

Don Brownlee
California State University - Northridge

Julia Johnson
California State University - Northridge

Mike Buckley
California State University - Northridge

"A field's interest in its own scholarly communication," writes Borgman (1989), "is a sign of its maturity" (p. 585). While this study does not argue that the CEDA community has reached full maturity, the authors wish to, at least, begin the process of disciplinary self-awareness. This investigation uses citation analysis, a form of bibliometrics, to examine the scholarly literature base of the CEDA community.

Bibliometric methods offer a wide variety of information to many audiences. Reeves and Borgman (1983) outline many of the potential beneficiaries from use of citation analysis:

A growing body of literature suggests that citation data can provide a relatively objective evaluation for journal editors, the academic associations that publish journals, and the researchers who contribute to the journals, as well as provide information about new research specialties and a determination of the interdisciplinary character of research programs and projects. (p. 122)

These research methods also allow educators to identify those publications considered most influential by their research colleagues and to use these resources in the instructional program.

Despite the potential advantages, researchers have been slow to adopt bibliometric analysis. Paisley (1989) recently contended, "Bibliometric studies, common in information science, are virtually unknown in communication research" (p. 107). While this may overstate the facts, bibliometric research in communication pales to the "(1)andmark studies of scientific communication [that] have taken place in physics, chemistry, biology, psychology, medicine, and engineering" (Paisley, 1989, p. 702).

If published citation analysis in communication is meager, it is nonexistent in the area of argumentation, debate and forensics. This study addresses the situation by applying citation analysis to the first decade (1980-90) of the CEDA Yearbook. The purpose of this study is to identify those publications and individuals that have been most influential in the philosophy and practice of debate within the CEDA community. In addition, bibliometric methods are used to examine the evolution of literature regarding CEDA.

The study of bibliometrics appears to have originated with Hulme's (1923) work in "statistical bibliography." Hulme examined the growth of modern civilization, particularly the processes of science and technology, through counting bibliographic documents. The term "bibliometrics" was coined by Pritchard (1969). He referred to bibliometrics as the "application of mathematics and statistical methods to books and other media of communication" (p. 349). A more recent definition, "the quantitative study of physical published units, or of bibliographic units, or of the surrogates for either," was offered by Broadus (1987, p. 376).

Bibliometric studies can be viewed as a companion to content analysis, since each illuminates separate features of scholarly communication. While content analysis examines the substance and meaning of a communication, bibliometric studies are directed at the external characteristics, such as the sources cited by an author.

Though bibliometric methods can be employed for several purposes, they principally serve to explore the communications of a field. Borgman (1989) notes the advantage, as well as a limitation, of these techniques:

Bibliometrics are applicable only to the study of the formal channels of scholarly communication, that is, the written record of scholarship; but in combination with data gleaned from other methods, they can provide a large, rich characterization of communication processes not otherwise possible. (p. 586)

While the community of scholars in any field communicate through both formal and informal channels, and that may be particularly true for forensics, an exclusive focus on the formal channels provides certain useful insights.

Bibliometric methods portray valuable information about the nature of a field. Bibliometrics identifies the contributing participants in a field of study, the channels available within the field, and the network created through the linkages of these elements. As Paisley (1989) notes:

It [bibliometrics] monitors the number and types of messages in various channels such as journals, annual reviews and handbooks, and conferences. It is used to quantify levels of scientific activity and to identify linkages among individuals and groups in the network. (p. 704)

As such, the communication structure of a field becomes more clearly defined.

The evolution of a field can also be described through bibliometric techniques. In fact, this has been the primary use of bibliometrics by information scientists (Lievrouw, 1989). Menard (1971) notes that there is a strong connection between the age of bibliometric citations and the rate at which a field grows. The rate and direction of change in research topics, notes Borgman (1989), may, likewise, be explored through these methods.

BIBLIOMETRIC MEASURES

What are the artifacts examined in citation analysis, a common means of bibliometric research? The author, source of publication and date of a reference citation are the principle considerations. Noting the author of a citation is useful for judgments regarding the relative importance of that individual's work within the field. Both the number of authors that cite a particular scholar and the frequency with which they do so serve to measure that scholar's recognition by colleagues (Voos and Dagaev, 1976).

