2008

# EBSCO's *Communication & Mass Media Complete*: An Appreciable Improvement Over Previous Communication Studies Indexing?

David C. Tyler
*University of Nebraska - Lincoln*, dtyler2@unl.edu

Signe Boudreau
*University of Nebraska - Lincoln*, sboudreau3@unl.edu

Katharine C. Potter
*University of Nebraska - Lincoln*, katpotter1@yahoo.com

Misty Redinbaugh
*University of Nebraska - Lincoln*

# EBSCO's *Communication & Mass Media Complete*: An Appreciable Improvement Over Previous Communication Studies Indexing?

David C. Tyler
Signe Boudreau
Katharine C. Potter
Misty Redinbaugh

**ABSTRACT.** In a prior edition of this study, we examined whether the established online communication studies indexes—*Communication Abstracts*, *ComIndex*, and *ComAbstracts*—provided a good avenue of access to the journal literature that researchers in the field cite and whether, where the current journal literature was concerned, that avenue of access might be equal or superior to that provided by large, multisubject online indexes. In

David C. Tyler is a Reference Librarian and the departmental liaison for Sociology and for Anthropology and Geography at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 225-D Love Library, Lincoln, NE 68588 (E-mail: dtyler2@unl.edu).

Signe Boudreau is a Reference Librarian and the departmental liaison for Communication Studies and for Journalism and Mass Communications at the University of Nebraska – Lincoln, N219 Love Library, Lincoln, NE 68588 (E-mail: sboudreau3@unl.edu).

Katharine C. Potter recently completed a M.A. in Library and Information Science at the University of Iowa via the PULS program and is currently serving as a reference librarian/lecturer at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 205 C.Y. Thompson Library, Lincoln, NE 68588 (E-mail: katpotter1@yahoo.com).

Misty Redinbaugh is a recent graduate from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln's College of Business Administration. Misty Redinbaugh, Student Project Assistant, c/o Susan Leach, LI 110 Office, Love Library, U of Nebraska –Lincoln, NE 68588 (Tel.: (402) 472-0703).

*57*

this iteration of the study, we similarly address EBSCO's new product for communication studies, *Communication & Mass Media Complete*.

**KEYWORDS.** Communication studies, indexes, indexing, databases, evaluation, comparison, coverage

## *INTRODUCTION*

In a prior edition of the study to follow, the authors attempted to determine whether the more popular online communication studies indexes in existence at the time—*Communication Abstracts*, *ComIndex*, and *ComAbstracts*—provided good coverage of the journal literature cited by publishing researchers in the field and whether their coverage of the more recent cited journal literature was comparable, or even superior, to that offered by several selected online multisubject/aggregator databases. To this end, we put together and performed a two-part evaluation. In the first part, we assembled a list of 6,170 cited journal articles drawn from 421 selected articles' bibliographies/works-cited pages that had appeared in the year 2000 issues and volumes of sixty-six selected core journals from communication studies and related fields and then checked to what extent the three selected communication studies indexes had indexed these items. For the second part of the study, we selected a subset of 2,126 cited articles that had been published in 1994 and after, including a few in-press and very recently published items that had appeared in the year 2000, and we then compared the coverage offered by the three selected communication studies indexes to that offered by five selected online multisubject/aggregator databases—*ArticleFirst*, *Academic Search Elite*, *OmniFile*, *Web of Science*, and *Ingenta*.[1]

Unfortunately for the completeness of the previous study, EBSCO released its new communication studies index, *Communication & Mass Media Complete* (henceforth *CMMC*), just as we were submitting for publication, so we were unable to include it. To correct this oversight, we have re-performed the study with *CMMC*, and we hope to provide answers to two questions: (1) does *CMMC* offer an appreciable improvement in indexing of the cited journal literature when its coverage is compared to that offered by *Communication Abstracts*, *ComIndex*, and *ComAbstracts*; and (2), if it does, how does that improved

indexing of the cited journal literature compare to the coverage offered by the selected large multisubject/aggregator databases?

## *REVIEW OF LITERATURE*

In recent years, there have been a number of index/database coverage studies of potential interest. The authors of these studies have evaluated and/or compared the coverage given by a wide variety of online indexes and databases to the social sciences in general, to several social science disciplines in particular, and/or to a number of topics of interest to social scientists. They have also examined the scope and extent of full-text content these databases have provided. This short review will present in chronological order by year of publication a selection of those studies published between 2000 and 2006. The review will not include product announcements or reviews, index/database histories, or comparative/evaluative articles that do not contain a study of disciplinary/topical coverage. Also, articles published prior to 2000 will not be included because of updates or improvements in database products, which may render such studies out-of-date.

From several searches of the *Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts* (*LISTA*) database, the authors were able to find citations to three studies of some interest published in 2000. The first, Davidson, Lutishoor, and Bailey's (2000) "Full-Text Resources for Undergraduates," was published in *College and Undergraduate Libraries* and presents the authors' fairly comprehensive comparative analysis of the databases *PA Research II*, provided by ProQuest, and *WilsonSelect*, provided by H. W. Wilson but, in this case, vended by FirstSearch. The authors reviewed a number of the databases' features—end-user retrieval options, interfaces, user assistance and support, results display and delivery options, and so forth—and considered the databases' utility, in light of their library's shrinking periodicals collection, as a means to bolster their library's support for undergraduate research. Of special interest to this journal's readers will be their comparative study of the databases' title lists. The authors categorized the journals indexed by the databases according to the subject classifications and serial types assigned to them by *Ulrich's* and other periodical directories and according to a common, broadly discipline-oriented system of categories (e.g., "Social Sciences," "Science and Technology," and so forth). There is no need to recount their entire findings here, but the authors did find that

both databases devoted a bit more than 50% of their coverage to titles from the social sciences, business and economics, and education.

A second article of some interest from 2000 appeared in Peter Jacsó's "Savvy Searching" column under the title "Database Source Coverage: Myth and Reality." In this short article, Jacsó demonstrated his methods for determining journal coverage in several selected databases via targeted searches of the databases and via the employment of such tools as the *DIALOG InfoPro Portal* and the *Journal Name Finder* databases. Although the author was primarily focused on demonstrating the efficacy of his methods, one may infer a great deal from the results of his demonstrations concerning the relatively poor coverage given select information science topics and journals by *Information Science Abstracts* (*ISA*) and *Library and Information Science Abstracts* (*LISA*), as compared to the coverage of the same provided by *Current Contents*, *INSPEC*, *EI Compendex*, and so forth.

The third article from 2000, Eleanor Read and R. Craig Smith's "Searching for Library and Information Science Literature," which appeared in *Library Computing*, greatly expands upon and makes explicit much of what could only be inferred from Jacsó's brief article. In this study, the authors evaluated the DIALOG versions of *ISA*, *LISA*, and H. W. Wilson's *Library Literature & Information Science* (henceforth: *Library Literature*). The authors used the subject profile technique, employing twenty subject terms selected from the databases' DIALOG Bluesheets, and searched the title fields of the database entries added from January of 1999 to April of 2000. They discovered that, although it had its shortcomings, *Library Literature* provided the strongest coverage for most areas, *LISA* was usually a strong second, and *ISA*, despite covering a few areas well, was usually a distant third in the results. Their most surprising discovery, however, was that for the three databases, despite their seemingly common disciplinary/topical focus, "[n]o more than 21 percent of the unique titles in any search were found in more than one file" (126).

