

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 895

IR 052 858

AUTHOR Marek, Kate  
 TITLE Dewey Decimal Classification for U. S. Conn: An Advantage?  
 P'3 DATE 31 Jan 88  
 NOTE 17p.; Best copy available.  
 PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS \*Academic Libraries; \*Cataloging; \*Classification; Higher Education; Indexing; Library Automation; Library Collections; Library Research; \*Library Technical Processes; Online Searching  
 IDENTIFIERS \*Dewey Decimal Classification; Library of Congress Classification; \*Reclassification

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the use of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) system at the U. S. Conn Library at Wayne State College (WSC) in Nebraska. Several developments in the last 20 years which have eliminated the trend toward reclassification of academic library collections from DDC to the Library of Congress (LC) classification scheme are considered: LC has proven to be less than perfect for academic collections; LC now assigns both DDC and LC call numbers; and even items already assigned a classification number require the attention of library staff. The following questions are then addressed: (1) What things need to be considered when deciding whether to reclassify a collection? (2) What are the current size recommendations for using the LC system? (3) What percentage of books added to the WSC collection have LC and/or DDC numbers available? and (4) What would the costs be to reclassify the WSC collection and how would automation change the costs? It is concluded that WSC should not reclassify its collection at this time. The potential of DDC as an online search tool providing subject access to the collection is discussed. (17 references) (MES)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED311895

DEWEY DECIMAL CLASSIFICATION FOR U. S. CONN:

AN ADVANTAGE?

Research Report  
Submitted to Dr. Jack Middendorf  
January 31, 1988

by  
Kate Marek

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kate Marek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR052858



## DEWEY DECIMAL CLASSIFICATION FOR U. S. CONN:

### AN ADVANTAGE?

Every institution or organization should periodically address some serious questions. Where have we been? Where are we headed? What has worked for us, and what could work better? Where would we like to be in ten years, and how can we get to that point? The purpose of this study is to examine the classification scheme currently in use at the U. S. Conn Library of Wayne State College, and to apply these questions to that study.

There are many dimensions to our service at U. S. Conn. Classification theory is an integral aspect of the field of librarianship. Other subdivisions are reference, acquisitions, administration, and circulation. To examine any of these topics is to examine an aspect of librarianship, and therefore, to study the ultimate purpose of any individual library.

Our theory is that the U. S. Conn Library's purpose is to purchase, store, and make readily available materials important to the education and research needs of the Wayne State College students and faculty. In addition, we provide access to materials to community members and to area high school and public libraries.

Does our classification scheme coordinate well with our institutional goals? Will that scheme, the Dewey Decimal Classification system (DDC), continue to work for us as we consider the next decade of service? Would a shift to a different classification scheme, namely Library of Congress Classification (LCC), enable us to better serve our patrons?

Reclassification of academic library collections from DDC to LCC was a trend in the late 1960's and early 1970's. The assumption was that, as technology for libraries was being developed, a national classification scheme would enhance the cooperative borrowing that was also developing. Library of Congress Classification was chosen, not as the most perfect scheme for academic libraries, but simply because it originated from our national library. With LC classification numbers provided by this central unit, it was presumed that the cataloging operations of individual libraries would be greatly streamlined. Catalogers could accept the class numbers as assigned by the Library of Congress without question, thereby saving professional time and freeing those catalogers for various other operations.

However, several developments in the last twenty years have eliminated the trend toward switching classification systems.

First, Library of Congress Classification itself has proven to be less than perfect for academic collections. <sup>Due</sup> By nature this classification system is often confusing and difficult for both catalogers and patrons. This is not to say that LC Classification is poorly structured; rather, that neither Dewey nor LCC (nor any other classification system) can be argued to be a perfect scheme for any library.

