HOW TO GROUP AND COMBINE TERMS

By Marvin Hunn

Ever have difficulty deciding how to group and combine terms into a search statement using search engine operators? Here is one approach to search statement formulation based on a table layout.

First decide what concepts you need to combine to retrieve what you need. Represent each concept as a column in a table. There may be many ways of expressing each concept. These are search terms. List search terms on rows of the table.

Concept1. List below terms that	Concept2 . List below terms that	Concept3. List below terms that
express Concept1	express Concept2	express Concept3
• Term1	• Term3	• Term5
• Term2	• Term4	• Term6
		• Term7

Your final search statement will use << OR >> to connect the terms and << AND >> to combine the columns. (See <u>https://library.dts.edu/basic-concepts</u> for a review of operators like AND and OR.)

(term1 OR term2) AND (term3 OR term4) AND (term5 OR term6 OR	term7)
--	--------

So a search for healthful snacks for dogs might look like the following.

dogs And (shack ok heat) And (heath ok humin)	dogs	AND	(snack* OR treat*)	AND	(health* OR nutriti*)
---	------	-----	----------------------	-----	-------------------------

Field codes go with the terms. Here is a search for books by Smith on the topic of dog snacks.

0	AU smith	AND	SU dogs	AND	(SU snack [*] OR SU treat [*]) ¹
---	----------	-----	---------	-----	--

Most databases offer a form for search terms where each column in the grid becomes a row in the form. This reversal can confuse. For example, the search form might look like the following.²

¹ Some systems don't like field qualifiers before parentheses; others allow it. So some allow this:

SU (snack OR treat) but some don't. Nearly all allow a field code paired with each term like this (SU snack OR SU treat).

² Alas, this search statement also gives us articles by smith about veterinary treatment of sick dogs. How could you improve the precision of this search statement?

Author	▼ smith	
AND Subject	▼ dogs	
AND • Subject	▼ (snack* OR treat*)	

You may want to mix field codes within a column. For example, suppose you want books on the 19th century Arminian treatment of predestination. You especially value books by Richard Watson. Nearly all books by him are about some aspect of Arminianism. So you might treat author Watson as a synonym for the subject of Arminianism.

Arminian theology	predestination
AU Watson, Richard	SU predestination
• SU Arminian*	SU election

(AU Watson OR SU Arminian*) AND (SU predestination OR SU election)³

How Word-Concept Mismatch Complicates Search Statements

Let's say you want to search for information about sons. You analyze "sons" as consisting of two important concepts: male and offspring. So you construct two lists of search terms, a list for the concept of male and a list for the concept of offspring, and you combine terms as follows.

(male OR masculine OR etc.) AND (offspring OR progeny OR etc.)

But what do you do with the word "sons"? It contains both concepts. So you combine as follows.

sons OR ((male OR masculine OR etc.) AND (offspring OR progeny OR etc.))

I think this is a clear example. It is easy to grasp that son = male offspring. It is easy to understand the search statement logic. But this is a bad example in the sense that a search for << male AND offspring >> is unproductive in the real world. Documents and database records don't ordinarily use such language.

³ More than one author has the name Richard Watson. This might retrieve works by **some** Watson on **political** elections. How can improve precision by specifying the correct author and the theological concept of divine election?