————. In press. Grammar and electronic communication. In *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*, ed. Carol A. Chapelle. Malden, MA, Oxford, and Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Jucker, Andreas H. 1993. The discourse marker *well:* A relevance-theoretical account. *Journal of Pragmatics* 19, no. 5:435–52.

Kolko, Beth. 1995. Building a world with words: The narrative reality of virtual communities. *Works and Days* 13, nos. 1 and 2:105–26. acorn.grove.iup.edu/en/workdays/toc.html.

Longacre, Robert E. 1983. *The grammar of discourse.* New York: Plenum Press.

Minsky, Marvin. 1975. A framework for representing knowledge. In *The psychology of computer vision*, ed. Patrick Henry Winston, 211–77. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Peterson, Eric E., and Kristin M. Langellier. 2006. The performance turn in narrative studies. *Narrative Inquiry* 16, no. 1:173–80.

Sbisà, Marina. 2007. How to read Austin. *Pragmatics* 17:461–73.

Schank, Roger C., and Robert P. Abelson. 1977. *Scripts, plans, goals, and understanding: An inquiry into human knowledge structures.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Searle, John R. 1989. How performatives work. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12:535–58.

Tannen, Deborah. 1979. What's in a frame? Surface evidence for underlying expectations. In *New directions in discourse processing*, ed. Roy O. Freedle, 137–81. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. Reprinted in *Framing in discourse*, 14–56. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

————. 1993a. Introduction. In *Framing in discourse*, 3–13. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

————. ed. 1993b. *Framing in discourse.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, Deborah, and Cynthia Wallat. 1987. Interactive frames and knowledge schemas in interaction: Examples from a medical examination/interview. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50, no. 2:205–16. Reprinted in *Framing in discourse*, 57–76. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Virtanen, Tuija. In press. Performativity in computer-mediated communication. In *Pragmatics of computer-mediated communication*, eds. Susan C. Herring, Dieter Stein, and Tuija Virtanen. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Werry, Christopher C. 1996. Linguistic and interactional features of Internet Relay Chat. In *Computer-mediated communication: Linguistic, social and cross-cultural perspectives*, ed. Susan C. Herring, 47–63. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

# 10

# Re- and Pre-authoring Experiences in Email Supervision

Creating and Revising Professional Meanings in an Asynchronous Medium

CYNTHIA GORDON AND MELISSA LUKE
*Syracuse University*

## Introduction

THIS ANALYSIS RESULTS from a collaborative, interdisciplinary research project undertaken by a communication scholar (Gordon) and a scholar in counselor education (Luke) to investigate the discourse of email supervisory communication in the context of student internships required as part of counselor education and training. Master's-level students enrolled in counseling programs complete internships at varying sites according to academic program (for instance, school counseling students intern in local schools, whereas mental health counseling students intern in community agencies, hospitals, or residential organizations). In addition to participating in onsite and in-class group experiences, interns also communicate with a supervising professor via a weekly email exchange. In these emails, interns describe their internship experiences, and share and reflect upon their thoughts and feelings regarding these experiences. The purpose of the supervisory exchanges is to track the internship activities and interns' development as counselors, and to facilitate interns' reflectivity, or their ability to critically analyze and consider their own professional performance. In responding to interns' emails, then, supervisors aim to provide opportunities for them to explore and expand their knowledge and skills so that they are better able to meet their professional responsibilities. Email supervision is thus a means of helping supervisees through their internships, but also a way of socializing them into professional identities and practices.

Our interest in email supervision is motivated broadly by two general issues. First, although supervision is a discursive phenomenon and a fundamental part of professional development, there is only a relatively small body of discourse analytic research examining this communication, especially in the context of counseling supervision. Second, although supervision via email is now a common practice, it remains understudied.

Our analysis is specifically motivated by our interest in a phenomenon related to the concept of "authorship," previously identified by Vásquez (2007) in her analysis of face-to-face supervision of language teachers. Analyzing narratives that novice

teachers told to their supervisors following a teaching observation, Vásquez found that supervisors at times "destabilized" and "reformulated"—or re-authored—novices' accounts as a means of facilitating development of professional competence and identities. For example, one supervisor reevaluates a novice teacher's perspective on events, likely to facilitate the apprentice's creation of a positive self-image (Vásquez 2007, 664). We found a similar phenomenon in our data.

We develop the concept of re-authorship by drawing on Bakhtin's (1981, 1986) notion of dialogue, and by examining different forms of re-authorship in the asynchronous context of email. We also extend the concept of re-authorship beyond revising narrative discourse, and beyond communication about actual internship behaviors. Our analysis identifies two primary forms of re-authorship—reinforcement and reframing—and one related form, advice giving, which we understand to be pre-authorship, stemming from Bakhtin's perspective on utterances as oriented to both past discourse and anticipated future discourse. Key linguistic devices in these collective processes of co-authorship include uses of adjectives and adverbs, professional jargon, first-person-plural pronouns, repetition, discourse markers, and speech acts, especially praising, agreeing, and encouraging or suggesting. We suggest that re- and pre-authorship together serve as productive means of accomplishing widely recognized supervision goals in the context of email. These goals pertain to socializing internship (counseling) behaviors, professional thought processes, and appropriate supervisory communication behaviors (in this case, email communication behaviors).

