

Classification in College and University Libraries

Dr. Eaton is associate professor, University of Illinois Library School.

IN THE INTRODUCTION to the standard edition of the *Decimal Classification*¹ (DC) is the statement that 96% of the public libraries, 87% of the college and university libraries, and 64% of the special libraries use the *Decimal Classification* of Melvil Dewey. These figures have a strangely familiar ring—they are identical with the figures given in the report of the survey of libraries, made 1920-1922.² Thus they are venerable figures, more than 30 years old.

It is quite possible that the figures for public libraries have changed little since that date; if a public library attempts reclassification it tends to change to DC, not away from it. On the other hand it is possible that the figures from special libraries are completely unrealistic at this date; it is doubtful if the numerous special libraries which have been established in the past twenty-five years have adopted DC.

This paper is concerned only with the classification schemes used in college and university libraries. It gives the results obtained in a survey of the college and university libraries. A questionnaire was distributed to the 904 accredited institutions in the United States, Alaska, Canal Zone, and Hawaii which are listed in *American Universities and Colleges*, 6th edition, 1952. Replies were received from 744 institutions, or more than 82%.

This is by no means the first attempt to learn, by means of a questionnaire, how libraries classify their books. A classic example of a survey by questionnaire provided the material for a paper delivered at the World's

Library Congress which was held during the Columbian Exposition of 1893.³ To secure information for his paper on "Classification," or as he explained the term, "the arrangement of books on the shelves," Horace Kephart, librarian of the St. Louis Mercantile Library, sent out a "circular of inquiry" to the heads of all libraries in the United States that were believed to contain 25,000 volumes or more. In all he distributed 183 questionnaires and received 130 replies, or 71%. These 1893 figures have proved a valuable source of material for historical studies of classification practice in the United States. The present study is an attempt at assembling comparable data for our period.

Since the questionnaire used for the present study asked for some of the same information that was requested by Kephart his circular is given below:

CIRCULAR

1. How many volumes are there in your library?
2. Do you use Cutter, Dewey, Edmands, Fletcher, Harvard, Larned, Perkins, Schwartz, or Smith Classification?
3. If so, do you modify it, and how? What changes in it would you suggest if it were to be made over?
4. If you use neither of the above, please give an outline of the main divisions of your shelf classification, with classmarks, and examples of your usage in numbering books. If a synopsis has been printed, a copy of it will suffice.
5. How long has this present system been used in your library?
6. If you were to classify your books anew, what method would you adopt?
7. Do you favor "close" classification (closer for example than the first three figures of Dewey, or the first two letters of the Cutter system)?

¹ Melvil Dewey, *Decimal Classification*. (15th ed.; Lake Placid Club, N.Y.: Forest Press Inc., 1951), p. xi.

² American Library Association, *Survey of Libraries in the United States*. (Chicago: ALA, 1926-27), v. 4, p. 7.

³ Horace Kephart, "Classification." *Papers Prepared for the World's Library Congress, Held at The Columbian Exposition*, ed. by Melvil Dewey (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1896), p. 861-897.

8. Do you think that the mnemonic element in such notations as the Cutter, Dewey, Schwartz, is worth what it costs?
9. Do you find by actual test that close classification wastes space?⁴

Kephart was able to use only 127 of his 130 answers since three came from libraries with collections of less than 25,000 volumes and he was primarily concerned with the classification problems of the "larger libraries." It is interesting to note his assumption that book classification is primarily a matter of shelf arrangement is accepted down to the present day in most libraries in the United States. Only in recent years has there been much discussion of classification as a means of presenting the contents of the library in an organized manner in catalogs. Of the 127 libraries, 43, or one third of the "larger libraries" were found in colleges and universities. Today the percentage of large book collections held by the academic libraries has increased considerably. It is probably safe to assert that about half of the large collections in the country are to be found in the colleges and universities.

