Response to reviewers:  
  
Thank you for the time you spent providing constructive feedback on this project. We have addressed reviewer suggestions below and entered changes in the document. We have attached two versions - one with tracked changes and the other finalized. Given the discrepancy between reviewers, we tried to address suggestions from individual reviewers without changing the fabric of the paper so much that it would alter the initial positive reviews of reviewers A and C.   
  
Add page numbers - we added page numbers to the document  
  
APA issues - we corrected all APA, citation-order errors  
  
Stating the research question more explicitly (reviewers B & C): We added a clear statement of purpose, along with two specific research questions.   
  
Explain the methodology (Reviewer B) - [explaining statement boundaries, double-coding, reliability/consensus coding, use one coding scheme with statistical comparison)   
  
1) We discussed how essays were divided into statements/nodes.   
2) Our rationale for double-coding was expanded. Some nodes were assigned two themes to maintain contextual integrity, acknowledging that sometimes two themes were nestled in the same context.   
3) We further defined how consensus coding occurred, which would eliminate the need for reliability, since all coders agreed.   
4) This is a preliminary qualitative analysis of outcomes. Furthermore, our participants provided reflective statements that resulted in different variables (themes) in the pre- and post-analyses data sets, so it would be difficult to track change statistically. While there seemed to be a trend for specificity of statements over time, the change in type of statements makes this difficult to model statistically.   
  
Conclusion (Reviewer A) - Expand limitations and future research; highlight concerns with current methodology and participants. (Reviewer B) - move information about benefits for students and instructors to literature review section. (Reviewer C) - discuss generalizability across other disciplines.   
  
A) Limitations and future directions were expanded. We addressed the need for further study of each of the interactants (i.e., students in the class, students serving as instructional interns, and faculty). We also discussed the implications to pursuit of PhD and other academic careers. Finally, we discussed implications for clinical practice.   
  
To address concerns with methodology. We addressed concerns (see above) regarding consensus coding methods.   
  
B) Move information about benefits for students and instructors to the literature review section. We believe that even though there is not empirical data here, the anecdotal outcomes still fit best here because they are pertinent to our future directions. Furthermore, it really begins to look at student and faculty implications through the lens of the instructional interns.   
  
C) Discuss generalizability across other disciplines. We added a statement in the conclusion section and supported this generalization to other disciplines given outcomes that are consistent with previous research.
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