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Abstract
This article focuses on children in conflict with the law and how they participate in court based on the linguistic strategies employed during examination phase in the courtroom. The data obtained was analyzed using Critical Discourse Analysis theory (CDA) by Norman Fairclough. CDA sees discourse as a social practice that involves the world socially and how it is made composed by other social practices. The theory holds that a study of the micro-discourse structures such as lexical choices and syntactic form in a given context leads to an understanding of the macro-discourse social structures such as power. The study adopted a descriptive design method because the variables were not manipulated. The study was carried out in the children’s court in Eldoret, Uasin Gishu County. This is because Eldoret is close to the researcher and also being the major towns in North Rift region, the courts around have cases involving children that they handle. Therefore the research would also benefit the other courts across the country. The sample of the study was obtained through stratified purposeful sampling. The study targeted 20 children in criminal cases. The main instruments of data collection were audio recordings of the court proceedings and interview schedules of children’s advocate both the prosecution and the defense attorney. The target population were children of 8 to 15 years old. From the analyses it is established that evidentiary rules empower those who assume the examiner role i.e. the prosecutor and the defense counsel by placing them in control of topic choice and change, and giving them the means to constrain the contributions of others. However, children in conflict with the law are not always able to exploit the language and master the courtroom discourse available to the prosecutor/lawyer. The children in conflict with the law usually find it hard to participate fully in a trial due to the nature of the courtroom language
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Introduction

There have been several studies carried out to show the interrelationship between language and the law dating back to the 1970s. Most studies during that era focused mainly on structures of language and more so language in context (Gumperz and Hymes 1972; Shuy & Shnukal 1980). Legal profession was on attack mainly because of how language and law are interrelated. Lawyers are users and abusers of language in that the legalese is seen as one of the most complicated and hard to comprehend language for the nonprofessional (layperson). The lawyers instead of simplifying this, they use it to justify the fees they charge their clients. David Mellinkoff (1963) identified the aspects of legal language that makes it hard to be understood by a layperson. In his book, he provided an overview of how the legal language originated and the linguistic devices and patterns of the legal register that cause confusion and puzzlement. He stresses that legal language “is puzzling not merely to the untutored non-lawyer. Puzzlement extends to bar and the bench” (Melinkoff 1963:25). He further believes that “The word precise is itself as loose as water and this paradox has helped keep alive the dodged belief of lawyers in the precision of their language” (Melinkoff 1963:295). Holland and Webb believe that the problem comes from how flexible a language is. Knapp (as cited in Holland and Webb pg. 91) talks of three subsets of linguistics. These are words from the general language, words from the legal language and then there are words that are contained in both legal and general language.

Holland and Webb argue that the legal language is used when lawyers are communicating and need to give a precise meaning of a word. Therefore, words that are common in both legal and general are the ones causing confusion and indeterminacy due to semantic imprecision of the general language. Peter Tiersma (2000) argues that legal language should be simplified when directed to the ordinary people. Courtroom discourse is professional discourse which is different from other daily verbal interactions (Santos 2004). According to Blommaert and Bulcaen (2000), the court interactions are governed by a set of rules that Critical Discourse Analysis theory (CDA) highlights. They include language and power, how discrimination occurs in a courtroom and who is the one in control during a court process.

According to Danet (1980), major functions of law in a society are to order human relations and to restore social order when it breaks down. In simple terms, it tells us what is acceptable in a society and what is frowned upon, and the legal implications when an unacceptable thing has occurred. This is where the law courts come in. The courts act as a place where disputes are resolved. They are mainly through oral presentations. There is a verbal interaction between judges, lawyers and plaintiff. The defendant or plaintiff can be anybody who is a key witness or accused in the court. The children have in some cases been brought as either defendants or plaintiffs and these children are the focus of this study.