In what follows we review previous research in two areas: the discourse analysis of expert-novice interaction and Bakhtinian understandings of authorship. We then introduce our dataset and analytic methods and we turn to our analysis, wherein we delineate and give examples of the three forms of co-authorship we identified, demonstrating how each one functions in the context of supervisory communication, in particular regarding socialization. We show how supervisors *reinforce* (and thereby re- or co-author) supervisees' email communication behaviors (such as their selection of message topic), professional counseling behaviors (such as how they interact with clients), and emotional responses to their internship experiences. We demonstrate how, through reframing, supervisors attempt to reshape and adjust, and in particular expand, interns' understandings of their professional experiences and practices. We suggest that supervisors' advice giving is usefully conceptualized as *pre-authorship*, and serves as a means of directing interns' future professional discourse and behaviors. We conclude by summarizing our findings regarding co-authorship in the context of supervisory email discourse, and discuss their implications in relation to the fields of counseling and supervision, and the discourse analysis of computer-mediated communication (CMC).

## Background

Our analysis is grounded in previous discourse analytic work on expert-novice communication and in theorizing related to the notion of authorship. There is a small but rich body of research in discourse analysis examining the details of expert-novice communication in what can be described as supervisory contexts. These include in-

teractions between experienced and novice medical practitioners (Atkinson 1999; Erickson 1999); MA and PhD students and their thesis and research advisors (Chiang 2009; Goodwin 1994; Vehviläinen 2009); and expert and novice teachers, including teaching assistants (Burdelski 2004; Vásquez 2004, 2007; Vásquez and Urzúa 2009; Waite 1992, 1993). These studies focus on a variety of issues, most notably how the asymmetry inherent in such encounters affects the production of speech acts such as assessments and directives by experts and how expert-novice socialization occurs. They collectively take the broad perspective we do—that supervision cannot productively be analyzed as a "one-way phenomenon" because both parties are responsible for co-constructing the encounter (Waite 1993, 697).

Two studies are especially relevant for our research. First, Burdelski's (2004) analysis of supervisor-teaching assistant weekly meetings examines narratives that teaching assistants wrote in their teaching journals and how supervisors responded in face-to-face meetings. He observes that teaching assistants wrote open-ended narratives; supervisors used closed-ended narratives to assign meanings to assistants' stories, advise them as to future courses of action, and justify their own positions. Supervisors thus contributed substantially to assigning meanings to teaching assistants' experiences. Second, Vásquez (2007) analyzes novice teachers' oral narratives that were recorded in nineteen post-teaching observation meetings. She finds that novice teachers tell two primary types of narratives—"reflective" narratives, which focus on internal states (thoughts and feelings) of the teacher, and "relational" narratives, which concentrate on interaction between individuals in the story. In both narrative types the novice teachers tended to formulate their "moral stance" (Ochs and Capps 2001) in uncertain terms. Most important for our purposes, Vásquez (2007) demonstrates that the supervisors play a pivotal role in shaping novices' accounts, sometimes challenging and re-authoring novices' narratives. For example, one teacher, in telling a narrative about an in-class activity she conducted, evaluates her own performance negatively throughout, including in her coda: "So at that point in time I finally—I realized this [the activity] isn't—this isn't gonna wrap up that well, I don't think." Her supervisor disagrees: "No it did," and explains why, reconstructing the story's resolution in a way that affirms the teacher's competence. As Vásquez explains, the teacher's "perspective on and evaluation of the same events are revised, or 're-authored'" by the supervisor (2007, 664).

Although neither Burdelski nor Vásquez explicitly draws on Mikhail Bakhtin's theories in their work, they are fundamental to our analysis. Bakhtin's (1981, 1986) dialogic view of language highlights the "already-spoken-about" quality of utterances (Morson and Emerson 1990, 136–39); this means, as Morson and Emerson explain, "Every time we speak, we respond to something spoken before and we take a stand in relation to earlier utterances about that topic" (137). O'Connor and Michaels's (1993, 1996) analysis of "revoicing" in teacher-student classroom interactions draws on this perspective: teachers reformulate what students say to accomplish tasks such as clarifying and explicating students' contributions, crediting students with ideas, and advancing class discussion. Applying Bakhtin's thinking to Vásquez's findings on re-authorship would yield a related understanding: When supervisors revisit novice teachers' prior discourse, they "take a stand" toward this discourse; in other words,

they lend their voices to—and re-author—its content and meaning while also accomplishing the supervisory task of socialization.

