Validation of Working Alliance Inventory for Supervision (WAI-S)

Salleh Amat [1], Shairatul Azlin Abdul Shukor [2], Mohd Izwan Mahmud [3]*

[1,2,3] *Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia.*
Email: [3] izwan@ukm.edu.my*

Abstract

This study is implemented to translate and culturally adapting the Working Alliance Inventory for Supervision (Supervisor) (WAI-S) into the Malay language. Translation and adaptation processes were done according to strategies proposed by credible guidelines involving translation, back translation, reconciliation of translated and back-translated version to produce a synthesized finalized version and followed with testing the synthesized version on a small group of a sample. The committee sat again in the final stage to produce the final version before embarking on a pilot test. The final translated Malay language version of WAI-S to indicate the targeted population of counsellor supervisor. Six experts evaluated the face and content validity of the translated instrument. The validity for the construct is predominantly reported as good and acceptable. A total of 30 respondents answered the questionnaire to determine the reliability. WAI-S Malay language version reliability is reported using Cronbach's Alpha with an excellent value of .94. The translation and adaptation processes of WAI-S into the Malay language were done accordingly and the WAI-S Malay version is valid to be used for further studies.

Key words: counselling supervision; supervisor; working alliance

I. INTRODUCTION

The original version of the Working Alliance Inventory for Supervision by Bahrick (1990) is an adapted version of the Working Alliance Inventory by Horvath and Greenberg (1989). Recently, WAI has also been adapted to measure working alliances in other relationships such as the coach-athlete relationships (Myhre & Moen, 2017). Meanwhile, in determining working alliance in the supervisory relationship, Bahrick (1989) changed the terms 'therapist' and 'patient' in the original version of WAI by Horvath and Greenberg (1989) to 'supervisor' and 'trainee'. The instrument was developed to measure the strength of working alliance in a supervisory relationship. A parallel version for supervisor and trainee was available. Both versions of the Working Alliance inventory for supervision for supervisor (WAI-S) and trainee (WAI-T) have been used widely in measuring working alliance in supervision (Akkurt et al., 2018; Park et al., 2019). However, to date, there has been a limited reference on the adaptation of WAI-S into the Malay language. Nevertheless, the need to adapt WAI-S into the Malay language is relevant due to the extensive development of counselling supervision in the country.

In a therapeutic relationship, a good rapport within a conducive and therapeutic environment is developed at the beginning of the session to ensure a smooth session development. The concern about building a good rapport in a helping relationship is extended to the discussion of the supervisory relationship (Watkins, 2014) and in the coaching relationship (Myhre & Moen, 2017). Furthermore, the term supervisory relationship that is also referred to as working alliance (Pearce et al., 2013) explains the elements of collaboration between a supervisor and a supervisee in a supervisory relationship. In addition, previous researches have adapted instruments measuring working alliance into other languages such as Korean (Son, Kang & Lim, 2006), French (Corbière et al., 2006),

Arabic (Zawawi & Al-Ali, 2014), Spanish (Andrade-González & Fernández-Liria, 2016) and Norwegian (Myhre & Moen, 2017). Hence, measuring working alliance is compelling in determining the quality of the supervisory relationship between the supervisor and the supervisee. Based on the premise, it is pertinent to adapt an extensive instrument into the Malay language for the use of determining the quality of a supervisory relationship in Malaysia.

As for WAI-S, three subscales constituted the inventory are Goal, Task, and Bond (Bahrick 1990; Horvath & Greenberg, 1989). These subscales represent directly the components of the working alliance model proposed by Bordin (1983) which are mutual agreement on task, goals and emotional bond. Each subscale consists of 12 items that represent the perception of the supervisors of the goals, tasks and emotional bonds that describe distinctive features of the supervisory relationship. However, from the inter-rater agreement, raters were unable to make a distinction between statements relevant to goals versus supervisory task (Bahrick 1990). As a result, Bahrick (1990) reported the adapted version of WAI-S consist of two factors which are Bond and Goals/ Tasks. Recently, WAI-S has been reported with one factor which represents the inventory itself (S.Keil, 2016; Shaffer & Friedlander, 2017). Therefore, it is considered fair to adapt WAI-S for Malay language speakers as an initiative to foresee the quality of a supervisory relationship in counselling supervision in Malaysia particularly.