Secondly, even more Library of Congress cataloging information has become available through the availability of MARC records. At the U. S. Conn Library, we access MARC records through OCLC. Many of those records are originated through or verified by the Library of Congress. If this is the case, the Library of Congress assigns both LCC numbers and DDC numbers. Twenty years ago, the argument for reclassification emphasized the time saved by using Library of Congress assigned classification numbers available on LC

cards. Since the Library of Congress now assigns numbers from both LCC and DDC systems, this argument is outdated.

Indeed, the Library of Congress is active in its push to provide as many verified records as possible. In 1985, for example, LC added 74,000 audio-visual records to the MARC bank. The Library of Congress has a great deal of interest in assigning DDC numbers to MARC records. The Dewey Decimal Classification system is widely used in Western Europe, and particularly in Great Britain. Our Library of Congress stresses the importance of international library cooperation. This emphasis and its concurrent interest in DDC will undoubtedly increase with advancing technology.

The third shift in thinking away from reclassification has developed from a more rational and objective trend in thought. In the late 1960's, the mood was so very pro-reclassification that many libraries glossed over the real nuts-and-bolts purpose of classification. Centrally assigned numbers sounded great when the dawning of automation pointed toward uniformity and one centrally assigned Library of Congress Classification number for each item. But this reasoning was never complete. Classification exists to group like materials together and to provide each item a unique and retrievable spot within a collection. U. S. Conn is a collection within itself, serving our Wayne State College patrons and our community. The Library of Congress may assign a book a particular classification number, but each item we receive must be modified to fit into our unique collection. <sup>material?</sup> This requires the attention of the cataloging staff for each item.

This is not to minimize the importance of OCLC and the suggested Dewey numbers available to our cataloging staff. These suggested numbers are a tremendous benefit and time saver. However, we access suggested Dewey

numbers as often as we would be able to access Library of Congress suggested numbers (see page 7 ). Then, each number is checked and adapted to fit into our unique collection.

It is appropriate at this point to address four specific questions suggested for this study.

1. What things need to be considered when deciding whether to reclassify a collection?

The choice of whether to reclassify a library collection from one scheme to another is very different from the original question of which classification scheme to choose. When the collection is new, careful research into classification theory is required. Schemes must be balanced against the ultimate goals of the institution, projected size of the collection, subject specialities, continuity with other similar libraries, and so on.

When looking at an established collection, however, the questions addressed are very different. When facing the possibility of recataloging every volume in the library collection (160,000 for U. S. Conn), the basic issue is this: Does our present system work well for us? If the cataloging operation is effective and efficient, it is inappropriate to consider a change. To use a cliché, "if it's not broken, don't fix it."

If it is proven, however, that there are major problems in the service of the library caused by a poor classification system, other considerations may be appropriate within the context of a reclassification discussion. What system would serve the institution better? How much better would that system work? How much would a change cost, and would that cost justify the resulting improvement in service? What interruptions in service would the

reclassification project cause? What exactly is the motive for the change? And, what long range benefits can the library hope to reap from a change in classification scheme?

In an analysis of how the Dewey Decimal Classification system is working for the U. S. Conn Library, several variables can be considered. For instance, is there a cataloging backlog? A bottleneck in processing might be due to a difficult classification scheme. Our cataloging flow, however, is smooth and timely. There is no evidence of a problem in this area.

Another issue is patron usability. Are the numbers found on the catalog cards easy to understand and easy to locate on the shelf? Certainly our use of DDC provides an advantage to our WSC patrons. Most students, faculty, and community members come to our facility with a knowledge of the Dewey Decimal System. Indeed, most of our patrons feel more comfortable using a familiar system.

Staff usability is also important. The logical and hierarchical structure of Dewey enables our professional staff to keep a better mental picture of the collection, thereby enhancing service to patrons. In addition, the cataloging staff is familiar with Dewey. A change to LCC would require learning a new system, and years of practice to perfect its application.

By using the Dewey Decimal System, U. S. Conn makes our collection more accessible to area libraries. Service to area public and high school libraries is an integral part of our work.

