


The Importance of Showing Up (Virtually): A Reflection on Practice of an Online Doctoral Writing Community of Practice

Danielle E. Lorenz 
Faculty of Education
University of Alberta

Nicole Patrie 
Department of Public Safety
and Justice Studies
Grant MacEwan University

Faculty of Education
University of Alberta

Correspondence:

Nicole Patrie
Department of Public Safety
and Justice Studies
MacEwan University

Faculty of Education
University of Alberta
Email: [patrien2 \[at\] macewan.ca](mailto:patrien2[at]macewan.ca)

Abstract

Although online discourses about dissertation writing (i.e., *You Should be Writing* memes) offer students levity, they function in stark contrast to how dissertation writing is treated in real life. Canadian education scholars with PhDs have examined the student-supervisor relationship (McAlpine & Weis, 2000), collaborative writing spaces (Eaton & Dombroski, 2022; Ens et al., 2011), and the overall difficulties of the dissertation process (Bayley et al., 2012; Walter & Stouk, 2020), but we have yet to locate literature on the perspectives of Canadian education PhD students who have generated online communities of practice to engage in their dissertation writing. To obtain better understanding of our personal relationships to writing and virtual communities of practice, we established an online writing group during the summer of 2023 where we wrote our respective candidacy proposal and dissertation chapters while also reflecting on and responding to prompts about the process of writing. This reflection on our writing practice concludes that if PhD students feel un(der)supported by institutional writing communities, or if said communities are not available, constructing their own community will be beneficial to their writing goals.

Keywords: doctoral students, online communities, writing communities, faculties of education, dissertation



Authors retain copyright. Articles published under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC-BY) International License. This licence allows this work to be copied, distributed, remixed, transformed, and built upon for any purpose provided that appropriate attribution is given, a link is provided to the license, and changes made were indicated.

Introduction

Doctoral degrees are structured around particular milestones that the candidate is expected to meet at certain points during their program. In our specific doctoral program in Educational Policy Studies at the University of Alberta, students begin with completing coursework. From there, they compose and then defend a candidacy exam that explains their plan for their PhD research. Following the collection of data, students then draft their dissertation which also culminates in an oral defense. Each of these stages involves putting words down on a (virtual) page, because, as Pat Thompson (2021) explained, “writing is a crucial aspect of doctoral work” (para. 1).

You Should Be Writing

The dissertation, and therefore writing, is the focal point of education doctoral programs. We are beholden to institutional deadlines that dictate how much we produce, by when, and of what quality. Consequently, the need to write is commonly referenced throughout social media (i.e., *You Should be Writing* memes, accounts, and posts). Although these online discourses offer levity and occasional encouragement, they are simultaneously problematic: the sheer multitude of social media discourse reminding doctoral students that we need to be writing is inescapable, and, occasionally, a source of stress. For example, how can we take a break from writing on social media, only to be reminded, however humorously, that we should be writing? The near constant reminder of the work—writing—to be done increases feelings of guilt and shame (Lobo, 2015).

Being painfully aware that we should be writing, we sought out venues for support. However, for a variety of reasons, any writing group our university was organizing was inaccessible to us. We are both white settler cisgender women, we are both working full-time, and we are both first generation scholars. Nicole is a primary caregiver with two small children. Danielle is disabled and chronically ill. Our specific social realities did not make it possible to attend university-supported writing groups; however, we should mention that, to our knowledge, during summer of 2023 there was not a university-supported writing group for graduate students. The absence of writing groups that worked with our individual schedules in some ways paralleled what we were able to find about writing groups as they related to literature on Canadian faculties of education. For instance, there has been scholarship that focused on student-supervisor relationships (McAlpine & Weis, 2000), collaborative writing spaces (Eaton & Dombroski, 2022; Ens et al., 2011), and the overall difficulties of the dissertation process (Bayley et al., 2012; Walter & Stouk, 2020). These works assume that there is a larger structure in place that supports doctoral student writing in faculties of education, which we do not feel is representative of our own experience. We have found support and community with writing outside our faculty and institution through online writing initiatives, but in the summer of 2023, we were looking for something more tailored and more specific to our particular program.

