Introduction

The library of congress was founded in 1800 to provide information to the congress, the law making body of the United states of America. It evolved between 1899 and 1920,when the scheme was first published according to Aina (2004).It consisted of twenty-one classes (21) in forty-seven (47) separately published schedules. It is the National Library of USA and the legal depository library for all the items published in the USA. Rowley and Farrow (2000) opine that the scheme is in twenty-one classes and set over fifty volumes. They assert that the publication began in 1899 and was virtually completed in 1910,apart from k class (law) which was not commenced until 1969,and was not completed until 1993.There are revised editions of most classes e.g the latest edition of Q(science) class in 2007 is about the tenth edition.

The scheme's name describes it precisely, it is the classification of the library of congress, that exists to serve the needs of that body. Rowley and Farrow (2000) maintain that even though as an in house classification, it is the classification of the worlds largest library. Its suitability to other large academic and research collections were soon recognized .It was greatly advanced by the Library's decision in 1901 to make its printed card available for sale to other libraries. Clarke (1971) corroborated this by saying that the scheme was tailor made for the collections of the Library of Ccongress and not initially designed for other libraries, hence the scheme was based on "literary warrant" that is on the convenient order of books and documents arrangement in the Library of congress. This implies that details of the classification has been developed according to the needs of the library's collection. The emphasis on the scheme is to a large extent on

the social sciences as this reflects the interest of the Congress. Political science (J) and education(L) are also well represented. The scheme is minutely detailed and covers all aspects of knowledge despite being special in purpose. Rowley and Farrow(2000) corroborate this by saying that the scheme is entirely enumerative with much repetition of detail. Aina (2004) equally posited that it is an enumerative scheme and covers all knowledge, that is listing all knowledge known to man.

Discrepancies of the library of congress scheme in terms of treatment of some subjects in class H (social sciences,) class Q (sciences) class T (technology) and class G(geography) : critical analysis.

The library of congress classification scheme (LCCS) is used for classification, or organization of knowledge, The essence of organizing knowledge is for easy retrieval .A library whose collections are not organized for easy retrieval is as good as a bookshop. There are many classification schemes , like the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC), Bibliographic classification (BLISS), universal decimal classification(UDC) Elizabeth Moys Classification Scheme, Barnad's Classification Schemes etc.The scheme in focus is the LCCS which is one of the modern classification schemes.

Majority of Libraries in Africa ,and the World use, admire and embrace LCCS because of its advantage of expansiveness. Ogbonyim (1994) supports this in the following words," there is no doubt that the Library of Congress is one of the modern schemes which majority of African libraries, admire and embrace because of its advantage of expansiveness. "In attestation of the popularity of the LCCS, the National

Universities Commission (NUC) has mandated it for the use of all the academic libraries in Nigeria to enable them get accreditation for their academic programmes.

Inspite of all the above strengths and merits of the LCCS, an indepth study of the scheme shows lots of scatterings of topical issues in knowledge in all the twenty-one(21) classes/ alphabets that were exhausted by the scheme. A situation where the same topic in a subject is scattered in the different classes of the scheme negates the principle of classification which the scheme is intended for.

Peculiarities of the scheme that support the scattering of knowledge.

The LCCS has the peculiarity of being compiled by different experts in different areas of knowledge.   In the words of Rowley and Farrow (2000) , "every class exists because of subject specialists who have perceived the need for it, and the order and detail of the classes have been developed." Therefore the big thing about LCCS is that a topic /subject of a particular discipline is classed or grouped with that discipline, the class of transportation and communication, (HE) would be used for illustration.

HE   1+ ---- Transportation

HE 148------Transportation and community development

HE 153------Use of animals for transportation

HE315--------Rural transportation

HE323--------Transportation geography

HE 617------Inland water transportation (ILLUSTRATION 1)

Illustration 1 above ,shows that the transportation in question is ordinary transportation, and was classed under HE (general transportation and communication.

