

they will not have changed by the time he has finished talking. These, however, have been years of experimentation and change."

It took three years to go from first gear to high. After three years the University of Maryland has gotten the cost down to \$5.77 per title or \$1.97 per volume.

It was originally planned to spend three years on reclassification. From the same article:

"At its present rate, the Project has another dozen years to run to completion. Costs will rise, trained staff will leave, and new staff will have to be trained — an expensive undertaking. In the meantime the collection is split, staff and patron must concern themselves with several locations, and the collection continues to grow."

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I want to say that if I were starting a new academic library I would use LCC. But I would think long and hard before changing classification schemes. To spend \$2.00 or even 50¢ per volume is a high price to pay to get some *possible* benefits. As long ago as the 16th century Richard Hooker said, "Change is not made without inconvenience, even from worse to better."

WE'D RATHER SWITCH THAN FIGHT

by

WILLIAM R. PULLEN

On November 1, 1959, the Georgia State College Library adopted the Library of Congress Classification System for incoming new books and began the reclassification of the existing collection. Today, I should like to discuss why we decided to adopt the LC System and to reclassify, to describe briefly the procedures we used in the reclassification, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the LC System in our institution.

At that time, the College had some 93,500 volumes classified according to the Dewey System, plus approximately 17,000 volumes of unclassified bound periodicals which were arranged alphabetically by title.

The instructional and research programs of the College were expanding both horizontally and vertically at a very rapid rate. It was evident that the book collections would have to be developed rapidly until we had a true research library if we were to serve adequately the needs of the institution. It was in this setting, then, that our decisions were made.

The first consideration was whether or not we would adopt the new system. A number of factors entered into this decision:

1. The LC is a finer and more detailed classification system, and we felt that it would serve a research library better than the Dewey. As an illustration of this point, we took 10 titles in the collection which were classified under the Dewey number 326, interpreted

as "SLAVERY", and assigned LC numbers to them. We found that these 10 titles fell into eight separate LC categories as follows:

1. E 185—General Works on Negroes in the U.S.
 2. E 441—General Work on Slavery in the U.S.
 3. E 443—Slavery; Duties of Masters
 4. E 449—General Works on History of Slavery in the U.S. during the Period of Abolition Agitation
 5. E 450—Fugitive Slaves
 6. HT 867—History of Slavery in Modern Times
 7. HT 987—General Works on Slave Trade in Modern Times
 8. HT 1162—Slavery in Great Britain or Colonies
2. The LC System is being continually revised and brought up-to-date by highly trained scholars so that you do not have the drastic periodical revisions which seem to plague catalogers with each edition of Dewey. For example, not too long after the assassination of President Kennedy, the Library of Congress had assigned a number for this. The library using Dewey had to wait until the next edition of Dewey.
3. The expandability of the LC System recommends itself to classifiers who have tried to cram new knowledge into the crowded schedules of Dewey. It should be noted that Melville Dewey invented his classification scheme a whole generation before the classifiers at the Library of Congress began to compile their scheme. The Dewey System is a classification of knowledge, not just a classification for books. The LC, on the other hand, is designed specifically for books. The committee at LC had 20 years to observe weaknesses in the Dewey System and to consider a more adequate scheme for dealing with a research collection. Because of this inadequacy in Dewey, you may find as many as 13 numbers following the decimal and generally longer and more involved Cutter numbers.
4. Finally, cost was a deciding factor. For all these titles for which we could obtain LC cards, we had the call number all prepared for us.

FACTORS CONSIDERED

The following factors were considered in our decision to reclassify the existing collection:

1. The convenience of the patron is, of course, self-evident, since he would have to cope with only one classification system.
2. The level of cataloging at our institution had been very low. The card catalog was incomplete, particularly in its indication of serials and series. Too often if the book and the LC card did not match, no effort had been made to adapt the card to the book. Cards for the tracings were not always made, and sometimes tracings were not indicated for cards which were made. Occasionally, the catalog card did not truly reflect the holdings of a particular title. In other words, considerable revision of the catalog and recataloging would have been necessary regardless of the decision to reclassify.
3. In addition to this, the major factor was that the books classified under the Dewey did not have unique or distinctive call numbers. The call number consisted of the class

number on the top line and the name of the author on the second. It was evident that if we continued with the Dewey classification, it would have been necessary to add Cutter numbers to all of these existing books. This would have meant the handling of all the cards for each title and we felt that the cost of reclassification would actually be less than merely adding the Cutter numbers, since, as already pointed out, the Cutter numbers would be given for those volumes for which we had LC cards.

So, with these decisions made, on November 1, 1959, we began using the LC system of classification for all incoming new titles and added editions, and began our reclassification project. In the beginning we used the Dewey for the added copies and added volumes for serials which time would not permit us to reclassify. By the end of the second year, however, very few items were being added to the Dewey, except in the law category. (LC did not have a law schedule at that time.)

We accept LC cataloging and classification unless there is an obvious error. We, of course, at times may decide to classify a volume as a separate that LC has classified in a series, or vice-versa. In other words, we use the complete LC call number as given, unless the Cutter number might have already been used for another title given original cataloging by us.

In our reclassification we worked directly from the shelf. In this way we did not have to worry at the time about missing books or books charged out to patrons. If and when such books appeared on the shelf, we reclassified them. The books that could be handled in a day were collected from the shelf and taken to the Catalog Department. There the shelflist card was pulled and a "Cards Temporarily Out" slip was typed and filed in place of the main entry when all cards were pulled from the catalog. (Now we merely copy the shelflist card with the Thermofax.) The book with all its cards was then given to the cataloger. The cataloger examined the volume and either accepted the entries as correct and indicated a new call number, or rejected the entries, prepared new and correct ones, and indicated the new call number. The book was then ready for the usual final stages of preparation. We found that we could save considerable time by adopting certain short cuts. One of these was by marking through the Dewey call number on the book card with a magic marker and typing a new call number on another place at the top of the card. Another was by using pressure sensitive labels over the call number on the book pocket rather than removing the pocket and retyping it.

