REPORT OF THE PILOT STUDY

Assessing the effectiveness and impact of information leaflets for children in conflict with the law

Child-Friendly JT

The right of minors to information, translation and interpretation in criminal proceedings: Development of child-friendly justice tools (JUST-AG-2016-06-760674)

Co-funded by the Justice Programme of the European Union

This report has been developed by Fundación Diagrama Intervención Psicosocial. It is part of the European project 'Child-Friendly JT - The right of minors to information, translation and interpretation in criminal proceedings: Development of child-friendly justice tools' (JUST/AG/2016/06), co-funded by the Justice Programme of the European Union. This report has been prepared based on the data collected by project partners in the work package 3 of the project.

The content of this document represents the views of the authors only and is their sole responsibility. The European Commission does not accept any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains.

Fundación Diagrama Intervención Psicosocial
Av. Ciudad de Almería
30002 Murcia, España.
www.fundacióndiagrama.es

This publication is licensed under a Creative Commons Attirbution - NonCommercial - ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License.

REPORT OF THE PILOT STUDY

Assessing the effectiveness and impact of information leaflets for children in conflict with the law

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of the Child-Friendly JT project is to contribute to the effective application of European law regarding criminal proceedings, specifically to promote the rights of children suspected or accused of a crime. The project will also contribute to the creation of tools that juvenile justice professionals may apply to guarantee the right to information and the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings.

During the second stage of the project, three information leaflets for children in conflict with the law were created. These leaflets contain essential information about their rights and information related to court proceedings according to the judicial stage: police arrest, trial and pre-trial detention. The leaflets have been written in plain language in order to enable children to participate properly in the criminal proceedings.

Following the creation of information leaflets for children in conflict with the law, their effectiveness and impact were tested through a pilot study. This document contains the results of the pilot study carried out in order to assess the effectiveness and impact of the leaflets in the participating countries.

2. OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESIS

According to the project, the main objective of the pilot study is to assess the effectiveness and impact of the information leaflets. The objective of this report is to analyse the knowledge of young people after reading the leaflets.

The hypothesis raised is that children have improved their knowledge after reading the leaflets.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Design

A quasi-experimental methodology was applied, using pre-post testing. Two measurements were obtained for each participant: before and after reading the leaflets. Two independent target populations were included (G1: children in conflict with the law; and G2: children outside the juvenile justice system who have not had contact with the juvenile justice system), in order to control the learning effect that occurs as a result of going through the justice system. By comparing the results obtained from each group, the knowledge gained by the main target group (children in conflict with the law) after passing through the justice system (prior experience) could be controlled. For this reason, G2 was considered as a "control group".

Both group 1 (G1) and group 2 (G2) were assessed before and after reading the leaflets (Pre-post test):

Timing / Group	PRE-TESTING (Before reading the leaflets)	POST-TESTING (After reading the leaflets)
G1 – Children in conflict with the law	G1 – PRE	G1 – POST
G2 – Children not in conflict with the law	G2 - PRE	G2 - POST

Given that the assessments needed to be conducted on three leaflets (arrest, trial, and pre-trial detention), and that they were to be carried out by answering two questionnaires (PRE and POST) per leaflet, this assessment process would have been very long for children. As such, each participant will only take part in the assessment of one leaflet. This implies that each group were divided into three subgroups (arrest, trial, and pre-trial detention). Thus, the final sample was divided into 6 independent groups, with two measurements for each group, as shown below:

LEAFLETS	GROUPS	PRE-TESTING (Before reading the leaflets)	POST-TESTING (After reading the leaflets)
A. ARREST	G1 – Children in conflict with the law	G1a - PRE	G1a - POST
	G2 – Children not in conflict with the law	G2a - PRE	G2a - POST
B. TRIAL	G1 – Children in conflict with the law	G1b - PRE	G1b - POST
	G2 – Children not in conflict with the law	G2b - PRE	G2b - POST
C. PRE-TRIAL DETENTION	G1 – Children in conflict with the law	G1c - PRE	G1c - POST
	G2 – Children not in conflict with the law	G2c - PRE	G2c - POST

3.2. Participants

The study was composed of a group of 194 young people. The majority of them were boys (84.5%)[1] between the ages of 13 and 20 (M=16.85, SD=1.2), of whom 36 were Bulgarian (18.6%), 26 were Croatian (13.4%), 31 were Cypriot (16.0%), 30 were Italian (15.5%) and 71 were Spanish (36.6%).