It was impossible to secure exact figures for purposes of comparison, but an attempt has been made to secure some comparison by using the figures of the Public Library Inquiry and the figures provided by the questionnaire. Two percent of the libraries reporting to the Public Library Inquiry⁵ contained 150,000 volumes or more.⁶ One hundred and thirty-one of the college libraries reported collections of 150,000 volumes. However, there are no figures for the really large libraries. The college or university librarian is not likely to consider a collection of 150,000 volumes as large. Probably the 40 libraries that reported 500,000 volumes or more constitute the large libraries, the group that Kephart would consider if he were sending out his questionnaire today.

Although Kephart listed nine classification schemes well known in that period, he found that only Dewey, which was used by a third of the libraries, and Cutter, which was growing in favor at that time, were widely used. The schemes of Edmands, Fletcher, Larned,

Perkins, Schwartz, and Smith had all been designed for public or special libraries and were not in great favor among college librarians. Three of the college libraries used Cutter, 19 used Dewey and the remaining 21 used local schemes, many of them fixed-location schemes. For the most part the librarians were well satisfied with the arrangement of books as it existed in their individual libraries; only seven expressed any desire to change. Of the seven, two favored Dewey, one Cutter, one wished to change from Dewey to Cutter, one favored Fletcher, one Perkins, and the seventh was ready to leave Dewey and develop an independent scheme designed to fit his own needs.

It is clear that, although there was much interest in classification at that time, no one solution to the problem of arrangement of books on shelves was accepted. Indeed the five largest libraries of that period used four different classification schemes. Harvard University, with 407,100 volumes used a scheme described as fixed location, close classification. The University of Chicago, with 280,000 volumes used Dewey. Yale described the scheme used for its 215,000 volumes as movable, close. Columbia College with 160,000 volumes used Dewey, and Cornell with 123,000 volumes had developed a scheme of broad classification based on the press numbers used in the British Museum.

The early years of the 20th century saw a gradual disappearance of the local schemes and the less well established schemes. Some local schemes were in use at the time of the survey of 1920-22 and a few still survive in libraries that are much too large to face the expense of reclassification. However, it must be remembered that of the 12% of the libraries that did not use DC in 1922, only a relatively small number were using the Library of Congress classification. The first wave of reclassification, from Dewey and other schemes to the Library of Congress (LC) classification,⁷ came about the middle of the 1920's, closely following the survey.

THE SURVEY

The present study was designed primarily to collect accurate figures as to the number of libraries using the classification schemes commonly taught in library schools. However it seemed advisable to include other questions

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 962.

⁵ Robert D. Leigh, *The Public Library in the United States*. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1951), p. 54.

⁶ These figures cover 7,408 libraries.

to collect information as to the editions of DC being used as well and the attitudes of the librarians toward the common schemes. A brief and simple questionnaire, which could be answered without checking records, was designed and sent to the librarians of the colleges and universities. The answers sometimes came from librarians and sometimes from the heads of technical processes or of cataloging, but the response was generous. The questionnaire used is given below:

Name of library _____
 Number of volumes _____

1. What classification scheme do you use?

2. Indicate the edition, or date of the schedule.

- 3a. Do you use it as printed (with a minimum of alteration)? _____
 or
- 3b. Do you make extensive alterations to meet local needs? _____
4. If you were reclassifying a library would you adopt this scheme? _____
5. If your answer to number 4 was "no" please indicate the scheme you would use. _____
6. If you care to do so, state a reason for your answer to number "5" _____
7. If you know that your library has ever been reclassified, the name of the original scheme and the date of reclassification would provide useful information.

The original plan had been to establish six categories of size into which the libraries could be grouped: less than 50,000 volumes; 50,000 - 100,000 volumes; 100,000 - 200,000

TABLE I
 Number of Libraries Contributing to the Survey

Volumes in Library	Number	Per Cent
- 25,000	105	14.1
25,000- 35,000	146	19.6
35,000- 50,000	128	17.3
50,000- 100,000	166	22.3
100,000- 200,000	96	12.9
200,000- 500,000	63	8.5
500,000-1,000,000	25	3.3
1,000,000-	15	2.0
Totals	744	100.0

volumes; 200,000-500,000 volumes; 500,000-1,000,000 volumes; more than 1,000,000 volumes. The division of the 100,000-500,000 volume group at the 200,000 point may seem a bit odd but it was made because the 15th edition of DC states that it is designed for libraries of 200,000 volumes or less. The large number of libraries with less than 50,000 volumes (379) seemed to call for further division and three categories were used instead of the one that had been proposed earlier. The number of libraries in each size category is shown in Table 1.