Language is seen as a tool for understanding the legal processes and how the operations of the legal system.
Statement of the Problem
Use of legalese in courts on lay litigants usually places them at a disadvantage. Lawyers use this language to avoid overgeneralization of concepts. To lay litigants, especially children, this language is too complex, comprehensive and has unnecessary explanations that could have otherwise be achieved by use of a simple sentence. However in some Kenyan court rooms, the researcher has observed that the number of appeals on already completed cases involving children is on the rise. In some court cases, children are at a disadvantage especially on the linguistics strategies the prosecution lawyer and defence lawyer uses when conducting an examination-in-chief and cross examining this lot. Due to their tender age and cognitive ability, children are disadvantaged when responding to questions. Cases involving children are not handled in the right manner, the right procedure is normally not followed. If the right procedure would have been followed in the cases, then the number of cases of appeal would go down. Therefore, the researcher investigated how following the right procedure and especially the linguistic strategies used in cases involving children would have a great impact in solving the cases amicably. Hence, cases involving child litigants are likely to be lost on the basis of the inability of children to understand the court proceedings and the language of the court. This is the gap this study was set out to fill.

Objectives of the Study
The study was guided by the following objectives;
   1. To investigate the linguistic strategies employed by lawyer/prosecutor during examination of children in conflict with the law.
   2. To explain the implications of the manipulative nature of courtroom language on children in conflict with the law.

Research Questions
The study was guided by the following questions;
   1. What linguistic strategies do lawyers and prosecutors employ during examination of children in conflict with the law?
   2. What are the implications of the manipulative nature of courtroom language on children in conflict with the law?

Theoretical Framework
Norman Fairclough (1989) is the proponent of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). This theory sees discourse as ‘a form of social practice’ and the context in which a language is used (Wodak 2001). Discourse should be examined in relation to social structures (Bryman, 2012). CDA does look at who uses the language, how the language is used, why the language has been used and when it was used. Several studies in Africa have used CDA to analyze their data. Kiguru (2014), Njeri et.al (2018) among others all hold the view that with CDA the courtroom discourse exploits this and use it against the laypeople who participate in courtroom trial. CDA negates power thus it reflects who holds most power in a trial.

CDA holds that a study of the micro-discourse structures such as lexical choices, syntactic form and pragmatic interpretation in a given context often leads to an understanding of the macro-discourse social structures such as power and dominance.

At the macro level, the researcher considered aspects such as social orders, power dominance and inequality while at the micro level we have linguistic aspects such as text
analysis, speech acts, grammar, style and rhetorical devices. The analysis of the examination and cross-examination helped to study how the micro level is dominant since it is a verbal interaction. This theory was used to reveal how the microstructures are reproduced, challenged or perpetuated in macro discourse realities. This was also used to show how the macro concepts of dominance and control are evidence in courtroom interactions and particularly in cases involving children in conflict with the law. Wodak and Mayer (2009) argue that CDA concentrates on interdisciplinary approach in order to gain the social understanding of how language is used and its functions based on social institutions.

Fairclough and Wodak (1997:271-280) listed eight principles of CDA. They include; CDA addresses social problems. The interest is not only in language but also in the linguistic character of social and cultural processes and structure. Its approach is both interpretative and explanatory; Power relations are discursive – the focus on discourse is also a focus on how power operates through language; Discourse constitutes society and culture which suggests that CDA operates with an understanding of language not merely as a reflection of social relations but also as part of them, as actually reproducing them in a dialectal relation; Discourse does ideological work, thus, ideologies which are particular ways of representing and constructing society which produce unequal relations of domination and exploitation are often produced through discourse; Discourse is historical suggesting that we must always examine discourse in context which must also include inter-textual level of how discourse is always connected to other discourse which were produced earlier; The relationship between text and society is mediated; Discourse analysis is interpretive and explanatory and uses methods systematically to relate texts to their context. CDA is a socially committed scientific paradigm that actively attempts to intervene and change what is happening in particular contexts.

To Fairclough (1992) the verbal interactions are done based on three dimensions. Discourse-as- text views the choices the interlocutors make about grammar, vocabulary and cohesive ideas. Discourse-as-discursive practice views discourse as how choices made in grammar, vocabulary and cohesive devices are produced and consumed by the participants, and how these choices are a means of grounding a given verbal exchange in a particular social context. This was useful in explaining how social relations of power are exercised and negated in courtroom questioning. It was useful in analyzing how the participants in a courtroom trial from the magistrate, the lawyers and the litigants relate with each other. Discourse-as-social practice sees discourse as a by-product and factor of ideology. An ideology by the society is disputed through discourse. Such that classes and groups are integrated and challenged through discourse.