Two target population of study were considered to assess the effectiveness and impact of the information leaflets. The first group was composed of 83 (42.8%) young people in conflict with the law. The criteria used to select the participants were: (1) they must be serving (or have served) a judicial sentence; (2) any type of judicial sentence was considered a valid option (probation, placement in the community, detention, community sanction, etc.); and (3) they must be between 14 and 21 years old since, even though a child is usually classed as a person below the age of 18, many children end their judicial sentence at a later age. The second group was composed of 111 (57.2%) young people outside the juvenile justice system (who have not had contact with the juvenile justice system. The same characteristics as group 1 were taken to account to select them, except they must not have had contact with the juvenile justice system.

Likewise, both groups were divided into three groups according to the three leaflets (arrest, trial, and pre-trial detention). Thus, each participant will only take part in the assessment of one leaflet.

The disaggregated data of the participants by leaflet and country is detailed below.

[1] 2 participants did not want to report their gender.

64 young people participated in the pilot study of the arrest leaflet, of whom 56.9% were young people who have not had contact with the juvenile justice system (17 school and 16 care system), and 43.1% were young people in conflict with the law (10 were serving a detention sentence, 9 probation, 8 placement in the community, and 1 community sanction).

Tabla 1. Sample data of the arrest leaflet study

		Country					
		Bulgaria	Croatia	Cyprus	Italy	Spain	Total
Sex (f)	Girl	5	0	0	0	4	9
	Boy	7	10	11	10	17	55
Group (f)	Children NOT in conflict with the law	6	5	11	5	10	37
	Children IN conflict with the law	6	5	0	5	12	28
Specific group (f)	Community sanction	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Custody sanction (detention)	0	0	0	0	10	10
	Placement in community	0	1	0	5	2	8
	Probation	6	3	0	0	0	9
	School	6	1	0	0	10	17
	Care system	0	0	11	5	0	16
	Other	0	4	0	0	0	4
Age	Min.	14	16	13	15	15	14
	Max.	18	20	17	18	17	20
	Mean	17.3	18.4	16.2	16.6	16.4	16.8
	S.d.	1.2	1.4	1.25	1	0.7	1.3

64 young people participated in the pilot study of the trial leaflet, of whom 60% were young people who have not had contact with the juvenile justice system (20 school and 16 care system), and 40% were young people in conflict with the law (12 were serving a detention sentence, 6 probation, 8 placement in the community, and 1 community sanction).

Table 2. Sample data of the trial leaflet study

		Country					
		Bulgaria	Croatia	Cyprus	Italy	Spain	Total
Sex (f)	Girl	4	0	0	0	7	11
	Boy	8	8	11	10	16	53
Group (f)	Children NOT in conflict with the law	6	4	11	6	12	39
	Children IN conflict with the law	6	4	0	4	12	26
Specific group (f)	Community sanction	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Custody sanction (detention)	0	0	0	0	12	12
	Placement in community	0	2	0	5	1	8
	Probation	5	1	0	0	0	6
	School	7	2		0	11	20
	Care system	0	0	11	5	0	16
	Other	0	2	0	0	0	2
Age	Min.	16	17	13	15	15	13
	Max.	18	18	17	18	19	19
	Mean	17.3	17.3	16.3	16.2	16.6	16.8
	S.d.	0.9	0.5	1.2	1	1.1	1.1

65 young people participated in the pilot study of the pre-trial leaflet, of whom 53.8% were young people who have not had contact with the juvenile justice system (17 school, 14 care system and 4 other), and 46.2% were young people in conflict with the law (16 were serving a detention sentence, 7 probation, 6 placement in the community, and 1 community sanction).