Karen Chapman's "An Examination of the Usefulness of *JSTOR* to Researchers in Finance" appeared in *Behavioral and Social Sciences Librarian* (henceforth: *BSSL*) in 2001. In this article, Chapman established criteria for the academic discipline whose researchers would find *JSTOR* useful: covered by JSTOR; leading journals are included; journals from related disciplines are included; primary resource format is journal articles; and draws significantly from resources more than two to five years old. Using ISI impact factors, she identified the top three finance journals, collected citations from their articles published in 1999 and matched the

list with *JSTOR*'s title list. Results indicated that finance meets the five criteria "tolerably well" and that *JSTOR* is "clearly a significant resource for support of scholarly research in finance" (46).

A second article from 2001, Robertson's "*E-Psyche*: A Comparison of Content with *PsycINFO*," compared the content and coverage of the respected *PsycINFO* database with a new direct competitor, *e-psyche* (by Database Access Group). Although far from complete at the time, *e-psyche* claimed that it would cover more than $2^1/_2$ times the number of sources indexed by *PsycINFO*. Although Robertson's comparison of title list samples showed considerable overlap, as well as a number of titles unique to *e-psyche*, *e-psyche*'s list was actually of periodicals it intended to index, not those it currently indexed. Further analysis using *Ulrich's Periodical Directory* revealed a much greater percentage of peer reviewed journals in *PsycINFO*. *E-psyche*'s creators had also claimed that it would provide broader subject coverage than *PsycINFO*, supposing *PsycINFO* to have a bias in favor of clinical research. The sample titles' call number ranges were examined by Robertson, and search results for clinical and experimental topics were compared. The call number comparison failed to support the claim, but the search results comparison did show that roughly half of *PsycINFO*'s results were from the clinical topics, while nearly three-quarters of *e-psyche*'s results were from the experimental topics. However, questions about *e-psyche*'s depth of coverage were raised. Robertson's conclusion that *e-psyche* was "far too young and undeveloped" to present a serious threat to *PsycINFO*'s supremacy later proved correct—it was purchased by American Psychological Association (APA) in 2003 and repackaged as *PsycEXTRA*, a "gray literature" database (APA licenses 2004).

A final article from 2001 compared databases of use for political science research. Thomas Schaffer's "Databases and Political Science Research," published in *Online Services Review*, compared eight databases: *ABC Pol Sci on Disc*, *ABI/INFORM*, *EconLit*, *PAIS International*, *Periodical Abstracts*, *Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI)*, *Sociological Abstracts*, *Wilson Social Sciences Abstracts Full Text*, and *PsycINFO*. Six representative keyword searches were conducted in each database. The resulting citations were sampled and evaluated for document type, fields searched, and relevance. Relevancy percentages were calculated. The results detail each database's strengths and weaknesses in regard to searching for political science topics. One interesting conclusion relevant to our own research related to *Periodical Abstracts*, a general periodical index. This database ranked first in total number of hits and third in percentage of total

relevancy, and the author concluded that "it would be difficult for political science researchers to conduct a comprehensive literature review without consulting *Periodical Abstracts*" (51).

In 2002 Chapman shifted her focus to support for higher level finance research provided by three full-text business databases: ProQuest Information and Learning's *ABI/INFORM*, EBSCO's *Business Source Elite*, and Gale Group's *General BusinessFile International*. In this study, published in *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, she again used the three finance journals and the citation list from her 2001 study above, and she discovered that nearly three-fourths of the citations were from only eight journals. In her comparative evaluation, *ABI/INFORM* was the clear winner, providing full-text coverage of six of them, as well as the greatest coverage depth. When the citation lists were then compared to the title lists, *ABI/INFORM* again fared the best, providing 35.9% of the citations in full text. In regard to the coverage "miss rate," however, *ABI/INFORM*'s was the highest (12.5%), and Chapman warns that this reliability issue should not be overlooked. Her final conclusion is that none of these databases fully serves the needs of scholarly researchers in finance.

Walters and Wilder's "Bibliographic Index Coverage of a Multidisciplinary Field," published in 2003 in *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, focuses on the database coverage of later-life migration research. The study's purpose was to determine whether subject-specific or general periodical indexes offer better coverage, as well as to distinguish the disciplinary relationship between the journals publishing the literature and the indexes covering the topic. The authors attempted to identify, to read, and to evaluate every article published between 1990–2000 on later-life migration in the United States and Canada. The resulting articles were grouped by journal and divided into one or more themes (e.g., patterns of migration, etc.). The bulk of the articles appeared in a small number of journals, primarily those serving gerontology and geography. Each article was searched for in twelve databases (seven subject-specific, two from the social sciences, and three broad/multidisciplinary). Several conclusions were drawn from the results: *Social Sciences Citation Index* indexed the most articles overall and performed best in all themes; multidisciplinary databases offered the best index coverage; no relationship existed between a database's size and effectiveness; and *Popline*, despite the bulk of the articles' not having been published in demography journals, offered better coverage of the topic than *EconLit*, *Sociological Abstracts*, or *GEOBASE*. For the best coverage of a multidisciplinary research topic, the study recommends the use of a variety of multidisciplinary databases.

An article from 2004, Blessinger and Olle's "Content Analysis of the Leading General Academic Databases," which appeared in *Library Collections, Acquisitions and Technical Services*, analyzed database title lists in a variety of ways. Two elements relevant to our research were subject coverage and journal quality. *Ulrich's Periodicals Directory* was used to identify peer-reviewed status and subject areas for titles from EBSCO's *Academic Search Premier*, Gale's *Expanded Academic Index*, and *ProQuest Research Library*. Findings indicated that primary coverage in all of the databases (53% of the titles) was in the social sciences. These titles had an average Journal Citation Reports impact factor of 0.82 and a median impact factor of 0.57. *Academic Search Premier* had the most social science titles, both overall and peer-reviewed, as well as the highest percentage of top-quartile journals by impact factor.

A second short article of note from the same year, Laura Ewald's (2004) "A Comparison of Subject Databases in Sociology, Communication, and Music," appeared in *Kentucky Libraries*. This study examined database subscriptions at an academic library to determine uniqueness and degree of overlap. As with many of the previous studies, the comparisons were based on database title lists. Among the social sciences databases (*Sociological Abstracts*, *Social Sciences Abstracts*, *Sociological Collection*, *Social Work Abstracts*) unique title percentages ranged from 40%–77%, and overlap ranged from 14%-66%. In the area of communication, EBSCO's *Communication and Mass Media Complete* contained 57% of the indexed titles in *Communication Abstracts*. This percentage rose to 88% when two other EBSCO databases were included in the comparison. The author closed by pointing out the limitations of comparing database title lists: reliability and variations in depth of coverage.

"Database Support for Research in Public Administration," a 2005 article by James Cory Tucker, appeared in *BSSL*. The purpose of this study was to identify the database most appropriate for researching a multi-disciplinary field at all levels. Tucker examined three business-specific databases (ProQuest's *ABI/INFORM Global*, EBSCO's *Business Source Premier*, Gale's *General BusinessFile ASAP*) and three multidisciplinary databases (Gale's *Expanded Academic Index ASAP* [*EAI*], EBSCO's *Academic Search Premier*, ProQuest's *International Academic Research Library*). He compiled a list of core public administration journals and grouped them by subject: public administration, political science, public finance, management and economics, public policy, and other social-science-related journals. This list was compared to the database title lists, and each database was analyzed for format (e.g., abstracts only), depth

of coverage, and coverage of the subjects listed above. The author concluded that although *EAI* provided the best overall coverage, including full-text, of sources for public administration research, access to more full-text databases, perhaps one of the business-specific products, might be necessary for comprehensive research.

