Pakistan Journal of Criminology
Vol. 10, Issue 3, July 2018(5-17)

Translation and Validation of Criminogenic Cognition Scale into Urdu Language

Muhammad Jamil[1]
Shameem Fatima[2]

Abstract

The main objective of thestudy was to translate the criminogenic cognitions scale into Urdu language and to establish psychometric prosperities of the Urdu version.Brislin's (1986) standard procedure of forward and backward translation, committee approach, and pretesting was used to translate the scale. Cross validation of the Urdu version against original English scale was done on a sample of 452 bilingual adolescents (M age = 20.61, SD = 2.50; 344 males & 108 females). It was found that means of subscale and full-scale scores of the Urdu version were comparable with those of English version. Furthermore, good alpha reliabilities, item – to – item correlations, correlations of subscale scores with full scale score, andmoderate to low inter scale correlations significantly added psychometric strengths to the scale. Implications for using Urdu version of criminogenic cognition scale in forensic, clinical, and research settings are also discussed.

Keywords*:* criminogenic cognitions, translation, age, education, gender

Introduction

Although moral reasoning has been the focus of psychology for a long time, other characteristics of moral cognition such as cognitive distortions, criminogenic cognitions,insensitivity, and neutralization may be stronger predictors of ethical versus unethical behaviour.As a focus of this study, criminogenic cognitions are defined by Andrew and Bonta (2010) as thoughts, ideas, and actions, which lead an individual towards antisocial activities. Commonly, it is explained that criminogenic cognitions are distorted ways of thinking, which sustain criminal behaviour by minimizing, justifying, or defending one's unreasonable behaviour. The researchers explain that cognitive distortions and criminogenic cognitions result in abnormal thinking, self-point out such types of immoral cognitions that serve to justify, perpetuate, and maintain criminal behaviours (Howitt & Sheldon, 2007). The empirical evidence from a diversecantered behaviour decreases in altruistic behaviour, and avoidance of responsibility, hence, promoting a criminal lifestyle. Moreover,

[1] Research Scholar at Punjab University, Lahore. Email: rjamil_rana@gmail.com
[2] Assistant Professor of Psychology, Department of Humanities, COMSATS Institute of Information Technology, Lahore. Email: shameem_pu@hotmail.com

clinicians working with criminals also studies using criminal, clinical, and normative samples supportsthat such patterns of cognitive distortions and criminal thinking are found in sex offenders, in individuals who are engaged in domestic violence and antisocial behaviours, and in college students showing misconduct within the institution (Gendreau, Goggin & Law, 1997; Gilchrist, 2007; Wallinius, Johansson, Larden, &Dernevik, 2011.

Several theories including generaltheory of crime and modern aggression theory describe that criminal attitude and thinking play a key role in initiation and maintenance of criminal, antisocial, and aggressive behaviours. Although crime rates and antisocial behaviours are increasing day by day across the globe; andthe theoretical and empirical evidence highlight the role of criminogenic cognitions in explaining deviant and immoral behaviour, yet,the literature provides little evidence of notable efforts to systematically, objectively, and cross-culturally assess these criminogenic patterns of thinking.Therefore, there is a growing need of developing, translating, and cross validating proper tools for the cross-cultural assessment of criminal thinking patterns.

For cross cultural assessment, the use of already developed valid and reliable assessment tools is considered economical in terms of time, efforts, and resources. However, to achieve potential benefits of cross-cultural assessment,the assessment tools need to be translated, adapted, and cross culturally validated. Translation of a scale should be carried in a way which retains the conceptual and lexical equivalence of items, and results in a valid adaptation of the scale (Fatima & Sheikh, 2014). According to Chang (2001), functional, conceptual, metric, and linguistic equivalenceof translated version against original scale must be ensured during translation and adaptation process.