Table 3. Sample data of the pre-trial leaflet study

		Country					
		Bulgaria	Croatia	Cyprus	Italy	Spain	Total
Sex (f)	Girl	1	0	0	0	7	8
	Boy	11	8	9	10	19	57
Group (f)	Children NOT in conflict with the law	5	4	9	5	12	35
	Children IN conflict with the law	7	4	0	5	14	30
Specific group (f)	Community sanction	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Custody sanction (detention)	3	0	0	0	13	16
	Placement in community	0	0	0	5	1	6
	Probation	4	3	0	0	0	7
	School	5	0	0	0	12	17
	Care system	0	0	9	5	0	14
	Other	0	4	0	0	0	4
Age	Min.	16	18	15	16	15	15
	Max.	19	20	17	18	18	20
	Mean	17.4	19	16.2	16.9	16.4	16.9
	S.d.	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	1.2

3.3. Instruments

6 *ad hoc* questionnaires were created, 2 of which correspond to each of the 3 leaflets (2 for arrest, 2 for trial, and 2 for pre-trial detention); 1 for pre-test and 1 for post-test (see next table). Likewise each questionnaire is composed of two "scenarios" (some hypothetical situations in which children are involved in the juvenile justice system). After these situations, a list of rights based on the leaflets and three questions were included (Which of these rights do you think are respected? Which ones are NOT respected? Which ones are NOT present?).

Participants were asked to identify which rights are respected or not respected. All of the rights listed on each leaflet are included. The correct answers were added up to give a score.

Timing / Leaflet	PRE-TESTING	POST-TESTING
A. ARREST	Questionnaire 1 (Pre-testing arrest) (cases no. 1 & 2)	Questionnaire 2 (Post-testing arrest) (cases no. 3 & 4)
B. TRIAL	Questionnaire 3 (Pre-testing trial) (cases no. 5 & 6)	Questionnaire 4 (Post-testing trial) (cases no. 7 & 8)
C. PRE-TRIAL DETENTION	Questionnaire 5 (Pre-testing pre-trial detention) (cases no. 9 & 10)	Questionnaire 6 (Post-testing pre-trial detention) (cases no. 11 & 12)

Moreover, it was taken into account the possibility that the children would find the "post" questionnaire more difficult than the "pre" questionnaire, even after reading the leaflet. For this reason, the pre questionnaire and the post questionnaire were interchanged. Some of the participants answered the post questionnaire first and, after reading the leaflet, then answer the pre questionnaire.

3.4. Procedure

In order to collect the data, each partner requested the necessary permission from the relevant national (or regional) authorities (depending on the country and group of participants). Once this permission was obtained, partners met with the persons responsible for the facilities (services, schools…), in order to explain the project to them. Afterwards, possible participants were identified and we contacted them to invite them to participate in the pilot study. The consent of the children and their or legal representative was also obtained.

Before administering the questionnaires, information was given to participants about what they have to do and how to complete the questionnaires, reminding them that is was a voluntary activity, the answers were anonymous and there were no right or wrong answers, so they should answer the questions according to their own personal opinion.

Then participants were provided with the first questionnaire, and they had time to answer the questions. When participants finished, the questionnaires were collected and they were provided with the corresponding leaflet. They had time to read it, and without taking the leaflets away, the second questionnaire were administered to the participants.

Each partner gathered the data obtained from the questionnaires in a data base, and subsequently shared it with Fundación Diagrama, who were in charge of accumulating the data, analysing them and producing a report.

3.5. Analysis

Descriptive analyses were carried out to examine the socio-demographic variables, and the scores obtained in each questionnaire. Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests were used to analyse the normal distribution of the variables. The scores (pre and post) were compared in order to determine whether the scores were better or not after reading the leaflets, using *t* tests for paired samples

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS.

4. RESULTS

The following shows the results obtained for each leaflet.

