to enhance the learning experience and, potentially, improve learning outcomes.

NOTES

1. For copies of the conference handouts contact Catherine_Cerulli@URMC.Rochester.edu.
2. The majority of conference attendees reported that more than 90% of their law guardian work is done in family court, with 4% reporting that their law guardian work was done in supreme court. An additional 4% reported that their law guardian work was done in both family and supreme courts. Only 2% reported that their law guardian work is in both family and the new Integrated Domestic Violence Court. It is possible that the conference materials did not reach those attorneys who practice in supreme court, which has jurisdiction over divorce cases.

3. The concept of employing empirical research to study the law or legal education is not new. For the past few years, legal education journals have debated the need to incorporate empirical research skills into law school curriculum (Epstein & King, 2003).

4. Eighty-five percent ($n = 35$) of the subjects learned about the conference through the mailed conference announcement. Another 7% ($n = 3$) learned of the conference through work, with the remainder having learned of it in some other way or through some combination of the mailing and work or other means.

5. Attendees had a combined 867 years of practice. Twenty-seven percent ($n = 11$) of the respondents reported that law guardian work composed 1–25% of their work; 38% ($n = 15$) reported that 26–50% of their work was as a law guardian; and 30% ($n = 12$) reported that more than 50% of their work was as a law guardian. Twenty attendees had practiced for 20 years or more, and three had practiced for 40 years or more. Over 60% ($n = 23$) of attendees said that the main reason they came to the conference was to obtain CLE credits. Thirty-six percent ($n = 13$) had other reasons. In overall ratings, 84% ($n = 32$) of subjects rated conference content as good or excellent. No attendee rated conference content as poor.

6. The 15-item measure is available from the authors upon request. Reliability alphas for subscales are good (Knowledge alpha = .75; Efficacy alpha = .49) to low (Practice alpha = .40).

REFERENCES

JOURNALS

- American Bar Association. (1994). *The impact of domestic violence on children*. A Report to the President of the American Bar Association.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Oxford, UK: Prentice-Hall.
- Barnard, J., & Greenspan, M. (2003). Incremental bar admission: Lessons from the medical profession. *Journal of Legal Education*, 53, 340–367.
- Boychuk-Spears, T. (2002). *Children who witness homicide and other violent crimes*. San Diego, CA: Specialized Training Services.
- Bassi, L. J., & Van Buren, M. E. (1999). *The 1999 ASTD state of the industry report*. Alexandria, VA: American Society of Training Development.
- Cerulli, C., Cross, W., O'Keefe, S., Nilsen, W., Thomas-Taylor, D., & Reixach, K. (2006). *The evolving role of law guardians: Exploring next steps and new directions*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Colquitt, J., LePine, J., & Noe, R. (2000). Toward an integrative theory of training motivation: A meta-analytic path analysis of 20 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 678–707.
- The David and Lucile Packard Foundation. (1999, Winter). *The future of children* (Vol. 9, No. 3). Los Altos, CA: Author.
- Davis, W. D., Fedor, D. B., Parsons, C. K., & Herold, D. M. (2000). The development of self-efficacy during aviation training. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(8), 857–871.
- Epstein, L., & King, G. (2003). Building an infrastructure for empirical research in the law. *Journal of Legal Education*, 53(3), 311–320.
- Eyring, J., Johnson, D. S., & Francis, D. (1993). A cross-level units-of-analysis approach to individual differences in skill acquisition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 805–814.
- Ford, J. K., Smith, E. M., Weissbein, D. A., Gully, S. M., & Salas, E. (1998). Relationship of goal orientation, metacognitive activity, and practice strategies with learning outcomes and transfer. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 218–233.
- Gadomski, A. M., Wolff, D., Tripp, M., Lewis, C., & Short, L. M. (2001). Changes in health care providers' knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors regarding domestic violence, following a multifaceted intervention. *Academic Medicine*, 76(10), 1045–1052.
- Graham-Bermann, S., & Hughes, H. (2003). Intervention for children exposed to interparental violence (IPV): Assessment of needs and research priorities. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 6(3), 189–204.
- Holton, E. F. III (2003). What's really wrong: Diagnosis for learning transfer system change. In E. F. Holton, III & T. T. Baldwin (Eds.), *Improving learning transfer in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Holton, E. F., Bates, R. A., & Ruona, W. E. A. (2000). Development of a generalized learning transfer system inventory. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 11, 333–360.
- Lakewood Research. (1997). Training industry report: 1997. *Training*, 10, 34–75.
- Loue, S. (2000). Intimate partner violence. Bridging the gap between law and science. *The Journal of Legal Medicine*, 21, 1–34.