The second article from 2005 that the authors found, by Tyler, Boudreau, and Leach, was the previous edition of this study, titled "The Communication Studies Researcher and the Communication Studies Indexes," which also appeared in *BSSL*. In this study, the authors hoped to discover two things: (1) whether researchers in communication studies and related fields publishing in 2000 could have used the online communication studies indexes *Communication Abstracts*, *ComIndex*, and *ComAbstracts* to discover the journal articles cited in their bibliographies and (2) whether, where the current journal literature was concerned, the communication studies indexes provided coverage of the cited journal literature comparable to that provided by a selection of large, multisubject/aggregator databases. They found, broadly speaking, that the three communication studies indexes' coverage of the selected body of cited journal literature was not particularly impressive, ranging from roughly 19%–30% of the over six thousand citations, and that the three indexes' coverage of the more current cited journal literature did not compare favorably to that provided by four of the five selected multisubject/aggregator databases: roughly 25%–34% coverage versus 48%–78% coverage, respectively, for the over two thousand citations to articles published from 1994 to 2000.

The first article from 2006 that the authors uncovered was Chapman and Brothers' "Database Coverage for Research in Management Information Systems," which appeared in *College & Research Libraries*. In this study, the authors examined the indexing and full-text coverage provided by twelve databases for twenty journals from management information systems (MIS) and related fields that had been identified as top-ranked, in a prior survey of MIS faculty conducted by Walstrom and Hargrave. The authors examined how well a random sample of the cited journal literature for 2000–2002 from three of the MIS journals was indexed by the twelve databases. Briefly, the authors found that *ABI/INFORM Global* and *Business Source Premier* (*BSP*) provided the best indexing, *BSP* provided the best full-text coverage, and that *BSP* and *Web of Science* and *BSP* and *ABI/INFORM Global* provided the best and second best coverage, respectively, when the databases were employed in tandem.

A second article from 2006, Kathleen Joswick's "Full-Text Psychology Journals Available in Popular Library Databases," appeared in *The*

*Journal of Academic Librarianship*. Her goal was to analyze coverage of core psychology journals in eight aggregator and four psychology-specific full-text databases. Using the 2004 *Social Science Citation Index* source publications in psychology, she compared the titles to each database's title list. Only 62.4% of the source titles were available in one or more of the twelve databases. The subject-specific databases outperformed the aggregators but still covered only 59.8% of the titles. Of particular interest were the discoveries that nearly 80% of the studied titles were in three or fewer databases and that the subject-specific databases had much less duplicative content. The core titles were also measured in relation to the databases' total number of full-text titles. Not surprisingly, the psychology journals made up a very small proportion of the aggregators' full-text offerings (from 0.08%–4.2%). Joswick concluded by cautioning librarians to be vigilant about assessing a database not simply on the number, but by the quality of the full-text titles it offers.

The final two articles from 2006, both published in *BSSL*, concerned themselves with the coverage provided to journals that publish archaeology research. The first, "Digging a Little Deeper," by Tyler, Potter, Leach, and Kreifels, examined to what extent twelve selected databases covering several fields—anthropology, art and art history, architecture, conservation and museum studies, the geosciences and geography, languages and literature, and the arts and humanities generally—provided at least partial indexing of ninety-three archaeology and archaeology-related journals of US origin over a fifty-year interval (i.e., 1950–2000+). The study found that almost all of the indexes provided some worthwhile coverage, especially of the most widely subscribed-to third of the journal titles and of those journals designated as "core," but that the Tozzer Library's *Anthropological Literature* (*AL*) database was the only index that provided substantial coverage of the journals in almost all categories. *AL*'s coverage, however, was also found generally to be gently moving down toward 50% coverage of the ninety-three titles over the fifty-year interval and "turning a bit more sharply toward 50% coverage over the past five to ten year interval" (Tyler, Potter et al. 2006a).[2]

A follow-up study, "Digging Deeper Still," which was available in the following issue of *BSSL*, by Tyler, Potter, Leach, Kreifels, and Turner examined the coverage given over the same fifty-year-plus interval to eighty-nine archaeology and archaeology-related journals from the United Kingdom and Ireland, and it added a thirteenth index, *British & Irish Archaeological Bibliography* (*BIAB*). The study also provided a series of appendixes that

presented supplemental results of the study for an additional thirty such journals from Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and the Republic of South Africa. The authors discovered, regarding the British and Irish titles, that *BIAB* gave solid coverage to the most widely subscribed-to titles and comparatively exceptional coverage to the smaller association and county titles; that *AL*, *AATA Online*, *Bibliography of the History of Art*, and *The Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals* provided some worthwhile, if uneven, coverage, but that the rest of the indexes performed very poorly. The supplemental results suggested, again, that *AL* was the best source and that *Anthropological Index Online*, the Royal Anthropological Institute's index of the holdings of The Anthropology Library at The British Museum, was a close second (Tyler, Potter et al. 2006b).

## *THE INDEXES AND DATABASES*

As mentioned above, for this brief follow-up to our previous study, we will be addressing a single new index, EBSCO's *CMMC*.[3] A brief profile of the index is provided below.

### *Communication & Mass Media Complete (CMMC)*

Claimed coverage: Cover-to-cover indexing and abstracting of 370 journals; selective indexing and abstracting of additional 230 journals;

Party responsible: EBSCO;

Topics covered: Advertising, marketing, communication/speech disorders, communication studies, film, mass media, journalism, linguistics, rhetoric;

Years covered: Coverage varies by title; a number of the major journals are indexed back to their first issues, but coverage for the majority of the titles begins in the 1980s and 1990s;

Total number of citations: 492,010;

Update frequency and number of citations added: Daily, with approximately 25,000 records added annually;

Available formats: Web-based (EBSCO "...*CMMC*", "...*CMMI*"; Oldenkamp 2004; Vukas, e-mail).

Similar brief profiles for the more established selected communication studies indexes and for the selected multisubject/aggregator indexes may be found in this same section of the prior study.[4]

## SEARCHING THE INDEXES/DATABASES

In searching *CMMC*, in order to ensure the greatest possible accuracy, each cited journal citation was searched for up to three times in three different ways. The initial search employed a few key terms from the cited articles' titles in combination with their authors' names in a combined search of the index's title and author fields. If the initial search failed, a second search was conducted that employed other and/or additional terms from the cited articles' titles in a keyword search of the index's title field. If the second search failed, a third search was conducted by browsing the index's publications list for the appropriate volumes and/or issues of the cited journals. If a record for the cited journal articles was found through any of the three searches, a hit was recorded; a miss was recorded if a record for the cited journal articles could not be retrieved in these ways.

This is the same protocol employed in the previous version of this study for the searching of the selected multisubject/aggregator databases. The previous searching of the established communication studies indexes, however, involved some procedural irregularities. Readers interested in information on how the results for the other communication studies indexes were obtained are invited to review this same section of the prior study.

## RESULTS, PART I: THE FULL LIST: *CMMC* AND THE COMMUNICATION STUDIES INDEXES

Given the wide-ranging scope and multidisciplinary nature of communication studies and given the generally unimpressive showing of the established communications studies indexes in the previous iteration of this study, the authors' expectations for *CMMC* were low. We generally expected that: (1) although it might offer a slight improvement over the established indexes, *CMMC* would likely index much less than 50% of the 6,170 cited journal articles that made up our selected sample; (2) because it is a new product, *CMMC* would likely have the bulk of its indexing concentrated in the more recent journal literature from the 1990s and 2000; (3) *CMMC* would likely have the bulk of its indexing concentrated in the cited journal literature from those citing journals that fell within the call letter ranges usually associated with communication studies, P and PN (see the appendix for information on the journals and call letter groupings);[5] and (4) as a result of the above, there would be a great deal of overlap between

TABLE 1. Citations Covered by *CMMC* and the Communication Studies Indexes (N = 6,170)

| Index | Hits | % |
|---|---|---|
| Communication Abstracts | 1,312 | 21.3 |
| ComIndex | 1,861 | 30.2 |
| ComAbstracts | 1,195 | 19.4 |
| CMMC | 2,295 | 37.2 |

*CMMC* and the established communication studies indexes and very little unique indexing.