With increasing concern of researchers, psychologists, and clinicians in cognitive distortions and criminogenic cognitions it is important totranslate, and cross validate the scales assessing criminogenic thinking styles acrossdifferent cultures and languages. Few scales available in this respect are Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking, the Criminal Sentiments Scale–Modified, and Criminogenic Cognition scale.The criminogenic cognition scale is distinct from other measures inseveral ways: the scale is based on clinicians' experiences; it isshorter as compared to other measures of criminogenic cognitions;and it does not require any special training foradministration, scoring, and interpretation. Therefore, the primary aim of

the study was to translate, and cross validate the criminogenic cognition scale into Urdu language. Criminogenic cognitions scale (Tangney, Meyer, Furukawa, & Cosby, 2002) consisting of 25 items is a self-report measure designed to assess cognitive distortions of criminals across 5 dimensions namely: notions of entitlement, failure to accept responsibility, short term orientation, insensitivity to the impact of crime, and negative attitudes toward authority. A secondary objective of the study was to assess demographic correlates of criminogenic cognitions among Pakistani adolescents and emerging adults. More specifically, major objectives of the study were as follows:

1.To translate the criminogenic cognitions scale into Urdu language.

2. To establish the psychometric properties of the Urdu version.

Methodology

Keeping in view the aims of the study, first, the scale was translated into Urdu language (Step 1) and then, psychometric properties of the Urdu versionwere assessed (Step 2).

Step 1: Translation of Criminogenic Cognition Scale

Brislin's (1986) criteria of translation were adopted to translate the scale into Urdu language, after obtaining permission from the authors to translate the scale. An attempt was made to ensure four types of equivalence, as mentioned in the introduction section, between English and Urdu measures of the scale. As suggested by Brislin (1970), four techniques are useful in this regard: 1) back translation method, 2) bilingual technique, 3) committee approach, and 4) pre-test procedure. Accordingly, the procedure of translation was completed using following techniques: Forward translation, committee approach, backward translation, and pretesting.

Forward translation

Five translators (native speakers of Urdu, assistant professors of English having enriched experience in translation and teaching in English) were requested to translate the scale into Urdu language. Upon obtaining their consent, they were briefed about some principles and guidelines to follow fortranslationofitems. They were instructedto maintain thecontent similarity, conceptualand functional equivalence, and the difficulty level between the Urdu translation and the original English version. They were also requested to consider cultural relevance of the items

to the Pakistani normsduring translation. The translators independently translated all items of the scale into Urdu language.

Committee approach

Acommittee was arranged consisting of five translators, an expert psycho-metrician, and the researchers to review all five translations and to compose a single consensus text. First, translators were asked to talk about any problem that arose while translating the scale and to discuss if there was any item which seems irrelevant to the Pakistani culture. Then, the committee reviewed and analysed the content of the translation, by focusing on translation of each item in detail. The committee also analysed the discrepancies between item translations and original items as well as any problematic items with reference to cultural irrelevance. The objective was to prepare an Urdu version of the scale which would ensure the functional, conceptual, and linguistics equivalence to the original English version. Most consistent translations with no cultural, functional, or conceptual discrepancy were selected for the items.

Back translation and a committee review

Three other well-known translators, meeting the criteria of bilinguals, who were not exposed to the original English scale, back translated the scale from Urdu into English language. They were also given the same instructions to focus on as were givenearlier for translating the items into Urdu language. The three new English translations were reviewed again by the same committee to analysefunctional and conceptual equivalence of new English translations with the original English one. Consequently, a final draft of the scale in Urdu language was ready for pretesting.

Pretesting

The Urdu translation of the scale was pretested on a sample of 13 participants. Participants were emerging adults within an age range of 22-24 years (Mean age = 23.1 years, SD = .31). They were instructed to respond to the scale items carefully. They were also briefed to point out any item that had poor cultural relevance to the Pakistani norms and was confusing or difficult to understand. This exercise of pilot testing revealed no significant cultural discrepancy of the items supporting the functional equivalence of the scale across both cultures.