Citing a scholar does not indicate that an author agrees with the cited work's conclusions, however. As Reeves and Borgman (1983) state, "A journal reference is an indication that an author has read an article and thinks that it is important enough to bring to the attention of other scholars" (p. 120). As one example, a correlation between frequency of citation and selection for the Nobel Prize was discovered in the sciences (Garfield, 1977). These bibliometric or citation analysis measures of an author's prominence have been found to be consistent with other assessments. Bibliometric rankings of a scholar's citations have been shown to be quite similar to those produced through either expert opinion (Koenig, 1983) or overall peer opinion surveys (McAllister, Anderson & Narin, 1980). Citation data, however, has the advantage of being more stable than many opinion measures.

The source of publication, usually considered in reference to journals, identifies the "core" sources of information within a field. Subramanyam (1976), for instance, used citation analysis to identify the core journals in the field of computer science. Much the same has been done in the field of communication through the work of Reeves and Borgman (1983) and So (1988). While most bibliometric research has concentrated on scholarly journals, the relative influence of professional conventions within a field or the significance of particular textbooks can be examined through citations. Additionally, citation analysis demonstrates how open or closed a particular journal, or even field, is to external sources of information.

Finally, the date of a publication plays a role in bibliometric analysis. Whether citations are to primarily recently produced publications or to older sources of information speaks to both the continuing influence of certain seminal articles and to the nature of the field itself. Scholarly fields that are in the process of rapid evolution will tend to cite more recent sources, by comparison to stable fields where the age of citations increases (Menard, 1971).

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

Each citation in the first ten Yearbooks, considered to include Perspectives on Non-policy Argument and Contributions on the Philosophy and Practice of CEDA, was recorded and coded as to author, source of publication, and date. Instances where authors cited themselves were noted and excluded from consideration on the

influence of particular articles or individuals. This is consistent with Narin and Moll's (1977) suggestion that self-citation be ignored due to its distorting effect. Other controls were used to limit the citations in one article from constructing a false, exaggerated image of a publication or scholar's influence. Also excluded were repeated citations of the same author within a paragraph or contiguous paragraphs. These were viewed as being a single continuous reference to the same source. Finally, where three or more references were cited together in support of the same claim, only the first cited reference was included. Each citation was, additionally, coded as belonging to one of seven fields - forensics, communication studies, law, philosophy, social sciences, psychology, and other. The "other" category generally comprised newspapers and popular magazines, though citations to publications related to the sciences, business and education are also included.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A total of 1334 citations were recorded from the first ten issues of the Yearbook. These Yearbooks contained 90 separate articles, ranging from extensively researched contributions to brief opinion-pieces.

Sources of Influence - Publications

Those publications that have had the largest number of citations within the Yearbook are reported below. This includes identification of both the journals in forensics that have been most frequently cited, as well as the textbooks that have had the greatest impact as measured by citations. The influence of papers presented at professional conventions is also documented.

Seven different forensics periodicals were cited. The distribution of citations, as illustrated in Table 1, is almost entirely dominated by the CEDA Yearbook itself and the Journal of the American Forensic Association, now titled Argumentation and Advocacy. These two publications account for nine out of ten citations to forensics periodicals. The much greater number of cites to Pi Kappa Delta's journal, The Forensic, as compared to Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha's Speaker and Gavel, probably

Table 1
Citations of Forensics Periodicals

<u>Periodical</u>	<u># of Citations</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
CEDA Yearbook	214	51
JAJA	162	39
The Forensic	26	6
Speaker and Gavel	6	1
Debate Issues	6	1
The Rostrum	2	1
Natl. Forensic Journal	1	1

reflects the closer historical connection between CEDA and PKD. Pi Kappa Delta first offered the CEDA topic at its national tournament and a substantial number of CEDA officers have also served as leaders of Pi Kappa Delta. On the other hand, it is puzzling that though the National Forensics Journal has published several articles regarding CEDA and debate, including CEDA as the theme of the Fall 1986 issue, only one of the 417 citations was to an article in that periodical. That single citation involved an author citing himself.