## Results for CMMC and the Communication Studies Indexes

As Table 1, 2, and 3 respectively show, *CMMC* both largely fulfilled our expectations and offered a few pleasant surprises. With just over one-third coverage of the 6,170 cited articles, *CMMC* offers a substantial improvement in indexing over the established communication studies indexes. In fact, its inclusion in the study raises the average of the indexes' coverage as a group by nearly four percentage points (i.e., from just over 23.6% to just over 27%), but its coverage is still well under 50%. Thus, *CMMC* would hardly seem to be a resource that the selected communication studies researchers would have wanted to turn to first in their search for pertinent materials.

## Results by the Cited Articles' Decades of Publication

As *CMMC* is a rather new resource, we had assumed, as mentioned, that EBSCO would have made a special effort to index the more recent literature in order to market *CMMC* as an attractively timely and current resource and that, as a result, the bulk of its improvement in indexing over the other communication studies indexes would be found in its indexing of the cited journal articles from the 1990s and 2000. As Table 2 shows, however, such was not entirely the case.[6]

Although the bulk of *CMMC*'s indexing does fall within the 1990s, its improvement over the established communication studies indexes occurs across the board. It would seem clear from these results, most notably in the "1970s" and "1960s & prior" categories, that in assembling its product

TABLE 2. Citations Covered by *CMMC* and the Communication Studies Indexes by Decade

| Index | 1960s & prior (n = 294) | | 1970s (n = 639) | | 1980s (n = 1,807) | | 1990s (n = 3,373) | | 2000 (n = 57) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Hits | % | Hits | % | Hits | % | Hits | % | Hits | % |
| Communication Abstracts | 0 | 0.0 | 62 | 9.7 | 429 | 23.7 | 809 | 24.0 | 12 | 21.1 |
| ComIndex | 5 | 1.7 | 213 | 33.3 | 544 | 30.1 | 1,076 | 31.9 | 23 | 40.4 |
| ComAbstracts | 6 | 2.0 | 26 | 4.1 | 261 | 14.4 | 880 | 26.1 | 22 | 38.6 |
| CMMC | 78 | 26.5 | 238 | 37.2 | 607 | 33.6 | 1,345 | 39.9 | 27 | 47.4 |

TABLE 3. Citations Covered by *CMMC* and the Communication Studies Indexes by Call Letter Group

|  | "B" Group (n = 516) | | "H" Group (n = 1,636) | | "P" Group (n = 1,918) | | "PN" Group (n = 1,319) | | "Misc" Group (n = 781) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Index | Hits | % | Hits | % | Hits | % | Hits | % | Hits | % |
| Communication Abstracts | 20 | 3.9 | 380 | 23.2 | 476 | 24.8 | 379 | 28.7 | 57 | 7.3 |
| ComIndex | 17 | 3.3 | 288 | 17.6 | 780 | 40.7 | 688 | 52.2 | 88 | 11.3 |
| ComAbstracts | 13 | 2.5 | 168 | 10.3 | 524 | 27.3 | 437 | 33.1 | 53 | 6.8 |
| CMMC | 54 | 10.5 | 506 | 30.9 | 795 | 41.4 | 782 | 59.3 | 158 | 20.2 |

EBSCO has put some thought and effort into ensuring that *CMMC* would be a more nearly comprehensive communication studies index.

## Results by the Citing Journals' Call Letter Groups

This far-ranging effort at superior, more nearly comprehensive coverage also appears when the indexes' hits for the cited journal literature are disaggregated into their citing-journals' call letter groups, as Table 3 illustrates.

*CMMC*'s coverage of the cited journal literature shown above is roughly equal to or superior to that of the next best-performing index, *ComIndex*, in every call letter group (for the journals and call letter groups, please see the appendix). In the call letter groups usually associated with communication studies, P and PN, respectively, its coverage is equal to and slightly better than *ComIndex*'s, and its coverage for the B, H, and catch-all Misc. groups ranges from just slightly to notably better. It even outperforms *Communication Abstracts* in the H range, the one range in which *Communication Abstracts* had proven itself superior to *ComIndex* in the previous study. Thus, *CMMC* would seem to be a resource as good as or better than the established communication studies indexes both in those areas on which they focus their attention and in those areas that they seem largely to ignore.

## Unique and Shared Hits for CMMC and the Communication Studies Indexes

Our final expectation for *CMMC*'s coverage was that there would be a great deal of redundancy in the coverage offered by *CMMC* and the more established communication studies indexes, but in light of EBSCO's

apparent efforts at a slightly more-comprehensive coverage, our earlier expectations no longer seem apropos. As Tables 4.1 and 4.2 respectively show, in head-to-head comparison with the other communication studies indexes and in comparison with these indexes as a group, *CMMC* offers a surprisingly sizeable amount of unique coverage.

When compared to the coverage offered by *Communication Abstracts* and by *ComAbstracts*, more than half of the coverage that *CMMC* offers is unique. Even when compared to its nearest best competitor in the group, *ComIndex*, roughly a quarter of the coverage that *CMMC* offers is unique. When one looks at the unique coverage offered by each of the other three indexes when compared to *CMMC*'s, *CMMC*, with the small exception of *Communication Abstracts* (i.e., approximately 17% of its indexing does not appear in *CMMC*), blankets nearly all of the coverage that they offer while offering a large number of citations not to be found in one or another of the other three indexes.

Of course, it remains to be examined, with respect to the communication studies indexes, whether *CMMC*'s superiority in indexing extends to the indexes as a group. As Table 4.2 reveals, it appears that it does and does not.

An impressive 17.6% of the cited-journal-article indexing offered by *CMMC* was not offered by any of the other three communication studies indexes, and, as was shown in Table 4.1, *CMMC* covers nearly all of the cited journal articles indexed by *ComIndex* and *ComAbstracts*. The exception to the rule in Table 4.2 is *Communication Abstracts*, which, with 13% unique indexing, appears to cover a corner of the field untouched by the other indexes. Even though *CMMC* appears to be superior to *Communication Abstracts* in every category examined, the line of *Communication Abstract*'s indexing runs enough askew to the other communications studies indexes' that a noteworthy block of its indexing is unique.