4.1. Results of the arrest leaflet

In general the results show that after reading the arrest leaflet the results improve. Comparing results by country, in Croatia, Italy and Spain the results are more positive. In the case of Italy, where participants took more time to read the leaflets, this could be the reason they have obtained better results.

Table 2. Differences pre-test and post-test scores by country

		Mean	S.D.	*t*
TOTAL	Score PRE Total	18.2	4.9	-1.05
	Score POST Total	18.7	4.3	
BULGARIA	Score PRE Total	21.5	3.9	2.123
	Score POST Total	19.3	5.2	
CROATIA	Score PRE Total	20.9	2.5	-0.367
	Score POST Total	21.2	2,3	
CYPRUS	Score PRE Total	10.4	3,4	1.39
	Score POST Total	8.7	3,3	
ITALY	Score PRE Total	12.5	4,5	-1.489
	Score POST Total	14.3	2,9	
SPAIN	Score PRE Total	17.8	3,9	-2.726*
	Score POST Total	19.3	3,7	

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; *** p<0.000

Children not in conflict with the law obtained better results than the other group. It may be due to differences in skills between groups.

Table 3. Differences pre-test and post-test scores by group and country

		Children NOT in conflict with the law			*Children IN conflict with the law*		
		Mean	**S.D.**	***t***	**Mean**	**S.D.**	***t***
TOTAL	**Score PRE Total**	18.9	5.4	1.893	17.6	4.4	0.214
	Score POST Total	20.0	3.9		17.4	4.3	
BULGARIA	**Score PRE Total**	23.7	1.6	0.77	19.3	4.6	2.259
	Score POST Total	22.5	3.5		16	4.8	
CROATIA	**Score PRE Total**	21	2.6	-0.825	20.8	2.8	0.144
	Score POST Total	21.8	1.6		20.6	2.9	
CYPRUS	**Score PRE Total**	10.4	3.4	1.39	-	-	-
	Score POST Total	8.7	3.3		-	-	
ITALY	**Score PRE Total**	9.8	1.3	-7.06	15.2	5.1	0.000
	Score POST Total	13.4	0.6		15.2	4.2	
SPAIN	**Score PRE Total**	19.5	3.2	-1.548*	16.2	3.8	-2.371*
	Score POST Total	21	2.1		17.7	4.3	

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; *** p<0.000

The order in which the questionnaires were administered also influenced the results. Those who first answered questionnaire 1 (cases No 1 & 2) and then questionnaire 2 (cases No 3 & 4) obtained better results.

Table 4. Differences pre-test and post-test scores by order

	Pre: questionnaire 1 (case 1 & 2)/ Post: questionnaire 2 (case 3 & 4)			*Pre: questionnaire 2 (case 3 & 4) Post: questionnaire 1 (case 1 & 2)/*		
	Mean	**S.D.**	***t***	**Mean**	**S.D.**	***t***
Score PRE Total	12.4	4.9	-5.629***	16.3	3.3	1.572
Score POST Total	15.6	4.9		15.1	4.6	

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; *** p<0.000

Analysing the correct answers for each of the "scenario" cases, it can be seen that in general the children obtained better results when they answered the questionnaire after reading the leaflet.

Table 5. Percentage of correct answers in each case of the arrest leaflet by order