Is the DDC expandable for our future needs? Is the classification scheme supported by a reputable organization? These questions are addressed next.

2. What are the current size recommendations for using the Library of Congress Classification System?

The American Library Association currently makes no recommendations for choice of classification system based on size of the collection. According to Karen Muller, Executive Director of the Resources and Technical Services Division of ALA, "It makes no difference which scheme is used as long as it is kept current and maintained." (Attachment 1)

While most large university libraries in the United States do use LCC, the University of Illinois at Urbana is an example of one that does not. The administration there analyzed the benefits and drawbacks of reclassifying their 6,000,000 volume collection from DDC to LCC. The decision at Illinois fifteen years ago was to remain with Dewey. DDC has proven to be feasible for any size collection.

Both the Library of Congress Classification scheme and the Dewey Decimal Classification are supported by long standing organizations which guarantee the continued support and durability of their systems. Twenty years ago the argument was that Dewey was less up to date than the Library of Congress system. However, Dewey has since published two full revisions (the 18th and 19th) and has also established "phoenix" schedules. These phoenix schedules are individual class divisions for quickly advancing fields, such as computer science, which are updated individually and issued in paperback form.

3. What percentage of books added to the WSC collection have LC call numbers available? What percentage of books added to the WSC collection have Dewey call numbers available?

The accessibility of previously assigned call numbers for materials added to the WSC collection depends on what is available to us through OCLC,



or what has been added to the MARC tapes. Since we use OCLC for cataloging, the procedure is to access the record through that system. If the record is found, the next step is to determine whether or not the record was created or subsequently endorsed by the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress is the copyright depository of all domestic works, and catalogs all works which are submitted there. "Cataloging In Publication" is a program whereby precataloging is done in cooperation with publishers, who send in galley proofs of material before it is actually published. Most works published by the major publishing houses in our country are handled this way. The Library of Congress initiated the Cataloging in Publication program in 1972 in an effort to expand uniformity and cooperation. The program has continued to increase over the last fifteen years. LC is currently active in involving the smaller presses in this program. The Library of Congress assigns both LCC numbers and DDC numbers. Therefore, all books that are submitted to the Library of Congress for cataloging receive two classification numbers. Most (at least 80%) of the material added to the WSC collection falls into this category.

The remaining 20% or less of the added material is either on OCLC without Library of Congress verification or is not found in that data base at all. These materials, for us, are usually gift items, very old publications being added to the OCLC database, or are music scores. Some are locally produced video tapes. Since there is no Library of Congress publication data available for this part of our collection, the classification number and all other cataloging information is locally assigned and added to the OCLC database.

Local cataloging will be done for these materials regardless of the

classification scheme used. If WSC converts to the Library of Congress Classification, it will not discernibly change the percentage of material in our collection that requires locally assigned class numbers.

4. What would the costs be to reclassify the WSC collection? Are the costs the same after automation?

Estimating costs for reclassification are difficult. Available per volume cost estimates are very outdated and vary greatly from institution to institution. One way to make a judgment is to simply take a median figure and multiply that by the annual price increases over the last decade. Late 1960's and early 1970's per volume cost estimates range from \$0.90 to \$3.25. (Attachment 2) Using a 1975 conservative base of \$2.00 per volume and increasing that cost by the annual inflation rates found in Table 764 of the Statistical Abstract of the United States (Attachment 3), the \$2.00 shifts to \$4.38. For the 160,000 volumes in U. S. Conn, then, the conservative cost estimate for reclassification would reach \$700,800, or nearly twice our total annual budget.