Thus, we concluded that the indexing staff at EBSCO are both covering the communications studies core and ranging farther afield a bit more assiduously than their counterparts at the other publishers. *CMMC*, in almost all categories, proved itself a marked improvement over the more-established indexes for the field. In light of the evidence provided in the above tables, we would, if we were to recommend a discipline-specific index for communication studies, clearly be inclined to recommend *CMMC*, with an additional recommendation that *Communication Abstracts* perhaps be subscribed to as a supplemental resource for the unique 13.7% of its coverage of the cited journal literature. The answer to our first question, then, would be that *CMMC* does appear to offer an improved coverage of the cited

TABLE 4.1. One-to-One Cross-Index Comparisons: Unique Hits & Shared Hits for *CMMC* and the Communication Studies Indexes

| Index | Communication Abstracts (1,312 hits) | | ComIndex (1,861 hits) | | ComAbstracts (1,195 hits) | | CMMC (2,295 hits) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Unique Hits | Shared Hits | Unique Hits | Shared Hits | Unique Hits | Shared Hits | Unique Hits | Shared Hits |
| vs. Communication Abstracts | — | — | 916 | 945 | 526 | 669 | 1,208 | 1,087 |
| vs. ComIndex | 367 | 945 | — | — | 7 | 1,188 | 595 | 1,700 |
| vs. ComAbstracts | 643 | 669 | 673 | 1,188 | — | — | 1,188 | 1,107 |
| vs. CMMC | 225 | 1,087 | 161 | 1,700 | 88 | 1,107 | — | — |

TABLE 4.2. Full Cross-Index Comparisons: Total Unique Hits for *CMMC* and the Communication Studies Indexes

| Index | Total Unique Hits | % of Total Hits |
|---|---|---|
| Communication Abstracts (1,312 hits) | 180 | 13.7 |
| ComIndex (1,861 hits) | 47 | 2.5 |
| ComAbstracts (1,195 hits) | 0 | 0 |
| CMMC (2,295 hits) | 403 | 17.6 |

journal literature when its coverage is compared to that of *Communication Abstracts*, *ComIndex*, and *ComAbstracts*.

## RESULTS, PART II: THE CURRENT JOURNAL LITERATURE SUBSET: CMMC, THE COMMUNICATION STUDIES INDEXES, AND THE MULTISUBJECT/AGGREGATOR DATABASES

The question of whether we would recommend a small, discipline-specific index for communication studies remains. In the previous iteration of this study, as a supplement to "Results, Part I", we evaluated how well the three discipline-specific communication studies indexes indexed the then-recent cited journal literature (i.e., a subset of 2,126 cited articles published during 1994 and after, up to and including cited in-press items later published in 2000) and compared this coverage to that provided by five selected, online, multisubject/aggregator databases. The results for the three communications studies indexes, when compared to the results of four of the five multisubject/aggregator databases, suggested to us that smaller, discipline-specific indexes were largely lacking in utility for communication studies researchers and that their needs, in terms of gross coverage, would quite clearly be better met by large, multisubject/aggregator databases. Despite *CMMC*'s proving itself superior to the older, more-established communication studies indexes, it seems highly unlikely that it could reverse our prior conclusions. We will, however, once again examine how well the indexes and databases covered the whole of the subset of recent cited journal literature and examine how well each covered the citing journals' call letter groups, and we will close the study by examining how much unique coverage the communication studies indexes provided when

TABLE 5. Citations from the Current Literature Covered by *CMMC*, the Communication Studies Indexes, and the Multisubject/Aggregator Databases (n = 2,126)

| Index | Hits | % |
|---|---|---|
| Communication Abstracts | 532 | 25.0 |
| ComIndex | 726 | 34.1 |
| ComAbstracts | 618 | 29.1 |
| ArticleFirst | 1,621 | 76.2 |
| Academic Search Elite | 1,021 | 48.0 |
| OmniFile | 105 | 4.9 |
| Web of Science | 1,477 | 69.5 |
| Ingenta | 1,655 | 77.8 |
| CMMC | 921 | 43.3 |

compared to the multisubject/aggregator databases, how much unique coverage the multisubject/aggregator databases provided when compared to the communications studies indexes, and how much unique coverage each index and database provided when its coverage was compared to that of the rest of the group as a whole.

## Results for CMMC, the Communication Studies Indexes, and the Multisubject/Aggregator Databases

As Table 5 shows, the addition of *CMMC* to the study has left the dynamic between the two groups of indexes/databases largely unchanged. In the earlier edition of this study, *ArticleFirst, Academic Search Elite*, *Web of Science*, and *Ingenta* as a group indexed on average slightly more than 2.3 times as many of the cited journals articles as *Communication Abstracts*, *ComIndex*, and *ComAbstracts* indexed as a group on average. The addition of *CMMC* to the group of communication studies indexes brings that disparity in group averages down a bit, to just under 2.1 times, but the three largest multisubject indexes—*Ingenta*, *ArticleFirst*, and *Web of Science*, respectively—each still offer coverage of the cited journal literature that is overwhelmingly superior to that of any of the communication studies indexes.

A point of some interest, however, is the comparability of the results for the two EBSCO products in the study, *Academic Search Elite* and *CMMC*. While *CMMC* offers a great improvement in the indexing of the cited journal literature over the indexing of the other communication

studies indexes, it clearly could not serve, in terms of its gross coverage, as an acceptable substitute for the three largest multisubject/aggregator databases. The results in Table 5, however, raise the rather intriguing possibility that *CMMC* could, for the communication studies researcher at least, serve as an acceptable alternative to *Academic Search Elite*.[7]

## *Results by the Citing Journals' Call Letter Groups*

The results in Table 3 revealed: (1) that *CMMC* provided coverage comparable or superior to *ComIndex*'s for the citing journals in the call letter ranges usually associated with communication studies, P and PN, and that both indexes were much superior to *Communication Abstracts* and *ComAbstracts* in these ranges; (2) that *CMMC* provided superior coverage to *Communication Abstracts* for the citing journals in the H call group and that both indexes were much superior to *ComIndex* and *ComAbstracts* in this grouping; and (3) that *CMMC* provided coverage much superior to the other three indexes' for the citing journals in the B call letter group and in the catch-all Misc. group (again, see the appendix for information on these call letter groupings). Our expectation with the current-literature subset was that these disparities in coverage among the communication studies indexes would likely continue but that, true to form for the group, *CMMC*'s improvement in coverage would be unlikely to upset the inferior/superior coverage dichotomy between the communication studies indexes and most of the selected multisubject/aggregator databases.

As Table 6 shows, our expectation was largely correct, but the results also offer a few surprises. *CMMC*'s and *ComIndex*'s coverage of the cited journal literature from the journals in the P call letter group remained roughly equal, and the disparity in their coverage of the cited journal literature from the journals in the PN call letter group increased just slightly in *CMMC*'s favor. The gap in *CMMC*'s favor between *Communication Abstracts'* and *CMMC*'s coverage of the cited literature from the journals in the H call letter group widened a bit more in *CMMC*'s favor, too, and its superiority over all three communication studies indexes in the other call letter groupings increased slightly, as well.

However, as the table suggests, *CMMC*'s superiority within the group of communication studies indexes does not necessarily translate into across-the-board competitiveness with the large multisubject/aggregator databases. *ArticleFirst*, *Ingenta*, and *Web of Science* offer perceptibly and fairly consistently superior coverage in nearly all of the call letter groups.

TABLE 6. Citations Covered by *CMMC*, the Communication Studies Indexes and the Multisubject/Aggregator Databases by Call Letter Group

| Index | "B" Group (n = 164) | | "H" Group (n = 552) | | "P" Group (n = 685) | | "PN" Group (n = 428) | | "Misc" Group (n = 297) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Hits | % | Hits | % | Hits | % | Hits | % | Hits | % |
| Communication Abstracts | 3 | 1.8 | 136 | 24.6 | 198 | 28.9 | 165 | 38.6 | 30 | 10.1 |
| ComIndex | 6 | 3.7 | 129 | 23.4 | 316 | 46.1 | 236 | 55.1 | 39 | 13.1 |
| ComAbstracts | 5 | 3.0 | 87 | 15.8 | 275 | 40.1 | 215 | 50.2 | 36 | 12.1 |
| ArticleFirst | 120 | 73.2 | 421 | 76.3 | 534 | 78.0 | 327 | 76.4 | 219 | 73.7 |
| Academic Search Elite | 92 | 56.1 | 154 | 27.9 | 393 | 57.4 | 276 | 64.5 | 106 | 35.7 |
| OmniFile | 3 | 1.8 | 56 | 10.1 | 14 | 2.0 | 21 | 4.9 | 11 | 3.7 |
| Web of Science | 127 | 77.4 | 366 | 66.3 | 479 | 69.9 | 278 | 65.0 | 227 | 76.4 |
| Ingenta | 55 | 33.5 | 439 | 79.5 | 558 | 81.5 | 365 | 85.3 | 238 | 80.1 |
| CMMC | 29 | 17.7 | 199 | 36.1 | 326 | 47.6 | 275 | 64.3 | 92 | 31.0 |

The single call letter group in which *CMMC* provided indexing on an equal or nearly equal footing with these three indexes was the PN group.