	CASE 1		CASE 2		CASE 3		CASE 4	
	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST
P1.Translation	50%	61.5%	72.5%	76.9%	88.2%	92.3%	21.6%	0%
P2.Letter	78.1%	84.6%	58.8%	69.2%	49.0%	30.8%	68.6%	84.6%
P3.Parents informed	92.2%	100%	17.6%	15.4%	82.4%	100%	5.9%	7.7%
P4.Lawyer	62.5%	100%	94.1%	92.3%	94.1%	100%	52.9%	100%
P5.Consulate	76.6%	76.9%	64.7%	84.6%	78.4%	76.9%	49.0%	84.6%
P6.Accompained	57.8%	76.9%	84.3%	84.6%	39.2%	46.2%	92.2%	61.5%
P7.Remain silent	53.1%	76.9%	78.4%	76.9%	76.5%	61.5%	56.9%	61.5%
P8.Duration	56.3%	53.8%	52.9%	92.3%	72.5%	84.6%	58.8%	84.6%
P9.Accusation	68.8%	76.9%	33.3%	46.2%	35.3%	38.5%	70.6%	61.5%
P10.Case materials	59.4%	53.8%	72.5%	69.2%	47.1%	46.2%	54.9%	61.5%
P11.Separately from adults	57.8%	46.2%	54.9%	84.6%	66.7%	69.2%	72.5%	46.2%
P12.Medical assistance	78.1%	92.3%	72.5%	76.9%	74.5%	92.3%	82.4%	76.9%
P13.Recording	71.9%	100%	78.4%	69.2%	76.5%	92.3%	64.7%	92.3%

4.2. Results of the trial leaflet

The mean scores are significantly different after the reading the trial leaflet. Comparing the results by country, all countries improved the results, except Italy, which obtained the same results.

Table 6. Differences pre-test and post-test scores by country

		Mean	S.D.	*t*
TOTAL	Score PRE Total	13.8	3.8	-3.120**
	Score POST Total	14.8	3.9	
BULGARIA	Score PRE Total	17.1	2.9	-0,202
	Score POST Total	17.3	2.7	
CROATIA	Score PRE Total	13.1	4.3	-2,888*
	Score POST Total	15.5	3.8	
CYPRUS	Score PRE Total	11.4	2.2	-1.440
	Score POST Total	13.1	2.5	
ITALY	Score PRE Total	16.3	1.8	0,287
	Score POST Total	16.2	1.8	
SPAIN	Score PRE Total	12.4	3.7	-2,552**
	Score POST Total	13.5	4.3	

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; *** p<0.000

Comparing the results between groups, children in conflict with the law had better scores, except in Spain. These results may be due to the fact that they have more personal experience. Nevertheless, in general, with the exception of Italy, children who have not had contact with the juvenile justice system improved the results more than children who are in conflict with the law after the reading the leaflet. It is necessary to highlight that children in conflict with the law had more difficulties in understanding the questionnaires and maintaining attention throughout the assessment process.

Table 7. Differences pre-test and post-test scores by group and country

		Children NOT in conflict with the law			*Children IN conflict with the law*		
		Mean	S.D.	*t*	Mean	S.D.	*t*
TOTAL	Score PRE Total	13.4	3.1	-3.905***	14.4	4.7	0,094
	Score POST Total	15.1	3.6		14.4	4.6	
BULGARIA	Score PRE Total	15.7	2.6	-1,955	18.7	2.8	4,568**
	Score POST Total	17.8	1.9		16.8	3.4	
CROATIA	Score PRE Total	11.0	4.7	-2,038	15.3	3.0	-2,049
	Score POST Total	14.0	3.4		17.0	4.1	
CYPRUS	Score PRE Total	11.4	2.2	-1.440	-	-	-
	Score POST Total	13.1	2.5		-	-	
ITALY	Score PRE Total	15.3	0.8	0,000	17.8	2.1	0,397
	Score POST Total	15.3	1.0		17.5	1.9	
SPAIN	Score PRE Total	13.8	3.0	-3,546***	10.9	3.9	-0,509
	Score POST Total	15.8	3.2		11.3	4.2	

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; *** p<0.000

The results are different according to the order in which the questionnaires were administered. The scores were better when questionnaire 3 was first administered and then questionnaire 4. However, the differences between pre-test and post-test were significantly greater when questionnaire 4 was first administered and then questionnaire 3.

Table 8. Differences pre-test and post-test scores by order

	Pre: questionnaire 3 (case 5 & 6) Post: questionnaire 4 (case 7 & 8)			*Pre: questionnaire 4 (case 7 & 8) Post: questionnaire 3 (case 5 & 6)*		
	Mean	**S.D.**	***t***	**Mean**	**S.D.**	***t***
Score PRE Total	14.9	3.7	-1,813	12.6	4,069	-2,296*
Score POST Total	15.5	3.6		14.3	4,304	

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; *** p<0.000

Analysing the percentages of correct answers for each item, it is observed that the scores were better after reading the leaflet in most of the items.