1.1 Supervisory Working Alliance

Supervisory working alliance is considered one of the most studied conceptualizations of a supervisory relationship (Ladany, 2014) that contemplated the foundation of a supervision process (Enlow et al., 2019). The strength of a supervisory working alliance displayed by Bordin's 1983 model of a supervisory working alliance which is built by mutual agreement on Goal, Task and Bond mirrored the quality of a supervisory relationship (Bernard & Goodyear,

2014; Bordin, 1983; Efstation et al., 1990; Enlow et al., 2019; Riechel et al., 2018; Watkins, 2012). Furthermore, Holloway (1995) and Beinart (2004) acknowledged the three elements that are crucial in maintaining a strong supervisory relationship which are the relationship interpersonal structure on power and involvement, the development of the relationship and the supervision contracts. At the beginning of a supervisory relationship, the supervisor and supervisee develop a more structured relationship that heads towards a less complex, informal relationship (Bordin, 1983; Holloway, 1995) as they reach understanding, strong bonding and completion of the tasks during supervision. Eventually, effective counselling behaviours among the supervisee were observed within a supervisory relationship that displayed a positive interaction (Riechel et al., 2018).

Supervisory working alliance has been comprehensively studied in many areas including counselling supervision. Numerous studies indicated the connection of supervisory working alliance to counsellor training and career counsellor supervision (Parcover & Swanson, 2013) self-disclosure (Miller, 2016), evaluation of the supervisor (Shaffer & Friedlander, 2017) and supervision satisfaction (Fisher et al., 2017; Park et al., 2019). Most of the studies focused on the perspectives of the supervisees (Akkurt et al., 2018; Fisher et al., 2017; Miller, 2016; Nor Mazlina Ghazali, 2015; Nor Mazlina Ghazali et al., 2016; Parcover & Swanson, 2013; Park et al., 2019; Shaffer & Friedlander, 2017). However, Park et al. (2019) and Bhat and Davis (2007) included the perspectives of the counsellor supervisors in their studies on working alliance. Park et al. (2019) in a study using a meta-analysis method strongly indicated the isomorphism phenomenon that is related to the supervisory working alliance between the supervisor and the supervisee and between the supervisee and the client of the counselling session. Therefore, the discovery created an awareness of the importance of evaluating the working alliance from the perspective of the supervisor. The next

question is, how do we measure the working alliance from the perspective of the supervisor in a local context, particularly in Malaysia?

Measuring the supervisory working alliance has been done extensively using various versions of instruments (Andrade-González & Fernández-Liria, 2016; Bahrick, 1990; Efstation et al., 1990; Horvath & Greenberg, 1989; Myhre & Moen, 2017; Tracey & Kokotovic, 1989). Under those circumstances, recognition of the importance of a strong working alliance between a supervisor and a supervisee has contributed to the identification of criteria of effective supervision. Subsequently, from the establishment of the Working Alliance Inventory (Horvath & Greenberg, 1989), Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) (Efstation et al., 1990), and Working Alliance Inventory (Bahrick, 1990), there has been growing interest in developing an instrument to measure supervisory working alliance. In a recent study, Pearce et al., (2013), developed Supervisory Relationship Measure (SRM) to measure the supervisory working alliance in a supervisory relationship. This effort has indicated the importance of measuring the working alliance in a supervisory relationship within a local context. Therefore, adapting one of the renowned and validated establish measures (Bastos et al., 2014) seems cost-effective and relevant in contributing to the advancement of counselling supervision in Malaysia.

1.2 Counselling Supervision in Malaysia

Counselling supervision is yet to be named as one of the main focus areas of counselling in Malaysia. The practice of counselling supervision is mainly within the context of counselling education and training in a various institution that offers counselling program. Among the accredited institution by the Malaysia Board of Counsellors includes public universities, private universities and teacher training colleges. The list of the accredited institutions continues as the Malaysia Board of Counsellors actively accrediting the institutions that fulfilled the requirements and standards

that have been outlined by the control body. The total credit hours for practicum is 3 and for the internship is 6. Each credit hour comprises 6 hours per week for 14 weeks (Lembaga Kaunselor Malaysia, 2016). Completion of 3 credit hours of practicum comprises of a minimum 252 hours practicum with 96 hours face to face interaction with clients is required for the counsellor trainees to accomplish. In addition, a counsellor trainee is required to fulfil the completion of 6 credit hours of internship that comprises a minimum of 504 hours internship with 192 hours of face-to-face interaction with clients to be entitled to registration with the Malaysia Board of Counsellors. Counsellor trainees will be observed by supervisors appointed by the faculty. Meanwhile, a site supervisor at the setting will also be appointed. The supervisors are to carry the role of a gatekeeper (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004, 2014) to guide, evaluate and determine the competency of the trainee. Therefore, establishing a good relationship is crucial to ensure both parties are committed to fulfilling their tasks during the supervision. Any dearth during the supervision process may result in unwanted conflicts in the supervisory relationship and affect the effectiveness of the supervision.