- McAlister-Groves, B. (1999). Mental health services for children who witness domestic violence. *The Future of Children*, 9(3), 122–132.
- New York State Law Digest, No. 541, (January 2005).
- Osofsky, J. (1999). The impact of violence on children. *The Future of Children*, 9(3), 33–49.
- Prinz, R., & Feerick, M. (2003). Next steps in research on children exposed to domestic violence. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 6, 215–219.
- Ruona, W. E. A., Leimbach, M., Holton, E. F. III, & Bates, R. A. (2002). The relationship between learner utility reactions and predicted learning transfer among trainees. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 6, 218–228.
- Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2001). The science of training: A decade of progress. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 471–499.
- Short, L. M., Fanslow, J. L., & Gadomski, A. M. (2004). *Psychometric properties of a survey to assess health care provider knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and intended behaviors concerning intimate partner violence*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Wilson, S., Cameron, S., Jaffe, P., & Wolfe, D. (1989). Children exposed to wife abuse: An intervention model. *Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work*, 70(3), 180–184.
- Yates, T. M., Dodds, M. F., Sroufe, A. L., & Egeland, B. (2003). Exposure to partner violence and child behavior problems: A prospective study controlling for child physical abuse and neglect, child cognitive ability, socioeconomic status, and life stress. *Development and Psychopathology*, 15, 199–218.

CASE LAW

- Nicholson v. Scopetta, 787 N.Y.S.2d 196 (N.Y. 2004).
- People v. Johnson, 95 N.Y.2d 368 (N.Y. 2000).

STATUTES

- New York Penal Law § 260.10 (McKinney 2000).
- New York Family Court Act Art. 6 (McKinney 1997).
- New York Family Court Act Art. 8 (McKinney 1997).
- New York Family Court Act Art. 10 (McKinney 1997).

Wendi Cross is an Assistant Professor of Psychiatry (Psychology) and of Pediatrics at the University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, New York. She is a clinician, clinical teacher, and researcher in the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Program in the Department of Psychiatry. Her research focuses on two related areas: developing and testing community-based training programs for evidence-based practices and school-based preventive interventions for students at risk for mental disorders and suicide. She is also the co-developer of Promoting Resilient Children Initiative (The Resilience Project), a school-based intervention for at-risk elementary school children delivered by paraprofessionals.

Catherine Cerulli is the Director of the Laboratory of Interpersonal Violence and Victimization and Assistant Professor with the Department of Psychiatry in the School of Medicine and Dentistry at the University of Rochester. The National Institute of Mental Health recently awarded her a K01 5-year career development grant to conduct a randomized control trial in Family Court. She maintains a joint appointment as the Director of Research at the State University of New York at Buffalo School of Law Family Violence Clinic, which she cofounded in February 1992. She was formerly an Assistant District Attorney in Monroe County, New York, where she created a special misdemeanor domestic violence unit. She has been working on issues surrounding domestic violence and child abuse for 22 years in a variety of capacities including shelter hotline worker, counselor, prosecutor, defense attorney, expert witness, and professor. She is currently a consultant on a Center for Disease Control grant at Emory utilizing a public health approach to increasing safety for domestic violence victims. She is a founding and current Board Member for the Crisis Nursery of Greater Rochester, Inc., a grass roots organization providing emergency respite care for greater Rochester area families with young children.