In this paper we document our reflections on our self-organized writing group from summer 2023. We each had different specific writing tasks. Nicole wanted to complete a full draft of her research proposal. Danielle, who had already completed her candidacy exam and data collection, wanted to finish (re)writing her quantitative analysis chapter. She also said that “a ‘stretch goal’ in terms of ‘writing’” would be to (re)code her ten participant interviews. In general, we were guided by three goals: to complete a part of our PhD, to learn about our personal writing and research processes, and to share our learnings and reflections with others. The latter is what we intend to accomplish here.

Background

Communities of practice are groups created for the purpose of learning and developing knowledge on a specific topic (Wenger, 2001). What distinguishes our writing group from others—and enables the group to meet the definition of a community of practice—was our learning intention. We did not only gather to complete writing projects, but to learn about writing groups and personal approaches to writing, and to co-construct knowledge pertaining to the development and support of writing groups. Other research on doctoral writing in communities of practice focuses on identity development, as emerging scholars or writers, and involves the support and leadership of faculty members (Coffman et al., 2016; Tapia & Stewart, 2022). In contrast, we created this writing community of practice by ourselves, for ourselves.

While online writing groups became more prevalent during and following the onset of COVID-19, what has been accessible to the authors is limited. For instance, our institution offers 15-person virtual writing cafes, but no scheduled sessions allowed us to write “together” because of our respective employment and familial demands. Thus, as students in the same education department who recognized the need for community while writing, we elected to create our own virtual dual modality (synchronous and asynchronous) writing group and community of practice.

Design and Creation of the Writing Group

We created the writing group in the summer of 2023, to run from the beginning of June to the end of August. The group ran for 12 weeks, with an agreed upon synchronous time to meet each week. Membership was opened to other students in our department. Although we did occasionally have others join our synchronous writing sessions, the maximum number of people we had in any writing session was four. For the most part, it was just the two of us.

During each 2.5-hour session we would join Google Meets, greet each other, check in briefly, and then write. At the end of the session, we would check in again to chat about what each of us had completed during the session. The rest of the writing time was asynchronous; that is, we wrote when it suited our individual schedules. However, we did agree to meet up at other times if possible and would frequently invite each other to write.

Based on her experience in other writing groups, Danielle devised a series of prompts that we used to outline our goals for each writing session (synchronous or asynchronous) and reflect on what we accomplished in that session. This prompt is available in Appendix B.

Copies of the writing group Instructions/Landing Page are provided in Appendix A.

Reflections

In the end, we each achieved our writing goals. Nicole finished a full draft of her research proposal. Danielle ended up completing her “stretch goal” and was able to start writing her second chapter. Accordingly, we were pleased and surprised with our ability to reach these sweeping goals. We believe that our success in meeting our goals was directly connected to the accountability we established with each other through this community of practice. Having a dedicated time to meet each week ensured that both of us would show up (virtually) to write, even if we did not feel like writing that day. Furthermore, these weekly meetings gave us a chance to discuss the distractions and frustrations we had with the writing process in a way we feel we could not otherwise voice to our friends and family outside of academe.

Keeping a writing journal while participating in the virtual writing group was also crucial to our success. In many ways, the journals provided us with a place to locate our distractions, frustrations, successes, and progress. The journals enabled us to look back and fully grasp our shared success in meeting our large writing goals. Below, we briefly discuss some of the more common reflections that we noticed when reviewing our journal entries.

Struggles in the Writing Process

Both of us struggled with the task of writing, but in different ways. Some of the struggles we had were with our respective writing or writing adjacent tasks. For instance, Nicole wrote, “I need strategies for starting—but not stream of consciousness [style writing]—because then my experiences get mixed up in what I’m writing, and I need to focus on the literature” (Week 7). This representative quotation illustrates how Nicole was learning a lot about her personal writing processes. Throughout the 13 weeks, she attempted to use a number of common writing strategies to various degrees of success. Danielle—who has more writing experience than Nicole—noted that she preferred to engage in the act of writing rather than completing some of the preparatory work that is required: “I wish I was writing-writing and not planning-writing, but we can’t always just write, I suppose” (Week 12).