A separate comment should be made about the role of the SCA/AFA summer conferences at Alta, Utah. The proceedings of each of those conferences have been cited, with a total of 80 citations to the published proceedings of scholarship presented at Alta. If the six Alta proceedings are considered as a periodical, they would rank third behind the Yearbook and JAF in frequency of citation.

Freeley's 1981 edition of Argumentation and Debate was the first major textbook mentioning CEDA, though Freeley limited his comments to one page regarding topic selection. Pi Kappa Delta's 1982 text, edited by Keefe, Harte and Norton, provided the initial textbook discussion of approaches to debating value resolutions. By the late 1980's, CEDA and debating values were routinely included in classroom textbooks. These texts, as well as others, are part of the literature drawn upon by authors in the Yearbook.

While somewhat over 31% (excluding Alta) of the recorded citations were to forensics periodicals, a lesser number were to textbooks on argumentation or debate. Twenty-three different textbooks were cited a total of 241 times, accounting for 18% of total citations. Table 2 lists the ten most frequently cited textbooks. By far the most frequently cited text was Advanced Debate. The 52 cites include all three editions of the text. This book, Ehninger and Brockriede's second ranked work, and Freeley's text have been through several editions and have been cited beginning with the first CEDA Yearbook. Still, 20 of the 52 citations to Advanced Debate were to the most recent 1987 edition, while only eight of the 32 citation to Decision by Debate were to the latest 1978 edition. Advanced Debate, with the addition in

Table 2
Citations of Argumentation/Debate Texts

Author(s)	Textbook	Citations
Thomas/Hart	Advanced Debate	52
Ehninger/Brockriede	Decision by Debate	32
Patterson/Zarefsky	Contemporary Debate	22
Freeley	Argumentation & Debate	19
Ziegelmueller/Dause	Argumentation	14
Brock, et al.	Public Policy Decision Making	12
Church/Wilbanks	Values & Policies/Controversy	10
McBath	Forensics as Communication	10
Rieke/Sillars	Argumentation/Decision Making	10
Keefe/Harte/Norton	Introduction to Debate	9

the 1987 edition of extensive material on value debate, must be considered the primary text relied on by scholars writing in the Yearbook.

Surprisingly, there have been relatively fewer citations to the two texts addressed specifically to advancing knowledge of value debating. Church and Wilbank's Values and Policies in Controversy and Wood and Midgley's Prima Facie were cited ten and six times, respectively. This is despite the fact that both were published in 1986, a year prior to Advanced Debate's latest edition. Some of the more recent texts with significant content related to CEDA or value debate were not available to the authors of the 1989 Yearbook, the last issue included in this analysis.

The top ranked texts have in common a focus on the practical aspects of debating. They tend to address argument primarily in the context of interscholastic debating, as is clearly indicated by the titles of the four most frequently cited textbooks. The sixth ranked text by Brock, et al, concentrates exclusively on the comparative advantage case. Texts that focused on argument separate from the debating context received few citations. This most likely reflects the preponderance of articles in the Yearbook concerned with practical and strategic debate issues, not the theory of argumentation.

A final category of written scholarship deserves at least brief mention - papers from professional conventions. The first CEDA annual, Perspectives on Non-Policy Argument, was almost entirely a collection of papers previously presented at various professional meetings. Discounting those papers that were subsequently published, a total of 66 citations, less than 5% of the total, are to convention papers. The vast majority, 42, are papers presented at the Speech Communication Association annual convention. Papers from WSCA were cited 9 times, CSSA 8 times, and ECA 7 times. No papers from Southern have ever been cited, nor has any paper presented at CSSA after 1984.

Forensics coaches and students wishing to become familiar with the publications that have influenced scholarship in the Yearbook need look no further than the Yearbook itself. Though the nature of the Yearbook as an open or closed system will be discussed later, it is worthwhile noting that those writing for this publication are quite cognizant of previous authors and significantly rely on their contributions. What is published in the Yearbook continues to influence future Yearbook authors.