CLASSIFICATION SCHEMES IN USE

The results of the present questionnaire indicate the day of varied and independent classifications in college and university libraries is almost past, although at least three individualists would still like to prepare local schemes suitable for their own collections. The graduate of the library school can assume that he will probably need to know either the LC or the DC system since only 1.5% of the libraries in colleges and universities use any-

TABLE 2
 Classification Schemes Used in College and University Libraries

Size, by Volumes	DC	LC	Cutter	Local	Other	Total
- 25,000	97	6	—	1	1	105
25,000- 35,000	133	13	—	—	—	146
35,000- 50,000	112	15	—	—	1	128
50,000- 100,000	145	20	1	—	—	166
100,000- 200,000	81	15	—	—	—	96
200,000- 500,000	43	17	2	—	1	63
500,000-1,000,000	11	13	1	—	—	25
1,000,000-	8	4	—	2	1	15
Totals	630	103	4	3	4	744

TABLE 3
Percentage of Colleges and Universities
Using Major Schemes

Size, by Volumes	DC	LC	Other
- 25,000	92.3	5.8	1.9
25,000- 35,000	91.1	8.9	0.0
35,000- 50,000	87.6	11.7	0.7
50,000- 100,000	87.4	12.0	0.6
100,000- 200,000	84.3	15.6	0.0
200,000- 500,000	68.2	27.0	4.7
500,000-1,000,000	52.0	44.0	4.0
1,000,000-	53.3	26.6	20.0
Totals	84.6	13.8	1.5

thing other than the two best known schemes. Three of the libraries replying to this questionnaire still use local schemes; two of them will continue to do so since their collections are too large to make reclassification feasible. Four libraries still use Cutter, one uses Bliss, and one uses Richardson, supplemented by LC in certain subject areas. DC is still found in 84.6% of the college and university libraries but it can be assumed that it is often adapted to the special needs of the library. Tables 2-3 show the distribution of schemes.

THE DECIMAL CLASSIFICATION

Since the DC is available in a number of forms it was assumed that libraries might be using a variety of editions. The purpose of the question asking for the edition or date of the schedule was to determine how many libraries were using editions more than ten years old. It was known that many libraries had continued to use the 14th edition of 1942 because they felt that their collections were

too large to be classified according to the reduced schedules in the 15th edition of 1951. It was also known that certain large libraries were working with earlier editions and had developed expansions to serve their own needs. The number of libraries using older schedules proved to be rather less than had been anticipated. If you include the libraries that did not answer the question with the number who stated an edition earlier than the 14th, only 8% of the colleges and university libraries are using anything other than the 15th or the 14th, or a combination of the 15th with an earlier edition.

The figures relative to the use of the 15th edition are probably not exact. A number of replies stated simply that the latest edition was used. This had to be interpreted as the 15th edition even though one such reply came from a librarian whose cataloger does not use the 15th edition. The libraries that stated they were using both the 15th edition and an earlier edition, were confusing since they often failed to state which was the basic scheme and how much use was made of the other scheme. The only clue that might help in answering this is that very few of the libraries that stated they were using the 15th edition either alone, or in combination with an earlier edition, stated that they had done any reclassification. The adoption of the 15th edition, with 1,000 of its 4,000 numbers changed, necessitates reclassification. When a report stated that the 15th edition was used only for comparison and for new expansions, the library was listed as using an earlier edition. Tables 4-5 show the use of the various editions.