Re-authorship is closely related to Tannen's (2007) analysis of repetition in discourse and her reconceptualization of reported speech as "constructed dialogue": speakers draw on others' words for their own purposes, and in recreating and recontextualizing them, construct new meanings (they do not merely report). Our understanding of re-authorship is also connected to Duranti's (1986) broader understanding of co-authorship in interaction and in particular to the notion of audience as co-author. (Both Tannen and Duranti explicitly draw on Bakhtin in their theorization.) We adopt the overarching idea that revisiting a topic is a kind of repetition that enables participants to share authorship of others' words and actions, and to reshape them retrospectively (see also Erickson's 1986 discussion of retrospective and prospective recipient design). As Tannen (2007) explains, repetition fundamentally alters the meaning of the "original," and "old" language thus becomes something new, and multivoiced.

We likewise build on Bakhtin's observation that utterances not only always respond to prior utterances, but also metaphorically "look forward" to others. As Bakhtin (1986, 94) explains, a speaker constructs an utterance "while taking into account possible responsive actions, for whose sake, in essence, it is actually created." Thus, we also consider how the email messages anticipate future messages and other actions; each email can be thought of as a "link" in "the chain of speech communication" (Bakhtin 1986, 94). A similar understanding of supervisor-supervisee face-to-face interaction has been proposed: Oliver, Nelson, and Ybañez conceptualize it as a dialogic co-construction, noting that "interaction among supervisor and supervisees impacts each of the people in the room, which then impacts the next interaction, which then impacts each of the people in the room and so on" (2010, 61).

Oliver, Nelson, and Ybañez's (2010) research also points to a wider phenomenon in the research on expert supervision of novices: it examines face-to-face encounters. However, email is increasingly used for supervisory communication; it remains understudied generally, but especially within discourse analysis. Recent exceptions are Crossouard and Pryor (2008, 2009) and a pilot study we conducted (Gordon and Luke 2012; Luke and Gordon 2011). Crossouard and Pryor (2008, 2009) use discourse analysis to examine email messages exchanged between a cohort of first-year professional doctorate students and their supervisor (a "doctoral tutor" who provided them assessment and feedback). Their 2008 study emphasizes how students are encouraged to conceptualize learning as entailing the development of researcher identities; the 2009 analysis focuses on how the tutor's feedback moves between different levels of authority (such as directly criticizing versus making suggestions), and between addressing program requirements and students' priorities.

Our previous research (Gordon and Luke 2012; Luke and Gordon 2011) investigates email messages exchanged between eight school counseling interns and their supervising professor (these data have been integrated into the current study's larger database). An assumption within the counseling and supervision literature is that supervision works to develop professional identities of interns (Auxier, Hughes, and Kline 2003); Luke and Gordon (2011) show how this identity development is facil-

itated linguistically through supervisors' and interns' uses of repetition, pronouns, and labeling. Gordon and Luke (2012) expand these findings by conceptualizing professional identity development as mutual negotiation of interns' "face" (Goffman 1967): We explore the construction of interns' knowledge and competence, as well as the establishment of their connections to and autonomy from others in their "community of practice" (Lave and Wenger 1991). In so doing, we highlight how uses of repetition, pronouns, discourse markers, and "constructed dialogue" (Tannen 2007) accomplish the facework that we suggest underlies professional identity development.

We build on this previous research while addressing re-authorship in email supervision. In the spirit of Herring's (2004) computer-mediated discourse analysis (CMDA), we consider the asynchronous, text-based context of email in our investigation, while also viewing "online behavior through the lens of language" (339).

## Data

Our data were collected from students enrolled in their capstone internship of a master of science counseling program at a university in the northeastern United States. Students were informed that the parameters of the internship course required email supervision, but participation in our study was optional. Twenty-three students enrolled in five different internship classes over three semesters agreed to participate. They were supervised by one of three supervisors: a professor (Luke), or one of two advanced PhD students who also agreed to participate in our study.

Of the twenty-three participating students, eighteen were women and five were men. Ages of interns ranged between twenty-four and fifty-two years old; nineteen interns identified as Caucasian domestic students, and four identified as international students of color. The first supervisor (Supervisor A) self-identifies as an African American, female, PhD student with two years of experience. Supervisor B self-identifies as a white, female professor; at the time of the study she had eight years of supervisory experience. Supervisor C self-identifies as a gay, white, male PhD student with four years of supervisory experience.

Students received the following instructions regarding communication with their supervisor:

> You are required to send one email per week to your email supervisor. Your email can address any part of your school counseling internship experience. The message need not be more than a few lines in length. The purpose of the email communication is for you to reflect on the aspects of your school counseling internship that had your attention during the past week.

Email exchanges, transferred to Word documents, ranged in length from five to thirty-eight single-spaced pages per student.

The supervisor answered each student email within forty-eight hours, which is standard protocol (see Clingerman and Bernard 2004). The supervisors were directed to respond to the core theme of each email, and to complete the communication cycle in their emails (rather than initiating new topics).[1] The goals of supervision, as outlined by Bernard (1979, 1997) and Lanning (1986), include developing interns' skill behaviors (intervention); encouraging reflection on case progression and their

own decision making (conceptualization); facilitating self-reflection on emotion, culture, and related issues (personalization); and teaching appropriate record-keeping and collegial engagement (professional behavior). These goals, we find, are accomplished in part thorough supervisors' re-authoring and pre-authoring practices.