CDA has had a number of strengths and weaknesses. Morgan (2010:4) highlights the strengths and weaknesses of CDA. First, the techniques can reveal often unspoken and unacknowledged aspects of human behaviour, making salient either hidden or dominant discourses that maintain marginalized positions in society; secondly, it can reveal or help to construct a variety of new and alternative social subjects positions that are available, which in itself can be very empowering to the most vulnerable individuals; third, Critical Discourse Analysis can provide a positive social psychological critique of any phenomenon under the gaze of the researcher; fourthly, it has a relevance and practical application at any given time, in any given place, and for any given people; discourse analysis is context specific; fifthly, understanding the function of language and discourse enables positive individual and social change, therefore it presents a critical challenge to traditional theory, policy and practice in
many contexts; and finally, reflective stance is incorporated wherein researchers cannot be neutral observers.

However, Morgan (2010:4) discussed the limitations of CDA: The wide view of options available through the various traditions can make it a problem on issues to do with methodology, as each tradition has its own methodological space, abstract, mechanism, and an understanding of discourse and discourse analysis in particular; meaning is never fixed and it is negated and interpreted depending with the context; similarities and differences between abstracts may bring forth confusion for upcoming researchers and the experienced ones. When there arises confusion, there should be an explanation of abstract ideas and justify their use in each and every analysis; it may lead to disruption of known notions of selfhood, gender, autonomy, identity, choice, and such disruptions can be very challenging; Every tradition has been evaluated, for instance, conversation analysis is termed as shallow.
Conceptual Framework
In this study, guidelines existing in cases involving children in conflict with the law, the courtroom environment, the age of the accused and the linguistic strategies among others are some of the factors associated with cases involving children as accused. They are presented on figure 1.1 below;

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Intervening variable</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Examination of CICL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question types</td>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of CICL</td>
<td></td>
<td>The magistrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psycholinguistic ability of CICL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children fear participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language challenges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected Outcomes
- Children fear participating
- Language challenges
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Linguistic Strategies Employed by Lawyers/Prosecutors during Examination of Children in Conflict with the Law

Lawyers and prosecutors use question types, topic management, epistemological knowledge of a suspect, topic commentary and use of multiple questions among others as forms of linguistic strategies (Conley and O’Barr 1998). Linguistic strategies researched in the current study were on question types. Lawyers use questions in courts when trying to elicit information from either the witnesses or the defendants that may aid with the case. Lawyers and judges usually exhibit verbal powers during questioning to dominate and elicit information from witnesses (Gibbons, 2003). Gibbons (2008) further states that, lawyers usually have a particular version of the events in their mind. Therefore, the only thing they always do is to confirm events with their clients. The witnesses and defendants usually have no right to ask questions, they are only compelled to answer to whatever had been asked, hence the difference in courtroom questions from the other social questions. Coercive questioning and minimal pressure are used to make up the truth in a trial court. Lawyers are thereby informed or alerted of the risks involved in such questioning (Gibbons, 2004). It is notably sensible to address this mode of questioning which may lead to language related problems in courts.

Balcha (2015) did a study on courtroom questioning both examination-in-chief and cross-examination. These form exchanges in the courtroom and makes it interactive between the litigants and the counsels. Witnesses are thereby forced to testify what they did not intend to (Gibbons 2003, 2008). The counsel in some cases put pressure on the litigants to agree with their (counsel’s) version of events. Legal proceedings demonstrate discourse strategies that are different from other jurisdictions and the discursive strategies by the counsel are a way of controlling and intimidating the litigants. In some cases translators were needed. There is a deliberate manipulation of linguistic resources in any courtroom proceeding. Tag questions were the most important type of courtroom questioning. The use of declarative question gave out the manifestation of power imbalance because lawyers then created their own version of the events and witnesses were forced to agree with it.