The process of counselling supervision in Malaysia is usually divided into three phases which are pre supervision, during supervision and post-supervision (Mohd Zarawi Mat Nor, 2014, 2016). Building a relationship between a supervisor and supervisee begins as early as during the pre-supervision phase where the students were introduced to their respective supervisors during the practicum and internship briefing session. The introduction session is followed by a small group discussion or meeting where the supervisor shares his or her vision of the supervision process, modes and frequency of interaction and communication and tasks that the students need to fulfil. Other than that, the supervisor also stated the rules and ethics that the trainees need to follow during their practicum and internship. The agreement between both parties has met the

criteria of mutual agreement of a supervisory relationship (Bordin, 1983; Holloway, 2014). The fact that a supervisory relationship is a triadic relationship (Bernard & Goodyear 2004, 2014), imposed the idea of the importance of contribution and commitment from all parties that affect the effectiveness of the relationship. The same scenario applies to the scenario of counselling supervision in Malaysia.

Besides, there have been various guidelines for the supervisors in Malaysia to conduct their supervision (Rafidah Aga Mohd Jaladin et al., 2012). The supervision process is carefully catered to the requirements stated in the guidelines produced by the institution. For example, other than committing to Malaysia Board of Counsellors requirements, regulations, standards and rules for practicum and internship, a counsellor trainee from education faculty or teacher training college will need to complete practicum requirement for teaching of academic subjects. Therefore, elements of consideration, understanding is critical in helping the student to develop positively as a competent counsellor as well as completing requirements for graduation. Counselling graduates that passed the requirements by the Malaysia Board of Counsellors are eligible to serve in public sectors, private sectors, education institutions and Non-Government Organization. The scope of their prospective clients varies from young children, primary and secondary school students, adults, elderly and refugees. Therefore, determining the status of the working alliance between the supervisor and the supervisee may contribute to establishing practices that promote a strong working alliance and adherence to the roles of an effective supervisor.

1.3 Research Objectives

This research aims to adapt and validate Working Alliance Inventory for Supervision (Supervisor) by Bahrick (1990). The adapted Malay language version of WAI-S in the Malay language is known as *Soal Selidik Ikatan Kerjasama Penyeliaan-Penyelia (SSIKP-P)*. The primary intention of the adaptation process

is to occupy the need to adapt the instrument to be used in the Malay language for the supervisors.

II. METHOD

2.1 Research design

The research was carried out as a descriptive study involving 30 samples that were chosen randomly among the population of counselling supervisors in higher education institutions in Malaysia. Initially, the processes of translation and validation of WAI-S were done according to proper strategies that were suggested by Beaton et al. (2000), Guillemin et al. (1993), Ramli Musa et al. (2007) and World Health Organization (2019). By combining strategies of translating and adapting an instrument, one may use various strategies possible in doing so as Gjersing et al. (2010) mentioned that there is no universal agreement on how to adapt an instrument for use in another cultural setting. The translation processes were conducted by a team of experts consisted of 10 members including guidance and counselling experts, two Malay language experts, a registered counsellor and the authors.

Following the translation process, the face and content validity are determined to provide evidence that the adapted SSIPK-P measures the content that it is supposed to measure (Yaghmaie F., 2003). Therefore, a group of expert panels was appointed to examine the face and content validity of SSIKP-P using the Content Validity Index (CVI). The expert panels consisted of six members as suggested by Yaghmaie F., (2003). They were from Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM), Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI), Universiti Malaysia Terengganu (UMT) and Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS). Professionals' background and experience in counselling and psychology were the criteria considered in the selection of the experts.

2.2 Adaptation process of the WAI-S

WAI-S consists of 36 questions rated on 7 point Likert scales ranging from 1 (Never) to 7 (Always). The higher the scores, the stronger

supervisory working alliance is likely (Bahrick 1990). Prior to the process of translation and adaptation, permission was obtained from the original author of the Working Alliance Inventory for Supervision (Bahrick, 1990) through email communication. First, committee members of experts were appointed. The members are two English language experts, two guidance and counselling experts, two Malay language experts, a registered counsellor and the authors which include the researcher and two supervisors.

To begin with, two experts in language and counselling who have no background knowledge of the original instrument WAI-S translated the WAI-S from the English language to the Malay language. They were instructed to do a conceptual translation rather than a literal translation to establish the actual meaning of the sentences that suit the local context (Kee Pau et al., 2017). Next, the translated version of WAI-S was translated back to its original language by another two experts in language and counselling. The two versions of translated and back-translated WAI-S were then reconciled and evaluated by the committee members to produce a synthesized Malay version of WAI-S.