Certainly the costs would drop dramatically if our catalog were fully automated. Instead of re-tagging materials by typing individual books cards, labels, and pockets, computer generated labels could be affixed to the books. New catalog cards would not be needed if the transfer to an on-line catalog had been completed. If reclassification continues to be an issue at U. S. Conn, our only option is to initiate the project after we are fully automated. It is impossible, though, to estimate these costs without a more complete knowledge of any automated system we install. In addition, there are no estimates available from libraries who have reclassified after having automated their catalog. Fully automated catalogs have only developed over

the past decade, a point past which few libraries undertook reclassification projects.

However, it is not difficult to project that to reclassify each of the 160,000 volumes in the U. S. Conn collection would require a tremendous outlay of staff time and energy, prohibitive funding, and a great deal of upheaval in the service to patrons.

Tying these four questions together, the paramount issue remains whether a change in classification system would improve our service. And, if so, will any improvement seen justify the cost incurred. Whether our catalog is automated or not, reclassification will be disruptive and expensive. I argue that our present system provides for expedient cataloging and patron access of materials. I cannot recommend a reclassification project for U. S. Conn.

#### Conclusion

When considering a classification scheme for any library, the purpose of that library must be considered. At U. S. Conn, we are dedicated to serving the students and faculty of Wayne State College. The information we provide to those patrons should support the goals of the college. Wayne State's first priority is its program toward undergraduate degrees. Also important are WSC's Master's programs and faculty research. The material provided by U. S. Conn, and access to that material, should support these institutional priorities.

What classification scheme can best fulfill this goal? The answer must be that no one classification scheme has proven itself to be "best." The classification scheme in and of itself must be seen as part of an overall plan of efficient and effective information storage and retrieval. The Dewey Decimal System can fulfill this purpose very effectively. The issue at this

point in U. S. Conn's history is not the choice of classification scheme. We are not in a position to make an initial decision on this question, and a change at this point would be expensive and time consuming. Rather, the issue is service. How can we maximize our current system to expand our service?

An exciting new dimension to classification theory has developed during the past five years. In 1982, Research Scientist Karen Markey initiated a project exploring the feasibility of the Dewey Decimal System as an on-line search tool. The hierarchical structure of Dewey, along with its extensive index available now on MARC tapes, makes this classification scheme ideal for subject access. Indeed, Dewey was developed as a system for a "classified catalog," or, a catalog arranged by class number rather than by alphabet. This research project was sponsored by OCLC and reports were published in 1986. Briefly, the findings supported the theory that DLC's logical, subject oriented structure has a great potential for on-line subject access.

As the only Nebraska state college with DDC, U. S. Conn is in a position to be a leader in the use of classification as an on-line subject search tool. In addition, the timing is right: with the acquisition of a fully automated system within the immediate future, we can incorporate this function into our program at the outset.

The question, then, becomes not what is the best classification system for academic libraries in general. Most would answer LCC to that question, although many strongly support DDC. But the issue for U. S. Conn is to assess where we are now and how to maximize our current situation. The Dewey Decimal Classification system is working well for us. We have every reason to believe it will continue to expand with our collection. And, the

possibility of on-line subject access through the use of Dewey numbers and index is exciting. Our challenge is to move forward, to maximize our potential, and to confidently state our advantage.

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION



January 26, 1988

Ms. Kate Marek  
U.S. Conn Library  
Wayne State College  
Wayne, NE 68787

Dear Ms. Marek:

Your recent letter to the American Library Association has been forwarded to the Headquarters Library for a reply.

You have asked for recommendations on assessing the viability of the Dewey Decimal System. I have consulted with Karen Muller, Executive Director of the Resources and Technical Services Division of ALA. It is Ms. Muller's recommendation, based on her research and experience, that it makes no difference which scheme is used as long as it is kept current and maintained.

The libraries at the University of Illinois, Champaign Urbana, and at Northwestern use Dewey; you may wish to contact them directly for further opinion.

Enclosed is the listing of books on Dewey Decimal Classification from the 1988 Subject Guide to Books in Print.

I hope this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Phillis M. Wilson".