Noticing Progress

As we were writing, some of the comments we made in our reflective journals indicated that we were cognizant of the progress we had made in that individual session. Occasionally, progress was very tangible in the way of increasing word counts and creating new images: “I made six new visualizations and re-did one from yesterday. I have nine more to create and then I will be done the chapter. My word count also increased to 10,339 [from 10,295]” (Danielle, Week 4).

While some of our reflections indicated relief that certain tasks had been completed, other comments demonstrated that we were redefining our perspective of what the writing process looked like: “I’m seeing progress as not always having the outcomes you want—I want pages of a proposal, but I am also making progress by looking at these concepts and reading and reflecting on them” (Nicole, Week 2).

Emotions

At times, we struggled with how writing was going, and as a result some of our reflections revealed several negative emotions. The negative emotions we identified in our logs spanned a full range and included frustrated, annoyed, discomfort, panic, anger, exhaustion, pessimistic, dread, distracted, sadness, dejected, and doubtful. The two quotations below illustrate feelings of discomfort, doubt, exhaustion, and pessimism. Nicole indicated “I’m tired of opening a new document because the old one no longer feels right. I never expected to be faced with this sort of experience” (Week 3). Similarly, Danielle said “I still feel like I’m on the brink of getting stuck. I will see what I have by the end of the week, see about working through the discomfort and see if I need to call a meeting with [my supervisors]” (Week 2).

Although some of the writing process was difficult and resulted in negative emotions, there were also times when we felt really good about how our work was going: “I feel good. This was a hurdle I needed to overcome” (Nicole, Week 7). While the representative quotes we chose for this section refer to feeling “good,” our reflections included more descriptive emotions, such as excited, free, satisfied, hopeful, great, thankful, relieved, and refreshed. Most often, these

feelings were related to completing a task, especially those that we had been previously struggling with or dreading: “I am also feeling good that the chapter is completed, and that I was able to do so early (between 4 and 11 days early) without feeling compelled to work long hours to do so” (Danielle, Week 4). Or, more succinctly, “[I feel] Good. I feel like a scholar” (Nicole, Week 9).

Self-Encouragement

At times, it appeared that both of us used our reflective writing to provide ourselves encouragement about the work we were doing. This was especially true when we were feeling down or overwhelmed. Given that we each set quite large goals for a 12-week period, we needed to encourage ourselves to stick with it. For example, Danielle noted that she completed a dreaded task (re-coding) and was able to refocus on “real” writing: “But I did get this thing done. I think the break I am taking for the next two weeks will be instrumental in getting me re-centred on writing” (Week 7). As Nicole learned more about how she approached the writing process, she was able to encourage herself by learning about the writing skills she was developing: “[I’m] Unmotivated, but I know how to do [what I’m doing]. So, [it’s] less self-esteem shattering” (Week 7).

Distractions

As we came to learn while doing this work, there were multiple types of distractions that could lead us from focusing on our writing. In general, distractions for Nicole were household and family management, health concerns, email and social media, people returning to work, and general tiredness increasing susceptibility to distractions: “Yesterday I attempted to write but my mind was elsewhere, so I hope I can get it done today” (Week 10) demonstrates some of the impacts of these distractions. Danielle noted similar distractions in her journal with one significant exception: her two cats often required attention (e.g., feeding, physical affection, refereeing) during the times she wrote. Regarding the cats quarrelling over a particular sunbeam, she said “Cats fought twice more; once around 8:30 and again around 8:45. I suppose I have to control the sun moving forward” (Week 3).

General Thoughts

Through our reflections, we realized that the writing process was not entirely cyclical for either of us. We experienced ups, downs, successes, roadblocks, distractions, and bursts of energy—but in a seemingly random manner. However, at the same time, the writing group enabled us to ensure that we persevered and did not give up. It allowed us space to acknowledge the times where we did not necessarily want to be writing, but knew that we had to, and to see this particular phase of our doctoral work as necessary and temporary. Additionally, we were able to maintain momentum throughout the 12 weeks, in part due to combining asynchronous and synchronous writing, and the continuity of completing same writing prompts at each type of writing session. The writing prompts provided a location to place our struggles, achievements, and goals, particularly during asynchronous sessions. The prompts also enabled us to view the writing sessions, whether asynchronous or synchronous, as part of the whole writing group project.

