Robert P. Holley
University of Utah Libraries,
Salt Lake City, USA

Classification in the USA

Holley, R.P.: **Classification in the USA.**
In: Int. Classif. 13 (1986) No. 2, p. 73–78, 19 refs.
United States libraries use classification to provide subject browsing in open stacks. The Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC), used by 85% of American libraries, is a theoretical, universal attempt to organize all knowledge. The Library of Congress Classification (LCC) lacks intellectual consistency since it was based upon literary warrant to organize materials in one collection. Many academic libraries use LCC because the Library of Congress' shared bibliographic records with the LCC call numbers reflect the collecting interests of academic libraries. LCC is more hospitable to change than DDC whose Phoenix schedules have encountered resistance throughout the world. Classification currently receives less attention than subject headings since United States librarians place great hope in the computer to resolve subject heading problems while remaining conservative about classification. Author

The theory and practice of classification within the United States grew out of certain principles of American librarianship[1]. While the United States has had international influence in classification as the country of invention of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) and the Library of Congress Classification (LCC), the United States has not adopted foreign classification schemes to any extent; and American librarians are in general deficient in their understanding of theoretical work done elsewhere. Thus, most of this paper will deal with developments within the United States library community. To achieve some understanding of this phenomenon, I would present the following as the significant factors in the American way of classification.

1. Open Stacks

American libraries of all types have a firm tradition of open stacks. While this factor could be attributed to a desire to allow patrons to retrieve their own materials after finding them in various bibliographic sources, the evidence does not support this conclusion. Open stacks do not require, in principle, classification since patrons could retrieve books by means of an accession number. In fact, shelving library materials by type and by size with an accession number is a practical solution because it makes more efficient use of buildings; sequential accessing does not require unpredictable growth space, and shelf height can be adjusted for the more common sizes.

Instead, I believe the underlying reason for open stacks is the desire to provide a subject approach through classification. In the opinion of *Elaine Svenonius*, "the main use for classification, at least in the United States, has been to facilitate browsing of books on shelves . . . Shelf browsing is an entrenched American tradition, but an activity about which relatively little is known" (1). Some research indicates a tendency for patrons to find materials through browsing, that is by using classification as a broad subject approach. In fact, many patrons in all types of libraries avoid the card catalog by immediately heading towards the parts of the collection where they are most likely to find their materials[2]. As further evidence, proponents of assigning classification numbers to everything explicitly state that they want to bring all like materials together intellectually no matter what their format. For example, the following is a quote from a report on the meeting of the *Subject Analysis Committee, Subcommittee on Subject Access to Microcomputer Software:* "Finally, the fixation of classing all software in DDC 001 or LCC QA must be avoided; instead the material must be distributed where it would logically fall if it were in book form, even if it needs to be gathered in a special collection[3].

In a sense, the dependence upon classification proves that we mistrust the type of access that we provide through the card catalog. Yet, unlike the British tradition of a classed catalog, American libraries seldom make the shelf list available to the public but use it as a location and inventory device within cataloging areas. Thus, the patron may search on the shelves by classification order but is not allowed access to the bibliographic tool arranged in this manner.

2. Uniformity vs. Diversity of Classification Schemes

Almost as a corollary of the first factor, American libraries take classification seriously. As I see it, one of the tensions has been the pull towards uniformity balanced against tendencies towards diversity. While uniformity has won out in the sense that most American general libraries use either the DDC or the LCC, I would like to look into the various factors involved in the struggle.

The United States has a long tradition of local independence which extends to libraries, and the extent of library autonomy would surprise many of our foreign guests. In principle, almost all libraries have the theoretical possibility of choosing whatever classification scheme they wish with any local modifications, or they can set up their own classification. Thus, no centralized body had a part in imposing the existing uniformity. Furthermore, as many have commented upon, the Library of Congress is not a national library in the legal sense of the term but instead the Library *of Congress*. No federal legislation exists to force any library to accept LC's classification scheme. In a similar fashion, the DDC is supported by a self sustaining foundation which has no force except the force of reason to have any American library use DDC. Finally, we do not even have a centralized educational system for librarians which could help impose uniformity by educating all librarians under the same guidelines.