Phillis M. Wilson  
Headquarters Library

cc: K. Muller, RTSB  
Enclosure

From The Use of Library of Congress Classification.  
Chicago, American Library Association, 1968.

TABLE I  
 Excerpts from Three Project Reports

Item	Rochester	South Carolina	Iowa
Years of the project	1927-31	1916-53	1950-51
Volumes reclassified	86,614	56,113	66,207
Titles reclassified	41,616	32,035	24,364
Cost per volume	\$0.26	\$1.69	\$0.45
Cost per title	\$0.54	\$3.07	—
Costs updated to 1960's:			
Per volume	(\$0.90)	(\$3.20)	(\$0.85)
Per title	(\$1.80)	(\$5.80)	—

ATTACHMENT 2

NO 764. ANNUAL PERCENT CHANGE IN SELECTED PRICE INDEXES 1960 TO 1985

(Yearly averages minus sign (-) indicates decrease GNP Gross national product (latest method 1981)

YEAR OR PERIOD	CONSUMER PRICES					PRODUCER PRICES					GDP DEFLATOR				
	All items	Food	Fuel oil and coal	(Gas) (Electricity and utility)	Rent	Services	Finished goods		Inter-m. and trans. goods	Crude goods		Total	Non-manufacturing	Manufacturing	PCE deflator
							Total	Consumer goods		Total	Fuel				
1960	16	10	7	41	14	33	8	10	2	24	10	15	13	12	19
1961	10	13	3	20	8	13	20	2	2	5	10	12	14	14	15
1962	11	3	3	5	12	19	8	6	1	10	5	10	14	12	12
1963	12	14	19	1	11	20	3	3	3	22	12	15	14	13	12
1964	13	13	1	1	11	20	3	5	1	10	12	15	14	13	12
1965	17	27	20	2	10	22	17	19	3	3	4	15	14	13	12
1966	23	50	25	2	13	39	32	34	14	51	4	21	23	20	17
1967	29	3	31	4	18	44	121	9	25	64	33	36	31	26	31
1968	42	36	31	9	24	52	29	27	23	16	23	50	46	43	45
1969	54	51	24	19	32	59	37	38	14	67	42	56	49	49	43
1970	59	55	43	44	42	61	35	31	19	36	150	55	47	49	43
1971	43	40	57	69	46	56	31	27	38	25	134	57	49	49	46
1972	33	43	9	51	15	38	11	27	40	109	70	47	43	38	41
1973	62	145	148	49	43	41	91	33	108	109	364	95	64	41	52
1974	93	144	378	153	51	93	153	156	238	127	314	91	33	47	52
1975	91	45	96	183	51	94	108	108	105	4	237	98	100	107	105
1976	88	31	66	114	54	83	44	37	51	29	124	64	60	33	57
1977	63	63	130	129	51	77	65	65	32	29	124	64	56	57	65
1978	100	100	53	90	58	85	78	79	66	32	213	67	56	57	65
1979	91	109	351	108	73	110	111	118	70	120	147	73	31	30	73
1980	77	86	379	171	89	154	135	142	128	170	189	89	30	39	92
1981	79	79	216	146	87	131	92	90	92	80	212	90	31	39	92
1982	40	-12	138	76	90	40	36	14	-29	180	64	60	35	36	57
1983	21	-60	89	58	52	21	13	6	-29	180	64	60	35	36	57
1984	38	22	38	52	32	21	20	25	22	-	-	35	35	34	38
1985	23	-35	17	61	51	9	5	-4	-75	-23	33	33	35	35	35
1960-65	14	12	2	11	20	4	3	3	5	2	18	14	14	14	16
1965-70	40	31	15	26	57	29	27	26	25	56	44	39	32	34	34
1970-75	88	164	96	45	65	82	83	104	119	172	71	69	67	67	67
1975-80	77	188	122	69	102	86	86	93	91	178	76	78	78	78	79
1980-83	59	86	142	81	110	66	63	52	24	200	80	78	81	81	81
1983-84	46	41	124	73	85	49	46	37	20	148	66	63	65	65	65
1984-85	44	37	102	68	77	42	39	34	21	109	60	57	57	57	57
1960-85	40	22	84	67	71	35	32	25	1	81	54	52	52	52	52