(Illustration 2)

 HV –Social pathology, social and public welfare ,criminology.

HV 1568-------Transportation of people with disabilities.

HV   1568.6----Travelling for people with disabilities.

HV   3005.5----Transportation of people with mental disabilities.

HV3022---------Transportation of people with physical disabilities.

HV8788+-------Transportation of prisoners.

The common subject treated in the above two illustrations could be taken as transportation, but they all meant different types of transportation, in different contexts according to different disciplines .The second one was transportation for different categories of people eg people with mental disabilities, physical disabilities, and even prisoners. So because it Is a welfare ,that is social and public welfare problem and social pathology issue ,it was classed under the broadest heading which is social pathology ,social and public welfare and criminology, which is in the HV class. This is acceptable and explains or illustrates the fact that a particular topic is usually classed or grouped to its parent discipline. To support the above illustration, Clarke (1997) opines in the following words;

"The main subject divisions are by Departments of library of Congress, hence the scheme
 do not strictly follow the order of subjects."

Rowley and Farrow supported the above assertion of Clarke in the following words

> *classes are divided in a broadly hierarchical manner , but as the scheme was*
>
> *compiled piecemeal, at a time when classification theory barely existed ,one*

must not expect the consistent application of either hierarchies or a facet structure even with a single class. As the most enumerative of all schemes, LCCS can only be learnt by practice .It cannot be learnt by application of principles because there are none.

With all the illustrated peculiarities, one can forgive the scheme for some imperfections, but cannot fail to point out where some subjects which are related ,interwoven and interrelated have been flagrantly disjointed. The Implications is that there are some universal and standard topics /subjects, that once there is any attempt to scatter them in other disciplines ,the knowledge is misplaced and thereby lost. This brings in frustration on the part of the users, because once related knowledge is scattered, the principle and philosophy of classification is defeated .The principle and philosophy of classification is to keep related subjects/topics together, and separate them with those that are dissimilar or unrelated .This is the organization of knowledge and the aim is for easy retrieval of the knowledge.

An in-depth study of the Library of congress classification scheme (LCCSH) exhibits some degree of scatterings of related knowledge in all the twenty –one classes exhausted by the scheme. For time limitations, the study will take a critical look at just a few classes, which are classes H,Q,T and a little touch on G.

Discrepancies in knowledge analysis as it affects, classes H Q, T, and G.

The above mentioned classes tried to scatter knowledge that are interrelated and interwoven .The classes focused on here are H-social sciences, T-technology Q-sciences and G-geography

The first discrepancy in knowledge analysis in class H(Social Sciences is in HA – statistics (general).The scheme specifically instructs the classifier to class under HA general works on social science statistics and censuses(including statistical data and methodology. The same scheme again instructed the classifier to class works on general theory and methodology of statistics in class QA 276. H(social sciences and Q(sciences) class both have wide alphabetical and knowledge margins. The alphabetical gap and the knowledge content gap in this example above do not suggest any relationship. The documents treating the same subjects /topic would be shelved quite separately in different reading rooms as the case may be. This negates the principle of classification which implies bringing like subjects/topics of related intellectual content together.

The second noticeable discrepancy on knowledge analysis in class H is on the subject data processing. The analysis is below for better understanding

H--- Social sciences(main class)

HF—Commerce(business)--subclass

HF5548—Data processing ---subject subdivision/subject of focus

HD—Industries .Land use .Labour.

HD 28- 30—Management. Industrial management

HD 30.2 -----Data processing in communication systems,IT and

management(including computer simulation).

QA75+ Electronic data processing

QA276-----Data processing and other mathematical statistics in general

The above analysis illustrates how data processing as a subject has been scattered in different classes of QA –Computer science ,HD—management, HF—commerce(business) but the underlying subject or topic of focus ,which has the same intellectual content when analyzed is data processing ,.Even by being in different alphabetical classes, presuppose ,that they would be shelved in different shelves, different rooms, and in academic libraries that have separate departmental libraries, which service different departments,   that subject of focus data processing would be scattered in different libraries there by ,scattering knowledge of a particular discipline. This negates the principle of classification, that should keep related subject together.