Yet what reasons have led American libraries of all sizes from the major academic research institutions of the world to small school and public libraries to the present degree of uniformity? Here I see many forces at work. Melvil Dewey was a towering figure during the

latter part of the 19th century, and I do not underestimate the power of his missionary zeal in spreading his classification system. Yet, I find deeper reasons within the American character for subsequent developments. In addition to a common language[4], the United States has a common cultural unity which is surprising given the multiplicity of political jurisdictions. The very American centered bias of our classification schemes helped to shut out any competitors from abroad.

On a practical level, pragmatism and a willingness to cooperate led to the general sentiment, though there have been notable exceptions[5], that the same work should not be done over and over again in different libraries. In fact, the spread of the LCC can probably be attributed to LC's card distribution service, which began in 1904. The maintenance of a separate classification scheme requires an intellectual effort of a high order which most libraries feel should be spent elsewhere, especially now that so much cataloging is done by library assistants who do not have a professional library degree.

I would speculate that the patron-centered philosophy of American libraries has also played its part. I do not perceive librarians in the United States as setting themselves up as gate keepers to library materials. Part of our problem in gaining professional recognition and respect from our public has been our zeal to impart our skills to them and to make the library as comprehensible as possible. Our tradition favors teaching our patrons how to use the library on their own and minimizes the interaction of librarians with skilled and, all too often, unskilled users. If each library were to have its own classification system, knowledge gained in one library would not transfer to another[6].

3. The Theoretical vs. the Pragmatic

My final point is the radically opposed philosophical basis of the two major American classification systems. From its inception, DDC attempted to give a theoretical ordering of all human knowledge while LC's goal was the classification and ordering of items within one particular library.

Each system has it advantages. DDC makes it easier to go systematically from the general to the specific by moving to the right in the classification number, but LCC may use its variety of expansion devices at any point in the schedule to open up space for new divisions of knowledge. Dewey is a theoretically closed system which can expand only in detail by adding decimal places while the LCC, though less rigorous in its intellectual framework, remains hospitable to change.

By its pragmatic approach, LCC also may readily admit its American bias by stating that as an American library its collection priorities are weighted towards its own country and that literary warrant justifies its decisions to emphasize the American perspective. The DDC, on the other hand, in practice reflects much of the same decision making since its founder needed to deal with the world as it existed in his day and from his point of view, but is in theory more open to criticism on the grounds that a theoretical system should have avoided Western, American, Christian bias.

4. Survey of Classification Systems in the United States

The two major classification schemes in the United States are the DDC and the LCC[7]. In addition, I would like to briefly comment on the Superintendent of Documents system since it functions as classification in the many libraries that have a separate United States government documents collection.

The DDC is probably the one most familiar since it has achieved the greatest acceptance outside of the United States. Even in this country, academic librarians in LCC using libraries probably encountered Dewey in library school and continue to use it if they have any contact with their local public library. Melvil Dewey published the first edition of his system in 1876, and the most current edition, the 19th, appeared in 1979 in three volumes. Responsibility for the DDC rests with Forest Press, a wholly owned subsidiary of the Lake Placid Education Foundation which Melvil Dewey set up to carry on his work. Editorial work is carried out under contract at the Library of Congress though Forest Press continues to market and to publish DDC. One recent innovation is a decision to implement continuous revision of DDC between editions so that changes do not occur all at one time when a new edition appears.

Dewey's basic structure divides all knowledge into ten groupings and then further subdivides each on a decimal basis such that each position to the right denotes a greater degree of specificity. Each classification number must have the three digits to the left of the decimal point while division to the right of the decimal is theoretically unlimited. While great specificity is possible, smaller libraries may shorten long numbers to meet the needs of their collection; and the DDC numbers distributed in Library of Congress bibliographic records indicate rational truncation points.

The DDC employs seven auxiliary tables for number expansion to allow for modification of the regular classification number by specific aspect. Currently, the four most commonly used tables are standard subdivisions, geographical subdivisions, individual literature subdivisions, and individual language subdivisions. One current proposal by Arnold S. Wajenberg is to provide machine readable delimiters between the main part of the classification and the subdivisions in order to permit more sophisticated machine readable searching (8).