Sources of Influence - Individuals
Any effort to identify "authorities" within a field is fraught with difficulty. Bibliometrics, through the use of citations, provides at least one measure of the influence of either a single scholarly product or an author's entire body of work (White & Griffith, 1981).

Though the CEDA Yearbook has been the publication most often cited, not every author of an article in the Yearbook has been cited by later scholars. Table 3 ranks the most frequently cited

Table 3
Most Frequently Cited Yearbook Articles

Author(s)	Article	Year	Cites	Citers
Zarefsky	"Criteria for Evaluating..."	80	12	9
Vasilius	"Presumption, Presumption..."	80	11	8
Bile	"When the Whole is Greater..."	87	11	5
Brownlee	"Advocacy and Values"	80	10	9
Brownlee	"In Search of Topicality..."	81	10	6
Howe	"CEDA's Objectives..."	81	9	6
Tolbert/Hunt	"Counter-Warrants..."	85	9	4
Bartanen	"The Role of Values..."	82	7	4
Young/Gaske	"On Prima Facie Value..."	84	7	3

articles from the Yearbook. Obviously, this list is limited to articles published from 1980 through 1988 and cannot measure the influence of contributions to the 1989 volume of the Yearbook. While most of the articles listed - Zarefsky, Vasilius, Brownlee, Howe and Bartanen - are from the early years, Jeffrey Bile's 1987 article advocating a holistic resolutorial focus received considerable attention in the two subsequent Yearbooks. Were self-citations included in the calculations, Bile's article would have been the more frequently cited in two years than David Zarefsky's article was in nine.

The ranking of articles in order of citations is not a measure of how meritorious, insightful or instructive this particular scholarship has been. Neither does it indicate that the authors citing these works are in full agreement with the original article, though fewer than 2% of total citations were in connection with negative comments. Rather, the number of citations is evidence of the extent to which these articles have determined the agenda for public discussion of the issues regarding CEDA and value debate.

The same bibliometric analysis was applied to the second most cited periodical, JAJA or Argumentation and Advocacy. As was the case with the CEDA Yearbook, the most frequently cited articles tend not to be the most recent. Table 4 provides the ranking of the five most often cited articles. The two most frequently cited

Table 4
Most Frequently Cited JAJA Articles

Author(s)	Article	Year	Cites	Citers
Matlon	"Debating Propositions..."	78	21	15
Paulsen/Rhodes	"The Counter Warrant..."	79	20	11
Warnick	"Arguing Value..."	81	13	8
Keeshan/Ulrich	"A Critique of the..."	80	7	5
Rowland	"Standards for Paradigm..."	82	6	5

are from the late 1970s. While it is unlikely that several of the JAJA pieces were addressed to the CEDA community as an audience, they have been frequently used as references for scholarship

regarding CEDA and value debate (Rhodes, 1989). In fact, the three leading articles from JAJA have been cited more often than any contribution to the CEDA Yearbook. Without question, these authors have influenced the CEDA community though that objective may never have been their original intent.

An effort has been made to identify the influence of the entire body of work of various authors, combining citations to journals, books and professional papers. The listing of the ten most frequently cited authors, found in Table 5, excludes any author whose entire set of citations is derived from a single reference. For example, this eliminated Jim Paulsen (only cited in Paulsen & Rhodes), J.W. Patterson (only cited in Patterson & Zarefsky), and Austin Freeley (only cited for single text) from

Table 5
Cumulative Citations to Individuals

Author	Total Citations	% of Total
David Zarefsky	62	4.5
Ronald Matlon	41	3.1
Wayne Brockriede	36	2.7
Douglas Ehninger	33	2.5
Jack Rhodes	31	2.3
Walter Ulrich	30	2.2
Don Brownlee	27	2.0
Robert Rowland	20	1.5
Jack Howe	18	1.3
Janet Vasilius	18	1.3

consideration. Those individuals who have been cited for several of their works appear more likely to have a continuing influence on the CEDA community.