## Analysis
Our analysis is data driven: We repeatedly read the data to identify patterns, and drew on the discourse analytic and counselor education and supervision literatures to collaboratively make sense of emerging patterns. Our previous pilot study also sensitized us to the presence of re-authorship (see Gordon and Luke 2012; Luke and Gordon 2011). We used NVivo 9, a qualitative data analysis software program, to assist us in data management and organization—including both the storage of the emails by intern, supervisor, semester, and area of counseling, and the coding of textual material into categories that we developed. Intercoder agreement was achieved by collaboratively coding a subset of the emails, then coding the remainder independently and cross-checking our coding of each passage, as suggested by Creswell (2009). In line with many previous CMDA studies, we couple "counting and coding" with qualitative consideration of individual examples (see Herring 2004). We identify two broad ways that the supervisors re-authored interns' experiences: we call these reinforcing and reframing. We discuss each in turn, with examples. This is followed by our discussion of the related phenomenon of pre-authoring.

### Re-authoring through Reinforcing
The first strategy we discuss is supervisors' re-authoring through reinforcing. Supervisors reinforce by revisiting a topic or theme introduced by the intern and supporting the intern's reported behaviors, experiences, or understandings. Repeating—whether on the lexical, syntactic, thematic, or other level—fundamentally alters the meaning of what is repeated, blending voices together in a new context, following Bakhtin (1981, 1986) and Tannen (2007). This achieves what we understand to be co-authorship of interns' discursive understandings of their experiences. In 260 examples of reinforcing we note three types: supervisor reinforcement of interns' email communication behavior (such as their selection of topics to discuss), reinforcement of professional internship-site behavior (such as how they reportedly interacted with clients), and reinforcement of interns' emotional responses to their experiences.

Reinforcing Email Behavior    Supervisors reinforce interns' supervisory email behavior, including what they chose to report and reflect upon in their messages, as well as how. They thereby reinforce the interns' professional behavior (here, how, and what to communicate to the supervisor) as well as the personalization (or emotional reflection) element of supervision.

Supervisors often use the speech act of thanking to reinforce interns' communicative choice to send the messages, as well as to confirm interns' appropriate provision of information. For example, Supervisor C begins a message to Jaime with "Thank you for your email," and Supervisor A responds to Dwayne's first message

with "Thank you for your first email of the course." In this way they affirm the students' supervisory communication behavior of having sent a message.

Praising is also used to reinforce interns' supervisory communication choices, including what information to share in the messages and how to reflect appropriately upon internship experiences. For example, in response to a message sent by Mei Li, Supervisor B begins by remarking, "WOW Mei Li, what a powerful reflection," thus bolstering the intern's abilities to identify, discuss, and reflect upon meaningful issues in in-depth, productive ways. Similarly, Supervisor C responds to a message from Xao by indicating, "You raise some interesting issues," and to a message from Christine with "The issue you raise around power is an important one." Adjectives such as "powerful," "interesting," and "important," coupled with thanking and praising, retrospectively reflect upon and positively reinforce interns' email communication in the context of supervision.

Reinforcing Professional Counseling Behavior    Supervisors also reinforce behaviors interns describe as having exhibited at their internship sites, thus accomplishing the intervention (or skill behavior socialization) aspect of supervision.

The speech act of praising plays a role in this reinforcement. For example, in response to Belinda's description of how she handled a panicked teenage client at her internship site, a drug treatment center, Supervisor A writes, "I think all in all Belinda you did a good job with this client." In response to Paula's description of how she gives her clients tasks to accomplish prior to their meetings with her, Supervisor A remarks, "Love the homework piece that you are giving to your clients." Supervisor B responds to Danielle's email describing how she used group interactions with students at her school to encourage students to see her individually by stating, "It is clear that your work was successful in generating individual appointments with students, which it sounds like was one aim."

In these examples, supervisors use positive assessments, including adjectives such as "good" and "successful," to affirm behaviors interns reportedly exhibited vis-à-vis clients. They thus co-author interns' understandings of their counseling behaviors.

Reinforcing Emotional Responses    As is relevant to the goals of supervision, supervisors reinforce interns' reported thoughts and feelings. Within the culture of counseling, thoughts and feelings are considered to be of great value; counselors need to deal with their own "stuff" (or issues) in order to be good counselors. In this spirit interns frequently express their emotions, and supervisors frequently reinforce them.

When Alyssa expresses feelings of guilt and concern after withdrawing from the internship class (and therefore having to leave her internship site), Supervisor A reassures her: "With any major transition, it is normal to feel out of sorts." Similarly, when Noreen describes her feelings about leaving her internship site at the end of the semester, Supervisor B responds, "It makes sense that you're working through a very mixed reaction to the endings with your clients." When Rachael expresses her worry about the fact that multiple client cancelations reduced the amount of practice hours she was able to gain, Supervisor B remarks, "Of course,

you're concerned about getting your direct client hours when you have 4 no shows in one day." Supervisor C reinforces Adrian's description of feeling exhausted in a different way, stating, "Having been a part-time student for my first few years in the doc program, I can very much identify with the weariness you have noted in this week's email."