Third major discrepancy is noticeable in the subject, software .This subject or topic is torn between classes H(social sciences) and Q(Sciences).The analysis is as shown below.

For H class

HF5548.375---- Software development

HF5548.38 A-Z--- Special types of software

HF5548.C26-----CBM Computer

HF5548.4.124----IBM Personal computer

HF5548.4D18----Database

HF5548.4D2-----DB Master. (All the above analyses are under software

development which is supposed to be under

QA75+ for computer science.

For Q Class

QA76.76.F34-----Software failure

QA76.76.S64-----Software maintenance

QA76.76.S66-----Software support

QA76.76.S95------Systems software

A dispassionate look at the two analyses above reveals that the subject matter in question is on software. Being scattered in different classes of H and Q has automatically scattered the subject/ topic of focus which is software. It would have been scattered in different shelves, different reading rooms or even in different departmental libraries in an academic library. As usual scattering related knowledge negates the principle of classification.

The fourth major discrepancy could be observed in the HC(Economic history and conditions and GC(Oceanography).The analysis is as follows

H--- Social sciences

HC-Economic history and conditions

HC92---Economic geography of the oceans(example1)

G---- Geography

GC1000+ ----oceanography(example2)

One can see here that the underlying subject is oceanography but it has been scattered in two different classes of G (geography) and H(social sciences).This has resulted in scattering of related knowledge, and a negation on the principle and philosophy of classification.

A fifth major discrepancy and inconsistency in the scheme is in the area of costs as a subject. The analyses is better understood below

HD47.3---Cost control (production under ;industrial management, land use

and labour)

HC79.C7---Cost(industrial)

HB3719-----Costs and business cycles

TS165------Manufacture (production management)

The subject cost has been treated in different classes in many subdivisions of the class H(social sciences),and in T(Technology. Under the social sciences ,the subject cost was balkanized between

HB—Economic theory and demography

HC---Economic history and conditions

HD---Industries ,land use and labour and

T---Technology

TS—Production management(manufacture)

All the subdivisions above are very broad and would scatter the subject/topic, costs in themselves. The T(Technology)class further widens the chance of putting the materials of related subject together .The underlying subject above is "costs" which could be under industrial management or business management or production and manufactures. They could all be subsumed under industrial management and put in the same class, instead of scattering them under different classes and different subclasses, as illustrated above. Scattering of related knowledge is not in agreement with classification or grouping of like things together, which the scheme is intended for.

The writer would have continued bringing to light all the areas of discrepancy in the LC scheme but for lack of time and space. The last discrepancy worthy of note is the unholy marriage between personnel management (HF5549) and social pathology (HV5800+).The analysis is illustrated below

HF5549---Personnel management

HF5549.7—Drug testing, drug employment(this is a social pathology

       Problem and should not be linked to personnel management).

HV5800+---Social pathology

HV5823-----Drug testing and screening

In the analysis above ,the scheme tried to unite in an unholy marriage personnel management and social pathology .Social pathology is related to sociology and some social and psychological aspects of the medical sciences, while personnel management is an aspect of general management. Even though they are all under social sciences,(HV and HF) are widely separated alphabetically on the scheme, therefore bringing topics under them together in an unholy marriage ,negates the principle of bringing like terms together, which the scheme is meant for.

Recommendations on the amendments of these discrepancies.

To the first discrepancy, the subject statistics which were classed between HA(statistics) and QA(mathematics) should be better placed in mathematical statistics which is QA276. Class H should be left completely for the social sciences. This will attempt to bring related subject together, which is the principle and philosophy of classification.