In the next step, the synthesized Malay language of WAI-S was sent for a validity evaluation by six experts in counselling and psychology. Once the validation process was complete, the committee reviewed the expert comments and produced a finalized version of translated and validated version of WAI-S called *Soal selidik Ikatan Kerjasama Penyeliaan-Penyelia* (SSIPK-P). This is followed by a pre-test with a small group of respondents to ensure the SSIKP-P is comprehendible within the targeted population. Finally, SSKIP-P was conducted in a pilot study involving 30 counselling supervisors from higher education institutes that offer training in first degree counselling programs for the purpose of reliability testing.

2.3 Participants

The population of this study is the counselling supervisors for the first degree counselling program in Malaysia's Higher Education Institution. The participants were selected from 10 higher education institutions that offer a first degree program in counselling that includes three teacher training institutes, six public universities, and one private university. Permission from the respected institutions was permitted prior to the study. A total of 30 participants were involved in answering the questionnaire.

2.4 Questionnaires

The questionnaire consists of four demographic questions and 36 questions of SSIKP-P. The distribution of the questionnaire was done by electronic mail that includes the link to the Google form of the questionnaire. The SSIKP-P consists of 36 questions rated on 7 point Likert scales ranging from 1-*"Tidak Pernah"* (originally 'Never') to 7-*"Selalu"* (originally 'Always').

2.5 Validity test

The validity study for SSKP-P was done by referring to its face validity and content validity The content validity of the WAI-S Malay version was evaluated using the Content Validity Index (CVI) (Hashimah Md. Yusoff et al., 2018; Lynn, 1986; Polit & Beck, 2006; Polit et al., 2007; Ramlan Mustapha, 2017). The experts determined the degree to which the instrument contains the sample items that measure the construct (Polit & Beck, 2006). Each expert evaluated the items based on a four-point ordinal scale of 1 = "Not Relevant", 2 = "Somewhat relevant", 3 = "Quite relevant", and 4 = "Highly relevant". The selection of a four-point scale is to ensure a neutral and ambivalent midpoint will be avoided (Lynn, 1986; Polit & Beck, 2006).

Average points were calculated and divided with the number of experts to determine the Item Content Validity Index (I-CVI). Each item rated 1 or 2 is given a score of 0, and items rated 3 or 4 are given a score of 1 (Salbiah

Mohamed Salleh@Salleh et al., 2019). Meanwhile, the proportion of items given a rating of 3 or 4 by the experts determined the Scale Content Validity Index (S-CVI).

III.FINDINGS

3.1 Demographic analysis

Four demographic questions were related to the supervisor's professional background. The supervisors were asked about their length of experience as a full-time counsellor, length of experience as a counselling supervisor, types of supervisor training that they have and the length of the supervisor training. Most of the respondents had experience as a full-time counsellor for 1 to 5 years (33.3%). Meanwhile, 26.7% of the respondents had experience as a full-time counsellor for 16 to 20 years and 20.0% of them had the same experience for 6 to 10 years. Other than that, the rest of the respondents had experience of between 11 to 15 years (10.0%) and more than 20 years (10%).

3.2 Validity of SSIKP-P

Six experts reviewed the instruments and agreed that the format of the instrument is appropriate, the items measure the domain, the language is comprehendible, the size of the font is readable, the meaning of every item, the objectives and the instructions are clear, and the spellings are correct. Overall, the experts agreed that the instrument fulfilled the listed requirements and is aligned with the objectives. The S-CVI of the instrument is 0.97, and this is an acceptable value with six experts (Lynn, 1986; Polit & Beck, 2006). Meanwhile, the I-CVI of each item also recorded at least a minimum acceptable value of 0.8 (Polit & Beck, 2006).

3.3 Reliability of SSIKP-P

Reliability analysis is conducted to determine the internal consistency of WAI-S Malay version. Analysis of the Cronbach's Alpha value was used to determine the reliabilities or internal consistency of the WAI-S Malay version. The result of the internal consistency coefficients for the scale was excellent (Cronbach's α = .94) for this sample, indicating an ideal internal consistency for research purposes (Johnson & Christensen, 2008).

IV. DISCUSSION

Careful measures are required in adapting a widely used instrument to be used in different languages and cultures. It is crucial to ensure that adaptation procedures allow the maintenance of the instrument's intended meaning and minimizing differences particularly in semantic, linguistic, psychometric and psychological levels (Hambleton & Jong, 2003). However, there are no agreed standardized methods in adapting an instrument (Gjersing et al., 2010; Gudmundsson, 2009). Therefore, the process of adapting WAI-S into the Malay language has integrated steps and strategies known in adapting an instrument by Beaton et al. (2000) Guillemin et al. (1993), Ramli Musa et al. (2007) and World Health Organization (2019). In addition, the procedures of adapting WAI-S into the Malay language have fulfilled eight criteria that Gudmundsson (2009) has outlined to justify the translated version of instrument usage. The eight criteria were selecting instruments with consideration of its reliability and validity, selecting qualified translators, selecting qualified experts with subject matters, applying proper methods of adaptations, applying proper methods of checking bias, applying proper methods in pilot testing, administration and scoring and performing validation studies (Gudmundsson, 2009).