Supervisors normalize interns' described emotions through various strategies, including through adjectives such as "normal" and adverbs such as "of course"; by suggesting that interns' responses are appropriate or "make sense"; and even by creating parallels between interns' experiences and their own. Supervisors thus revisit and validate, and thereby re-author, interns' described emotions.

In summary, in reinforcing interns' email communication behaviors, their counseling behaviors, and their emotional reactions, supervisors do not blatantly "change" intern conceptualizations, instead they "repeat" or "reiterate" them. Nevertheless, we suggest reinforcing is usefully conceptualized as a kind of re-authorship, through a Bakhtinian lens. Supervisors take what an intern composed in a previous email and recontextualize it in their own email in agreement and support, lending their perspective and voice to the discourse on the topic.

### Re-authoring through Reframing

The second kind of re-authoring we identify can be described as "reframing," following Tannen and Wallat's (1993, 59) understandings of framing as related to "structures of expectation," and of "interactive frame" as referring to "frames of interpretation" that participants use to understand situations, events, and utterances. What Vásquez (2007) conceptualizes as re-authoring in her study of face-to-face expert-novice discourse is akin to our description of reframing, which we suggest is one particular kind of re-authoring. When reframing occurs, supervisors invoke new understandings of interns' experiences. They do this by labeling interns' behaviors and experiences using professional jargon and concepts from professional practice, and by encouraging different interpretations of emotions and events. Thus, reframing often encourages interns to view their experiences not only through the lens of the profession, but also from multiple perspectives. Considering multiple perspectives and understandings, sometimes referred to as "both-and" (an in-group term), is an especially important part of reflection; it thus works toward interns' professional development in terms of conceptualization (reflection on case development) and personalization (self-reflection and awareness). (The "both-and" notion is reminiscent of discourse analytic understandings of linguistic strategies as potentially having multiple simultaneous meanings; see Tannen 1996.) In reframing, supervisors offer alternative "definition[s] of what is going on [or what went on] in interaction" (Tannen and Wallat 1993, 59).

In our first example of reframing, Christine emails her supervisor at the end of week 4 of her internship about her feelings about missing some internship hours for personal reasons earlier in the semester. (The extracts we present in what follows appear in their original forms; spelling, grammar, capitalization, etc., are not changed. We use [sic] to acknowledge spelling and other errors in the messages. Such errors seem to reflect a level of relative informality in the messages. They could also reflect comfort between interns and supervisors.)

(1a) Christine → Supervisor C

Due to some events that occured [sic] unexpectedly in my life, I had to take a few hours out of interning a couple weeks ago. I feel now that I am behind (and I am, if you consider my overall hours), and all I feel like I do is intern! Overall, I am not concerned I will not get my hours, but I have to make sure I definitely stay on top of them. Also, I have to be careful of missing time unless I really need to.

In response to this message, the supervisor offers an adjusted understanding of Christine's situation:

(1b) Supervisor C → Christine

It sounds like the stress of the semester and your many requirements are beginning to get to you! Having spoken to you earlier, I do understand some of those unexpected and traumatic events that you are referring to (i.e. car break-in, deaths, etc.). I think for me it raises the issues that we aren't counselors in a vacuum, but also have our own life's situations and expectations to handle. For me, I think this email raises the importance of counselor self-care, as well as thinking about priorities.

While reinforcing Christine's emotions through showing understanding ("I do understand"), Supervisor C also subtly reinterprets Christine's unexpected life events, loss of hours, and feelings of being "behind" as the result of "stress of the semester and your many requirements"; Christine herself did not use the word "stress" or the phrase "many requirements," instead referring to "some events" and "hours." The supervisor also normalizes her experiences, creating a shared perspective using "we" and "our": he remarks, "We aren't counselors in a vacuum, but also have our own life's situations and expectations to handle." This situates Christine's described experiences within the broader professional field, as something presumably all counselors must manage as part of their professional role. Thus her worries are reframed from individualized to an integral counseling issue. Supervisor C also offers a new overarching meaning to her email message: Her described experiences are understandable and addressable through two professional activities—prioritizing tasks to address conflicting demands, and taking care of oneself (which is referred to in the profession using the term "self-care").

In offering these different and multiple understandings, the supervisor opens up new ways of thinking for Christine. He segments these alternate conceptualizations using "for me" and "I think," both of which can be understood as discourse markers (following Scheibman 2009 regarding "for me," and Kärkkäinen 2003 regarding "I think"); discourse markers frequently play a role in transitioning between alternative reframings in our data.

In the next example Tamara describes her surprise regarding her clinical site director's attention to case notes (written records of a counselor's work with an individual client), and the supervisor offers an even more complex reframing. Tamara frames case notes as being unsatisfying because they are too vague; she attributes this vagueness to "CYA" ("cover your ass"), which refers to the idea that documentation protects providers of counseling services.