It has now been eight years since we adopted the LC system and began the reclassification. With this experience behind us, there are a number of questions which we can answer and some which we cannot. We can at least make observations on most questions.

Has the new system lived up to our expectations? We feel that it has. Knowing what we do now, we would definitely decide to adopt the LC—if we were faced with this decision today. Is the LC less costly than the Dewey? We feel that it is, although I cannot present statistics to support this statement. In the first place, I would hesitate to compare production figures in our Catalog Department before and after the change because of the previous low level of cataloging and because of the difference in the administration of the department. In like manner I would hesitate to compare our cataloging statistics with those of another library because of the many factors which might be involved. I can say, however, that it is not unusual for one of our semi-professionals to turn out between 50 and 60 titles with LC cards per day. We doubt that any of you using the Dewey can make that statement. Also, we feel it stands to reason that a semi-professional using the LC system can handle a wider range of material than if he were using Dewey

and had to classify some of the material himself. If you don't think this last is an important point, then you haven't tried to fill a professional cataloging vacancy lately. In stressing the semi-professional here, let me hasten to say that I am not one of those people who believes that the professional cataloger is becoming obsolete—extinct, perhaps, but not obsolete.

What has been the patron's reaction to the LC system? After a brief period of orientation the new student and faculty member can find their way around in it. We have had some complaints from faculty members, but some people will resist any change. The major complaint has been from a faculty member who wanted all the books even remotely connected with his field to be placed on a shelf together.

How far have we progressed with our reclassification? To begin with, our catalogers worked on this project through the years, as they had time over and above the cataloging of the incoming material. It was not until two years ago that we had additional personnel for this purpose. We now have only the 300's, or approximately 15,000 volumes left to reclassify.

What has been the unit cost on the reclassification? Again, I have no figures on this, since the reclassification and the recataloging have necessarily gone hand in hand and it has been impossible to keep the two statistics separately. Also, as I already mentioned, the same personnel who handled the current material also handled the reclassification.

Would it have been better to have had a special labor force for the reclassification, rather than the regular staff, as we did? We feel that ours was the best system for us, since it allowed a more even flow of material through the Catalog Department.

CONCLUSION

In summary, I should like to say the following to the people who are considering changing to the LC system and reclassifying: Find out, if you can, where your library is going; that is, to what size it will grow and of what nature the collection will be. If you feel you are going in the direction of a large collection of a research nature, you should seriously consider the change to the LC system for the following reasons:

1. It is a more detailed and finer classification system.
2. It does not have the drastic periodical revisions which are brought about with each new edition of Dewey.
3. Its expansiveness and timeliness will allow the addition of books more easily than the Dewey.
4. It is a less costly system to use.

Now the decision to reclassify, on the other hand, I feel is more difficult. The size of the existing collection certainly is to be a determining factor. Even had it not been for the two factors already mentioned; that is, the low level of cataloging and the lack of unique call numbers, I feel we would still have reclassified, since we had less than 100,000 volumes. Had we had a half million volumes instead, we might have decided to reclassify only part of them.

I must concede that two classification systems in use in one library are an inconvenience to the patron and the staff, but I should like to point out that two systems *can* be used.

Also, I should like to point out that there is no time limit, other than inconvenience, on reclassification. I feel that we owe a great deal to the patron of today, but I also feel that we owe equally as much to our successors and the patron of tomorrow. When I leave my present position I will be able to say with reference to the classification system that I have not dug the Georgia State College Library so deeply into a hole with a Dewey shovel that my successors will have a difficult time getting out.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES AND THE KNOWLEDGE EXPLOSION

by

GEORGE M. STEPHENS

When we explore public library service we are talking about the heart of the state's education system, as the 1967 General Assembly recently affirmed.

After twelve years in public school, citizens in most North Carolina counties must turn for further learning during their remaining forty or fifty years to their public library. Moreover, when we talk education we are exploring North Carolina's major endeavor. Neither manufacturing, agriculture, nor service jobs outnumber the total number of workers in education.

Of our five million population, fully one citizen in four is at work in some form of education—student or teacher, trainee, or self-directed learner. Probably no state in the Union has such a high proportion of its citizens at work learning or teaching. And no form of industry yields such returns. Years invested in school and in college, as well as in most other learning programs, have the effect of doubling income for those who learn well in this age of rising technology.

When available tax funds are considered, North Carolina's education effort ranks high among the 50 states. And its schools show a good value for the taxpayer's money. Striving for a full generation to build statewide basic support for schools, we have risen to about two-thirds of the national average. North Carolina aims to provide in its schools the training to *learn how to prepare by further learning* for today's better jobs. North Carolina invests over \$400 per pupil each year to operate its public schools. Considering the total income of our people and what they can spare for taxes, this is a heavy investment in each young citizen.

Once out of school, how much safeguarding of this investment does each new citizen have spent on him by a state so concerned with education to earn a better living? Approximately 16¢ per year, unless he is in a county favored with a college or a technical institute. Almost the only learning materials open to him in most counties are in public libraries, pitifully small and understaffed.

Now let us explore North Carolina's education beyond the twelve school years. Here is where we drop from the \$400-plus per student per year to sixteen cents for the citizen who must turn to public libraries for further learning materials and guidance. To meet the needs of our citizens facing today's knowledge explosion, \$3.50 per capita can be used for operating public library service as a realistic national standard.

Compared to this, where does North Carolina stand? At just barely one-third of this