From the beginning of the process, the team focused on conceptual translation rather than literal translation by involving Malay language speakers who are also experts in both English language and counselling. This will allow minimal time consumed in producing a translated version of the instrument as the experts were already familiar with the terms used in the instrument in English and Malay language. The process of translating WAI-S also has implemented the most common translation methods of translation and back translation (Gudmundsson, 2009). Moreover, after the reconciliation of the translated and

back-translated version, the experts and the authors gathered to produce the harmonized version of the instrument. The involvement of the experts during this stage has minimized the editing that needs to be done after the instrument was validated by the experts. Nevertheless, comments and suggestions by the experts who validated the instruments were considered. Notwithstanding the consideration, no items were needed to be retracted from the instrument. Thus, a comprehensive discussion among the experts and authors was very important in adapting a culturally accepted instrument for the Malay language speakers.

Significantly, adapting WAI-S into the Malay language is relevant to current trends and the need for the growth of counselling supervision field in Malaysia particularly. Initially, various originally English language working alliance measures have been translated into other languages such as Korean (Son, Yoo et al., 2006), French (Corbière et al., 2006), Arabic (Zawawi & Al-Ali, 2014), Spanish (Andrade-González & Fernández-Liria, 2016) and Norwegian (Myhre & Moen, 2017). In fact, various foreign language translated versions of working alliance measures have shown acceptable internal consistency as listed in Table 1 below:

Table 1. *Comparison of internal consistency of original English language version of working alliance measures and translated into foreign language versions*

English language version	*Cronbach's Alpha* of English language version	Translated foreign language	*Cronbach's Alpha* for translated version
Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee(WAI-T) (Bahrick, 1990)	.93 (Bhat, & Davis, 2007)	Korean (Son, Yoo et al., 2006)	.92
Working Alliance Inventory (Horvath & Greenberg, 1989)	Client: .93 Counsellor: .87	Spanish (Andrade-González, & Fernández-Liria, 2016)	WAI-P: .96 WAI-T: .97
Short Version-Working Alliance Inventory (Tracey & Kokotovic, 1989)	Client Task: .90 Bond: .92 Goal: .90 General: .98 Therapist Task: .83 Bond: .91 Goal: .88 General: .95	French (Corbière et al., 2006) Norwegian (Myhre & Moen, 2017)	Client Task: .64 Bond: .77 Goal: .67 General: .88 Therapist Task: .86 Bond .78 Goal: .81 General .93 Coach Task: .80 Bond: .80 Goal: .62 General: .88
Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI-T) (Efstation et al., 1990)	Trainee scales Total: .95	Arabic (Zawawi, & Al-Ali, 2014)	Trainee scales Total .96

These studies have proven the feasibility of translating instruments measuring working alliance for international participants from different language backgrounds. Without a doubt, WAI-S has been recognized as one of the prominent instruments in measuring supervisory working alliance (Park et al., 2019). Therefore, adapting WAI-S to be used in research involving counsellor supervisor is appropriate. The usage of WAI-S in studies involving Malaysian counsellor supervisors will also help in better understanding the supervisory working alliance mechanism in Malaysian culture. Eventually, adapting WAI-S into the Malay language will also encourage the practice of exchanging knowledge of findings from local research with experts from around the world (Hambleton & Jong, 2003) and uphold the growth of counselling supervision in Malaysia.

Nevertheless, the translated Malay version of WAI-S also aims to aid in the insight of the Malaysian counsellor supervisor's perception of the supervisory working alliance. The initiative began as a response to examining the working alliance in a supervisory relationship. However, the fact that there is a very limited reference of the existence of an instrument to measure working alliance in the Malay language triggered the idea of adapting a widely used instrument, Working Alliance Inventory-Supervision by Bahrick (1990). Furthermore, the need to assess working alliance from the perspective of a supervisor has brought attention to adapting an instrument parallel to the supervisee's version. The continuous effort in the inclusion of supervisor's perspectives began from Holloway and Wampold (1984) when they examined the supervisor's response towards supervision interview. In 2013, Pearce et al., (2013) published Supervisory Relationship Measures (SRM) that is reported may predict the supervisor's satisfaction. Therefore, aligned with the continuous effort of examining the supervisors' perspective in Malaysia particularly, the WAI-S Malay language version is produced.