Within the United States and Canada, 85% of all libraries use the DDC (9). It is generally considered more suitable for public libraries and smaller academic institutions though several major academic research libraries, University of Illinois and Duke for example, remain committed to DDC. One problem for any library which collects non-Western publications is the relatively little space given to topics of concern to Third World Countries in comparison with the space devoted to American and Western European thought.

The LCC, though perhaps more of interest to our foreign guests, defies any brief description. Never intended as a universal classification scheme, its purpose was to classify those books held by the Library of Congress; and revisions occur as needed. Influenced by

Charles Ammi Cutter's *Expansive Classification*, JCM Hanson, head of the Catalog Division, and Charles Martel, chief classifier, introduced the new classification scheme at the Library of Congress. Class Z, Bibliography, was the first published schedule and appeared in 1898. The LCC is not complete because law classification schedules for much of the world have not yet appeared.

To indicate the difficulties in describing the system, let me make one extensive quotation:

> The scheme consists of 28 different schedules, each having different authorship, possessing varying dates of origin and revision, separate indexes and individual auxiliary tables. No philosophic principle governs the scheme's constitution and no manual of instruction for use exists for the scheme as a whole. It was intended as an "in-house" system for catalogers classifying materials for the United States Congress rather than a broadly conceived universal scheme. The system does not necessarily suit libraries other than the Library of Congress nor was its purpose ever to do so (7).

Be that as it may, I will nonetheless try to describe briefly some of the more general features of the scheme since it is used in about 15% of American libraries including "virtually all university libraries and half of all college and junior college libraries" (7, p. 97). The first line of each classification number is made up of an alphabetical portion of from one to three letters and a number portion. As with the DDC, numbers may be divided decimally; but this does not indicate a clear hierarchical arrangement since simple call numbers in parts of the schedule may indicate a high degree of specificity. If further subdivision is required, a Cutter number may be given on the second line, usually using the topic of the subdivision to form the cutter such as .B3 for Bavaria or .N4 for nickel. Again, numbers are expanded decimally as needed to make any new topic fit in alphabetically with the others in the list. Especially in Class H (Social Sciences), complex auxiliary geographic tables exist which are needed to formulate the call number for specific areas of the world. While such classification numbers logically divide the world according to geographic areas, they are not added on at the end as in the DDC nor would they be accessible as country indicators in a machine readable environment.

Why then is the LCC used by so many academic research libraries within the United States? First, there is the pragmatic reason indicated above that Library of Congress cataloging data provides the Library of Congress call number including the book number. Second, the system is so immense and hospitable to change that new topics can be added with a minimum of disruption. Third, most American academic research libraries have reasonably similar collecting policies to those of the Library of Congress though on a smaller scale. Except for items of purely local interest which can be accommodated easily in Class F (Local American History, F1-975), Library of Congress purchases a high percentage of what American research libraries buy and groups the materials in a way understandable to American scholars. Fourth, unlike Dewey, the call numbers remain short even though the classification provides a high degree of specificity. In fact, LCC's flaws may become apparent only as future attempts at developing call number searching reveal its lack of underlying structure.

While perhaps not thought of as a classification scheme, Superintendent of Documents numbers function as such in many American libraries. For practical reasons, many American libraries do not individually catalog United States government documents but instead shelve them by the Superintendent of Documents number. Since government bibliographic aids such as *The Monthly Catalog* give this number, patrons can use it to retrieve desired items. In a sense, this type of access to government documents is similar to the use of indexes for periodicals.

Superintendent of Document numbers are based upon the organizational structure of the United State government. The first part of the classification number is a letter, often a mnemonic for the issuing agency, then a number with numerical divisions as necessary to place the issuing agency within the hierarchical structure, and finally a book number. I find this system of interest since it goes contrary to the principles indicated above about the need for subject access through classification, and indeed some American librarians would like to integrate government documents into the general collection[8]. Yet even here a subject grouping exists since the government is arranged by subject interest divisions. Most information on education emanates from the Department of Education while items on national defense will come from the Department of Defense. While results are not conclusive, preliminary research indicates that American library users expec to be able to browse successfully with the Superintendent of Documents classification[9].