Step 2: Cross Validation of the Urdu translation of CCS Sample

After translating the scale into Urdu language using a standard procedure, new translated version was cross validated on a sample of 452 adolescents and emerging adults (344 males,108 females) within anage rangebetween 14-29 years (*M*= 20.61 &*SD* = 2.50). The sample was selected from various educational institutes. The participants were studying in varying grades from 10th grade to M Phil (with majority-75%-of the sample studying at undergraduate level). Educational level was assessed in terms of numbers of yearsof formal education (M educational level = 14.19 years, SD = 1.25). Only those participants were selected who could read, write, and understand both Urdu and English languages with equal proficiency.

Measures

Demographic sheet was prepared in the study by the researchers to assess demographic variables including age, gender, and educational level.

Criminogenic cognitions scale

Urdu and English versions of the criminogenic cognition scale were used to assess psychometric equivalence of the new Urdu translation against the original English scale. Criminogenic cognitions scale is a 25 item self-report measure that has been reported to have statistically sound psychometric properties (Tangney etal., 2012). The scale calculates a full-scale score of criminogenic cognitions as well as five subscale scores includingnotions of entitlement, failure to accept responsibility, short-term orientation, insensitivity to the impact of crime, and negative attitude toward authority.Respondentswere required to rate all items on a 4-point response format from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 strongly aggress. Higher score on each of the five domains indicated highest level of thought distortion.

Procedure

After obtaining approval from the institutional research review committee, participants were approached and briefed about the nature and purpose of study. English and Urdu versions of the scale were administered to different participants in a counterbalanced order. The second version of the scale was administered after an internal of 4 days of the administration of the first version. No time limits were imposed to complete the scales. Response rate in the current study was 92%.

Results

Means and standard deviations as well as paired sample t test were calculated to assess the significance of discrepancy between two versions for five subscale scores and one full-scale score (see Table 1). Descriptive statistics from Table 1 indicate that means and standard deviations of Urdu and English versions were comparable for five subscale scores. However, t test statistics showed a significant difference on full scale score (p = .03). Table 1 also shows a high correlation between two versions for five subscales and the full scale (r = .81 to .69) adding strength to psychometric properties of the scale.

Table 1

Showing Descriptive Statistics, Significance of Discrepancy, and Correlation between English and Urdu Measures of CCS

Measures	Likely range	English version		Urdu version		*t* value	correlation
		M	SD	M	SD		
STO	5-20	12.28	2.42	12.06	2.44	-1. 25	.77**
NOE	5-20	12.72	2.26	12.43	2.41	-1.35	.73**
FAR	5-20	11.44	2.40	11.40	2.31	-.61	.81**
NATA	5-20	13.04	2.13	13.13	2.16	1.24	.74**
IIC	5-20	11.87	2.20	11.65	2.13	-1.21	.69**
CCS	25-100	61.35	61.25	60.67	6.43	-1.95*	.78**

Note: * = p< .05, ** = p< .001; STO=Short-Term Orientation; NOE=Notions of Entitlement; FAR=Failure to Accept Responsibility; NATA=Negative Attitudes to Authority; IIC=Insensitivity to Impact of Crime; CCS = Criminogenic Cognition Score total.

Item to item correlations were also calculated and presented in Table 2. It is evident that item to item correlations between English and Urdu measures are very good (concentrating around .70) indicating that both English and Urdu measures are comparable.

Table 2

Showing Item-to-Item Correlation between Scores of English and Urdu Measures for Five Subscales

Short Term Orientation	Notions of Entitlement	Failure to Accept	Negative Attitudes	Insensitivity to Impact of

				Responsibility		Toward Authority		Crime	
Item	*r*	Item	*r*	Item	*r*	Item	*r*	Item	*R*
3	**.75***	1	**.77***	2	**.84***	10	**.73***	4	**.74***
8	**.69***	6	**.78***	5	**.73***	13	**.73***	7	**.67***
18	**.72***	16	**.69***	9	**.75***	17	**.72***	11	**.59***
24	**.74***	19	**.63***	15	**.75***	20	**.69***	12	**.68***
25	**.72***	23	**.72***	22	**.76***	21	**.69***	14	**.75***

Note: * = $p < .001$.