(2a) Tamara → Supervisor B

All interns were asked to bring casenotes [sic] to supervision this week by our clinical director here. We reviewed these in individual supervision. I was surprised by the extent to which there is concern about CYA. Every word seems to matter. I tend to choose my words carefully anyway, and did not feel overly criticized. I found the review helpful, but the emphasis on writing notes at this agency seems to be about avoiding opinion and being vague. I tend to include too much detail. It is a fine line between writing the kind of note that the agency expects and actually writing something that will be useful to myself or another therapist in the future. I certainly don't remember the details from one session to the next. I feel that we can be so concerned with CYA and vagueness that we might fail to write anything substantial.

In her response, the supervisor reconceptualizes the intern's experiences with case notes (bolded font has been added to draw attention to phrases of particular analytic importance):

(2b): Supervisor B → Tamara

You seem to have encountered some of **the tensions that can exist between individual attempts at being therapeutic and the beauracratic [sic] attempts to minimize liability.** Of course, you address how counterintuitive this is, because like yourself, detailed records would seem to provide better quality and continuity of care. I sense some disappointment about how much **agency effort and resources are being expended regarding the exact word selections** used in notes, when in your opinion there might be far better uses of this collective energy, including your own. Lastly, it seems like part of **your surprise might result from a lack of communication** as to why this focus or the rationale for the vagueness and omission of any clinical judgment in case notes.

The supervisor's response reframes the intern's description of her experiences. The supervisor does not address what might be Tamara's underlying concern about avoiding words that might get a counselor in trouble (this could be owed to supervisors' general reluctance to be too critical of site-specific practices). She does, however, suggest multiple understandings of the phenomenon, and in so doing, accomplishes reframing. First, she suggests that what Tamara described can be conceptualized as "tensions" that exist between an individual therapist's efforts at effective therapy and a bureaucratic interest in liability. Second, she focuses on what she perceives to be the intern's concern about seemingly excessive attention to word choice by reconceptualizing it as the more technical and encompassing issue of expenditure of "agency effort and resources." Third, using the discourse marker "lastly," she suggests that the intern's reaction can be understood as related to a "lack of communication" around the whole issue of case notes. In these ways, Supervisor B reframes the intern's complaints and concerns about case notes within the field of professional practice, where individual therapists must work within bureaucratic requirements and with limited resources, and

where communication is a pivotal issue. (It is possible that in doing so she has overlooked Tamara's actual concern, although we cannot be certain.)

These examples are 2 of the 279 instances of reframing we identified. Although some of the "shifts" in frame are more extreme than others, in all, supervisors attempt to portray a different understanding—and often multiple possible understandings—of an internship site or emotional experience. The use of discourse markers like "lastly" and "for me" play a role in this; other examples of reframing involve prefacing by discourse markers such as "however," "in addition," "moreover," and "that being said" (see Gordon and Luke 2012 for a discussion of "that being said" in supervisory communication). Supervisors also use professional names and categories to socialize interns into shared professional—rather than idiosyncratic—conceptualizations of certain kinds of situations. Thus, concern about lack of internship hours due to personal life events is reconceptualized as a normal professional matter that causes stress and brings to mind the importance of self-care. Likewise, concern about vagueness in case notes is re-authored by the supervisor, becoming the broader professional issues of therapeutic/bureaucratic tensions and worksite communication.

### Pre-authoring

Finally, we examine a phenomenon that we suggest is closely related to re-authoring: pre-authoring, or advice giving by the supervisors, which occurred frequently (we identify 342 examples). Although previous research on re-authorship in supervisory contexts does not encompass this concept, we suggest that pre-authoring is a closely related interactional pattern when considered within Bakhtin's dialogic understanding of social interaction.

Prior research finds advice giving to be a careful process in expert-novice interactions (Vásquez 2004). We similarly find that advice is typically provided indirectly and with attention to social face, occurring through speech acts such as encouraging and suggesting (rather than ordering). However, more interesting for our purposes is the larger idea that supervisors' email messages not only "look back" to interns' past messages, but also "look forward" to the future. Example 3 is a case of pre-authoring; the supervisor attempts to affect the intern's thinking about two topics—her understanding of her client's progress, and of the intern's own "self-efficacy" (a professional term which refers to belief in one's own capabilities).

(3) Supervisor B → Linda

I encourage you to consider the meaning you attribute to your clients' development or lack thereof, as well as how/where/when/why your self-efficacy increases/decreases related to your work.

Supervisor B advises Linda to consider certain issues; she also can be viewed as even more indirectly advising her to think (and communicate) using such terms as "self-efficacy."

In the next example, the supervisor advises that the intern proactively learn about and test out new counseling techniques (interventions):

(4) Supervisor A → Martin

We can never have too many interventions under our belt so I definately [*sic*] encourage you to research and read more and don't be afraid to practice new interventions once you believe that it will fit the client(s) you are seeing.

Supervisor A encourages the intern as well as attempts to shape his future counseling behaviors. As in the previous extract, the supervisor may also be indirectly promoting (advising) the intern's use of professionally relevant terminology ("interventions," "clients").

In the next example, Supervisor C gives advice on internship emails; by socializing the intern into the expectations and norms of supervisory communication, he pre-authors the intern's future messages while also contributing to her professional development.