The intriguing possibility that *CMMC* could, for the communication studies researcher, serve as an acceptable substitute for the other EBSCO product in the study, *Academic Search Elite*, is lent some additional credence by the two databases' results in Table 6. The two offer comparable coverage for the PN and Misc. groups, and *Academic Search Elite* offers slightly superior coverage for the P group. However, *CMMC* offers superior coverage of the H group, a reversal that might be accounted for by EBSCO's likely concentration of its coverage of business-related communication in its *Business Source Elite*, *Business Source Premier*, and *Business Source Complete* products.

Interestingly, the only call letter group in which *Academic Source Elite*'s coverage is remarkably superior to *CMMC*'s is the B group, in which it out performs both *CMMC* and, surprisingly, the otherwise superlative *Ingenta* database. For reasons unknown to us, the latter two indexes, as well as the older communication studies indexes, seem to be largely uninterested in indexing the journal literature devoted to the psychology of communication and/or to writing and rhetoric. Of course, the coverage of the cited journal literature from the selected journals in the B group offered by *Ingenta* and

*CMMC*, which could be characterized as poor and rather poor, respectively, is far superior to the nearly nonexistent coverage offered the call letter group by the three older communication studies indexes, but this dearth still represents a puzzling short-fall in the two indexes' otherwise good-to-excellent coverage.

### Unique and Shared Hits for CMMC, the Communication Studies Indexes, and the Multisubject/Aggregator Databases

At this point the argument in favor of the smaller and more highly specialized communication studies indexes would appear to be very weak and the need for another such index, dubious. One of the two arguments that we had earlier offered as a justification of the communication studies indexes—that they might, in head-to-head comparison with each of the multisubject/aggregator databases, provide a greater coverage of the cited journal literature of the field of communication studies—appears false. What remains is the second argument that the communication studies indexes offer, with their tighter topical focus, a more in-depth coverage of the literature of the field of communication studies and thereby provide indexing for a large number of journal articles not covered by the broader multisubject/aggregator databases.

For Table 7.1, we recorded how many of each of the communication studies' indexes' "hits" within the current-literature subset were not covered by each of the other indexes and databases when compared head-to-head and how many of each were shared. As the table shows, *CMMC* demonstrated some improvement in uniqueness of indexing over the three older communication studies indexes where the raw number of uniquely indexed items is concerned, but the percentage of *CMMC*'s indexing that was unique was often roughly the same as that of the other communication studies indexes (e.g., when compared to *Web of Science*, the approximate percentage of the communication studies indexes' indexing that was unique was as follows: *Communication Abstracts*: 22%; *ComIndex*: 29.5%; *ComAbstracts*: 26%; and *CMMC*: 30%). *CMMC* did perform better than its fellow communication studies indexes against most of the multisubject/aggregator databases, but we feel that *CMMC* was still overwhelmed, as were its fellow communication studies indexes, by the largest of these databases. Against *ArticleFirst* and *Ingenta*, only a mere 16.8% and 10.1% of *CMMC*'s coverage was not provided by the two databases, respectively.

There remains the possibility that *CMMC*'s worth as a stand-alone product for communication studies could still be argued for if one were to

TABLE 7.1. One-to-One Cross-Index/Database Comparisons: Unique Hits and Shared Hits for *CMMC* and the Communication Studies Indexes When Compared against Themselves and against the Multisubject/Aggregator Databases

| Index | Communication Abstracts (532 hits) | | ComIndex (726 hits) | | ComAbstracts (618 hits) | | CMMC (921 hits) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Unique Hits | Shared Hits | Unique Hits | Shared Hits | Unique Hits | Shared Hits | Unique Hits | Shared Hits |
| vs. Communication Abstracts | — | — | 322 | 404 | 245 | 373 | 449 | 472 |
| vs. ComIndex | 128 | 404 | — | — | 1 | 617 | 249 | 672 |
| vs. ComAbstracts | 159 | 373 | 109 | 617 | — | — | 343 | 578 |
| vs. ArticleFirst | 59 | 473 | 110 | 616 | 66 | 552 | 155 | 766 |
| vs. Academic Search Elite | 155 | 377 | 197 | 529 | 120 | 498 | 290 | 631 |
| vs. OmniFile | 508 | 24 | 698 | 28 | 607 | 11 | 869 | 52 |
| vs. Web of Science | 117 | 415 | 214 | 512 | 165 | 453 | 277 | 644 |
| vs. Ingenta | 46 | 486 | 71 | 655 | 49 | 569 | 93 | 828 |
| vs. CMMC | 60 | 472 | 54 | 672 | 40 | 578 | — | — |

reverse the relationships in Table 7.1 and then to discover that much or most of the coverage provided by the multisubject/aggregator databases was also provided by *CMMC*. As Table 7.2 shows, unfortunately, nearly 50% of *Ingenta*'s hits, nearly 53% of *ArticleFirst*'s hits, and nearly 56.4% of *Web of Science*'s hits were not to be found in *CMMC*'s indexing of the cited journal literature. Thus, these three large multisubject/aggregator databases covered much of what *CMMC* indexed, and *CMMC* covered half or less of what they indexed.

With respect to the ancillary issue raised earlier regarding *CMMC*'s serving as a replacement to *Academic Search Elite* for the communication studies researcher, the results in Table 7.1 and Table 7.2 bring the relationship between the two indexes more clearly into focus and suggest the argument is not supportable. *CMMC* produced just one hundred fewer hits than *Academic Search Elite*, and the bulk of their hits were shared. However, relative to each other, roughly one-third of the two databases' hits (i.e., 31.5% of *CMMC*'s and 38% of *Academic Search Elite*'s) were unique. Thus, the two EBSCO products' relationship would seem to be more complementary than we had earlier thought, and rather than sacrificing one product for the other, we would suggest that a library could profitably subscribe to both resources and achieve indexing nearly equal to that of the largest multisubject/aggregator databases.[8]

Of course, as Table 7.3 shows, almost none of the cited journal literature in this study is exclusively indexed by only one index or database, so there also appears to be no viable argument in favor of *CMMC* where absolute uniqueness of coverage is concerned. Given how very large the multisubject/aggregator databases are and given that there were already three indexes devoted to the same field as is *CMMC*, it seemed unlikely that *CMMC* could provide a unique avenue into a little-indexed or entirely ignored portion of communication studies literature, and Table 7.3 suggests that this supposition was correct. In both depth and breadth, the field of communications studies appears to have been well covered.