Inter-scale correlations among five subscales and a full-scale score are presented in Table 3. All the five subscales were significantly correlated with full scale score (r = .65 to .43). Good correlation of subscales with full scale score indicates that five dimensions tap thesame underlying concept. Additionally, coefficients of internal consistency are also good for five subscales and for the full scale.

Table 3

Inter-scale Correlations and Alpha Reliability Coefficients of the Urdu Version

Measures	2	3	4	5	6	α
1-Short Term Orientation	.08	**.18****	.02	**.16****	**.54****	.65
2-Notions of Entitlement		**.26****	.08	**.22****	**.60****	.75
3-Failure to Accept Responsibility			**.11***	**.26****	**.65****	.69
4-Negative Attitude to Authority				.04	**.43****	.68
5-Insensitivity to Impact of Crime					**.58****	.65
6-Total CCS						.72

Note. *= $p < .05$. ** = $p < .01$.

Finally, correlations of demographic variables (age and education) with five subscales and a full-scale scorewere assessed and presented in Table 4. It is evident that level of education is negatively correlated with notion of entitlement and failure to accept responsibility as well as with full scale score of criminogenic cognitions. It is worth mentioning that independent sample t test could not be calculated for gender differences due to incomparable groups (males = 344 & females = 108). Therefore, biserial correlation was calculated between gender (a dichotomous variable) and

criminogenic cognitions. It was found that gender wassignificantly correlated with short-term orientation and insensitivity to the impact of crime subscales i.e., being a female was associated with high score on both subscales.

Table 4

Correlation of Age, Education,and Gender with Five Subscale Scores and a Full-Scale Score (Urdu Version) of CCS

Measures	*Age*	*Education*	*Gender*
Short Term Orientation	.01	-.07	**.10***
Notions of Entitlement	-.04	**-.18****	-.071
Failure to Accept Responsibility	-.03	**-.11***	-.045
Negative Attitude to Authority	.04	.04	.027
Insensitivity to Impact of Crime	.08	.00	**.121***
Total CCS	.02	**-.12***	.042

Note. *= $p < .05$. ** = $p < .01$.

Discussion

The main objective of the study was to translate and validate the criminogenic cognition scale into Urdu language to be used with Pakistani population. With reference to Pakistan, assessment of criminogenic cognitions as an antecedent of criminal, deviant, and antisocial behaviour is a relatively ignored topic in the field of forensic psychology. Given the seriousness of increasing crime rates, more research on this topic is needed, which requires the availability of standardized tools. However, the assessment tools which are developed for and normed on a different population and in a different language other than the national language of Pakistan (i.e., Urdu) are not applicable to Pakistani population. Therefore, some indigenously developed or translated scales are required. Translation and adaptation of already existing tools is cost effective in terms of time, resources, and efforts. Therefore, an initiative was taken to translate, and cross validate the criminogenic cognition scale into Urdu language to be used with Pakistani population.

Translation of the scale

Brislin's (1986) standard criteria of translation were used to translate the scale. The aim of achieving the conceptual, functional, linguistic, and psychometric equivalence with the original scale was achieved by usingdifferent translation

techniques. First, the current study utilized the contributions of more than one bilingual translatorfor forward and backward translations to avoid subjectivity bias, and to maintain equivalence. Additionally, translators were given clear instructions to focus on cultural relevance of the items, maintain low difficulty level, and ensure conceptual and functional equivalence of the items across both cultures. However, the translators were native Urdu speakers and they learned English as a second language,therefore, a committee approach, as recommended by Cha et al. (2007),was also used to further clarify any issue relevant to subjectivity, translation, and equivalence.Moreover, in line with previous literature (e.g., Cha et al., 2007), use of back translation process added further strength to translation procedure to assess any conceptual or linguistic discrepancy across both versions.To assess content equivalence, bilingual translators were required to back translate the scale from Urdu to English language independently and blindly. Furthermore, linguistic equivalence was ensured during the committee approach by comparing different translations against actual dictionary translation of the term, and through back translation technique.Finally, translated version was pretested on a small sample to assess cultural relevance and content clarity in the cultural context of Pakistan.

