
Book reviews

RAJAGOPALAN, T.S. (Ed.): **Relevance of Ranganathan's Contributions to Library Science**. Companion Volume to Proceedings of the International Conference Organised by the Indian Library Association and Co-sponsored by the Sarada Ranganathan Endowment for Library Science, 11-14 November 1985, New Delhi, India. New Delhi: Vikas Publ.House 1988. XII,295p. ISBN 0-7069-4012-1

This is a companion volume to *Ranganathan's Philosophy: Assessment, Impact and Relevance*, also edited by Rajagopalan and published by Vikas in 1985, which was reviewed in *International Classification*, Vol. 13(1986) No.2. It contains a report of the proceedings of the conference together with 15 papers which arrived too late to be published in the earlier volume.

These 15 papers demonstrate once again the breadth of Ranganathan's interests covering, as they do, classification (of course), information technology, education and training, information flow in industry, reference service and management. Ranganathan was an internationalist, and it is good to see contributions on Ranganathan and Yugoslav librarianship, 1950-1985 (by Mira HORVAT-BAUER), education and training for library and information science in Kenya (by J.S.MUSISI), and two separate pieces on information technology in Thai libraries (by Prapavadee SUEBSONTHI and Knid TANTA-VIRAT). Susan BURY provides a thoughtful comparison of *Colon Classification* (CC) and the second edition of Bliss's *Bibliographic Classification* (2BC) based initially on a number of criteria: basis of approach, order of main classes and within classes, universality, hospitality, adaptability or flexibility, terminology, facet analysis, hierarchical relations, synthesis, notation (hospitality, simplicity, brevity, mnemonics, expressiveness, flexibility, correlation and ease of use), revision mechanisms and evaluation. This is followed by a detailed comparison of the treatment of one subject field (sociology) in the two schemes, with a sample of nine titles classified by the two schemes; 2BC scores on its scope notes and specificity but not on its excessive enumeration of compounds. The overall conclusion is that 2BC has the advantage over CC for basis; order; adaptability; simplicity, brevity and flexibility of notation; ease of use; revision; and evaluation. CC scores for the less important criteria of crispness of terminology, mnemonics and expressiveness of notation. More importantly, the influence of Ranganathan is seen in what is now the best general classification scheme available (Ms Bury is, I think, attempting to describe 2BC thus, but the printer has removed the end of her contribution!)

E.J.COATES shows that information languages associated with mechanised systems could learn a great deal from classification schemes/thesauri based on Ran-

ganathan's theories; he mentions *Thesurofacet*, the *Unesco Thesaurus*, the British Standards Institution's *Root Thesaurus and Construction Industry Thesaurus*; he could have added some others such as *London Education Classification* and *London Classification of Business Studies*. I was saddened to see Coates stating that in British library education practice, the 'habit of teaching alphabetical subject indication as part of cataloguing, and as something fundamentally different from classification lingers on'. This is not my experience after 22 years as a full-time lecturer, many of them on classification and indexing.

I now lecture on library and information management, so I was particularly interested to read R.K.Rout's paper on the contribution of Ranganathan to the operational management of libraries. It is typical that Ranganathan should have introduced the techniques of scientific management into Madras University Library in 1925, long before many librarians even used the term 'management', and that he should have applied classification principles by systematising the library functions into different sections and applied techniques like functional planning, job analysis, time study, standardisation and records management. These are, as Rout points out, the bases on which modern management techniques like system planning, input-output analysis, management by objectives and participative management found applications in library and information services.

Pages 177-267 contain M.A.GOPINATH'S report of the proceedings of the International Conference on Ranganathan's Philosophy: Assessment, Impact and Relevance. Gopinath brilliantly distils the thoughts of many distinguished writers on Ranganathan himself and on a wide range of subjects including the five laws of library science, terminology of library and information science, the work of FID/CR on classification, the personality facet, synthesis in the Dewey Decimal Classification and Colon Classification, design and construction of thesauri, indexing models, AACR 2, national statistical databases, a librametric study to rank scientific periodicals, scientific management and education and training for librarianship and information science. In my review of the main volume, I complained about the absence of an index. This volume has one, but I am afraid it is not very good and it does not cover the first volume either. It seems to be based on titles of papers rather than subjects and one looks in vain for AACR 2, curriculum design, evaluation, information technology, monitoring, reference services, special libraries and thesauri, though all these subjects are dealt with. There are strange entries like 'Application of information technology in libraries', 'Application of management techniques in libraries', 'Comparison of CC with 2BC', 'Design of library records' and 'Modern technology applications'. There are several errors of alphabetisation, and no effort is made to merge entries for the same author, so that we get