Table 9. Percentage of correct answers in each case of the trial leaflet by order

	CASE 5		CASE 6		CASE 7		CASE 8	
	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST
P1.Information	80.4%	92.9%	35.3%	50.0%	71.4%	82.4%	14.3%	45.1%
P2.Translation	78.4%	42.9%	94.1%	85.7%	85.7%	98.0%	50.0%	82.4%
P3.Lawyer	98.0%	100%	72.5%	64.3%	71.4%	66.7%	92.9%	84.3%
P4.Parents informed	58.8%	50.0%	90.2%	78.6%	78.6%	74.5%	42.9%	66.7%
P5.Accompained	62.7%	71.4%	80.4%	85.7%	85.7%	82.4%	42.9%	68.6%
P6.Individual assessment	62.7%	71.4%	58.8%	71.4%	57.1%	72.5%	64.3%	88.2%
P7.Participate	29.4%	35.7%	84.3%	92.9%	14.3%	31.4%	71.4%	74.5%
P8.Case materials	54.9%	57.1%	74.5%	71.4%	50.0%	64.7%	85.7%	84.3%
P9.Privacy	76.5%	78.6%	70.6%	71.4%	78.6%	88.2%	64.3%	66.7%
P10.Appeal	62.7%	78.6%	74.5%	78.6%	64.3%	84.3%	78.6%	86.3%

4.3. Results of the pre-trial leaflet

The results show that the scores improved after reading the pre-trial leaflets. This result is repeated in all countries.

Table 10. Differences pre-test and post-test scores by country

		Mean	S.D.	*t*
TOTAL	Score PRE Total	13.7	4.6	-5.214***
	Score POST Total	16.2	4.9	
BULGARIA	Score PRE Total	14.8	5.0	-3.587**
	Score POST Total	18.6	4.8	
CROATIA	Score PRE Total	16.4	2.9	-0.695
	Score POST Total	17.3	3.5	
CYPRUS	Score PRE Total	15.0	1.4	-1.1497***
	Score POST Total	20.9	0.8	
ITALY	Score PRE Total	8.2	2.7	-2.290*
	Score POST Total	11.8	3.0	
SPAIN	Score PRE Total	13.9	4.6	-1.399
	Score POST Total	14.9	4.9	

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; *** p<0.000

Both groups improved their results after reading the leaflet. This result was repeated in all countries, except in Croatia. Children who have not had contact with the juvenile justice system obtained better results in the pre-test, and they also improved their scores much more after reading the brochure than the other group.

Table 11. Differences pre-test and post-test scores by group and country

		Children NOT in conflict with the law			*Children IN conflict with the law*		
		Mean	S.D.	*t*	Mean	S.D.	*t*
TOTAL	Score PRE Total	14.8	3.7	-5,450***	13.9	4.6	0,174
	Score POST Total	18.0	4.0		14.9	4.9	
BULGARIA	Score PRE Total	17.0	1.2	-4,000*	13.3	6.2	0,083
	Score POST Total	21.0	1.2		16.9	5.7	
CROATIA	Score PRE Total	16.5	4.2	-1,997	16.3	1.5	0,613
	Score POST Total	19.3	1.7		15.3	3.9	
CYPRUS	Score PRE Total	15.0	1.4	-11.497***	-	-	-
	Score POST Total	20.9	0.8		-	-	
ITALY	Score PRE Total	8.6	1.8	-1,380	7.8	3.6	0,144
	Score POST Total	10.8	2.3		12.8	3.5	
SPAIN	Score PRE Total	15.8	3.5	-1,159	12.2	4.9	0,459
	Score POST Total	17.2	3.2		12.9	5.2	

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; *** p<0.000

The order in which the questionnaires was delivered had an effect on the scores once again. Participants who answered questionnaire 5 (cases 9 and 10) first and then questionnaire 6 (cases 11 and 12) improved their scores. Conversely, those who answered questionnaire 6 (cases 11 and 12) first and then questionnaire 5 (cases 9 and 10) worsened their results.