## *CONCLUSION*

It would seem that the addition of *CMMC* to the arena of communication studies indexing has done little to alter the conclusions that we drew previously: that the small, discipline-specific index may have largely lost its utility for the communication studies researcher. Although *CMMC*, in its indexing of the cited journal literature gathered here, demonstrated

TABLE 7.2. One-to-One Cross-Index/Database Comparisons: Unique Hits and Shared Hits for the Multisubject/Aggregator Databases When Compared against *CMMC* and the Communication Studies Indexes

| Index | ArticleFirst (1,621 hits) | | Academic Search Elite (1,021 hits) | | OmniFile (105 hits) | | Web of Science (1,477) | | Ingenta (1,655 hits) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Unique Hits | Shared Hits | Unique Hits | Shared Hits | Unique Hits | Shared Hits | Unique Hits | Shared Hits | Unique Hits | Shared Hits |
| vs. Communication Abstracts | 1,148 | 473 | 644 | 377 | 81 | 24 | 1,062 | 415 | 1,169 | 486 |
| vs. ComIndex | 1,005 | 616 | 492 | 529 | 77 | 28 | 965 | 512 | 1,000 | 655 |
| vs. ComAbstracts | 1,069 | 552 | 523 | 498 | 94 | 11 | 1,024 | 453 | 1,086 | 569 |
| vs. CMMC | 855 | 766 | 390 | 631 | 53 | 52 | 833 | 644 | 827 | 828 |

TABLE 7.3. Full Cross-Index/Database Comparisons: Total and by Call Letter Grouping: Unique Hits for *CMMC*, the Communication Studies Indexes, and the Multisubject/Aggregator Databases

| Index | Total Unique Hits | % of Total Hits | Hits Call Letter "B" | Hits Call Letter "H" | Hits Call Letter "P" | Hits Call Letter "PN" | Hits Call Letter "MISC" |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Communication Abstracts | 3 | 0.006 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| ComIndex | 2 | 0.003 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ComAbstracts | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ArticleFirst | 31 | 0.019 | 6 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Academic Search Elite | 5 | 0.005 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| OmniFile | 1 | 0.010 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Web of Science | 35 | 0.024 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 3 | 4 |
| Ingenta | 44 | 0.027 | 2 | 19 | 14 | 2 | 7 |
| CMMC | 4 | 0.004 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |

that it provides an appreciable improvement over its fellow communication studies indexes, it too was still largely overwhelmed by the indexing provided by most of the large, multisubject/aggregator databases studied. Our results suggest that *CMMC*, perhaps in tandem with *Communication Abstracts*, would best serve as an adjunct to a midsized multisubject/aggregator database like *Academic Search Elite*, and, on the basis of our findings, we would be hard pressed to argue for a greater role for *CMMC*. In fact, as in the previous section, this would be precisely the role for *CMMC* that we would recommend to the librarian hoping to serve an active communication studies program. Subscribing to both *CMMC* and a product like *Academic Search Elite* would allow one to provide coverage of communication studies comparable to that provided by the largest multisubject/aggregator indexes while still offering the advantages of easy searching ability and broad full-text content that such resources usually provide and that students seem to prefer and to appreciate. Although we do not wish to overstate the case against them, we again find ourselves inclined to argue against the utility of the small, discipline-specific index for publishing communication studies researchers. The field of communication studies has become too large and too varied in its interests and scope to be wedged into its own little index.

## NOTES

1. For additional information regarding the earlier version of this study, please refer to: Tyler, Boudreau, and Leach (2005).

2. A typo appears to have crept into Figure 2. Graph 7 of the article, which should read "(n = 11)", as does every other Graph 7 in the article.

3. A version of *CMMC* without full-text content, *Communication & Mass Media Index*, is also available from EBSCO (EBSCO ". . . *CMMI*").

4. Due to the amount of time necessary for the completion and publication of this follow-up study, several of the profiles may have become slightly inaccurate by virtue of their being out of date. We encourage the interested reader to consult the index- and database-providers' Web pages or contact a sales representative for more up-to-date information. For example, additional information on the communication studies indexes may be found at the following: ComIndex: http://www.cios.org/www/ComIndex.htm ComAbstracts: http://www.cios.org/www/Abstract.htm Communication Abstracts: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsProdDesc.nav?prodId=Journal200918

5. For further information about the studies' selected sample and the selected journals, please see this article's appendix and "Appendix I" and "Appendix II" of the previous article. Also, please note that the call letter P group of the citing journals contains one title with the call letters PE that probably more properly belongs to linguistics than to communication studies.

6. In the previous version of this study, the column for the cited journal articles published in the 1970s erroneously indicated that there were 634 articles in this category. The error was likely a product of the lead author's atrocious handwriting, and the currently reported number, 639, is correct for both articles.

7. The reader ought to bear in mind, of course, that *Academic Search Elite* is EBSCO's lower tier product and that its *Academic Search Premier* database offers slightly more comprehensive indexing (EBSCO "*Academic Search*$^{TM}$*Elite*," "*Academic Search*$^{TM}$*Premier*"). The reader also ought to be aware that a sizeable amount of the full-text content for communications studies was removed from EBSCO's aggregator databases to *CMMC* (Oldenkamp 2004; Vukas e-mail). Depending upon one's needs for more indexing or for greater full-text content in communication studies, either product might prove the more useful.

8. The total of *Academic Search Elite*'s hits when added to *CMMC*'s unique hits relative to *Academic Search Elite*'s coverage would be nearly equal to the coverage offered by each of the three largest multisubject/aggregator databases (i.e., 1,021 + 290 = 1,311 hits).

## REFERENCES

APA licenses content from former e-psyche database. 2004. *EContent: Digital Content Strategies & Resources*. February 13. http://www.econtentmag.com/Articles/ArticleReader.aspx?ArticleID=6098.

Blessinger, K. and M. Olle. 2004. Content analysis of the leading general academic databases. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services* 28 (3): 335–346.

Chapman, K. 2001. An examination of the usefulness of JSTOR to researchers in finance. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian* 19 (2): 39–47.

Chapman, K. 2002. Full-text database support for scholarly research in finance. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship* 7 (4): 35–44.

Chapman, K. and P. Brothers. 2006. Database coverage for research in management information systems. *College & Research Libraries* 67 (1): 50–62.

Davidson, B. H., S. Lutishoor, and A. S. Bailey. 2000. Full-text resources for undergraduates: An analysis of *PA Research II* and *WilsonSelect*. *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 7 (2): 25–50.

EBSCO Publishing. *Academic Search*™ *Elite*. http://www.epnet.com/thisTopic.php? market ID=1&topicID=3 (accessed May 17, 2006).

EBSCO Publishing. *Academic Search*™ *Premier.* http://www.epnet.com/thisTopic.php? marketID=1&topicID=1 (accessed May 17, 2006).

EBSCO Publishing. *Communication & Mass Media Complete*™*(CMMC)*. http://www. epnet.com/thisTopic.php? marketID=1&topicID=56 (accessed May 17, 2006).

EBSCO Publishing. *Communication & Mass Media Index*™*(CMMI)*. http://www.epnet.com/thisTopic.php?marketID=1&topicID=58 (accessed May 17, 2006).

Ewald, L. A. 2004. A comparison of subject databases in sociology, communication & music. *Kentucky Libraries* 68 (4): 18–21.

Jacsó, P. 2000. "Database source coverage: Myth and reality," Savvy Searching. *Online Information Review* 24 (6): 450–453.

Joswick, K. E. 2006. Full text psychology journals available from popular library databases. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32 (4): 349–354.

Oldenkamp, David M. 2004. EBSCO's New Communication and MassMedia [sic] Complete (*CMMC*). *Searcher* April 2004: 40–48.

Read, E. J. and R. C. Smith. 2000. Searching for library and information science literature: A comparison of coverage in three databases. *Library Computing: Internet & Software Applications for Information Professionals* 19 (1/2): 118–126.