(5) Supervisor C → Belinda

Hi Belinda,

Seems like you have had a lot going on with different sessions. What would help me is if you focused on one client . . . discussed what the issues are for that client and then what awareness you are having of yourself. Also presenting reflection for me with that client.

In this example, the supervisor asks for a focus on one client (instead of a general discussion of many). He does not demand such behavior, but rather hints that that is what he wants ("What would help me is"). As part of this, he asks the intern to demonstrate self-reflection in the emails (conceptualization), an important component of counseling experience and practice and also a goal of supervisory communication.

Examples such as these capture how supervisors offer forms of advice to interns—they typically encourage, suggest, and recommend. This echoes prior research findings on the somewhat mitigated nature of expert-novice communication. Most importantly, they show how supervisors attempt to shape—to "pre-author"—interns' future thoughts and behaviors by advising, thus shaping future reflection and skill behaviors. In using professional jargon, they could be understood to be modeling proper understandings and uses of discipline-relevant terminology for the future. In their email messages, the supervisors both re-author and pre-author; they co-author interns' discourse, experiences, interpretations, and behaviors.

## Conclusion

We suggest that re- and pre-authorship, together constituting co-authorship, are useful in considering supervisory email communication. Although the concept of co-authorship resonates easily with face-to-face encounters (where a co-present "audience" [Duranti 1986] shapes the discourse), we find that it is relevant to email as well, especially when considered in the context of the supervisor's role: in a Bakhtinian spirit, we suggest that supervisors' messages respond to interns' emails and the past experiences described therein through reframing and reinforcing; they anticipate interns' to-be-experienced events (including future emails) as well through pre-authoring. In us-

ing various linguistic strategies in re- and pre-authoring, experts attempt to socialize novices through affecting their interpretations of past experiences, feelings, and professional behaviors, and through potentially affecting future behaviors—they become co-authors.

Our analysis represents an initial interdisciplinary exploration of email supervision as co-authorship; there remains much to be learned, for instance, about interns' uptake of supervisors' re- and pre-authoring. However, we believe our research at this stage contributes to three areas: the discourse of email supervision, co-authorship and supervision goals, and email as a co-constructed discursive phenomenon.

Our analysis identifies co-authorship patterns of email supervisory communication, outlining forms and functions of what we have called reframing, reinforcing (collectively, re-authoring), and pre-authoring. This deepens our understanding of the nature of supervisors' contributions to the authorship of interns' discourse and experiences, while also uncovering a range of discursive strategies that are used, including adjectives and adverbs, professional vocabulary items, repetition, and discourse markers, as well as speech acts, in particular praising, agreeing, and encouraging or recommending.

We identify re- and pre-authoring as means of pursuing goals of supervision (as presented by Bernard 1979, 1997; Lanning 1986): intervention, conceptualization, personalization, and professional behavior. By reinforcing interns' skills, behaviors, and internship activities, reframing their conceptualization of these within professional understandings, and advising future behaviors, supervisors accomplish the goals of intervention and professional behavior, encouraging appropriate counselor-client and collegial engagement. Reframing, reinforcing, and pre-authoring are also all used to facilitate self-reflection on emotion, culture, and related issues, which helps accomplish the personalization goal, by encouraging interns to become aware of their own experiences and viewpoints. Reframing and pre-authoring in particular are used to encourage reflection on case progression and decision making from professionally relevant perspectives (conceptualization). Thus, our research demonstrates how supervisors' discursive revision of interns' described experiences, as well as their anticipation of interns' future experiences, functions in pursuit of the professional socialization of novice counselors.

Finally, this study contributes in a small way to the development of a computer-mediated discourse analysis that is "informed by a linguistic perspective," making interpretations that are "grounded in observations about language and language use" (Herring 2004, 339). Specifically, it demonstrates the utility of applying interactive concepts such as co-authorship and a Bakhtinian perspective to asynchronous CMC. Doing so lends insight not only into how socialization occurs in this medium, but also into how seemingly "individually composed" email messages can be usefully conceptualized as being jointly constructed, and how various kinds of "co-authorship" phenomena occur in expert-novice discourse online.

and audience members at GURT 2011 for their feedback on earlier versions of this chapter. In addition, we greatly appreciate the comments and suggestions that we received from Deborah Tannen.