The ten individuals listed in Table 5 collectively account for nearly a quarter (23.7%) of all citations during the ten years. Their influence on the development of CEDA and practice of value debate is evident, as indicated by the citation behavior of their peers. It is interesting to note that several of the ten have not been active participants in the CEDA community. Their impact has been almost exclusively through their scholarship as applied to CEDA. A more accurate determination of the interconnections that constitute CEDA's scholarly network requires examination of the citations in the entire set of literature, not just the Yearbook. As such, that mapping is beyond the capacity of this study.

The Yearbook's Nature and Evolution

As was previously noted, bibliometric techniques can illustrate the evolution of a scholarly field. Those methods were applied to examine the Yearbook as an individual publication. Both the nature of the Yearbook as an open/closed system and its changes during the first decade of publication are detailed below.

Several bibliometric studies have been conducted to explore these two issues concerning communication journals (Reeves & Borgman, 1983; Rice, Borgman & Reeves, 1988; So, 1988). So (1988) provides a summary of the measures used to explore the openness of a publication:

Since self-citing rate shows the proportion of a journal's citations referring to itself, it is an indication of its degree of "closure." In contrast, openness is the proportion of a journal's citations referring to outside publications, thus indicating how "open" the journal is to the outside. We can express a journal's openness in three different terms. The first is overall openness, which is the complement of self-citing rate. The other two, own-field openness and other-field openness, indicate, respectively, how open a journal is to other journals in other fields. (pp. 239-240)

Self-citation and openness measures were calculated for the CEDA Yearbook. The resulting statistics allow comparison to the measures of communication journals.

The Yearbook may be seen as a comparatively closed system. A total of 16% of citations in the Yearbook were to other Yearbook articles. If the first volume is excluded from calculations, since self-cites were impossible, the figure rises to 17.5%. This compares to an average of 6% self-cites for the 9 communication journals studied by Reeves and Borgman (1983). A comparison to other forensics journals might be more appropriate, but no such studies have been completed to date.

Use of So's other measures reinforces the view of the Yearbook as a less-than-open system. Table 6 documents the distribution of citations among the various coded fields. While Reeves and Borgman (1983) found that 87% of communication journal citations were to journals outside the field and So's (1988) later study recorded a slightly lower 85%, this investigation found only one-third of citations in the Yearbook were outside the field of forensics. By comparison to work in communication studies, the Yearbook appears

Table 6
Distribution of Citations to Fields

Field	# of Cites	% of Cites
Forensics	888	66.6
Philosophy	130	9.7
Communication	104	7.8
Other	92	6.9
Law	57	4.3
Social Science	44	3.3
Psychology	19	1.3

relatively closed to research conducted in other scholarly areas. This internal orientation has been true since the beginning of the Yearbook. In the 1981 edition, the first year where self-citation was possible, 14.3% of citations were to the Yearbook, as Table 7 depicts.

The final element of this bibliometric study of the Yearbook sought to determine if the annual has evolved over the decade. While one characteristic of the journal has changed, as indicated in Table 7, others aspects remain stable. The category demonstrating the greatest change was citations per article. The 18.3 citations/article in the 1980 Yearbook is severely distorted by the fact that nearly 60% of the citations are found in just one

Table 7
Evolving Characteristics of the Yearbook

Yearbook	Self-Cite %	Cite Age	Articles	Cites/Article
1980	0.0	8.70	6	18.3
1981	14.3	4.72	8	8.8
1982	8.2	8.82	6	10.2
1983	18.6	8.49	8	8.8
1984	19.1	6.88	16	8.8
1985	11.3	9.68	10	10.6
1986	11.3	7.04	8	17.8
1987	16.1	8.91	9	15.9
1988	27.0	7.84	12	23.4
1989	18.9	8.46	7	25.7

of the six articles in that edition. Excluding that one article, the average in 1980 falls to 9.6 citations and is in line with the averages for the first six years. Beginning with the 1986 Yearbook, the average substantially increased. During the past two years, the average citations per article has been double that of earlier years.