Robertson, M. 2001. E-psyche: A comparison of content with *PsycINFO*. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian* 20 (1): 1–13.

Schaffer, T. 2001. Databases and political science research. *Online Information Review* 25 (1): 47–53.

Tucker, J. C. 2005. Database support for research in public administration. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian* 24 (1): 47–60.

Tyler, D. C., S. O. Boudreau, and S. M. Leach. 2005. The communication studies researcher and the communication studies indexes. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian* 23 (2): 19–46.

Tyler, D. C., K. C. Potter, S. M. Leach, and J. M. Kreifels. 2006a. Digging a little deeper: Coverage of archaeology from the U.S. from 1950 to 2000+ in discipline-specific and subject-oriented online indexes. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian* 24 (2): 21–67.

Tyler, D. C., K. C. Potter, S. M. Leach, J. M. Kreifels, and B. Turner. 2006b. Digging deeper still: Coverage of archaeology from the United Kingdom and Ireland from 1950 to 2000+ in discipline-specific and subject-oriented online indexes. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian* 25 (1): 33–91.

Vukas, Rachel. E-mail message to S. O. Boudreau, June 29, 2005.

Walters, W. H. and E. I. Wilder. 2003. Bibliographic index coverage of a multidisciplinary field. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology* 54 (14): 1305–1312.

## APPENDIX: Selected Journals by Call Letter Group and Call Number

| Journal Titles, Volumes, and Issues | LC Call Number | Call Letter Group | # Selected Biblio-Graphies | # Selected Journal Citations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Philosophy & Rhetoric, 33, 1 | B1 | B | 7 | 41 |
| Etc.: A Review of General Semantics, 57, 1–4 | B840 | B | 17 | 19 |
| Argumentation, 14, 1 and 2 | BC1 | B | 6 | 36 |
| Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 24, 1 and 2 | BF353 | B | 9 | 199 |
| Journal of Memory and Language, 42, 1 | BF455 | B | 7 | 221 |
| Human Relations, 53, 1 | H1 | H | 4 | 135 |
| Science Communication, 22, 1 | H62 | H | 4 | 49 |
| Management Communication Quarterly, 14, 1 | HD30.3 | H | 7 | 118 |
| Telecommunications Policy, 24, 2 | HE7601 | H | 5 | 19 |
| Journal of Consumer Research, 27, 1 | HF5415.3 | H | 9 | 213 |
| Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 14, 1 | HF5717 | H | 6 | 79 |
| Business Communication Quarterly, 63, 1 and 2 | HF5718 | H | 17 | 117 |
| International Journal of Advertising, 19, 1 | HF5801 | H | 6 | 108 |
| The Journal of Advertising, 29, 1 | HF5801 | H | 6 | 138 |
| Journal of Advertising Research, 40, 1 & 2 | HF5801 | H | 10 | 87 |

APPENDIX: (*Continued*)

| Journal Titles, Volumes, and Issues | LC Call Number | Call Letter Group | # Selected Biblio- Graphies | # Selected Journal Citations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising, 22, 1 | HF5801 | H | 5 | 181 |
| Human Communication Research, 26, 1 | HM258 | H | 8 | 200 |
| Journal of Applied Communication Research, 28, 1 | HM258 | H | 4 | 76 |
| Media, Culture, & Society, 22, 1 | HM258 | H | 6 | 25 |
| Public Opinion Quarterly, 64, 1 | HM261 | H | 6 | 91 |
| Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33, 1 | P1 | P | 4 | 40 |
| Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 19, 1 | P40 | P | 7 | 188 |
| Communication Research Reports, 16, 4 | P87 | P | 11 | 204 |
| The Communication Review, 4, 1 | P87 | P | 9 | 42 |
| Communication Theory, 10, 1 | P87 | P | 6 | 98 |
| Critical Studies in Media Communication, 17, 1 | P87 | P | 5 | 13 |
| The Howard Journal of Communications, 11, 1 | P87 | P | 4 | 97 |
| Journal of Communication, 50, 1 | P87 | P | 6 | 163 |
| Journal of Communication Inquiry, 24, 1 | P87 | P | 5 | 47 |
| Journal of Popular Culture, 33, 3 | P87 | P | 7 | 6 |
| Language & Communication, 20, 1 | P87 | P | 4 | 58 |
| Mass Communication & Society, 3, 1 | P87 | P | 5 | 186 |
| Communication Research, 27, 1 | P91 | P | 4 | 157 |
| European Journal of Communication, 15, 1 | P91.3 | P | 4 | 47 |

APPENDIX: (*Continued*)

| Journal Titles, Volumes, and Issues | LC Call Number | Call Letter Group | # Selected Biblio-Graphies | # Selected Journal Citations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Communication Reports, 13, 1 and 2 | P91.5 | P | 10 | 177 |
| Nordicom Review, 22, 1 | P91.5 | P | 9 | 46 |
| Media Asia, 27, 1 | P92 | P | 4 | 17 |
| Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 15, 1 | P94 | P | 4 | 30 |
| The Journal of Media Economics, 13, 1 | P96 | P | 4 | 20 |
| Women's Studies in Communication, 23, 1 | P96 | P | 6 | 69 |
| Discourse & Society, 11, 1 | P302 | P | 5 | 59 |
| Discourse Processes, 30, 1 | P302 | P | 3 | 117 |
| American Speech, 75, 1 | PE2801 | P | 4 | 37 |
| Text and Performance Quarterly, 20, 1 | PN2 | PN | 6 | 34 |
| Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 30, 1 | PN171.4 | PN | 4 | 28 |
| Written Communication, 17, 1 | PN211 | PN | 4 | 42 |
| Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 44, 1 | PN1991 | PN | 10 | 214 |
| Journal of Popular Film & Television, 28, 1 and 2 | PN1993 | PN | 11 | 12 |
| Argumentation and Advocacy, 37, 1 | PN4001 | PN | 11 | 91 |
| Communication Studies, 51, 1 | PN4001 | PN | 5 | 81 |
| Communication Education, 49, 1 | PN4071 | PN | 11 | 129 |
| Communication Quarterly, 48, 1 | PN4071 | PN | 8 | 165 |
| Quarterly Journal of Speech, 86, 3 | PN4071 | PN | 4 | 63 |
| Southern Communication Journal, 66, 1 | PN4071 | PN | 7 | 114 |
| Western Journal of Communication, 64, 1 | PN4071 | PN | 5 | 90 |
| Communication Monographs, 67, 1 | PN4077 | PN | 6 | 143 |
| Gazette, 62, 1 | PN4699 | PN | 5 | 26 |

APPENDIX: (*Continued*)

| Journal Titles, Volumes, and Issues | LC Call Number | Call Letter Group | # Selected Biblio-Graphies | # Selected Journal Citations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Journalism & Communication Monographs, 1, 4 | PN4722 | PN | 2 | 31 |
| Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 55, 1 | PN4788 | PN | 6 | 56 |
| Political Communication, 17, 1 | JF1525 | Misc. | 4 | 83 |
| Popular Music and Society, 24, 1 | ML1 | Misc. | 4 | 12 |
| Health Communication, 12, 1 | R118 | Misc. | 5 | 146 |
| American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 10, 1 | RC423 | Misc. | 10 | 149 |
| Journal of Communication Disorders, 33, 1 | RC423 | Misc. | 4 | 206 |
| Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 43, 1 | RC423 | Misc. | 5 | 151 |
| The Information Society, 16, 1 | Z668 | Misc. | 5 | 34 |