TABLE 4
Editions of the DC Used in Academic Libraries

Volumes in Library	15th Plus Earlier	15th 1951	14th 1942	13th 1932	12th 1927	11th 1922	5th Abridged Ed. 1936	Not Stated	Total
- 25,000	24	32	26	4	3	1	2	5	97
25,000- 35,000	35	26	58	9	1	—	—	4	133
35,000- 50,000	29	33	42	3	—	1	—	4	112
50,000- 100,000	49	21	70	—	2	—	—	3	145
100,000- 200,000	23	13	45	—	—	—	—	—	81
200,000- 500,000	14	5	18	3	2	—	—	1	43
500,000-1,000,000	—	4	6	—	1	—	—	—	11
1,000,000-	2	—	3	1	—	1	—	1	8
Totals	176	134	268	20	9	3	2	18	630

TABLE 5
Use of Editions of DC by Percentages

Volumes in Library	15th Plus Earlier	15th	14th	13th, 12th, or 11th	5th Abridged	Not Stated
- 25,000	24.7	33.0	26.6	8.3	2.1	5.2
25,000- 35,000	26.3	19.6	43.6	7.5	0.0	3.0
35,000- 50,000	25.9	29.4	37.5	3.6	0.0	3.6
50,000- 100,000	33.7	14.5	48.2	1.3	0.0	2.1
100,000- 200,000	28.4	16.0	55.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
200,000- 500,000	32.6	11.6	41.9	11.6	0.0	2.3
500,000-1,000,000	0.0	36.3	54.5	9.1	0.0	0.0
1,000,000-	25.0	0.0	37.5	25.0	0.0	12.5
Totals	27.9	21.4	42.5	5.1	0.3	2.8

RECLASSIFICATION

Librarians are of necessity practical. Cataloging and classification demand a large part of the library budget and there are few administrators who feel that they can further increase that cost for a period long enough to reclassify a library. Some rather large libraries have undertaken reclassification in spite of the cost involved. Some have begun and discontinued the work before complete reclassification was completed. A surprisingly large number of small libraries have been reclassified in recent years. The record of reclassification (used here only with the meaning of changing from one scheme to another) is incomplete. Sometimes the person making the report did not know what had been done during the earlier period of the library; in some cases, answers were vague. The reports do show that a certain amount of reclassification has been carried on since 1920. The first movement, in this century, seemed to follow close upon the ALA Survey. Another movement seemed to begin about 1935 and continued until the

outbreak of the war. Today a few libraries are trying to solve their problems by reclassifying. They give as reasons anticipated growth or the request of the faculty. Table 6 shows the changes in classification that were reported at this time.

The changes from local schemes, from the less common schemes of Smith and Rowell, and from Cutter, a scheme which has not been kept up-to-date, are easy to understand. It is easy to understand also why the larger libraries feel that the LC classification might be more useful to them. But it is surprising to find that half of the changes from DC to LC classification have occurred in libraries with less than 100,000 volumes. In reading the explanations made by the librarians of these 26 relatively small libraries one concludes that the change was a matter of expediency. These librarians make the change to the new scheme by taking LC numbers, often including the author number, from the printed cards. Thus classification becomes a purely clerical routine but incoming books are pigeon-

TABLE 6
Reclassification of University and College Libraries

	DC to LC	LC to DC	Local to DC	Local to LC	Local to Cutter	Cutter to DC	Cutter to LC	Smith to DC	Rowell to LC
- 25,000	3	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—
25,000- 35,000	7	1	3	—	—	—	1	—	—
35,000- 50,000	8	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	—
50,000- 100,000	8	—	1	1	—	1	1	1	—
100,000- 200,000	9	—	1	1	—	1	—	—	1
200,000- 500,000	9	—	—	1	1	2	—	—	—
500,000-1,000,000	5	—	—	—	—	1	3	—	—
1,000,000-	2	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Totals	51	1	7	4	1	7	5	1	2

TABLE 7
Preference for Classification Schemes in Libraries Using DC

Size of Library in Volumes	Total Number	Number Using DC	Number Preferring LC	Number Preferring Bliss	Number Preferring Local Scheme
- 25,000,	105	97	9	—	1
25,000— 35,000	146	133	17	—	1
35,000— 50,000	128	112	15	1	1
50,000— 100,000	166	145	29	—	—
100,000— 200,000	96	81	24	—	—
200,000— 500,000	63	43	24	—	—
500,000—1,000,000	25	11	6*	—	—
1,000,000—	15	8	5**	—	—
Totals	744	630	129	1	3

* Three of these would possibly consider LC.