Using CDA as the main theory, Kiguru (2014) examined the discourse used in local Kenyan courts. The other theories he used for the study were Conversational Analysis and the Speech Act Theory. This study was on giving a critical analysis of power asymmetry among discourse participants in sampled Kenyan courts. The study investigated the questioning and pragmatic strategies used by lawyers, police prosecutors and unrepresented accused persons during direct examination and cross-examination phases of trial. The study also looked at the use of various speech act functions and background contributions by the examiners. Further analysis was done on how witness responses exemplify how power and control are achieved and challenged in the courtroom through linguistic means. CDA views discourse as a social practice that constitutes the social world and is constituted by other social practices. The theory holds that a study of the micro-discourse structures such as lexical choices and syntactic form in a given context leads to an understanding of the macro-discourse social structures such as power. From the analyses, it was evident that rules empower those who assume the examiner role by placing them in control of topic choice and change, and giving them the means to constrain the contributions of others.
The Implications of the Manipulative Nature of Courtroom Language on Children in Conflict with the Law

Questions can be manipulative. Questioning is the key flagship of the courtroom discourse. This demonstrates the power of language, which has influence and control of linguistic interactions. One party is placed in a situation where he/she needs to prove innocence to a crime and the other party is brought in to answer to the charges leveled against him/her. The judge or the magistrate always acts as an arbitrator. They need to get all the facts of the case which are normally assembled in a systematic way in order for them to get a clearer understanding of what happened before they make a ruling (Danet, 1980).

Satia (2013) focuses on the strategies used in the magistrate’s court in Kenya during cross-examination. The article analyzed strategies of controlling the linguistic responses of prosecution witnesses that were employed by two accused persons in a grievous-bodily-harm case involving family members at a magistrate’s court in Kenya. The study analyzed audio–recorded court proceedings using a discourse analytic approach. The range of controlling strategies used by the defendants included aggressive questioning styles, the use of multiple questions, formulaic questions, epistemological challenges and accusatory remarks against the witnesses. Although the lay defendants demonstrated an unusual level of awareness of cross-examination strategies, the researcher proposes a further research on investigating where the lay litigants learnt the strategies.

Njeri et, al (2018) undertook a study on critical analysis of linguistic manipulation and power disparities among discourse participants in criminal trials at the Kibera Law Courts, and posited the view that the employment of manipulative techniques by both legal professionals and unrepresented accused persons during hearings is a vital part of the courtroom discourse. The researchers observed that the court participants in the various segments of criminal proceedings used judgmental sampling to select instances of linguistic manipulation. The findings of the study were that both legal professionals and lay defendants employ such linguistic manipulative techniques as “so”, summarizers, alternative questions, and interruption to show control and dominance of the discourse in criminal proceedings at an equal level and despite the differences in legal knowledge. Power is unequally distributed among court participants and that this power imbalance is more rampant among courtroom officials.

Methodology
Research Design and Sampling Techniques
A research design is the conceptual structure in which research is conducted (Kothari, 2003). This study adopted a descriptive research design because the variables were not manipulated. The qualitative procedures in sampling, data collection and data analysis were employed. Descriptive research is a study designed to depict the participants in an accurate way. It is mainly used to investigate social issues, and they enable researchers to come up with solutions or recommendations on how to deal with the disparities observed (Mugenda, 2008). The behavior of participants is described without interference of the researcher or affecting the participants’ behavior. This type of design is good because of the high level of confidentiality involved. It is convenient and fast in collection and analysis of data.

According to the target population, the average population of Eldoret children remand home is 80-100. From this, the actual sample size of the respondents was arrived at by applying Mugenda and Mugenda’s, (2003) recommendation of a sample of 10 to 30 % of the target population. However, in a small universe a larger proportion can be selected. In this
case, 50% of the population of 8-15 years was picked which was a total of 20 children and 3 lawyers. Purposive sampling was used to choose this age bracket.

The verbal discourse in the sampled trials was captured reflecting the examination and cross-examination of witnesses. This provided data on both the questioning patterns, pragmatic strategies and speech act functions used by various discourse participants in an attempt to win the trial. The recordings constituted the linguistic data that were analyzed to determine how power asymmetry was produced and challenged in courtroom discourse. Taking of freehand notes by the researcher on other features relevant to the trial participants, contributions and context was also done to assist in accurate transcription of data.

The study was based on both primary and secondary data collected through audio-recordings of court proceedings, questionnaires and interviews. The collection of data using multiple methods was used considering the complexity of the courtroom procedures. The research instruments designed were first tested in the field before being applied by the research team during the actual data collection. They were structured according to the research objectives where the survey data was obtained by administering structured questionnaires containing both closed and open ended questions for the children in conflict with the law. Milroy and Gordon (2003) note that in studies involving lengthy recordings, ‘the borderline between overt and covert recording can become blurred’ (p. 83). This assertion holds true in the court set up where it would be impractical for the researcher to negotiate permission to record with every participant.