Overall, our experience with this writing group suggests that if PhD students feel un(der)supported by institutional writing communities, or if said communities are not available, constructing their own community will be beneficial to their writing goals. More specifically, our

experience demonstrates the cyclical nature of writing and learning to write, the embeddedness of emotions, and the usefulness of group support.

Conclusions

Much of the literature on doctoral student writing groups outside of the Canadian education departmental context involves significant involvement and leadership from faculty members or the institution. These writing groups are usually either restricted to students who the leading faculty are directly supervising (e.g., Colombo & Rodas, 2023; Gagné et al., 2024) or are very broad and include the entire university community (e.g., García Marrugo & Anson, 2024; Hodge & Murphy, 2023). Our reflections on our self-organized group stand apart from these because we did not have the same institutional support as other doctoral students. However, as outlined below, some literature does parallel other aspects of our self-directed writing group.

Kozar and Lum (2015) noted the importance of asynchronous and synchronous writing in the context of a writing group at a large Australian metropolitan university. Utilizing the asynchronous/synchronous structure worked best for us because it provided a workable amount of flexibility and responsibility to each other. Although other writing communities focused on full-day, in-person writing sessions (e.g., Hodge & Murphy, 2023), the structure of the writing group we created made us accountable to both our writing and the other person.

Our reflections on self-encouragement, progress, and struggling with the writing process echo some of the less tangible outcomes of writing group participation. That is, participation in writing groups helps to develop confidence and autonomy as emerging scholars (Guerin & Aitchison, 2024). Similarly, participating in writing retreats increases self-efficacy and writing self-regulation of PhD students (Vincent et al., 2023). These outcomes of participation in writing groups validate the perspective that learning to write is a social and cultural activity that should occur in a collaborative setting (Kimar & Aitchison, 2018).

Finally, as we noted earlier, many of the writing groups, retreats, or programs that are reported in scholarly literature receive significant support and leadership from institutional structures, and increasing institutional writing support for people in doctoral studies is a common recommendation (e.g., Abamuad, 2023; Olejnik, 2023). Kumar and Aitchison (2018) critiqued the reality of graduate writing support, articulating a disconnect between writing as an essential part of graduate studies, the growth of campus writing centres, and the increasing workload of faculty supervisors. Furthermore, they noted that the perceived isolation of writing and research stands in direct opposition to their conjecture that learning occurs in social contexts, where people can become “networked scholar[s]” (p. 362). A similar critique is offered by Beasy et al. (2020), whose peer-facilitated Write-In program was financially supported by the students union and not the core university. The authors drew connections to the increasing individualization and responsabilization of systemic issues, such as inadequate supports. They also highlighted how a peer-facilitated program achieves the immediate need of writing support but doing so inadvertently enables the university and its actors to continue to pass on providing students with needed support. The parallels between the work of Kumar and Aitchison as well as Beasy and colleagues and that of our own experience—both last summer and as this academic year progresses—are not lost on us. We were compelled to create this writing group because we could not access the supports that we needed. Unless there is significant intervention by university administrators, graduate students will likely continue to find themselves in a similar position.

Recommendations

Despite the problematic structure of academe, we nonetheless want to acknowledge the utility of student-led writing groups to encourage sustained writing, both asynchronously and synchronously. This multi-faceted approach allows for participants to remain accountable to themselves and each other and become more confident in their ability to write. It also facilitates developing skills to continue organizing self-directed groups in light of gaps or misalignments in institutional support structures. For graduate students to succeed with their writing, not only must there be some kind of dedicated structure to any writing group that is developed, but the people involved must be willing to attend regularly and do the work needed on their own time. In other words, committing to writing as part of a group is integral to the success of everyone involved. As we came to find out in the summer of 2024—when our respective schedules could not allow us to meet like they did the year prior—the absence of a writing community makes writing a little bit more difficult and a lot lonelier. Although our experiences and reflections cannot be generalized to others' experiences, we maintain that writing communities are essential to students reaching their goals.