5. Curreut Issue in Classificatiou

I believe that classification currently receives much less attention both on the theoretical and practical levels than verbal subject access. I see several reasons for this lack of attention. The first is the very practical one that while American libraries use two different classifications, almost all use *Library of Congress Subject Headings* or *Sears Subject Headings*, which share the same philosophy and differ on most points only in comprehensiveness.

Second, since subject headings are intended to allow library users to find materials in our bibliographic tools, they must of necessity match the language of the users. Yet as we all know, language is in a constant state of change, especially in this era of rapid technological innovation. As new concepts appear, as old ones die, as terminology is modified, subject headings, to be easily used, should reflect these linguistic changes. However, thesaurus and subject heading list revision always lags behind in the same way as no dictionary is ever completely up to date. Since the gap between library subject headings and current usage is easy to see, it occasions comment both by librarians and patrons[10].

Classification, on the other hand, is already a rational construct and further removed from the day-to-day life of our patrons. I believe that for most of them call numbers already reside in the land of technical librarianship. Users were much more likely to tell us that "European War, 1914–1918" was a silly term for World War I than that 450.7 or HG459 is a bad call number.

The third reason follows from the second. American librarians hope for a solution to subject heading problems from computers while they are at present less likely to see any radical change in classification as a result of the growth of online catalogs. While I realize that this is not a totally accurate statement since we have projects such as the current effort to examine the role of the DDC in the online catalog (12). Americans are more excited about the possibility of radically improved verbal subject access from key word searching, Boolean logic, customized authority control, and the like.

Finally, and I will dwell more on this later, librarians are more conservative about classification than about subject headings because they do not want to remark the books. While various strategies may be used to provide for change in subject headings such as explanatory cross references, updating the cards or machine readable records, etc., no easy solutions exist for implementing changes in call numbers since the previously marked books exist as physical objects requiring expensive human labor even in this computer era.

One issue from the recent past that is no longer of much concern is the debate about the relative suitability of the DDC and LCC for use in large academic research libraries. As a side effect of the rapid growth of academic research libraries during the 1960's, many changed over to the LCC, some from their home grown systems but most from Dewey (13). As libraries expanded rapidly, the larger collections provided a rationale for LCC since it was felt that LCC provided finer distinctions for large collections and more nearly met the needs of academic researchers. Furthermore, Library of Congress printed cards and machine readable records do not include Dewey numbers for many foreign language and esoteric research materials; and the expanding libraries found that they could get a much higher percentage of ready-to-use classification numbers if they adopted the LCC.

This trend diminished in the 1970's and early 1980's for various reasons. Many of the libraries for which the change was suitable had already done so. In addition, the last ten years have been a time of retrenchment. Libraries would have more difficulty in obtaining the resources to make to transition. Furthermore, our patrons object to having items shelved in different parts of the library with different classification schemes. In fact, in a recent survey of library information seeking behavior at my own institution, faculty volunteered in the comment section that they would like to see the two parts of the collection brought together (14). When the decision to change classification was made in former richer times, some hope was usually given for the reclassification of the older materials into the new classification. Today, when libraries feel themselves fortunate to have the staff to cope with current receipts, reclassification no longer is a prudent use of resources. Thus, it does not seem likely that many academic library users of Dewey will switch to the LCC in the near future.

The main philosophical issue for DDC is the appropriateness of Phoenix schedules. As indicated earlier, DDC is a closed system whose overall structure is relatively inflexible. Forest Press and its advisory boards are faced with difficult choices. Without revision, DDC will deviate more and more from the current structure of knowledge as ways of thinking undergo substantial change. Even when the numeration is appropriate, any area with a rapid expansion of information may require longer and longer numbers to accurately reflect new developments. To resolve this difficulty, DDC has decided to target a limited number of major revisions for each new edition. These revisions, called the Phoenix schedules, start off from a new philosophical base to develop a revised schedule which often reuses an existing call number range. There is an obvious difficulty here for libraries. They already have items under the old numbers which they must either change, or they must live with the intermixture of two varying meanings for similar Dewey numbers. In a sense, the conflict is unresolvable because without mechanisms for change DDC would eventually become obsolete as it no longer reflected the world of knowledge of its time. On the other hand, as stated earlier, reclassification costs money and staff time that libraries can ill afford. I would submit, in fact, that there would be more opposition to this policy if it were not for the fact that many small to medium public libraries expect to withdraw obsolete books over a period of time and that this withdrawal policy serves as a self-correcting device for intermingled classification problems.