The changes in citation rates mirror changes in the editorship of the Yearbook. During the six years of Don Brownlee's tenure as editor (1980-1985), the cumulative average citation/article was 10.3. During the three years (1986-88) that Brenda Logue edited the Yearbook, the average rose to 19.5. In fact there were more citations during those three edition than the previous six taken together. During Walter Ulrich's first year as editor (1989), articles averaged 25.7 citations.

The progressive increase in citations per article has placed the Yearbook in the general range of journals in communication. For example, So's (1988) research found that articles in Communication Education averaged 20.4 citations, the Journal of Communication averaged 21.6, the Central States Speech Journal averaged 27.4, the Quarterly Journal of Speech averaged 36.2, and Communication Monographs averaged 43.7. The Yearbook has taken on a character reflecting greater scholarship and less personal opinion.

One measure that demonstrated no real pattern of change during the ten years is the average age of the citation. Menard (1971) postulated that fields experiencing rapid knowledge growth will show declining rates of citation age. No decrease is evident in the Yearbook's age of citations, as Table 7 illustrates. Beyond

the citations per article measure, this citation analysis found no evidence that the Yearbook is markedly different today than at its conception in 1980.

CONCLUSION

This initial bibliometric investigation of the CEDA Yearbook identifies the individuals and publications that have influenced and continue to influence the development of CEDA and value debate. This notion of influence is not normative. We do not mean to imply judgment of the quality of any scholarship or the appropriateness of any contributions to the field. However, examination of citations enhances the CEDA community's awareness regarding the scholars and publications that do most effect this field's progress and development.

Use of citation analysis also can allow mapping of the networks of scholars in a field. Specifically, these interconnections of scholars, sometimes referred to as "invisible colleges," allow for informal channels of communication between scholars in a field to be identified and analyzed. Barnett, Fink, and Debus (1989) argue that by "Using these [citation] data, "clusters of authors have been identified for specific areas of research, each scientist having mutual influence with at least one member within the cluster" (p. 511). Such a future investigation of the connections among the forensics community would be possible using bibliometric methods.

Similar studies of other forensic journals will allow a more complete mapping of the interconnections among scholars and journals in the field of forensics. This study of the Yearbook has demonstrated that CEDA is a system that has been relatively closed to scholarship outside this specific field since its inception. By comparing the communication structures of the Yearbook to those of other forensic journals, the openness of the larger forensic community to external influence could be determined. Based on information gleaned from these studies, forensic scholars would be provided clearer insight into the ways in which they could enhance the growth and development of forensics.

Note: Any effort to validate or invalidate evidence in a debate with the findings of this article is a misuse of the research. Debaters committing this transgression deserve rebuke (and 0 points).

REFERENCES

- Barnett, G., Fink, E.L., & Debus, M.B. (1989). A mathematical model of academic citation age. Communication Research, 16, 510-531.
- Borgman, C.L. (1989). Bibliometrics and scholarly communication. Communication Research, 12, 583-599.

- Broadus, R.N. (1987). Toward a definition of "bibliometrics." Scienceometrics, 12, 373-379.
- Garfield, E. (1977). The 1980 Nobel Prize winners. Essays of an information scientist, 2, 189-201. Philadelphia: ISI Press.
- Hulme, E.W. (1923). Statistical bibliography in relation to the growth of modern civilization. London: Grafton.
- Koenig, M.E.D. (1983). Bibliometric indicators versus expert opinion in assessing research performance. Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 34, 136-145.
- Lievrouw, L.A. (1989). The invisible college reconsidered: Bibliometrics and the development of scientific communication theory. Communication Research, 16, 615-628.
- McAllister, P.R., Anderson, R.C., & Narin, F. (1980). Comparison of peer and citation assessment of the influence of scientific journals. Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 31, 147-152.
- Menard, H.W. (1971). Science: Growth and change. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Narin, F., & Moll, J.K. (1977). Bibliometrics. In M.E. Williams (Ed.), Annual review of information science and technology (Vol. 12, pp. 35-58). White Plains: Knowledge Industry.
- Paisley, W. (1989). Bibliometrics, scholarly communication, and communication research. Communication Research, 16, 701-717.
- Pritchard, A. (1969). Statistical bibliography or bibliometrics. Journal of Documentation, 25, 348-349.
- Reeves, B., & Borgman, C.L. (1983). A bibliometric evaluation of core journals in communication research. Human Communication Research, 10, 119-136.
- Rhodes, J. (1989). Counter-warrants after ten years: The strategy re-examined. In B. Gronbeck (Ed.), Spheres of Argument (pp. 406-410). Annandale, VA: SCA.
- Rice, R.E., Borgman, C.L., & Reeves, B. (1988). Citation networks of communication journals, 1977-1985: Cliques and positions, citations made and citations received. Human Communication Research, 15, 256-283.
- So, C.Y.K. (1988). Citation patterns of core communication journals: An assessment of the developmental status of communication. Human Communication Research, 15, 236-255.