Qualitative data was clustered according to the type of responses and then coded to interpret findings while descriptive analytical statistics such as frequency distributions, cross tabulations and percentages were used to analyze key assessment variables. The analyzed data was then presented in form of frequency tables and prose for interpretation, summary, conclusions and recommendations.

Discussions of Findings
Linguistic Strategies employed during Examination of Children in Conflict with the Law
The Tag Questions are controlling. They are used in both examination-in-chief and cross-examination and are meant to control the defendant. They are the most coercive of all the question types. The child is restricted to respond and it is an indicative of power in the courtroom (Moeketsi, 1999). The Tag Question is the most important type of courtroom questioning because it is intimidating and coercive. Gibbons (2003:101), says that the tag questions are “strengthening devices which make the demand for compliance greater than that of a simple question” and so “it is more coercive”. The Tag questions are so common in cross-examination. The counsel in some cases put pressure on the litigants to agree with their (counsel’s) version of events.

Cross-examination is a discursive event (Fairclough, 1992) and hence its production and interpretation of what is said must take into account the institutional practices at play. This is to say, the lawyer/prosecutor asks the questions and the accused in this case, a child in conflict with the law, answers what has been asked. Hence, the prosecutor has all the time allocated by court to ask as many questions as she wants to be able to strengthen her case against the accused thus showing how much control she has.

Due to age and lack of experience, the child is likely to have been faced by psycholinguistic difficulties. The silence and use of short answers and low tone in answering some of the questions may be an indicator of his communication difficulty. Roy (1990:74) has
found that “those who do not fully comprehend a conversation assent to weakly when they do not understand”. They easily accept what has been said in as much as they may not have understood the question.

Quirk and Greenbaum (1973:194) observed that the statement in Tag Questions “expresses an assumption, and the question an expectation”, hence this accounts for how the prosecutor is able to make the responses of the child in conflict with the law affirm to facts that are dangerous to the child’s case. This shows that the child in a way incriminated himself. The silence when asked a question is taken as a ‘yes’ in a court of law. One major cross-examination strategy is the use of Yes-No questions repeatedly to show inconsistencies in witness’ story and leading questions are central in the process (Roberts1998). Cross-examination in any legal setting is necessary to discredit the witness’ story and discovering the truth.

Declarative questions involve an examiner making a statement and expect to get either a positive or a negative affirmation from the respondent. This is to clarify on issues and to build the case. The declarative questions contain information of importance to the case in that, they mainly need ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answers. In cross-examination, these types of questions start with ‘so’ and such like words. This places a greater demand on the witness or the defendant to agree with the assertion of the question as observed by Farinde (2009). This type of questions may sometimes have a rising intonation. It manifests power imbalance in the courtroom. Declarative questions have a greater power in a case. They challenge accused testimony. The examiner therefore has the advantage to use his/her “beliefs about the truth of the evidence” (Woodbury, 1984:217). The use of Declarative Question gave out the manifestation of power imbalance because lawyers then created their own version of the events and witnesses were forced to agree with it. Declarative questions were also seen to be used to coerce the children in conflict with the law to accept facts that contradict what they claim as their version of the truth.

**Implications of the Manipulative Nature of the Courtroom Language**
The youngest child was 10 and 12 years for both lawyers. This can be attributed to the fact that they are approaching the adolescent ages, where they are experiencing a lot of changes in their bodies. During this stage, the children are likely to be withdrawn from their guardians, they want to experience on their own, and some end up committing crimes due to peer pressure. They want to belong, to be accepted and to be loved. When all these are not fulfilled, they end up looking for attention in the wrong places. Another observation could be that most of the parents have left their children to be disciplined by the church or the teachers in school. Due to the high number of this age group, it then becomes an uphill task for them to be able to control these children, the gap present can lead some of them to commit such crimes and find themselves in courts or juveniles. Emotional gaps can also lead to crimes. When some of these children are left at the mercy of the outside world, they end up feeling lonely, to fill the gap they may fall into bad companies. Poor parenting leads to lack of moral values and this affects the principle of life. When such imbalance is struck it may likely affect the behaviour of this child.