The LCC handles the problem of substantive revision by creating whole new areas and declaring the old numbers obsolete. Not being bound by a decimal arrangement, LCC can add letters to the alpha portion and expand to infinity if necessary in the numerics. Examples of such changes in recent years are the creation of BQ in the religion section for Buddhism and the expansion of Polish history by multiplying each number by 10. Thus, DK401-DK443.7 became DK4010-DK4800. While reclassification would still be necessary to bring all the materials together, at least a dual meaning for the same number does not occur.

Both systems, however, still reflect the ordering of knowledge that prevailed during the period of their birth. Psychology (BF in the LCC and 150–159 in Dewey) remains a part of Philosophy though literary warrant today would give it much greater prominence in a new classification scheme.

I do not want to spend time on the role of classification in the online catalog. This issue is not limited to the United States but will have world-wide implications. I am especially interested in reading the results of Karen Markey's project on subject access through DDC[11]. In addition, I would suggest consulting "Use of Classification in Online Retrieval" by Elaine Svenious for a discussion of the theoretical possibilities as she sees them (15).

6. International Implications of Classification in the United States

The United States, as stated previously, has had world wide influence in the area of library classification. Even the Bliss Classification, not widely used in the United States, has its adherents in Great Britain[12]. Forest Press, as keeper of the DDC, takes its international responsibilities seriously and supports translations and adapta-

tions of DDC into foreign languages. The relationship between Forest Press and the issuing body varies from country to country, but currently Dewey or some subset is available in at least a dozen languages[13]. On the other hand, the LCC remains in principle a classification scheme for its own collection which others use at their own risk. While *Canadiana*, the Canadian National Bibliography, provides LCC numbers with an expansion in the F schedule for Canadian history (FC), the Library of Congress makes no claim for the international aspects of its system. While I am aware that LCC is used internationally at least in the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, I was unable to find a comprehensive list of LCC foreign libraries. Perhaps Forest Press is more receptive to an international marketing effort because its existence depends upon the continued acceptance of the DDC while the Library of Congress is assured of its continued existence through the support of the American taxpayer.

As I stated in my paper last year at the Nairobi IFLA Conference in another context (17), I am convinced of the advantage of classification as a subject retrieval device across international and linguistic boundaries in comparison with verbal subject headings. Classification is tied to the concept rather than to the naming of the concept and as long as the concept in the real world remains the same in each language all that needs translation are the descriptive and index terms in the classification schedule. In a certain sense, classification can serve as a scientific name for unambiguous concepts in the same way as Latin serves as the basis for scientific names in biology. As Elaine Svenonius states, "a classification such as DDC that has already been translated into many languages comes ready-made as a switching mechanism. With the use of such a classification, a user's search terms entered into the system in one language can be switched through DDC numbers to retrieve documents in several different languages" (15, p. 80). Where the system breaks down is in the area of human constructs since political, economic, and educational systems vary from country to country even where the language is the same. These problems, however, are minor in comparison to the difficulties of transferring a subject heading structure with all its linguistic differences from one country to another, even when they both share a common language[14]. Furthermore, classification can adapt to changing and varying terminology as long as the underlying concept remains the same.

Classification has also the advantage of bringing together like materials in an efficient way, especially in small collections. While the user of a small collection may have difficulty in following the subject heading reference structure to broader, narrower, and related terms when the complexity has been established for large collections, classification can group together within a restricted number of records all the items on a subject, at least as long as the subject is the one that determined the classification number of the book.