To the second discrepancy, the subject data processing, which has been scattered in different classes of QA75+(electronic data processing)QA276(data processing and other mathematical statistics in general)HF 5548(data processing) and HD30.2(data processing in communication systems, IT and computer simulations ,should be placed under QA276(which is data processing and other mathematical statistics in general) because it is a more embracive generic term.

To the third discrepancy, the subject software which is torn between HF(commerce/business) that is HF5548.375 etc and QA76+(computer science) should strictly be placed in QA76.76 which is computer programmes and other software. Every enquiry on software should be seen on computer science not on commerce/business, to avoid scattering related knowledge.

To the fourth discrepancy the subjectHC92 (Economic Geography of the Oceans) should strictly be left in GC100+(oceanography)To leave it in HC(economic history and conditions)means subsuming the subject oceanography under social sciences. This is improper scattering and misplacement of knowledge.

To the fifth major discrepancy on the subject costs, instead of scattering it in HB(economic theory),HC(economic history and conditions) HD (Industrial Management, land use and labour and TS (production management/manufactures),it should be classed in HD47.3(which is cost control under production and industrial management. This is because the subject only refers to cost during production.

The last discrepancy is an unholy marriage of subjects which should be treated separately. Drug testing and drug employment classed in HF5549.7(personnel management) should be classed in social pathology which is (HV5800).It should even be

more appropriately classed in HV5823(drug testing and screening, under social pathology. It should be divorced from personnel management which is a different subject altogether.

Conclusion.

Inconsistencies and discrepancies are features of the LC scheme. An in-depth study of the whole twenty-one classes of the scheme reveals this. One can only bring to light some of these inconsistencies and discrepancies, so that the individual classifiers for the different classes can work more in conjunction, and put together subjects that are supposed to be in the same place.

Granted that the scheme treats topics that are related to a particular discipline together with that discipline ,there are some subjects as the writer has observed, that were either not perfectly placed where they should be ,or were placed in an unholy union where they should not be. The only worry is that such practices negate the principle and philosophy of classification, which involves ,putting related topics together.

Having observed all these, the writer is not unmindful of the saying ,that there is no perfection anywhere under heaven.

References

Aina, L. O. (2004). *Library & Information science text for Africa.* Ibadan :

      Cataloguing policy and support office lib services (2007). 10th ed.   *Library*

      *of congress classification schemes(classes. H,Q,T,G).*washington DC:

      Washington D.C library of congress, cataloguing distribution service.

Clarke S.O (1997). *Fundamental of library science* Warri: Coewa, publishers.

Nwalo KIN (2000) *Reference sources & services.*   Ibadan: centre for external

      studies,University of Ibadan.

Ogbonyomi A L (1994). The treatment of African documents by library of

      Congress. *African journal of library, Archival & information science*,   4, no. 2.

      117-126

Rowley J and Farrow(2000). *Organizing knowledge :an introduction to managing access*

      to information .-3rd ed. England: Gower.

Abstracts

The paper did a brief historical survey of the library of congress classification scheme, and lauded its merits. It was observed that the library of congress classification scheme was embraced by many libraries all over the world. The paper x-rayed the inconsistencies and discrepancies that were observed in the scheme. The criticisms were focused more on by using four classes, which are H,Q,T,G for some critical analyses and illustrations. Some subjects /topics were analyzed in detail to illustrate the stances of the writer. The broad subjects that were analysed were Social Sciences which is emphasized by the scheme, Sciences, Technology and Geography. Suggestions were proffered that could help correct these anomalies.

INCONSISTENCIES OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CLASSIFICATION SCHEME IN TERMS OF TREATMENT OF SOME TOPICS IN CLASSES H(SOCIAL SCIENCES) Q (SCIENCES) T(TECHNOLOGY) AND G (GEOGRAPHY): A CRITICAL ANALYSIS.

BY

STELLA. A ONWUKANJO

LECTURER 1

E- mail address: stellaradiant@yahoo.com

GSM Number: 08023417566

DEPARTMENT OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY.

MINNA

NIGER STATE.