The internal consistency of this adapted instrument is reported as good (α = .94). Although Bahrick (1990) did not report a comprehensive reliability analysis of the instrument (Tangen & Borders, 2016), numerous studies indicated an acceptable internal consistency of WAI-S exceeding 0.90 (Bhat & Davis, 2007; Ladany et al., 1999; Mehr et al., 2015). These consistent findings have proven that WAI-S is a reliable instrument. Therefore, the reported internal consistency of this adapted WAI-S added a significant discovery that contributed to the possibility of WAI-S usage in a different language. Other than that, Bahrick (1990) discovered a high inter-correlation among the subscales; Goal, Task and Bond that shows multicollinearity among the subscales (Akkurt et al., 2018; Inman & Ladany, 2008). Therefore, it has resulted in the usage of a total score in determining the strength of the working alliance (Akkurt et al., 2018; Bahrick, 1990; Bhat & Davis, 2007; Mehr et al., 2015; Sweeney, 2014). Indeed, the administration of WAI-S Malay language version also considered this matter and for this reason, the scoring followed the suggested method by the respective research.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Admittedly, WAI-S Malay language version has few limitations. The production of WAI-S Malay language version is solely an adapted version of the original version of WAI-S. In the future, researchers may look into the possibility of integrating research methods qualitatively and quantitatively to develop an instrument based on findings from the local perspectives. A Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) is also proposed to future researchers in determining the variables that represent the construct of WAI-S Malay version. An extended Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) may also be beneficial to provide information on the factors structure of the measure. Further research on criterion validity should also be done for comparison with other instruments that measure supervisory working alliance. Other than that, measuring supervisory relationships can also be

expanded in other fields and viewpoints. Therefore, by allocating more comprehensive literature, better understandings of supervisory working alliance can be achieved. Last, but not very least, this study involved a minimum number of respondents that eventually limits the probability of more extensive analysis. Hence, it is preferred for future researchers to conduct comprehensive scale research involving more participants from counselling supervisors or other fields.

In a nutshell, this research has contributed to the production of a systematically translated version of WAI-S into the Malay language known as SSIKP-P to match the local context. WAI-S Malay version has been validated and proven to be a reliable instrument to be used among the population of counsellor supervisors. Nevertheless, the instrument has a high potential in contributing to the progression of counselling supervision practices among the counsellor supervisors in Malaysia respectively.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

1. Akkurt, M. N., Ng, K. M. & Kolbert, J. (2018). Multicultural discussion as a moderator of counseling supervision-related constructs. International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 40(4), 455–468. doi:10.1007/s10447-018-9337-z

2. Andrade-González, N. & Fernández-Liria, A. (2016). Spanish adaptation of the Working Alliance Inventory-Short (WAI-S). Current Psychology, 35(1), 169–177. doi:10.1007/s12144-015-9365-3

3. Bahrick, A. S. (1990). Role induction for counselor trainees: Effects on the supervisory working alliance. The Ohio State University.

4. Bastos, J. L., Duquia, R. P., González-Chica, D. A., Mesa, J. M. & Bonamigo, R. R. (2014). Field work I: Selecting the instrument for data collection. Epidemiology and Biostatics Applied to Dermatology, 89(6), 918–923. doi:10.1590/abd1806-4841.20143884

5. Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F. & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the Process of Cross-Cultural Adaptation of Self-Report Measures. SPINE, 25(24), 3186–3191.

6. Beinart, H. (2004). Models of supervision and the supervisory relationship and their evidence base. In Fleming (Ed.) & Linda Steen (Ed.). Supervision and Clinical Psychology Theory, Paractice and Perspectives, (pp. 36–49). Canada: Brunner-Routledge.

7. Bernard, J. M. & Goodyear, R. K. (2004). Fundamental of Clinical Supervision. Boston: Pearson Allyn and Bacon.

8. Bernard, J. M. & Goodyear, R. K. (2014). Fundamentals of Clinical Supervision. Essex, England: Pearson Education Limited.

9. Bhat, C. S. & Davis, T. E. (2007). Counseling supervisors' assessment of race, racial identity, and working alliance in supervisory dyads. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 35(2), 80–91. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.2007.tb00051.x

10. Bordin, E. S. (1983). Working alliance based model of supervision. The Counseling Psychologist, 11(1).

11. Corbière, M., Bisson, J., Lauzon, S. & Ricard, N. (2006). Factorial validation of a French short-form of the Working Alliance Inventory MARC. International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research, 15(1), 36–45. doi:10.1002/mpr

12. Efstation, J. F., Patton, M. J. & Kardash, C. A. M. (1990). Measuring the working alliance in counselor supervision. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37(3), 322–329.

