

Emily Brown
LIB202
Team 3
Assignment #1

Topic: History of the Olympics

5-10 terms: Olympics, Olympic history, Ancient Greece, history of Olympics, Olympic games, first Olympics. Ancient Olympic Games, history of ancient Olympic games, Ancient Olympics

Google search:

Practical benefits and drawbacks: Plethora of sites related to the subject. Major drawback is having to comb through it. Web searches often have multiple results that are all part of the same web site. time to figure out system? Zero, Google on chrome is very, very simple and familiar to me.

Quantity of info? Tons, almost too much.

Quality of info? First hit is Wikipedia, an inherently unreliable site.

Authoritative? Hard to confirm the authority of any site with out hunting except when lucky.

Precise? Varying results of how precise the information is delivered.

Up to date? Very hard to find the date of publication, but since this is the History of the Olympics, maybe that's not totally relevant. Useful for citing though.

Relevant? Varying success. Some articles have references.

Satisfaction with results? The majority of what I've found are not sources I'd use for a paper. Varying degrees of information given, even with very specific terms searched.

Did the original terms help? Yes.

Overall, this a way to find quick information, but it's very difficult to be sure of it's reliability. Usually it's very difficult to cite and the results you get are often more of a miss than a hit. For example, though I was searching for "history of ancient Olympic games" I still got pages with the more recent Olympic games detailed.

King Library search:

Practical benefits and drawbacks: I've decided to use the library guide for history in the King Library to search for my topic. Not sure how this works, reading over the specific time frame databases but none fit. Going with Project Muse to try a search there, one I'm familiar with. Trying a second database, one I dislike highly but am familiar with, Jstor. Both databases are behaving similarly.

Quantity? Scarce. I'm readjusting my search terms to work with the database. Not getting what I want at all. Frustrating, but when I do find a result on topic, it's very good and worth the hunt. Getting lots of reviews of books from Jstor, unhelpful. Muse, movie listings.

Quality? The few results I'm getting that are relevant are spot on and interesting. Excellent articles, very cite-able.

Authoritative? Journal articles, easy access to all the relevant data for citing. Very good.

Precise? I'm still figuring out this database, trying advanced search. Difficult to figure out what terms to use. The articles that are on topic have very interesting focuses.

Up-to-date? While the date of the articles is very easy to find, the topic doesn't need to be up to date. This format makes it easy to check however.

Relevant? Not always. Some of it is discussing peripheral issues related to the topic. Not exactly helpful. Worth reading through.

Satisfaction? The majority of the articles I found that were on topic and relevant were very cite-able and quite good. But it is very scarce per database. I'd probably end up using 2-3 databases for articles on one paper, but they would be very good sources of information.

Did the Original Terms Help? Yes

Overall, I think that this would be the best way to get a variety of articles on very specific topics, like the history of the Olympics. Since they are mainly journal articles that have one unique perspective on the topic, you'd get some info not found in text books. Pretty ideal for research papers and the like.

Chico Library search:

Practical benefits and drawbacks? If your looking for a general topic, such as ancient Rome, or you want to be able to touch a book, then this is a good place to go. However, if you are looking for actual source materials this is not a good approach. There is only so much physical space on the shelves, and having books on specific topics, such as the history of the Olympics, is not always possible.

Time to figure out system? Very fast, even though it was my first time using their web based catalog search. It showed records available, both at the Chico branch as well as branches they could borrow from. The stacks were well labeled.

Quantity? Measly. 12 records, mostly Juvenile, and mostly regarding the modern Olympics

Quality? The only books on the history of the Olympics were children's books. Poor quality for any kind of serious paper.

Authoritative? Not at all. The books I opened up didn't even have a bibliography, just an index of terms

Precise? The children's books were all over simplified, with illustrations and fonts that looked like handwriting. Not at all what I'd call precise.

Up to Date? Considering the subject matter, I'd say this was irrelevant.

Relevant? I would never use any of the books I found as a source for a paper.

Satisfaction? Totally dissatisfied. I didn't find one adult book on the topic. If I absolutely had to use something from one of them on a paper, it would be snippets of information from the ancient world history section and the modern Olympic games introduction areas, if that. I didn't see any magazines on the topic either.

Did Original terms help? Yes, I found what I was looking for with only a few modifications of my keywords.

Overall, this method of searching for sources on a specific topic like this was a big waste of time. There isn't enough shelf room to keep books on more than general topics. The fact that the books that were the closest to what I was looking for were children's books was just disappointing. Well organized library though.