Cross validation of the scale

The translated version of criminogenic cognition scale was validated with the Pakistani population against the original English scale. This step was taken to assess metric equivalence of Urdu translationwith English version by testing and comparing psychometric properties of both versions.

For cross cultural studies, instrument validation is achieved by assessing several psychometric properties such ascomparison of scale means and variances andassessment of alpha reliabilities (Paunonen& Ashton, 1998). Accordingly, when means and standard deviations on five subscales and total criminogenic cognition score were compared, these were seemed to be comparableon Urdu and the English versions.Despite seemingly comparable mean scores, t test statistics from paired sample t-test resulted in a significant t value for the full-scale score. Several reasons may explain the finding. First, a large sample size may have caused such a low t-statistics to be significant. Second, the possibility of type 1 error may have resulted in significant t-statistics (p=.046, nearly equal to .05). If the probability of type 1 error hasbeenreduced by increasing the confidence interval, the discrepancy would no longer remain significant.

Alpha reliabilities of the subscales were from moderate to good (.65 - .75)which werealthough closer to, however, a little better than the reliabilities of the English scale that was normed on a Western population. Better alpha reliabilities may have been the consequence of careful translation process that was aimed atmakingthe scale culturally relevant. It is important to note that despite a fewnumbers of items (only 5) in each subscale, alpha coefficients are considered very sound.

Scores on all the subscales were significantly correlated with the total CCS score.Also, most of thesubscale scores were significantly inter-correlated, indicating homogeneity as well as versatility of subscales in assessing same underlying concept. However, negative attitude to authority subscale was only significantly correlated with failure to accept responsibility subscale. This lack of consistency with other subscales mighthave been due to sampledemographics that were, normative sample, youth group, and participants from collectivistic culture. Opposing authority figures and failing to realize a true sense of responsibility are behavioural repertoire of normative young individuals particularly when living in a collectivistic culture where there are many significant others to meet their needs. While, the other subscales including short term orientation, insensitivity to the impact of crime, and notion of entitlement are usually the cognitive patterns of criminals. Unfortunately, it was impossible to get a well-educated sample of bilingual criminals; therefore, a sample of normative youth was used.Additionally, item to item correlations were also calculated which were significantly very good i.e., majority of the correlation coefficients were around .70.

Secondary to the study objectives was to assess demographic correlates of criminogenic cognitions. Consistent with previous literature (e.g., Mandracchia& Morgan, 2012), education was found to be the negative correlate ofnotions of entitlement and failure to accept responsibility subscale scores as well as oftotal CCS score. However, contrary to the expectations, no significant relationship of criminogenic cognitions was found with age,may be due to the reason thatthe sample was not wide in terms of age range (majority 75% of the sample was between age range of 18 to 22). In terms of gender differences, females tended to score high on short term orientation and insensitivity to impact of crime subscales. Although this is an unusual finding, however, incomparable sample sizes in terms of gender might have been the reason for this unusual finding.

Limitations and Implications

However, certain limitations should be considered while interpreting the results. First, validation of the scale was done with a normative sample of adolescents and emerging adults instead of criminals due to unavailability of educated bilingual criminal sample. Second, validation of the scale was assessed against only English version of the criminogenic cognition scale. Accordingly, future studies can assess discriminate and convergent validities of the Urdu version with other measures of moral and criminal thinking and behaviour. Final, the current study focused only on few demographics, but, future researchers are recommended to assess other more relevant demographic factors such as socioeconomic status, broader age range, comparable gender categories, peer influence, family environment, and parenting etc. in relation to criminogenic cognitions.