Table 12. Differences pre-test and post-test scores by order

	Pre: questionnaire 5 (case 9 & 10) Post: questionnaire 6 (case 11 & 12)			*Pre: questionnaire 6 (case 11 & 12) Post: questionnaire 5 (case 9 & 10)*		
	Mean	**S.D.**	***t***	**Mean**	**S.D.**	***t***
Score PRE Total	12.8	4.6	-7.431***	16.3	3.3	1.572
Score POST Total	16.5	4.9		15.1	4.6	

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; *** p<0.000

After reading the leaflet the percentage of correct answers increased in cases 9, 10 and 11, but not in case 12.

Table 13. Percentage of correct answers in each case of the pre-trial leaflet by order

	CASE 9		CASE 10		CASE 11		CASE 12	
	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST
P1.Information	28.0%	13.3%	80.0%	80.0%	53.3%	88.0%	80.0%	78.0%
P2.Lawyer	88.0%	100%	60.0%	80.0%	86.7%	84.0%	100%	86.0%
P3.Medical examination	84.0%	100%	76.0%	93.3%	100%	94.0%	100%	82.0%
P4.Education	72.0%	73.3%	38.0%	53.3%	100%	68.0%	100%	90.0%
P5.Family life	58.0%	93.3%	48.0%	26.7%	33.3%	36.0%	86.7%	74.0%
P6.Participate programmes	54.0%	46.7%	62.0%	80.0%	60.0%	78.0%	86.7%	76.0%
P7.Religion	52.0%	66.7%	68.0%	86.7%	93.3%	86.0%	86.7%	78.0%
P8.Parents informed	16.0%	33.3%	76.0%	73.3%	80.0%	82.0%	60.0%	66.0%
P9.Individual assessment	46.0%	40.0%	70.0%	80.0%	60.0%	66.0%	53.3%	60.0%
P10.Appeal	34.0%	73.3%	66.0%	66.7%	60.0%	76.0%	60.0%	68.0%
P11.Separately adults	58.0%	80.0%	64.0%	73.3%	60.0%	74.0%	60.0%	68.0%

5. CONCLUSIONS

Overall, it can be stated that after reading the leaflets participants improved their knowledge of their rights in criminal proceedings. However, the results were not always consistent. A number of variables may have influenced them.

On the one hand, one of the main limitations of the study was perhaps the complexity of the tool that was created *ad hoc* to evaluate the effectiveness of the leaflets. After the test, comments from the young people and professionals involved highlighted that the questionnaires were long and complicated. Furthermore, although efforts were made to use an adapted language, participants found that some concepts and terms remained complex.

Another variable that impacted on the results of the study was time. The short length of time dedicated to carry out the pre-test, read the leaflet and carry out the post-test, may have hindered the participants' assimilation of the information. If more time had been allowed for the reading and processing of the content, the results may have been different. Italian participants had more time to read the leaflets, which may be the reason why their results improved more in the post-test.

Despite the fact that participation in the study was voluntary, motivation was not consistent amongst the participants, which may have had an effect on their responses. The professionals involved in the study reported that some of the participants from the group of children in conflict with the law claimed to already know what their rights were, and did not pay much attention to the leaflet.

Furthermore, it was also noted that in some cases the level of understanding and concentration was low, which hampered the carrying out of the study.

These leaflets are a good tool to help young people get to know their rights, but they must form part of a series of actions that go beyond merely handing over a leaflet. Children need more time to assimilate the content of the leaflets. Likewise, professionals in the field of juvenile justice must reinforce the leaflets' information by explaining to children in simple and accessible language all the rights that the leaflets include. This requires that professionals, a term under which interpreters are also included, be trained so that children are provided with adequate attention, thus upholding their right to information, translation and interpretation.