** In one of these libraries the head of technical processes prefers LC but the head cataloger prefers Bliss.

holed as quickly as printed cards are received.

A desire to change the classification scheme is present more often than the means to change. Large libraries consider reclassification an expensive luxury but many librarians would prefer some scheme other than the one now in use if it were possible to make a change. Table 7 reflects what appears to be a growing dissatisfaction with DC.

One can sympathize with the librarian in a college of music who says that Dewey was never meant for a library with an extensive collection of music but it is less clear why so many librarians of general colleges find the well-tried DC so unsatisfactory. Of the 630 libraries now using DC, 133 would like to change to some other means of book arrangement. Several librarians expressed the belief that LC classification was more satisfactory for college libraries but did not explain in what respects they considered it superior. Possibly the librarians who made these statements were concerned with closed stack libraries and the choice of a classification scheme for such a library is not influenced by the reader's reaction to book arrangement. A classification scheme is not necessarily *good* or *bad* in itself, but it is satisfactory if it meets the needs of library patrons. That no less than a fifth of the libraries now using DC feel that LC classification would be better is shown in Table 8.

However, not all librarians feel that LC classification is ideal for all situations. No less than 13% of the libraries which use LC would like to return to the DC. In giving reasons for this recommendation a number of

the librarians stressed the elaborateness of LC and its unsuitability for small, open-shelf collections. Others stated that they favored the continuation in the undergraduate college of the classification scheme with which students were already familiar as a result of using it in high school libraries. Table 9 shows that it is only in libraries of less than 200,000 volumes that the value of the DC is stressed.

In addition to the libraries now using LC and DC there are others who feel the need of change. The librarians who use Cutter are at a disadvantage because they must provide the expansions that are needed to keep this scheme up to date. Most of the librarians now using Cutter would prefer LC classification but one librarian said he would prefer DC if it were available in an up-to-date expansion. The one librarian using Bliss mentioned the difficulties that beset any classifier

TABLE 8
Libraries Using DC that Would Prefer LC

Size of Library in Volumes	Number of Libraries Using DC	Percentage of Those Libraries Preferring LC
- 25,000	97	9.2
25,000— 35,000	133	12.8
35,000— 50,000	112	13.4
50,000— 100,000	145	20.0
100,000— 200,000	81	29.6
200,000— 500,000	43	55.8
500,000—1,000,000	11	54.5
1,000,000—	8	62.5
Totals	630	20.4

who uses a scheme that is not commonly used and stated a preference for LC classification to have the advantage of the class numbers assigned by the Library of Congress.

How much reclassification will take place in the years immediately ahead of us cannot be estimated. It is unfortunate that the people who are considering reclassification cannot hear what tasks confronted the libraries that undertook reclassification. Some of the larger libraries have completed their projects successfully, but other libraries that began reclassification discontinued the work without completing it. Thus they are left with two or more classification schemes in use in their libraries. When classification is used primarily for arranging books on the shelves in closed stack areas, a variety of classifications makes little difference.

Many libraries have found it necessary to develop expansions of their basic classification to take care of special collections. Often these are provided with a notation that is uniform with that used for the basic scheme. These local adaptations are seldom available for use by other libraries and are not considered in the following discussion of the use of more than one classification scheme in a single library.

COMBINATION OF SCHEMES

In a number of the smaller libraries special schemes were used for religious books. Nine of the 379 libraries with book collections of less than 50,000 volumes indicated that the Lynn classification was used for religion. In some of these libraries the major classification was DC; in others it was LC. Seven additional libraries in this size group used the Walsh modifications of the DC 200 class. One of the latter libraries had begun with Lynn for religious books but had found it too elaborate for a small library and had changed to Walsh. One library in this group specified that it used the Loyola University form of the 100 class of Dewey. One library claimed to use the 15th edition of DC with Bliss modifications but did not elaborate that statement.