Despite limitations, the study has made a significant contribution in providing a valid and reliable instrument in Urdu language to forensic psychologists, clinicians, and researchers for the assessment of criminogenic cognitions. The scale is likely to be helpful to clinicians and psychologists in many important ways: to assess high versus low risk individuals; to plan and tailor treatments for specific criminogenic cognitions during offender rehabilitation; to evaluate progress during treatment sessions; and to assess differential efficacy of different treatment plans in reducing specific cognitive distortions etc. Also, it can be used as a screening tool to identify at risk individuals so that they may be provided treatment to avoid involving in risk and criminal behaviours. Furthermore, the scale will help researchers in the field of forensic psychology to assess criminogenic thinking patterns and to assess their causes and remedies. Moreover, findings from the study raise the need to increase the literacy rate and educational level of Pakistani youth to decrease the chances of developing cognitive distortions which isthe likely correlateof criminal behaviours.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the contributions of Dr TahiraJibeen, Dr. Farzana Ashraf, Dr.Muneeba Shakil, Dr. Zubair Baig, Mr. Samar Kamal Fazli, Ms. Amna Naveed, Ms. Jaweria Farooqi, and Ms. Sazia Gulzar in translating and back translating the scale into Urdu and English language.

References

Andrews, D. A., &Bonta, J. (2010). *Psychology of criminal conduct* (5th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.

Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *1*(3), 185-216.*doi*:10.1177/135910457000100301.

_____. (1986). The wording and translation of research instruments. In W. J. Lonner& J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Field methods in cross-cultural research* (Pp. 137-164). Beverly Hills: SagePublications.

Cha, E. S., Kim, K. H., &Erlen, J. A. (2007). Translation of scales in cross-cultural research: issues and techniques. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *58*(4), 386-395.doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04242.x

Chang, C. Y. (2001). *Cross-Cultural Assessment: A Call for TestAdaptation.* Association for Assessment in Counselling.

Fatima, S., & Sheikh, H. (2014). Translation and Adaptation of Parent-child Relationship Scale into Urdu Language. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, *24*(1), 98-114.

Gendreau, P., Goggin, C. E., & Law, M. A. (1997). Predicting prison misconducts. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, *24*(4),414-431. doi: 10.1177/0093854897024004002

Gilchrist, E. (2007). The cognition of domestic abusers: Explanations, evidence and treatment. *Aggressive offenders' cognition. Theory, research and practice*, 247-266. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Howitt, D., & Sheldon, K. (2007). The role of cognitive distortions in paedophilic offending: Internet and contact offenders compared. *Psychology, Crime andLaw*, *13*(5), 469-486.*doi*: 10.1080/10683160601060564

Mandracchia, J. T., & Morgan, R. D. (2012). Predicting offenders' criminogenic cognitions with status variables. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, *39*(1), 5-25.doi: 10.1177/0093854811425453

Paunonen, S. V., & Ashton, M. C. (1998). The structured assessment ofpersonality across cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29,*150–170.

Tangney, J. P., Meyer, P., Furukawa, E., & Cosby, B. (2002). The Criminogenic Cognitions Scale. *George Mason University*, Fairfax, VA.

Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., Furukawa, E., Kopelovich, S., Meyer, P. J., & Cosby, B. (2012). Reliability, validity, and predictive utility of the 25-item Criminogenic Cognitions Scale (CCS). *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, *39*(10), 1340-1360.doi: 10.1177/0093854812451092

Wallinius, M., Johansson, P., Larden, M., &Dernevik, M. (2011). Self-serving cognitive distortions and antisocial behaviour among adults and adolescents. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, *38*(3), 286-301.doi: 10.1177/0093854810396139

Appendix

Criminogenic Cognitions Scale URDU Version

ان بیانات کے حوالے سے، نیچے دیے گئے پیمانہ کے مطابق نشاندہی کریں کہ یہ کس حد تک آپ کی موجودہ سوچ کی عکاسی کرتی ہے۔