Children in conflict with the law are always disadvantaged when they lack legal representation makes them unable to participate effectively in the legal system. This can lead to lack of a fair trial. When a child is represented by a lawyer in court, he/she stands a better chance in his/her case as legalese is a challenge to the children. Intimidating court setting can also make a child be at a disadvantage. Most children’s cases are dealt with in adult courts.
Lack of privacy often leads them to tend to shy away from being effective in cases involving them as offenders.

Language barrier and lack of proper terminologies to utilize in courts make children in conflict with the law be at a disadvantage. Children may say one thing to mean another one in court. Language barrier is also a contributing factor but the court will mostly ask the child to state a language that they feel most comfortable with or get the court clerk to act as a translator. The children in conflict with the law can answer questions out of context. This may also contribute to their inability to comprehend the language of the court and many a times translation done may not carry the intended meaning. Translating legal interactions in courtroom may be so demanding to the court clerks. The court clerk is faced with conflicting responsibility as a translator of conveying the whole message, requiring him/her to attend to “intended meaning, implied meaning and presupposed meaning” (Hatim and Mason, 1990:33). So they are tasked to ensure that there is no loss in the translation.

The *voie dire* will establish whether or not the child is intelligent enough to answer the questions. The questions used are based on the answers anticipated by the examiner. The younger the child, the less complex and more plain the questions should be. The children in conflict with the law are in most cases treated differently from those of the children who are witnesses in courts in terms of questioning. This may be attributed to the fact that children in conflict with the law are the accused hence seen as criminals and especially if the crime committed is capital offences such as murder. The lawyers and the prosecutor will try as much as they can to be harsh to this group especially during cross examination.

Language use has not worked for the children in conflict with the law. A few times the language used has been to the detriment of the children in conflict with the law. They have to rely on an interpreter which may make some words to loose meaning during the translation process. Matu et, al (2012) found out that the interpreters role in any courtroom proceedings is very crucial. The interpreters have a complex role of ensuring that they pass the right information from the source language to the target language. They have a great role to understand and appreciate their role to avoid biasness and ambiguity. The interpreters should always observe the rules of accuracy, omission, interruption and impartiality. The perception on addition during interpretation was due to the fact that oral legal discourse is goal-oriented and when not fully understood, impacts negatively on the participants. This was different from the findings of the current study where to do the nature and fatigue of their role, the interpreter a times omits some information.

**Conclusion**

The discourse participant roles in the courtroom are pre-allocated, and, as a consequence, power is exercised more by those who take on the role of examiner. This forms a basis for inequality as examiners can make demands to which the witness has to respond. In addition, examiners have more power as they have the most right to speak, to choose the topic, to control the topic and to change the discourse topic. The courtroom provides an emotive environment. The courtroom environment elicits fear and anxiety to the children defendants. They are also a times unable to understand the language of the law. The linguistic strategies are a disadvantage to them due to age and literacy levels. Defendants play a very vital role in any court process. The findings of this study demonstrated that the children in conflict with the law face challenges when appearing in courts in cases involving them. They are required to by the Kenyan law to try and absolve themselves from the crimes that they are accused of committing. The criminal justice system should ensure that children in conflict with the law
feel safe, valued, understood and well integrated in the court process. The courts should adopt to child-friendly services and language so as to enable them participate fully in a trial. The child-friendly provisions should be highly encouraged.

**Recommendations from the Study**

Based on the findings of the present study, it would be prudent for the government to provide a separate professional prosecution services for children in conflict with the law. Such a program could aim at educating the children on the various legal procedures and ways of language use that are unique to the court setting. This could be a way of mitigating the language-based challenges that have been shown to face the children. The courts should ensure that the court manual for direct examination and cross-examination of children in conflict with the law be availed at all times and followed to the letter. Also, do a revision on the guidelines on how to do direct examination and cross examination of children in conflict with the law. This will enable the court staff handle these children best basing on the language tailored for them. Finally establish a fully-fledged children’s court in all the major towns away from the public eye. This will ease anxiety and fear on the part of the children hence they will be able to handle and participate well in cases that they are involved in.
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