Thus, the classification numbers provided by United States cataloging agencies, both in DDC and in LCC, may be more useful to the international community than the subject headings in the same record. Perhaps the IFLA Section on Classification and Subject Cataloguing as part of its international charge should suggest and encourage research on the whole issue of classification within the international context. I for my part would like to see more research done within the American library community to see how the Dewey Decimal and the Library of Congress Classification schemes can serve all libraries.

7. The Future of Classification in the United States

I am confident that classification will continue to play a substantial role in United States librarianship. For the reasons given above, the innate conservatism of librarians who do not wish to cope with remarking existing items will work against substantive modifications in existing classification schemes. Furthermore, except for special libraries, I do not foresee the invention of any new schemes in the near future. If anything, it is the online catalog that will have an impact in the medium to long term future. If I can hazard any guess about the future, I would suggest that the computer may bring back the classed catalog where classification once more takes on a more important role in subject access. One classification number will indeed be the call number and provide information as to the physical location of the book, but subsidiary numbers for subsidiary subject aspects will provide an alternative access point in the online record as the current shelf list becomes a subject access tool. Just as the library patron today expects to find all relevant items under the appropriate subject heading, the library patron of the future may expect the same assurance as he or she browses through the online shelf list. Though knowledgeable in the intricacies of the card catalog, I have often used browsing as an access tool when I wanted several books on a subject without needing specific titles. An online catalog which would provide the same capability on the computer screen while also bringing to my attention both other related classification numbers and items in other locations would be a definite improvement.

Address:
Dr. Robert P. Holley, Assistant Dir. f. Techn. Serv.,
University of Utah Libraries, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA

Notes:

1 This paper is a revised version of a speech presented at the 51st IFLA General Conference (Aug. 20, 1985) under the sponsorship of the Section on Classification and Indexing.

2 Other recent articles on browsing are listed under the references (2), (3), and (4).

3 See (5). For another quote on nonprint materials, we have: "General classifications have largely ignored nonprint materials . . . By assigning detailed classification numbers to everything and making those numbers independent of the way objects are stored, we would be treating nonprint materials fairly and making them equally accessible to the library user". See (6).

4 It will be interesting to see what changes occur as Spanish becomes more important as a second language within the United States and as library service increases for the Spanish-speaking population.

5 There have been some exceptions to this uniformity. Until about 1970, the Yale University Libraries used their own classification system before switching to the LCC, but even here

much of the classification merely transferred LCC numbers to a new notation scheme.

6 Americans believed in standardization since the introduction of interchangeable parts by Eli Whitney. I remember reading an essay which contended that the similar arrangement of our fast food restaurants and convenience grocery stores all across the United States contributed strongly to our sense of national unity.

7 For this brief presentation of DDC and LCC, I have borrowed heavily from the summary in (7).

8 For a discussion of this tension between integrating government documents and maintaining them in special areas, see (10), p. 218.

9 "Since browsing patterns for government publications have not been reported in library literature, it may be interesting to describe those of four social scientists who listed this as a means for locating publications . . ." see (11), p. 56. See also (10), p. 210.

10 The literature on the problems of Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) is immense. Sanford Berman is perhaps the major proponent of changing LCSH to more closely match contemporary American usage.

11 For details of this project, consult the article (12).

12 "To our knowledge the Bliss Classification is used completely as a system in only one library in the U.S., – that of City College where it was instituted by its author. The system is more widely used and apparently more popular in Great Britain" (16, p. 165).

13 Forest Press has informed me that authorized editions of the DDC are available in French and Spanish and are in preparation for Arabic and Italian. Local editions been developed in Afrikaans, Hebrew, Indonesian, Korean, Malayan, Thai, Turkish, and Vietnamese. For a list of these editions see under Section 43 in (19).