NOTE

1. The supervision response protocol consisted of the following: (1) if there were multiple themes within a student email, the supervisor attempted to identify and respond to the core theme; (2) the supervisor responded in a manner that completed the communication cycle; (3) the supervisor refrained from asking questions or opening up a new line of communication that could prompt a subsequent student response; and (4) as appropriate, the supervisor encouraged the student to raise certain topics in internship class or with their site supervisor. When the supervisor responses were sent to the students, the respective internship instructor was copied and she or he chose whether and how to address supervisory content within the class.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, Paul. 1999. Medical discourse, evidentiality and the construction of professional responsibility. In *Talk, work and institutional order: Discourse in medical, mediation and management settings,* eds. Srikant Sarangi and Celia Roberts, 75–107. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Auxier, C. R., Frances R. Hughes, and William B. Kline. 2003. Identity development in counselors-in-training. *Counselor Education and Supervision* 43:25–38.
Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays.* Eds. Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson. Trans. Michael Holquist. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
———. 1986. The problem of speech genres. In *Speech genres and other late essays,* eds. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, trans. Vern W. McGee, 60–102. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
Bernard, Janine M. 1979. Supervisor training: A discrimination model. *Counselor Education and Supervision* 19:60–68.
———. 1997. The discrimination model. In *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision,* ed. C. Edward Watkins Jr., 310–27. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
Burdelski, Matthew. 2004. Close- and open-ended narratives of personal experience: Weekly meetings among a supervisor and teaching assistants of a "Japanese language education practicum." *Linguistics and Education* 15:3–32.
Chiang, Shiao-Yun. 2009. Personal power in a power-full "I": A discourse analysis of doctoral dissertation supervision. *Discourse and Communication* 3:255–71.
Clingerman, Tamara L., and Janine M. Bernard. 2004. An investigation of the use of e-mail as a supplemental modality for clinical supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision* 44:82–95.
Creswell, John W. 2009. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Crossouard, Barbara, and John Pryor. 2008. Becoming researchers: A sociocultural perspective on assessment, learning and the construction of identity in a professional doctorate. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society* 16:221–37.
———. 2009. Using email for formative assessment with professional doctorate students. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 34, no. 4:377–88.
Duranti, Alessandro. 1986. The audience as co-author: An introduction. *Text* 6:239–47.
Erickson, Frederick. 1986. Listening and speaking. In *Languages and linguistics: The interdependence of theory, data, and application,* eds. Deborah Tannen, 294–319. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
———. 1999. Appropriation of voice and presentation of self as a fellow physician: Aspects of a discourse of apprenticeship in medicine. In *Talk, work and institutional order: Discourse in medical, mediation and management settings,* eds. Srikant Sarangi and Celia Roberts, 109–43. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior.* New York and Toronto: Pantheon.
Goodwin, Charles. 1994. Professional vision. *American Anthropologist* 96:606–33.

Gordon, Cynthia, and Melissa Luke. 2012. Discursive negotiation of face via email: Professional identity development in school counseling supervision. *Linguistics and Education* 23:112–22.
Herring, Susan C. 2004. Computer-mediated discourse analysis: An approach to researching online behavior. In *Designing for virtual communities in the service of learning,* eds. Sasha A. Barab, Rob Kling, and James H. Gray, 338–76. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Kärkkäinen, Elise. 2003. *Epistemic stance in English conversation: A description of its interactional functions, with a focus on "I think."* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Lanning, Wayne. 1986. Development of the supervisor emphasis rating form. *Counselor Education and Supervision* 25:191–96.
Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Luke, Melissa, and Cynthia Gordon. 2011. A discourse analysis of school counseling supervisory e-mail. *Counselor Education and Supervision* 50:274–91.
Morson, Gary Saul, and Caryl Emerson. 1990. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a prosaics.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
O'Connor, Mary Catherine, and Sarah Michaels. 1993. Aligning academic task and participation status through revoicing: Analysis of a classroom discourse strategy. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 24:318–35.
———. 1996. Shifting participant frameworks: Orchestrating thinking practices in group discussion. In *Discourse, learning, and schooling,* ed. Deborah Hicks. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Ochs, Elinor, and Lisa Capps. 2001. *Living narrative.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Oliver, Marvarene, Kay Nelson, and Kathy Ybañez. 2010. Systemic processes in triadic supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor* 29:51–67.
Scheibman, Joanne. 2009. Routinized uses of the first person expression *for me* in conversational discourse. In *Formulaic language (volume two): Acquisition, loss, psychological reality, and functional explanations,* eds. Roberta Corrigan, Edith A. Moravcsik, Hamid Ouali and Kathleen M. Wheatley, 615–38. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Tannen, Deborah. 1996. *Gender and discourse.* New York: Oxford University Press.
———. 2007. *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tannen, Deborah, and Cynthia Wallat. 1993. Interactive frames and knowledge schemas in interaction: Examples from a medical examination/interview. In *Framing in discourse,* ed. Deborah Tannen, 57–76. New York: Oxford University Press.
Vásquez, Camilla. 2004. "Very carefully managed": Advice and suggestions in post-observation meetings. *Linguistics and Education* 15:33–58.
———. 2007. Moral stance in the workplace narratives of novices. *Discourse Studies* 9:653–75.
Vásquez, Camilla, and Alfredo Urzúa. 2009. Reported speech and reported mental states in mentoring meetings: Exploring novice teacher identities. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 42:1–19.
Vehviläinen, Sanna. 2009. Student-initiated advice in academic supervision. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 42:163–90.
Waite, Duncan. 1992. Supervisors' talk: Making sense of conferences from an anthropological linguistic perspective. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 7:349–71.
———. 1993. Teachers in conference: A qualitative study of teacher-supervisor face-to-face interaction. *American Educational Research Journal* 30:675–702.