۱ = بالکل بھی اتفاق نہیں کرتا ۲ = اتفاق نہیں کرتا ۳ = اتفاق کرتا ہوں ۴ = بہت زیادہ اتفاق کرتا ہوں

۱۔ میں جب بھی کوئی چیز کرنا چاہتا ہوں، تو میں توقع رکھتا ہوں کہ لوگ اسے مہیا کریں۔

۲۔ میری موجودہ حالت کے کسی حد تک/جزوی طور پر ذمہ دار میرے بچپن کے برے تجربات ہیں۔

۳۔ مستقبل ناقابل پیشگوئی ہے اس لیے اس کے بارے میں منصوبہ بندی کا کوئی فائدہ نہیں۔

۴۔ میرے جرم/جرائم سے کسی کو کوئی خاص نقصان نہیں پہنچا۔

۵۔ مجھے لگتا ہے کہ میری زندگی میں جو بھی ہوتا ہے زیادہ تر اس کی وجہ صاحب اقتدار/طاقت ور لوگ ہی ہوتے ہیں۔

۶۔ میں اس وقت تک بالکل بھی مطمئن نہیں ہوں گا جب تک مجھے وہ سب کچھ نہ مل جائے جس کا میں حق دار ہوں۔

۷۔ چوری اس وقت تک جائز ہے جب تک متاثرہ فرد کو کوئی جسمانی نقصان نہیں پہنچتا۔

۸۔ اگرچہ میں پکڑا گیا ہوں، اس کے باوجود خطرہ مول لینا فائدہ مند تھا۔

۹۔ میرے ماضی کی وجہ سے مجھ پر بہت سی ایسی چیزوں/کاموں کے الزامات لگائے گئے جو میں نے نہیں کیے۔

۱۰۔ زیادہ تر قوانین اچھے ہوتے ہیں۔

۱۱۔ جرائم کا نشانہ بننے والے عام طور پر وقت کے ساتھ ساتھ نقصان پورا کر لیتے ہیں۔

۱۲۔ جب آپ کوئی جرم کرتے ہیں تو نقصان صرف نشانہ بننے والے کا ہی ہوتا ہے۔

۱۳۔ زیادہ تر پولیس آفیسرز/گارڈز اپنی طاقت کا غلط استعمال کرتے ہیں۔

۱۴۔ معاشرہ میرے جرم/جرائم کو بہت بڑھا چڑھا کر پیش کرتا/اچھالتا ہے۔

۱۵۔ کبھی کبھار میں خود پر قابو نہیں رکھ پاتا۔

۱۶۔ میں لوگوں سے توقع رکھتا ہوں کہ وہ دوسرے لوگوں کی نسبت مجھ سے بہتر سلوک کریں۔

۱۷۔ بااختیار لوگ عام طور پر میرے بہترین مفاد کا سوچ رہے ہوتے ہیں۔

۱۸۔ اگر آپ آج کچھ حاصل کر سکتے ہیں تو اس کے لیے بچا بچا کر رکھنے کا کیا فائدہ؟

۱۹۔ میں اس بات پر اصرار کرتا ہوں کہ مجھے میری جائز عزت دی جائے/مقام دیا جائے۔

۲۰۔ اگر کوئی پولیس آفیسر/گارڈ مجھے کرنے کے لیے کہتا ہے تو عام طور پر اس کی کوئی اچھی وجہ ہوتی ہے۔

۲۱۔ بااختیار لوگ عام طور پر دوسروں کا فائدہ اٹھاتے ہیں۔

۲۲۔ میں محض ایک پیدائشی مجرم ہوں۔

۲۳۔ میں دوسرے لوگوں سے زیادہ کا حقدار ہوں۔

۲۴۔ میرے خیال میں آج سے لطف اندوز ہونا کل کے بارے میں پریشان ہونے سے زیادہ بہتر ہے۔

۲۵۔ میں ایک باقاعدہ وقت کے نظام کے اندر رہ کر کام کرنا پسند نہیں کرتا۔