Guidelines for Creating a Writing Group

We have included documents for graduate students (or other writers) to create and organize their own writing group. This can be useful for graduate students acting independently, supervisors empowering students to create writing groups, or faculty members interested in developing their own communities of practice. These guides are included and linked in the Appendices: Appendix A details instructions and decisions to be made when setting up a writing group, and Appendix B is the writing reflection that we used for each writing session (both synchronous and asynchronous sessions).

Author's Contributions

DEL contributed to 50% of the manuscript. NP contributed to 50% of the manuscript.

Open Researcher and Contributor Identifier (ORCID)

Danielle E. Lorenz  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9924-7393>

Nicole Patrie  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0003-9701>

Ethics Statement

This reflection on practice did not require ethics review as confirmed by the Research Ethics Office at the University of Alberta.

Conflict of Interest

The authors do not declare any conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement

There is no data to share.

References

- Abamuad, K. (2023, January 27). *Graduate level writing challenges need a different kind of mentorship*. University Affairs. <https://universityaffairs.ca/career-advice/responsibilities-may-include/graduate-level-writing-challenges-need-a-different-kind-of-mentorship/>
- Bayley, J. G., Ellis, J. B., Abreu-Ellis, C. R., & O'Reilly, E. K. (2012). Rocky road or clear sailing? Recent graduates' recollections and reflections of the doctoral journey. *Brock Education Journal*, 21(2). <https://doi.org/10.26522/brocked.v21i2.279>
- Beasy, K., Emery, S., Dyer, L., Coleman, B., Bywaters, D., Garrad, T., Crawford, J., Swarts, K., & Jahangiri, S. (2020). Writing together to foster well-being: doctoral writing groups as spaces of wellbeing. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(6), 109–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1713732>
- Coffman, K., Putman, P., Adkisson, A., Kriner, B., & Monaghan, C. (2016). Waiting for the expert to arrive: Using a community of practice to develop the scholarly identity of doctoral students. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 28(1), 30–37. <https://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/>
- Colombo, L., & Rodas, E. (2023). Doctoral writing groups for the advancement of dissertation and publication writing. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 13(2), 49–65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18552/joaw.v13i2.788>
- Eaton, C., & Dombroski, J. (2022). Supporting graduate writers through a writing commons. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 68(4), 499–514. <https://doi.org/10.11575/ajer.v68i4.73428>
- Ens, A. H., Boyd, K., Matczuk, L. A., & Nickerson, W. T. (2011). Graduate students' evolving perceptions of writing collaboratively. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 41(2), 62–81. <https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v41i2.2299>
- Gagné, A., Herath, S., & Valencia, M. (2024). A triethnography of identity transformation through the phases of mentoring for scholarly publication. In P. Habibie & R. Kohls (Eds.), *Narratives and practices of mentorship in scholarly publication* (pp. 100–121). Routledge.
- García Marrugo, A. I., & Anson, D. W. (2024). The impact of an online doctoral writing group: Increased confidence, feedback literacy, and wellbeing. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.24012.gar>
- Guerin, C. & Aitchison, C. (2023). Finding confidence in writing: Doctoral writing groups. In D. L. Elliot, S. S. E. Bengtson, & K. Guccione (Eds.), *Developing researcher independence through the hidden curriculum* (pp. 147–156). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hodge, L., & Murphy, J. (2023). Write on! Cultivating social capital in a writing group for doctoral education and beyond. *Educational Review*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2023.2184772>