Austin, D V 19 (and it should be D W!)
Austin, Derek 256
Bauer, Horvat 230
Bauer, Mira Horvat 18
Coates, E J 42
Coates, Eric 250

Finally, the proof-reading of this volume is as bad as that of the earlier volume. Here are a few examples of irritating errors: EC (instead of 2BC) (p.36); Seyers (instead of Sayers) (p.53); EXCERTA MEDICA (instead of EXCERPTA MEDICA) (p.67); Gomershall (instead of Gomersall) and Austin, S. (instead of Austin, D. (p.73); Atherton, Pauliris (instead of Atherton, Pauline) and Harvard- Williams (instead of Havard-Williams (p.103); Huxley, Elsbeth (instead of Huxley, Elspeth) (p.119); Coats (instead of Coates) and Atchison (instead of Aitchison (p.213); Frills Hansen (instead of Friis Hansen) (p.266), Dahlberg, Ingetkaut (instead of Dahlberg, Ingetraut (p.271); and Syntaitic (instead of Syntactic) (p.295 - in the index!). On page 219 Derek Austin is quoted as thanking the organisers for giving him a change to preside; he may have welcomed the change, but it was the chance for which he was probably thanking the organisers.

As in the earlier volume, the contents are stimulating but the presentation leaves much to be desired.

K.G.B. Bakewell

Liverpool Polytechnic School of Information Science and Technology, 79 Tithcarn Street, Liverpool L2 2ER, UK

DHYANI, Pushba: **Classification Schemes and Indian Libraries. 2nd rev.ed.** New Delhi: Metropolitan 1989. XI,243p. ISBN 81-200-0296-2

A classification system is naturally bound to reflect the structure of knowledge as perceived by the classificationist. Such perceptions are invariably shaped by the culture and the time in which the classificationist grows up. Therefore, no classification system designed by a human being is value free. Every classification system has a built-in national and cultural bias. Any experienced classifier knows that a general classification system has always to be modified and adapted to suit local literature. A great deal of work has been done both at the individual and corporate levels to make suitable extensions and modifications in general classification systems as well as to study the use of such changes made in different countries at different levels (1-4). The book under review is another such work now in its second edition - a second edition of such a research book itself speaks of its merit.

The first edition published in 1983 (under the same title, and by the same publisher) was a published Ph.D. thesis of the author. For the first edition 251 libraries, mostly from Delhi and Rajasthan, and a few others from other parts of India were surveyed in the late 1970's in order to draw a picture of the use of different classification systems in India. For the second edition 88 more libraries have been surveyed bringing the total to 339-142 from Delhi, 70 from Rajasthan and 127 from other parts of India. All the libraries included in the survey are holding a minimum of 10,000 books each. A majority of 190 are special libraries, followed by 116 academic and 33 public libraries. The following table mirrors the extent of use of different classification systems in India:

System	No.oflibraries using	Percentage
DDC	175	51.7
CC	81	23.9
UDC	51	15.0
LCC	2	0.6
Spec.Schemes	15	4.4
No classif.	15	4.4
Total	339	100.0

Obviously DDC is the classification system most used in India with 51.7% of all the types of libraries included in this sample survey. Its actual use may be still higher. India is the largest user of DDC in the orient.

The use of the systems in different types of libraries is tabulated below:

Types of libraries	Classification Systems						Total
	DDC	CC	UDC	LCC	Spec.S.	No System	
Special	90	31	48	01	12	08	190
Academic	63	45	03	01	01	03	116
Public	22	05	-	-	02	04	33
Total	175	81	51	02	15	15	339

Second in popularity is the CC which is described as India's de facto national classification. However, in special libraries the UDC used in 48/190 (= 25.3%) of the special libraries registers as leading over the CC being used in 31/190 (= 16.3%) of the special libraries. It simply means that the UDC is more popular than CC in Indian special libraries. However, it is revealing that the books of some 8/160 (= 4.2%) of the special libraries are not at all classified.

According to another survey of 146 science & technology libraries conducted in the early 1980's (5) the picture of the use of classification systems in such libraries is somewhat different:

Classif.Syst.	No.oflibraries	Percentage
DDC	46	31.5
CC	13	8.9
UDC	74	50.7
Spec.Syst.	06	4.1
No System	07	4.8
	146	100.0

The entire book is divided into six chapters followed by seven appendices and an index. The first chapter explains the aim and method of study. Data were collected by questionnaire method followed by personal visits and interviews in some cases. Frustrating hurdles in doing field surveys (especially in the case of libraries) are painfully known to every librarian who has ever undertaken such a task. The second chapter describes in brief the different classification systems and seems a non-essential one; it may be safely omitted by researchers without loss of information. Chapter 3 is the key chapter describing the use of different schemes in different libraries. The use of book numbers in some libraries is described briefly