13. Enlow, P. T., McWhorter, L. G., Genuario, K. & Davis, A. (2019). Supervisor'supervisee interactions: The importance of the supervisory working alliance. Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 13(3), 206–211.

14. Fisher, A. K., Simmons, C. & Allen, S. C. (2017). An experiential approach to clinical supervision training : A mixed methods evaluation of effectiveness an experiential approach to clinical supervision training. Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 36(5), 460–476.

15. Gjersing, L., Caplehorn, J. R. & Clausen, T. (2010). Cross-cultural adaptation of research instruments language, setting, time and statistical considerations. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 10(13).

16. Gudmundsson, E. (2009). Guidelines for translating and adapting psychological instruments. Nordic Psychology, 61(2), 29–45. doi:10.1027/1901-2276.61.2.29

17. Guillemin, F., Bombardier, C. & Beaton, D. (1993). Cross-cultural adaptation of Health-Related Quality of Life Measures: Literature review and proposed guidelines. J Clin Epidemiol, 46(12), 1417–1432.

18. Hambleton, R. K. & Jong, J. H. A. L. de. (2003). Advances in translating and adapting educational and psychological tests. Language Testing, 20(2), 127–134.

19. Hashimah Md. Yusoff, Mohd. Isa Hamzah & Shahlan Surat. (2018). Kesahan dan kebolehpercayaan Instrumen Indeks Pemupukan Kreativiti dalam Pengajaran Guru dengan Elemen Islam (I-CFTI) berdasarkan pendekatan model Rasch. Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia, 43(3), 77–88.

20. Holloway, E. L. (1995). Clinical Supervision: A Systematic Approach. Sage Publications.

21. Holloway, E. L. (2014). Supervisory roles within systems of practice. In C. Edward Watkins (Ed.) & Milne (Ed.). The Wiley International Handbook of Clinical Supervision. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

22. Holloway, E. L. & Wampold, B. E. (1984). Dimensions of satisfaction in the supervision interview. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

23. Horvath, A. O. & Greenberg, L. S. (1989). Development and validation of the Working Alliance Inventory. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36(2), 223–233.

24. Inman, A. G. & Ladany, N. (2008). Research: The state of the field. In Hess (Ed.), Hess (Ed.), & Hess (Ed.). Psychotherapy supervision; Theory, research and practice, (pp.500–517). John Wiley and Sons Inc.

25. Johnson, B. & Christensen, L. (2008). Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches. California: Sage Publications.

26. Kee Pau, Ahmad Jazimin Jusoh, Asma Perveen, Hapsah Md Yusof & Hsin-Ya Tang. (2017). The Malay Version of CCAPS-62 : A preliminary investigation of translation , validity , and reliability. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 7(3), 635–652.

27. Keil, M.S (2016). Mindfulness in clinical supervision: Impacts on the working alliance and supervisees' perceptions of self efficacy. Azusa Pacific University.

28. Ladany, N. (2014). The ingredients of supervisor failure. Journal of Clinical

Psychology, 70(11), 1094–1103. doi:10.1002/jclp.22130

29. Ladany, N., Lehrman-Waterman, D., Molinaro, M. & Wolgast, B. (1999). Psychotherapy supervisor ethical practices : Adherence to guidelines, the supervisory working alliance and supervisee satisfaction. The Counseling Psychologist, 27(3), 443–475.

30. Lembaga Kaunselor Malaysia. (2016). Piawaian dan kelayakan latihan kaunselor. Lembaga Kaunselor Malaysia.

31. Lynn, M. R. (1986). Determination and quantification of content validity. Nursing Research, 35(6), 382–386.

32. Mehr, K. E., Ladany, N. & Caskie, G. I. L. (2015). Factors influencing trainee willingness to disclose in supervision. Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 9(1), 44–51.

33. Miller, M. I. (2016). Supervisory alliance and psychology interns disclousers. Pepperdine University.

34. Mohd Zarawi Mat Nor. (2014). Supervisors ' practice in conducting supervision on guidance and counselling teachers in primary school. Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan, 4(1), 73–84.

35. Mohd Zarawi Mat Nor. (2016). The process of practicum supervision on guidance and counselling teachers in primary school : A case study. EDUCARE International Journal for Educational Studies, 9(August), 1–12.

36. Myhre, K. & Moen, F. (2017). The effects of the coach-athlete working alliance on affect and burnout among high level coaches. Central European Journal of Sport Sciences and Medicine, 18(2), 41–56. doi:10.18276/cej.2017.2-05

37. Nor Mazlina Ghazali. (2015). Influence of supervisory relationship and supervision contextual factors on supervision outcomes among trainee counsellors. Universiti Putra Malaysia.