- Kozar, O., & Lum, J. F. (2015). Online doctoral writing groups: do facilitators or communication modes make a difference? *Quality in Higher Education*, 21(1), 38–51.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2015.1032003>
- Kumar, V., & Aitchison, C. (2018). Peer facilitated writing groups: a programmatic approach to doctoral student writing. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23(3), 360–373.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2017.1391200>
- Lobo, G. I. (2015). Academic guilt. In G. C. Semenza & G. A. Sullivan (Eds.), *How to build a life in the humanities*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137428899_10
- McAlpine, L., & Weiss, J. (2000). Mostly true confessions: Joint meaning-making about the thesis journey. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 30(1), 1–26.
<https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v30i1.183344>
- Olejnik, M. (2023). Potential of WAC in graduate writing support: Helping faculty improve systems of graduate writing. *The WAC Journal*, 154–170. <https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2023.34.1.10>
- Starke-Meyerring, D., Paré, A., Sun, K. Y., & El-Bezre, N. (2014). Probing normalized institutional discourses about writing: The case of the doctoral thesis. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 8(2), A13–A27.
<https://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/295>
- Tapia, C., & Stewart, N. (2022). Doctoral students' collaborative practices in developing writer identities. *Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, 32, 237–261.
<https://doi.org/10.31468/dwr.929>
- Thompson, P. (2021, October 18). Understanding academic writing - Starting the PhD. *Patter* [Blog]. <https://patthomson.net/2021/10/18/understanding-academic-writing-starting-the-phd/>
- Vincent, C., Tremblay-Wragg, É., Déri, C., Plante, I., & Mathieu Chartier, S. (2023). How writing retreats represent an ideal opportunity to enhance PhD candidates' writing self-efficacy and self-regulation. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 28(7), 1600–1619.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2021.1918661>
- Walter, L., & Stouck, J. (2020). Writing the literature review: Graduate student experiences. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 11(1).
<https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2020.1.8295>
- Wenger, E. (2002). Communities of practice and social learning systems. In F. Reeve, M. Cartwright, and R. Edwards (Eds.), *Supporting lifelong learning: Organizing learning* (vol. 2; pp. 160–179). Routledge.

Appendix A: Setting Up Your Own Writing Group Instructions/Landing Page

Whoo! You are doing a thing!

In this folder is this landing page, and a blank writing prompt. You'll need to set up your own group structure for compiling the writing prompts and reflections, in a place that is accessible to all participants.

Steps to Starting a Writing Group:

1. Find some friends to write with
2. Determine how long your group will run
 - a. We did 12 weeks. Personally, we think a set number of weeks is better than “indefinitely.” You can reassess, recommit, and restart. Completing a set number of weeks is an accomplishment, while having a group “fizzle out” feels like failure.
3. Create the “infrastructure” for holding onto your reflections. This can be a physical book or something online (i.e., Google Workspace).
4. Determine synchronous meeting times, send meeting invites.
5. Do the thing(s).

To make this a communal writing space that leads to success, we agree that:

- We set goals for ourselves for the 12 weeks. That may be pages, paragraphs, words written, or something more abstract. In essence, we each need to articulate what we want from this group and this process.
- Once a week—(Friday afternoons from 1:00 until 3:30)—we agree to meet synchronously (when we can). We all say hi to each other in Google Meet for a few minutes, and then get started.
- The rest of our writing time will be asynchronous; that is, we write, as individuals, when it suits ourselves and our schedules. However, if folks want to meet up at other times send the invites!
- At the beginning of each writing session (async or sync), we each spend ~15 minutes to fill out the reflection prompt.
- We leave ~15 minutes at the end of the writing session to fill out the other half of the prompt.
- At the end of the 12 weeks, we revisit the goals we made. Did we achieve them? How do we feel about our progress?
- At the end of our 12 weeks, we take some time to decide what we want to do. Do we want to continue this group? Do we want to take a break? Do we want to meet synchronously in person?

Appendix B: Writing Prompt

Writing prompts (one prompt is to be filled out for each writing session)

Name:	Date:	Session # of the Week:
Start Time:	End Time:	Time in Minutes:
What do you want to accomplish today?		
How do you feel about the task you have to complete?		
What distractors (physical, emotional, environmental, human, animal) may compete with your time and focus today?		
What did you accomplish in this session? How does the work you did today contribute to the goal you have?		
How do you feel about what you got done?		
What did you notice about your attention and focus in this session? What can you change for the next one?		
What are some icky points, sticky points, or other things that you're feeling right now?		
Anything else you'd like to say?		