In the next group of libraries, those with book collections of 50,000 to 100,000 volumes, four libraries indicated that they use a special scheme for religion. In one instance Lynn was used for religion in a library that was classified according to LC classification. In

TABLE 9
Libraries Using LC that Would Prefer DC

Size of Library in Volumes	Number of Libraries Using LC	Percentage of Those Libraries Preferring DC
- 25,000	6	50.0
25,000- 35,000	13	7.7
35,000- 50,000	15	13.2
50,000- 100,000	20	15.0
100,000- 200,000	15	6.6
200,000 500,000	17	0.0
500,000-1,000,000	13	0.0
1,000,000-	4	0.0
Totals	103	13.6

two cases Lynn was chosen for religion in libraries that used Dewey for the main part of the collection. In the fourth case Walsh modifications were used with Dewey. A technical library, Case Institute of Technology, used Dewey for the main collection and the Universal Decimal Classification for physics and chemistry. One college in the group, which formerly used a different classification for some classes, is now putting everything into a single classification. Rollins College which had used Library of Congress classification for the sciences, music and fiction began reclassifying those classes according to the 15th edition of the DC in 1951.

A number of examples of libraries using special schemes for a part of the collection are found in schools with collections of from 100,000 to 500,000 volumes. Wells College at Aurora, New York, uses Dewey for the main library and the Metropolitan Museum of Art scheme for the library of the Art Department. The United States Military Academy, at West Point, was originally classified according to Dewey but has adopted LC classification for naval and military science and for the material on the two world wars. The University of Idaho uses Dewey for the main collection but supplements it with various special schemes for special collections. It uses the McCurdy classification for physical education, the Korateau scheme for forestry, and the Nebraska Experiment Station scheme for agriculture. Clark University has in effect three classification schemes. The library, which was originally classified by a local scheme, went through a partial program

of reclassification at one time. At the present time radically shortened versions of LC classes H and J are used, and some other classes are used as printed by Library of Congress. The remainder of the library uses the original local scheme. The reclassification project was discontinued some years ago.

Several schools in this group mentioned that their government documents are arranged according to the classification of the Superintendent of Documents. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and Brooklyn College are Dewey libraries that follow this plan; Texas Technological College at Lubbock, Texas, is an LC library using this special arrangement for documents. Oxford University, Miami, Ohio, specifies that it uses the Illinois adaptation of modern foreign language literature with DC. Mount Holyoke, one of the few remaining Cutter libraries, uses LC classification for science. William and Mary uses Dewey for its main collection, with the Dartmouth adaptation for the 800's, LC classification for Shakespeare, and a local scheme for Virginia.

A number of libraries in the 500,000 to 1,000,000 volume group are currently engaged in reclassification, usually changing from DC to LC classification. Others in the group have at some time begun a reclassification project but dropped it before completion. Brown reported that, although the main collection has been reclassified from a modification of Cutter, some sections remain unchanged and a half dozen special classification schemes are used for special collections. Dartmouth uses primarily DC, but some parts of the library remain in its original local scheme, patterned after Cutter. Physics and mathematics have been reclassified according to LC classification.

The 15 libraries containing more than a million volumes each, have special problems that have been growing with the libraries during the past years. Columbia uses Dewey as its main classification but uses LC for its art and medical libraries. Stanford uses DC for the main library but uses LC classification for the Hoover Library and some smaller collections. Princeton, which uses the Richardson scheme, reclassified social sciences, fine arts, music, ethnology, and folklore, during the period from 1920 to 1940, using the LC classification. The University of Michigan

uses LC except for literature and medicine which have been left in DC. The University of California (Berkeley) uses LC except for law, English language and literature, and a considerable amount of material in foreign languages and literature which are still in the Rowell classification. Illinois uses DC for its main collection but LC for its map collection. Yale and Harvard with local schemes make such special adjustments as needed.