Subramanyan, K. (1976). Core journals of computer science. IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication, 19, 2-25.

Voos, H., & Dagaev, K.S. (1976). Are all citations equal: Or, did we op. cit. your idem? Journal of Academic Librarianship, 1, 19-21.

CORRESPONDENCE

I am writing because of an article that appeared in the 1990 CEDA Yearbook by David Berube ("Parameter\$ for Criteria Debating," CEDA Yearbook, 11 (1990): 9-25). In this article, he paraphrases that I "recently wrote that after endorsing a resolution an arguer must defend outcomes." He goes on to explain why "my premise is wrong . . . and [my] conclusion is wrong." If you check the enclosed article he is referring to (Kent Colbert, "Value Implications for Lincoln-Douglas Debate," Forensics Educator, 4 (1989-90): 12-17) you should understand my objection. The word "must" never appears in the article and I have highlighted for you several qualifications of using value implications throughout the article, especially in the last paragraph.

Kent R. Colbert
University of the Pacific

Correction

In Irwin A. Mallin's article in the 1990 CEDA Yearbook ("The Application of Proximate Cause to CEDA Debate," pp. 44-56), on page 44, the sentence:

For example, the Fall 1990 resolution "Resolved: that government censorship of public artistic expression in the United States is an undesirable infringement on individual rights", asks for a balancing of rights of artistic expression against the governmental interests (such as morality, or whatever else an affirmative team may reasonably choose to argue) that lead to censorship.

should read:

For example, the Fall 1990 resolution "Resolved: that government censorship of public artistic expression in the United States is an undesirable infringement on individual rights", asks for a balancing of rights of artistic expression against the governmental interests (such as morality, or whatever else a negative team may reasonably choose to argue) that lead to censorship.

I regret the error.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Manuscripts are now being accepted for the 1992 CEDA Yearbook.

Statement of Purpose

The *Cross Examination Debate Yearbook*, an official publication of the Cross Examination Association, is a refereed journal, dedicated to publishing quality scholarship related to the theory and practice of CEDA debate, forensic tournament administration, and other areas of interest to the CEDA membership. In addition, the editorial staff of the CEDA yearbook will consider publication of book reviews, scholarly exchanges, arguments for change in the structure or practice of CEDA debate, and other features.

Submissions

Manuscripts, typed and double spaced, should be prepared in accordance with the most recent MLA guidelines. If the manuscript is accepted, the authors will be required to submit the manuscript on disk.

Four copies of the manuscript should be sent to:

Ann Gill
Department of Speech Communication
302 Eddy
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523
(303) 491-6858

Include at detachable cover page identifying the author (s) and the institutional affiliation of the author (s). The CEDA Yearbook employs a system of blind review; the manuscript itself should contain no reference to author (s) or their affiliation (s). Manuscripts will not normally be returned, so authors are encouraged to retain the original copy. The first author will receive notification of receipt of the manuscript and all subsequent correspondence related to the manuscript.

Deadline

The deadline for papers to be considered for the 1992 yearbook is *January 10, 1992*. Earlier submissions are encourage.