38. Nor Mazlina Ghazali, M. Taha, Wan Marzuki Wan Jaafar, A. Anuar, F. Yahya & M. A. R.Roose. (2016). Influence of supervisory relationship and satisfaction among trainee counselors in practicum process. Journal of Cognitive Sciences and Human Development, 2(September), 85–95.

39. Parcover, J. A. & Swanson, J. L. (2013). Career counselor training and supervision: Role of the supervisory working alliance. Journal of Employment Counseling, 50(4), 166–178.

40. Park, E. H., Ha, G., Lee, S., Lee, Y. Y. & Lee, S. M. (2019). Relationship between the supervisory working alliance and outcomes: A meta-analysis. Journal of Counseling and Development, 97(4), 437–446.

41. Pearce, N., Beinart, H., Clohessy, S. & Cooper, M. (2013). Development and validation of the supervisory relationship measure: A self-report questionnaire for use with supervisors. British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 52(3), 249–268.

42. Polit, D. F. & Beck, C. T. (2006). The content validity index : Are you sure you know what ' s being reported ? Critique and recommendations. Research in Nursing and Health, 29, 489–497.

43. Polit, D. F., Beck, T. & Owen, S. V. (2007). Focus on research methods is the cvi an acceptable indicator of content validity ? Appraisal and recommendations 459–467. doi:10.1002/nur

44. Rafidah Aga Mohd Jaladin, Noh Amit & Melati Sumari. (2012). Counseling supervision for counselor development in Malaysia. International Journal of Social Science, 3(1), 1–21.

45. Ramlan Mustapha. (2017). Reka bentuk Model Integriti Akademik Berasaskan

Penghayatan Rohani. Universiti Malaya.

46. Ramli Musa, Mohd Ariff Fadzil & Zaini Zain. (2007). Translation, validation and psychometric properties of Bahasa Malaysia version of the Depression Anxiety and Stress Scales (DASS). ASEAN Journal of Psychiatry, 8(2), 82–89.

47. Riechel, M. E. K., Webber, W., Chae, K. B., Kayanan, P. J. & Miller, D. (2018). Trust development in the supervisory working alliance. The Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision, 11(1). Retrieved from https://repository.wcsu.edu/jcps/vol11/iss1/8

48. Salbiah Mohamed Salleh@Salleh, Jamil Ahmad, Mohd Aderi Che Noh & Adibah Abdul Latif. (2019). Teknik pelaporan Indeks Kesahan Kandungan (CVI) dalam kajian sains sosial. In Mohd Awang Idris (Ed.), Mohd Sobhi Ishak (Ed.), Azanin Ahmad (Ed.), & Aszunarni Ayob (Ed.). Penyelidikan Sains Sosial Aplikasi Teori dan Metodologi, (pp. 7–19). Kuala Lumpur: Penerbit Universiti Malaya.

49. Shaffer, K. S. & Friedlander, M. L. (2017). What do "interpersonally sensitive" supervisors do and how do supervisees experience a relational approach to supervision? Psychotherapy Research, 27(2), 167–178.

50. Son, E. J., Yoo, S.-K., Kang, J.-Y. & Lim, Y.-S. (2006). The influence of the supervisory working alliance and the supervisee's experience level on his or her role difficulties and supervision satisfaction. Korean Journal of Counseling and Psychotherapy, 18(4), 695–711.

51. Sweeney, J. R. (2014). Site supervisor self-disclosure : A shared experience. University of Tennessee

52. Tangen, J. L. & Borders, D. A. (2016). The supervisory relationship: A conceptual and psychometric review of measures. Counselor Education and Supervision, 55(3), 159–181.

53. Tracey, T. J. & Kokotovic, A. M. (1989). The factor structure of the Shortened Working Alliance Inventory. Psychological Assesment, 1(3), 12.

54. Watkins, C. E. (2012). Psychotherapy supervision in the new millennium: Competency-based, evidence-based, particularized, and energized. Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy, 41(3), 193–203.

55. Watkins, C. E. (2014). Clinical supervision in the 21st century: Revisiting pressing needs and impressing possibilities. American Journal of Psychotherapy, 68(2), 251–272. doi:10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.2014.68.2.251

56. World Health Organization. (2019). WHO Process of translation and adaptation of instruments. Management of substance abuse, https://www.who.int/substance_abuse/research_tools/translation/en/ [25 February 2019].

57. Yaghmaie F. (2003). Content validity and its estimation. Journal of Medical Education, 3(1), 25–27.

58. Zawawi, J. A. & Al-Ali, T. M. (2014). Jordanian counselor trainee's self-efficacy and performance: The impacts of supervision. European Journal of Business and Social Sciences, 3(2), 69–93. Retrieved from http://www.ejbss.com/recent.aspx