14 For the problems of adapting LCSH within an Australian context, see (18).

References

(1) Svenonius, E.: Directions for research in indexing, classification and cataloging. Libr. Resources & Techn. Serv. 25 (1981) p. 94–95

(2) Green, R.J.: The effectiveness of browsing. College & Res. Libr. 38 (1977) p. 313–316

(3) Willard, P., Teece, V.: The browser and the library. Public Libr. Quart. 4 (1983) p. 55–63

(4) Ross, J.: Observations of browsing behavior in an academic library. College & Res. Libr. 44 (1983) p. 269–276

(5) New, G.R., Matthews, W.E.: CCS/SAC Subcommittee on Subject Access to Microcomputer Software. Libr. of Congress Inform. Bull. 43 (1984) p. 306

(6) Gorman, M.: The longer the number, the smaller the spine. Amer. Libr. 12 (1981) p. 498

(7) Downing, M.H.: Introduction to cataloging and classification. 5th ed. Jefferson, NC. 1981

(8) Wajenberg, A.S.: MARC coding of DDC for subject retrieval. Inform. Technol. & Libr. 2 (1983) p. 246–251

(9) Comaromi, J.P.: Use of the Dewey Decimal Classification in the United States and Canada. Libr. Resources & Techn. Serv. 22 (1978) p. 403

(10) Hernon, P., McClure, C.: Public access to government information: Issues, trends, and strategies. Norwood, NJ, 1984

(11) Hernon, P.: Use of government publications by social scientists. Norwood, NJ, 1979. (p. 56)

(12) Markey, K.: Subject-searching experiences and needs of online catalog users: Implications for library classification. Libr. Resources & Techn. Serv. 29 (1985) p. 34–51

(13) Mowery, R.L.: The "Trend to LC" in college and university libraries. Libr. Resources & Techn. Serv. 19 (1975) p. 389–397

(14) Broadbent, E.: A study of humanities faculty library information seeking behavior. Unpublished manuscript submitted to Catalog. & Classif. Quart., p. 13

(15) Svenonius, E.: Use of classification in online retrieval. Libr. Resources & Techn. Serv. 27 (1983) p. 76–80

(16) Tauber, M.F., Wise, E.: Classification systems. New Brunswick, NJ 1961. p. 165

(17) Holley, R.P.: The consequences of new technologies in classification and subject cataloging in third world countries: The technological gab. Nairobi 1984. IFLA Doc. 32-CLAS-1-E.

(18) McKinlay, J.: Australia, LCSH and FLASH. Libr. Resources & Techn. Serv. 26 (1982) p. 100–108

(19) Classification Systems and Thesauri, 1950–1982. Vol. 1 of Intern. Classif. & Indexing Bibliography (ICIB 1). Frankfurt, FRG: INDEKS Verl. 1982.

Synergy and Diversity in Industry, Law and Language

The International Association "Language and Economics" (Internationale Vereinigung "Sprache und Wirtschaft" e.V.) will organize from Nov.6-7, 1986 its 12th Annual Conference to take place at Mons, Belgium. The three special subtopics will be: International contracts; Specialized language (LSP) in international business studies; Language between producer and consumer. Conference languages are German, English, French. For further information contact: Doz.Marcel Urbain, Universite de l' Etat de Mons, Place Warocque, 17, B-7000 Mons, Belgien.

The theme of the 11th international congress in 1985 had been "Language and Information in Business World and Society". It took place at Hamburg, 30 Sept. - 3 Oct. 1985. Some 50 papers were presented by experts from 10 European countries, both from the theoretical as well as from the practical side. So -as Hilmar GRUNDMANN wrote in his report on this conference - it was possible that a genuine and a vivid dialogue could take place which, however, showed that something like a "double reproach" exists between these two sides: the practicians reproach the theorists with the argument that their results are not close enough to practical application and the theorists, that the practicians principally refused to accept their results, not to speak of applying them. This had happened in practically all of the ten sections which were devoted to the following topics: Information as prime material; communication technology and the future of society; translation problems in economics; language between producer and consumer; intercultural communication in foreign trade; communication at the work bench; foreign languages in industry and trade; databanks and information systems; terminologies and special languages in economics; and finally: refereeing in economics. - The proceedings will appear in 1986/87 in two volumes. So far, only the abstracts are available as well as the congress folder with everything else. For inquiries about these as well as the prices, please turn to Prof.Dr.Theo Bungarten, Germanisches Seminar, Universität Hamburg, Von-Melle-Park 6, D-2000 Hamburg 13.