CONCLUSIONS

In comparing the answers received on this survey with those received on the 1893 study one notes a difference in the attitude toward classification. In 1893 there were many schemes, most of them local, and the librarians expressed themselves as well satisfied. The libraries of today use a small number of classification schemes, but the librarians are not too well satisfied with classification as it exists today. Today 84.6% of the libraries use DC but a considerable number of librarians who use that scheme express dissatisfaction with it. They use it only because it has become well established and the cost of reclassification is prohibitive.

On the other hand it is evident that the theory of cooperative classification has been widely accepted by librarians. Dewey's dream that you might go into any library in the country and be assured of finding the book bearing the same classification number that it had in every other library may yet come to pass, but the class numbers will be those from the Library of Congress classification, not those from Dewey's *Decimal Classification*.

This may be because there is a tendency today for librarians and catalogers to think of classification as a shelving device. The aim of the cataloger is to get the material on the shelves, and out of the cataloging department. Whether or not the material will be easily available to the patron once the cataloger has finished with it seems to matter very little. The library bought the book, cataloged it, placed it on the shelves. That ends the library's responsibility. The answers to questions showed far too little consideration of the patron. Too few of the answers showed any thought of how the classified collection would serve the people for whom it was being prepared.

A librarian who writes a full page of com-

ment about how efficient he has become as a result of changing from DC to LC classification for his collection of 35,000 volumes makes no mention of how the change will affect the patrons of the library. He only emphasizes the point that by accepting the Library of Congress numbers for both class and author, he can speed up his work and save time in the preparation of the books for the shelves. It is not to be assumed that no librarians are concerned with the use of collection. Several mentioned points that indicated that they were quite conscious of their responsibility to the students who made up the college community. Several of these people mentioned the advantage of retaining DC in a small college to simplify the transition from the library of the secondary school to the library of the higher institution. Some of the catalogers in libraries of colleges of education emphasized their belief that teacher-training schools needed to use DC since it is being used in the high schools.

In addition to the catalogers using the LC classification numbers, there are the catalogers using the DC numbers on the LC cards without checking them. The numbers printed on the cards are usually the closest classification possible and many of the libraries using these numbers do not need close classification. If these librarians simply accept the numbers as

they appear, without consulting numbers used previously, older books on a subject will probably not be shelved with new works on that subject. Those who accept the DC number as printed on the LC cards fail to mention any work of revising earlier classification.

The classifiers of today have available two usable classification schemes. The LC scheme is designed for a large library, and since it lacks general numbers for many areas will never serve very well in the small library needing broad classification. It will serve the large library very well. DC is, at the moment, in a most unfortunate state due to severe amputation and a 25% change in what remains. Numerous statements found on the questionnaires indicate the deep concern felt by librarians who consider DC an excellent scheme for small libraries, and for those of medium size, but feel that it can no longer be depended upon because its changes necessitate too much revision of existing classification. The 15th edition of DC is not adequate in scope for even the small library. It is to be hoped that the 16th edition, which is anticipated in the next few years, will satisfy the needs of libraries already classified according to DC. But even with a good up-to-date scheme the classifier must know how to apply the scheme to his library and must be willing to work at classification.

Doctoral Programs Offered

The School of Librarianship on the Berkeley campus of the University of California will offer programs leading to the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Library Science. The program for the degree of Doctor of Library Science is intended primarily for those interested in the technical and administrative aspects of librarianship; the program for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy is designed for those interested in teaching and research and in problems of a broadly historical and theoretical nature. The fields contemplated for the Ph.D. are bibliography, history of libraries, history of books and printing, and the library as a social institution; those for the D.L.S. are public libraries and college and university libraries. Information concerning details and requirements of the two programs may be obtained by writing the Dean, School of Librarianship, University of California, Berkeley 4.

This is the first time that opportunity for work at the doctoral level in librarianship has been offered at any institution west of the Mississippi. The universities that have already established such programs are Chicago, Columbia, Illinois, and Michigan.