Represents zero. Includes bottled gas. Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, The Agency Income and Product Accounts of the United States 1929-82, and Survey of Current Business, July issues Index 1992: 100. PCE Personal consumption expenditures. See table 766. Base year for percent change is 1959. Average annual percent change. For explanation of average annual percent change see Guide to Tabular Presentation. Source: Except as noted U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Monthly Labor Review.

NO 765. ANNUAL PERCENT CHANGE IN WAGE RATES, COSTS, PRODUCTIVITY, AND FEDERAL BUDGET 1973 TO 1985

ITEM	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
Real wages and earnings private													
Manufacturing	95	76	94	73	80	81	83	81	99	54	41	37	37
Non-manufacturing	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	72	70	72	77	90	88	44	11	4	11
Total	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	81	76	80	80	101	96	45	11	11	11
Costs													
Manufacturing	79	36	92	84	77	86	96	105	94	27	11	12	11
Non-manufacturing	18	22	18	20	15	4	18	4	10	6	11	11	11
Total	60	120	78	57	61	77	112	110	83	84	11	11	11
Productivity													
Manufacturing	113	140	60	78	103	124	116	154	31	24	11	11	11
Non-manufacturing	65	94	234	179	103	121	94	124	148	100	81	77	11
Total	71	38	114	161	122	101	68	91	94	142	30	11	11

Not available. Fiscal year. Data for later 479. Source: U.S. Office of Management and Budget, Federal Budget and Economic Outlook, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Monthly Labor Review, and U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Report on the U.S. Economy.

WAYNE, NEBRASKA





## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AIA World Encyclopedia of Library and Information Services, Chicago: American Library Association, 1980.
- American Library Directory (37th edition), New York: R. R. Bowker, 1976.
- Gorman, Michael, "The Longer the Number, the Smaller the Spine," American Libraries (September, 1981), p. 498-499.
- Harrod's Librarian's Glossary, Brookfield, Vermont: Gower Publishing Company, 1987.
- Meltby, A., "Dewey Decimal Classification: A Liability?" Catalog and Index (Spring, 1984), p. 4-5.
- Mandel, Carol A., "Classification Schedules as Subject Enhancement in Online Catalogs," Washington, D. C., Council on Library Resources, Inc., October, 1986.
- Markey, Karen, "Final Report to the Council on Library Resources: Dewey Decimal Classification Online Project," OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc., Dublin, Ohio, 1986.
- Montag, Jan, "Dewey vs. Library of Congress; Position Paper." November, 1978 [Wayne, Nebraska].
- 1984: Challenges to an Information Society. Proceedings of the 47th ASIS Annual Meeting (Vol. 21), White Plains, New York, Knowledge Industry Publications, Inc., 1984.
- "Pros and Cons of Decimal," Library Association Record (February 1984), p. 64.
- Stevenson, Gordon, "The Library of Congress Classification Scheme in Relationship to Dewey." [n.d., n.p.]
- Talmadge, Robert L., "One Library's Case Against Conversion," Problems in Library Classification, New York: R. R. Bowker, 1968.
- Tanis, Norman, "The Pros and Cons of Reclassifying to the Library of Congress Classification System," Kansas Library Bulletin (1970), p. 7-9.
- Trotter, R. R., "Dewey as an Asset," Catalogue and Index (Spring 1984), p. 1-4.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1987 (107th edition), Washington, D. C. 1986.
- Use of the Library of Congress Classification, Chicago: American Library Association, 1968.
- Werner, Bondan S., Introduction to Cataloging and Classification. Englewood Cliffs, Colorado, Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1985.